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It is concluded that Josephus used the Greek and Hebrew forms of Exodus and Numbers, and the Greek text of Ezekiel. He shows close acquaintance with Philo's *Life of Moses*. From Josephus' halakic and haggadic expansions on the Bible, many of which have parallels in the rabbinic literature, it is concluded that Josephus drew on a common fund of hagadah and halakha. He is a datable witness to these literary developments within Judaism.

**Degree Type**

Dissertation

**Degree Name**

Doctor of Philosophy (PhD)

**First Advisor**

Louis H. Feldman
Second Advisor
William Adler

Third Advisor
Tessa Rajak

Subject Categories
Biblical Studies | Cultural History | History of Religion | Intellectual History | Jewish Studies | Language Interpretation and Translation | Translation Studies

Comments

This dissertation is available at ScholarlyCommons: https://repository.upenn.edu/dropsietheses/37
The Account of the Ancient Israelite Tabernacle
and First Priesthood
in the Jewish Antiquities of Flavius Josephus

by

Stuart Dunbar Robertson

A Dissertation
submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

July 22, 1991

Annenberg Research Institute
420 Walnut Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19106
APPROVAL

This dissertation, entitled

The Account of the Ancient Israelite Tabernacle
and First Priesthood
in the Jewish Antiquities of Flavius Josephus

by
Stuart Dunbar Robertson
Candidate for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

has been read and approved by

[Signatures]

Date 3.9.91.
To:

My father, the Rev. Irvine Robertson

My mother,

My family,

Professor George Simpson.
THESIS ABSTRACT


This dissertation makes an analysis of Josephus' Tabernacle account, found in The Jewish Antiquities 3. 99-207, with the goal of: first, shedding further light on his Biblical text; second, determining what non-Biblical sources, both rabbinic and classical, he used; and third, evaluating his motive in retelling the Biblical narrative.

Chapter I begins with an examination of Josephus' objectives, which were seen to be: first, to explain to a curious, not necessarily anti-Semitic, gentile readership the nature of the ancient Israelite shrine; and second, to make clear to his own people, before whom he appeared to be a charlatan, that he shared their concern for the Jewish heritage, which was being redefined following the destruction of the Temple. The balance of the first chapter discusses previous scholarship on the Exodus Tabernacle account, taking note especially of D.R. Nelson's work that includes an examination of Josephus' Tabernacle account.

Chapter II compares his description of the Tabernacle court and superstructure with the Hebrew and Greek Biblical text of Exodus, with Ezekiel's vision of the Temple, with Philo, the Mishnah, the Babylonian Talmud, with various midrashim, as well as with Greek classical sources that describe cultic settings.

Chapter III compares Josephus' description of the Tabernacle furniture with the same range of sources. Special attention is given
to the temple of Apollo at Delphi, to which Josephus calls attention in describing the table in the Tabernacle. Josephus' interest in the cosmic symbolism of the Tabernacle is particularly noted in his description of the candelabrum.

Chapter IV examines Josephus' discussion of the priestly vestments. Here it is observed that Josephus deemphasizes Aaron, though not the High Priesthood, and gives more attention to the ordinary priests than the Biblical text does.

Chapter V examines the concluding details Josephus' brings into his Tabernacle narrative. This includes particular notice of the symbolism of the Tabernacle, Aaron's appointment as High Priest, coverings over the Tabernacle furniture, the half-shekel tax, a postscript on the architects, and the dedicatory sacrifices for the priests and Tabernacle.

It is concluded that Josephus used the Greek and Hebrew forms of Exodus and Numbers, and the Greek text of Ezekiel. He shows close acquaintance with Philo's *Life of Moses*. From Josephus' halakic and haggadic expansions on the Bible, many of which have parallels in the rabbinic literature, it is concluded that Josephus drew on a common fund of hagadah and halakha. He is a datable witness to these literary developments within Judaism.
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Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

Objectives and Method

The inquiry that follows has as its objects: 1) to describe the changes, both additions and modifications, made by Josephus in his retelling of the Biblical description of the ancient Israelite Tabernacle, and to consider why he made the changes which he made; 2) to discover what his Biblical sources were, and 3) to discern what non-biblical sources may have been before him in reshaping elements of the Biblical account.

Josephus' Objectives in the Tabernacle Account

Josephus wrote the Antiquities (hereafter Ant.) after he finished writing The Jewish War (hereafter War), that is after ca. 79-81 C.E.\(^1\) Thus at least nine years had elapsed since the destruction of the Temple by Titus. This calamitous event changed the character of Judaism.\(^2\) As Jacob Neusner has written, "When the

---

\(^1\) Shaye Cohen, *Josephus in Galilee and Rome: His Vita and Development as a Historian* (Leiden: Brill, 1979), pp. 84-90. Cohen cites the *communis opinio*, established by Alfred von Gutschmid in "Vorlesungen über Josephus' Bücher gegen Apion," *Kleine Schriften* IV. ed. F. Rühl. (Leipzig, 1893), 335-589, that the *Jewish War* was written between 75 and 79 C.E. But Cohen concludes his evaluation of the evidence by reporting that "in BJ 1-6 we have a relatively coherent uniform work finished as a whole before 81" (p. 90). See also Seth Schwartz, "The Composition and Publication of Josephus's Bellum Judaicum Book 7," *HTR* 79 (1986), 373-386.

\(^2\) Elias J. Bickerman has written of this: "It was the Roman Emperor Titus who in 70 C.E., by destroying the Temple of Jerusalem, put an end to the bloody sacrifices of the Jews and the Christians and thus eventually to paganism itself. He was certainly the greatest religious reformer in history." *The Jews in the Greek Age* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1988), p. 139. Cf. Shaye J.D. Cohen, "The Significance of Yavneh: Pharisees, Rabbis, and the End of Jewish Sectarianism," *HUCA* 55 (1984), 27-53, who lists the theological difficulties caused by "the cessation of the sacrificial cult—the loss of the sacred center of the cosmos, the destruction of the physical symbols of
Temple was destroyed, it is clear, the foundations of the country's religious-cultural life were destroyed. . . The structure not only of political life and of society, but also of the imaginative life of the country, depended upon the Temple and its worship and cult."

No longer could the prescribed sacrifices be offered in the holy Place. The change from the kind of worship that is described in the Hebrew Bible was now all but irreversible. The growing interest in halakah that led to the codified Mishnah, and then to the Talmudim of Palestine and Babylon, witnesses to the kind of development to which the Jewish people was moved by the loss of their Temple.

It is thus of particular interest to see how Josephus, scion of a priestly family,\(^4\) retold the Biblical account of the ancient Tabernacle.

---


4 *Life*, 1. Cf. *War* 1. 68. Josephus' description of John Hyrcanus: "He was the only man to unite in his person three of the highest privileges: the supreme command of the nation, the high priesthood, and the gift of prophecy. For so closely was he in touch with the Deity, that he was never ignorant of the future" reflects his self-conscious descent from the Hasmoneans mentioned in *Life* 2, coupled with his self-description, found in *War* 3. 351-54, where he intimates that he had the prophetic gift in the ability to interpret dreams. Cf. Gideon Fuks, "Josephus and the Hasmoneans, JJS 2 (1990), 166-176, where the author compares Josephus' statements concerning the Hasmoneans in the earlier work, *War*, with the later, *Ant*. He argues that it is the more favorable climate of the later period that prompted Josephus to write his true, favorable, point of view on the Hasmoneans in *Ant*. He accepts that Josephus was indeed of Hasmonean ancestry, against the challenge to the
Here, as Geza Vermes has noted, we find an example of early Jewish Biblical interpretation "in a society which adopted the Bible as its fundamental charter [but which was] required [in its] exegesis to respond to its . . . practical, apologetical and doctrinal need."\(^5\)

Josephus and Philo stand apart from their Jewish contemporaries in devoting particular attention to describing and explaining the Tabernacle. Philo wrote prior to the destruction of the Temple, and Josephus afterwards, but they were contemporaries. Josephus explicitly mentions Philo only once,\(^6\) but his literary debt to Philo in the Tabernacle account is apparent, as I shall show in this study.\(^7\)

Although comparison has been made between Josephus' description of the Temple and M. Middoth,\(^8\) this comparison has little to do with Josephus' Tabernacle narrative. Apart from Philo, there is no other Jewish writer, contemporary to Josephus, who endeavored

---


\(^6\) Ant. 18.259. Here Josephus lists Philo as head of the delegates sent from Alexandria to the emperor, Gaius. He calls him, "a man held in the highest honour, brother of Alexander the alabarch and no novice in philosophy" (ἀν καὶ φιλοσοφίας οὐκ ἀπείρος).


to unfold for gentile review the nature and significance of the ancient Tabernacle.\footnote{Although, according to the Aristeas legend, the Septuagint translation was made in order that the Jewish law could be included in the great library at Alexandria, Egypt, for the sake of non-Jewish savants, and this translation included the Tabernacle narrative, the Greek version is intentionally a \textit{translation} of the Hebrew Bible. One can examine it along side the Hebrew in order to secure an estimate of the Hebrew text that underlies it. It does not incorporate the legendary material that Philo and Josephus draw into their Tabernacle accounts.}

In Josephus' \textit{Antiquities}, the Tabernacle narrative was no doubt influenced by his intimate acquaintance with the Temple, but he did not often, it seems, deliberately call attention to parallels with the Temple and Temple worship of his personal acquaintance. He apparently intended his Tabernacle narrative, which came early in the \textit{Antiquities}, to call attention to the ancient shrine of his people, quite on its own intrinsic interest.

The Tabernacle, the directions and construction of which are described in the Book of Exodus, was the earliest precursor of the Temple built by King Solomon. Josephus never saw Solomon's Temple. The Temple of Josephus' day was begun by Jews who returned from exile under Sheshbazzar (Ezra 1: 8). It was brought to its subsequent magnificence by Herod the Great. Josephus devoted to the Tabernacle, the first sacred Place, the attention a proud, if maligned Jew could not avoid in telling of the ancient roots of his people.

To describe these roots well served at least two purposes. First, it promoted the aims of apologetic in showing his people had a venerable heritage. This effort was directed to his non-Jewish readership, both the "anti-Semitic" kind Josephus had particularly in
mind in writing Against Apion (hereafter Apion),\textsuperscript{10} and the kind that

\textsuperscript{10}This was not an uncommon objective in apologetic writers of late antiquity. Bickerman calls attention to what Pliny wrote of the Egyptian author, Apion. Pliny wrote that he sought "to free from blame the rites of his own people." "Apion offer[ed] a (rationalist) explanation of Egyptian worship of beetles ad exertsandos gentes suae ritus." E.J. Bickerman, "The Jewish Historian Demetrios," Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults: Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty, Part 3: Judaism before 70 (Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity, vol 12, part 3) (Leiden: Brill, 1975), 73. Bickerman comments on this general motive of ancient historians. "Speaking of Orientals in Greek, these intellectuals from the East, display the same apologetical accent and are univocal in the face of the Greek conqueror. Josephus and Philo of Byblus, Manetho and Berossus, reproach to the Greeks their ignorance of Oriental history and wisdom. Josephus explicitly opposes the common and true glory of the Orient to the pretentious self-praise of the Hellenes. Yet, he writes his book on the antiquity of the Jews against a pamphlet of the above mentioned Egyptian Apion." Josephus was specific in Apion 2. 152: "In fact, each nation endeavours to trace its own institutions back to the remotest date, in order to create the impression that, far from imitating others, it has been the one to set its neighbours an example of orderly life under law" (Thackeray's translation). Plato remarks on the Greek ignorance of Oriental history in the Timaeus 22b, as an Egyptian priest says to Solon: "you ever remain children; in Greece there is no old man." Herodotus, in the second book of his History, called "Euterpe," which is an account of Egypt, writes that though the Phrygians came into being before the Egyptians, a fact "proven" as two infants, on their own, without having heard any other words spoken, each first spoke the Phrygian word for bread, "bekos" (3), the Egyptians could rightly claim credit: for first dividing the year into twelve months, for first using the names of the twelve gods, for first erecting altars, images, and temples to the gods, and for first engraving the figures of animals on stones (4). In short, Herodotus was extolling the greater antiquity of the Egyptian culture. Origen mentions the attempt of Celsus to undermine the notion of the antiquity of the Christian faith by impugning the antiquity of the Jews (Against Celsus 1. 22). Sevenster records various strands of the argument for the greatest antiquity of the Egyptians, who were acclaimed to be the source of the Jewish practice of circumcision. J.J. Sevenster, The Roots of Pagan Antisemitism in the Ancient World (Leiden: Brill, 1975), pp. 134 ff. Cf. Louis H. Feldman, "Use, Authority and Exegesis of Mikra in the Writings of Josephus," in Jan Mulder and Harry Sysling, eds., Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity (Compendia Rerum Judaicarum ad Novum Testamentum, sect. 2, vol. 1) (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1988), 481 f, where the author discusses Josephus' apologetic goals. See also Louis H. Feldman, "Pro-Jewish Intimations in anti-Jewish Remarks cited in Josephus' Against Apion," JQR 78, 3-4 (Jan-Apr, 1988), 230-243, where the author discusses the problem of the readership of Apion. He argues that the increase of the Jewish population during the Hellenistic-Roman period was partly due to widespread literary propaganda. Josephus' Apion no doubt had a place in this propaganda.
was merely curious.¹¹ In the course of his description of the Tabernacle itself, Josephus makes an aside, obviously intended for readers such as Apion:

But one may well be astonished at the hatred which men have for us and which they have so persistently maintained, from an idea that we slight the divinity whom they themselves profess to venerate. For if one reflects on the construction of the tabernacle and looks at the vestments of the priest and the vessels which we use for the sacred ministry, he will discover that our lawgiver was a man of God and these blasphemous charges brought against us by the rest of men are idle (Ant. 3. 179-180).

Second, Josephus could remind his own people, before whom he appeared a renegade and a charlatan, that he shared their interest and their place in this heritage. If the Life was written as a personal postscript to the Antiquities, as is apparent from the closing remarks of the so-called second ending,¹² then Josephus intended to identify himself with the story that he had finished telling.

Josephus was aware, as David Goldenberg has shown,¹³ of

¹¹John G. Gager, in The Origins of Anti-Semitism (New York: Oxford University Press, 1983), pp 83 f writes of the broad and deep interest in the pagan world in the Jews, which was not characterized by hatred, but by deep curiosity. Cf. Louis H. Feldman, "Is the New Testament Anti-Semitic?" International Christian University Publication IV-B, HUMANITIES Christianity and Culture 21 (ISSN 0073-3938) (December, 1987), 1-14. Here Professor Feldman answers the charge that the New Testament is the source of Anti-Semitism that reached its climax in the twentieth century. He concludes that if the New Testament is read from cover to cover, discerning the intention of each part, it does not appear to be anti-Semitic. The New Testament exhibits a special kind of interest in the Jews. Christianity was a new "religion" coming into being with its roots in Judaism.

¹²Cf. the discussion in L.H. Feldman, Josephus and Modern Scholarship (1937-1980) (Berling: Walter de Gruyter, 1984), pp. 837-38. Feldman concludes that "the absence of any specific reference in Josephus to a second edition would place the burden of proof on those who argue that there was one."

¹³David Goldenberg, Halakhah in Josephus and in Tannaitic
currents of development in halakah well underway by 75 C.E. E.P. Sanders has observed that some of the controversies between the Pharisees and Sadduccees were due to halakic disagreements. Louis Ginzberg has noted that the eminent 18th-century Gaon, R. Elijah of Vilna, "wished to see the works of Josephus made accessible to Hebrew readers that they might be helped by them in their study of Talmud." 

**Literature:** A Comparative Study (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Dropsie University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1978), passim. On p. 1, Goldenberg introduces his study by writing of three categories of halakhah found in Josephus: paraphrases of biblical laws, small collection of laws in Apion 2, and laws and customs mentioned throughout the Antiquities. See also the same author's "The Halakha in Josephus and in Tannaitic Literature," JQR ns 67 (1976-77), 30-43, and "Josephus Flavius or Joseph ben Mattithiah," JQR ns 70 (1979-80), 178-182, in which the author emphasizes that though Josephus was Hellenized, he was essentially a Jew. In this article Goldenberg argues against W.C. van Unnik's emphasis on Josephus' Hellenism, to the neglect of his Jewishness in his Flavius Josephus als historischer Schriftsteller (Heidelberg, 1978). The bias is particularly conspicuous in Willem C. van Unnik's failure to mention S. Rappaport's Agada und Exegese bei Flavius Josephus (Frankfort a/M, 1930). See also David Rokeah, "The Temple Scroll, Philo, Josephus, and the Talmud," NTS ns 34 (1983), 515-526, in which the author shows, inter alia, Josephus' rather intimate acquaintance with the Essene community's use of oil and of their moderation in use of wine. He notes that while the Temple Scroll does not support Josephus, neither does it contradict him. He says this by way of correcting Yigael Yadin's intimation that there is a contradiction between Josephus and the Dead Sea Scrolls. Rather than there being a contradiction, Rokeah states that Josephus was writing about daily practice, whereas the Temple Scroll described a once yearly event, the religious ritual releasing the new wine and grapes for consumption. See Todd S. Beall, Josephus' Description of the Essenes Illustrated by the Dead Sea Scrolls (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1988), where the author argues that Josephus has given a trustworthy account of the Essenes. See also Israel Hildesheimer, "The Herodian Temple, according to the treatise Middoth and Flavius Josephus," Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly 18 (1886), 92-113, in which the author examines certain disparities between Josephus and the Mishnah, and suggests how, rather than merely noting the contradictions between the two, to Josephus' discredit, one may be used to supplement the information gleaned from the other.


The speech of Moses that immediately precedes the Tabernacle section reveals Josephus' sensitivity to the changing needs of his own people. He gives as the purpose of the Tabernacle a usefulness that would have been particularly reassuring after the destruction of the Temple. In the days of the Tabernacle and Temple worship, the sacrifices were the central element. After the destruction of the Temple, prayers were the dominant element in synagogue worship. Josephus puts into Moses' mouth these words that explain the purpose of the Tabernacle: "but that He himself, frequenting the

16Cf. Ant. 15.248 where Josephus writes: "For sacrifices could not be made without these [fortified] places, and it was impossible for any of the Jews to forego offering these, for they would rather give up their lives than the worship which they were accustomed to offer God." Cf. also War 2.409 f. Sanders wrote that "the notion that the Temple should serve some function other than sacrifice would seem to be extremely remote from the thinking of a first-century Jew." Jesus and Judaism, p. 84.

17Cf. G.F. Moore, Judaism (3 vols. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1955), II, 218. "That prayer takes the place of sacrifice was deduced from Hosea 14: 3, 'Say unto Him, Altogether forgive iniquity and accept what is good; so will he render (instead of) bullocks (the words) of our lips.' R. Abahu said: What shall replace the bullocks we formerly offered to thee? "Our lips," in the prayer we pray to Thee" (Pesikta Shubah, end). "So long as the temple stood we used to offer a sacrifice and thus atonement was made; but now we have nothing to bring but prayer" (Tanhumah Korah 12, near the end). When Philo writes of the purpose of the Tabernacle in Life of Moses 2. 73, it is "so that during their journeys and encampment they might bring their sacrifices to it," and in § 75, it is "in order that his performance of the rites belonging to his sacred office might be in more than full accordance and harmony with the fabric." Philo does not mention prayer as the reason for the Tabernacle. In the Psalter, Psalm 69, a psalm of David, whose date is uncertain, yet which surely preceded the Maccabean period (cf. Artur Weiser, The Psalms, trans. Herbert Hartwell (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1962), pp. 493 f) we read in vss. 30-31, "I will praise the Lord more than an ox or a bull with horns and hoofs." Here sacrifices are of less significance than praises of God. Prayer and sacrifices took place side by side in the Tabernacle. Josephus reads back into the story of the Tabernacle a point of view that would have prevailed after the destruction of the Temple. Philo, Life of Moses 2. 108, after mentioning the importance of the right attitude in the one who worships, says, "For the true oblation, what else can it be but the devotion of a soul which is dear to God?"
tabernacle, may be present at our prayers."⁠¹⁸ Exodus 25: 8 merely says: "They shall make for me a στένα (LXX ἁγίασμα) so that I may dwell ἐν ὑμῖν with them ὑπέρ (which LXX changes to "and I will appear among you," καὶ ὄφθησομαι ἐν ὑμῖν). The Divine presence at prayers was important in Biblical times, to be sure, but when there was no longer a special Place, a Temple, where God was present, it was particularly important to remind the reader that God was present when His people prayed. As I shall show in due course, Josephus took the opportunity in his Tabernacle narrative to emphasize the Divine presence.

In describing the building of the Tabernacle, Josephus tells of an element in his people's history that touched, one might say, on both the halakic and the hagadic aspects of Jewish tradition. It was halakic in that the Tabernacle account of Exodus begins with the record of Israel's obedience to the Divine commands. The commands were law. It was hagadic in that his account retells part of the Biblical history. Josephus reserved a discussion of the Divine commands for his projected work on "Laws and Customs,"⁠¹⁹ a plan he

---

⁠¹⁸Ant. 3. 100. It might be noted that after mentioning the benefit of the Divine presence at their prayers, he refers to the tables of the Law. The Law was central to the development of Judaism after the exile, but even more so in the Tannaitic period. Cf. Schürer, The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ, Revised edition, II, 314-380.

⁠¹⁹Ant. 1. 25; 4. 198. Josephus uses the terms ἔθνων καὶ αἰτιῶν. Although Josephus projected writing on this subject in a subsequent work, Ant. 3 and 4 includes the discussion of many laws. Hans Petersen, in "Real and Alleged Literary Projects of Josephus," American Journal of Philology (1958), 259-274, argues that Josephus' Against Apion is the intended work "On Customs and Causes." That it was written in two rather than four books, Petersen explains, "It is not to be expected that the prophet prove always right, and it is only in the course of human events that Josephus, who predicted correctly Vespasian's accession to the imperial throne, predicted incorrectly the number of books which his own work would contain" (p. 265). Petersen's interpretation has
may have intended to follow at least with regard to the first part of
the Biblical Tabernacle narrative that gives the directions for the
building of the Tabernacle.

From his place of exile in Rome, Josephus seemed to intend to
offer himself to the non-Jewish reader as an apologist, and to the
Jewish reader as a priestly counselor who saw the larger picture,
when the short-range view of his people's circumstances was bleak.
He proposed that prayer was the essential purpose of the holy Place
all along, even in the days of the Tabernacle.

Problems in the Biblical Text from which Josephus drew his Account
of the Tabernacle.

Josephus' account of the Tabernacle has not received much
notice from scholars of either Judaism or the Bible. Until David
Russell Nelson's 1986 doctoral thesis, Biblical scholars have actually
paid scant attention to Josephus as a witness to the Exodus
tabernacle material, even though Josephus is the earliest single,
complete, Jewish witness, apart from LXX, to the Biblical text of his

been refuted by Louis H. Feldman. Feldman states that Against Apion was, in
fact, written in two rather than four books by design, and that the discussion
of the nature of God and of the Jewish code of laws is brief, and not the central
theme of the work. Josephus (Loeb edition) 10. 143, note d. David Altshuler, in
"The Treatise ΠΕΠΙ ΕΘΩΝ ΚΑΙ ΑΙΠΙΩΝ "On Customs and Causes" by Flavius
Josephus," JQR ns 69 (1978-79), argues, in line with Thackeray's suggestion
that Josephus produced more than one edition of the Antiquities (Josephus 4.
415), that he "revised AJ Book 3 and included what he did not say there in CA
Book 2" (p. 228). Altshuler calls attention to the work of Samuel Krauss (JE,
"Josephus Flavius") who proposed "that CA supplemented AJ much as the Vita
filled out the Bellum Judaicum" (p. 227). Dionysius of Halicarnassus, it might
be noted, in the Roman Antiquities, I, 5. 2, expresses a like intention, which he
accomplishes in the body of his work. Dionysius' terminology περὶ δὲ τῶν
πράξεων . . . καὶ περὶ τῶν ἐπιπηδεμάτων, though different from Josephus' seems
to express a like differentiation between cultural and factual information.

20David Russell Nelson, Studies in the Development of the Text of the
day. The otherwise careful studies of Julius Popper, A.H. Finn, and D.W. Gooding do not even mention Josephus. Were it not for brief notice of Josephus in various encyclopedia articles on the Tabernacle, he might have been altogether ignored.

Yet, Josephus' Biblical text for the first eleven books of the Antiquities has not been disregarded by any means. Adam Mez, in 1895, proposed that Josephus' Biblical text for the historical books was a Greek version different from the Septuagint, close to the manuscripts described in the Cambridge Septuagint as boc2e2. H. St. John Thackeray shared Mez's view regarding Josephus' Biblical text for the historical books.

Josephus has come to be consulted carefully as a witness to the text of the historical books. The discovery of Biblical scrolls in the Judean desert in 1947, spurred greater interest in Josephus as a contemporary witness to the history of the Biblical text. Dominique Barthélemy's Les Dévanciers d'Aquila helped to catapult Josephus to

---

22 A.H. Finn, "The Tabernacle Chapters," JTS 16 (1915), 449-482.
25 Adam Mez, Die Bibel des Josepbus untersucht für Buch V-VIII der Archäologie (Basel, 1895). The Cambridge Septuagint has thus described the miniscules Holms and Parsons designated as 19, 108(b), 82(o), 127(c2), and 93(e2).
the front as a witness to the historical books. Eugene Ulrich's *The Qumran Text of Samuel and Josephus* argues that "Josephus used a Greek Bible of the proto-Lucianic tradition for his Samuel narrative."  

Serious consideration of Josephus' Pentateuch sections, however, has barely begun. Thackeray expressed the view that in the Pentateuch sections, Josephus used a Semitic text with slight use of the Septuagint. But he did not develop this thesis.

Tessa Rajak's doctoral dissertation, *Jewish History and the Greek World*, begins an exploration of Josephus' retelling of Exodus. She notes some parallels in vocabulary between the *Antiquities* and "The Septuagint." But she observes that "the more recherché words used by Josephus to describe the Tabernacle, its accoutrements, and its purifications... show no specially close relationship to the Greek versions as we have them." Rajak recognizes Josephus' own contribution to the vocabulary that describes priestly garments in

---


29 Thackeray, *Josephus, the Man and the Historian*, p. 81.


particular. Here, she proposes, he was moved by nostalgia, looking back to his own involvement in the Temple cult. Josephus, Rajak writes, mixed

Aramaic terms with the Hebrew ones of the Bible and their Greek equivalents. "Priests," are called χαναναία (χωναή); as for their special gown, ἡμεῖς δὲ παρὰ βαβυλωνίων μεμαθηκότες ἐμίαν αὐτήν καλούμεν. Clearly these Aramaic terms are the ones which he knew and had used. It is not surprising that he describes the garments in his own way; he would have grown up seeing close associates of his family wearing them. And the Temple equipment was of course also familiar even if there was no Tabernacle in existence. Nevertheless, Josephus may have sought help in gathering suitable Greek vocabulary, perhaps... from a list of equivalents. Some process of this kind would seem to account for the echoes of Ex 30,22 in AJ III, 197. Particularly significant there is Josephus' use of the word κάλαμος for a kind of perfume, which is apparently obscure enough for him actually to have to explain it to his readers. This suggests that he was not taking phrases over from some Greek versions blindly and unthinkingly. The account of the High Priests' vestments also shows awareness of Greek traditions of translation, when the ephod is said by Josephus to look like the Greek ἐπωμίς (AJ III, 162), which is the word used to translate it in the LXX. Since ἐπωμίς is part of a woman's garment, it is far from an obvious choice for comparison. Again, the description of the High Priest's breastplate ἐσμήν (γυμν) as λόγιον (III, 164), an oracle, is paralleled by the λόγιον of the Septuagint and Philo's λογείον (Vit. Mos. II, 113) [see Thackeray's note, AJ III, 164, Josephus IV, 394]). Here too the possibility of a Hebrew-Greek glossary of such technical terms arises.33

Rajak refers to the unprovable hypothesis of such a lexical aid as "an attractive hypothesis, for he most often agrees with the Septuagint in precisely those points on which he could have

33Ibid., pp. 239-240.
Professor Rajak calls attention to Josephus' uniqueness as a historian of antiquity, basing his work directly on a written source, the Jewish Scriptures. "The work of Greek historians of the remote past consisted in collecting memories, which would exist in a variety of forms and versions and might be of recondite character, and in combining, sifting and criticizing them." By contrast, Josephus wrote of his objective: "the narrative will proceed through the Scriptures, rendering them accurately in their original ordering. For I have already undertaken to do so throughout this whole work, without adding or removing anything." Rajak sees Herodotus possibly as Josephus' model in this enterprise. Herodotus drew on the "native tradition and reports on many interviews in Babylon and Egypt, especially with priests, some of whom read to him from written records." Subsequent to

34 Ibid., pp. 241-42.
36 Ibid., pp. 471-72. Cf. Ant. 1. 5; 10. 218. Cf. also the discussion of the range of opinions on the meaning of this pledge of fidelity to the text found in Louis H. Feldman, "Flavius Josephus Revisited: the Man, His Writings, and His Significance," Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt II (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1984), 788-790. See also Louis H. Feldman, "Use, Authority and Exegesis of Mikra in the Writings of Josephus," Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity (Compendia Rerum Judaicarum ad Novum Testamentum, sect. 2, vol. 1) (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1988), 466-70. Here the author first discusses previous attempts to explain this promise: 1. Josephus was depending on the ignorance of his readers, and 2. Josephus was giving a generally meaningless, stock, formula affirming his accuracy. Then he proposes: 1. that Josephus viewed his task as carrying on the tradition of the Septuagint, which not only translated, but interpreted the Hebrew Bible as well; 2. that Josephus' promise extended only to the commandments of the Tora; or/and 3. that Josephus had in mind not only Scripture, but aggadic material that had not yet been reduced to writing.

Herodotus, of course, are the Greek writers Josephus mentions in *Apion*: Manetho, Hecataeus of Abdera, Ptolemy of Mendes, Menander of Ephesus, Dion, and Berossus. The sacred writings before Josephus, Rajak observes, were complete, whereas the sacred texts of the others were fragmentary. And only the Jews were so devoted to their sacred writings that they would die for them.

All in all, Rajak's insight emphasizes Josephus' design of being faithful to his source. Furthermore, it was a source with which he had long, personal acquaintance. It was a source available to him in Hebrew, Greek, and Aramaic. Already midrashic tradition was developing. That this interpretive process was under way Josephus would have known from his participation in synagogue worship, as well as from mingling with fellow Pharisees.

Naomi Cohen writes of Josephus' own refashioning of the Biblical narrative. She proposed that in *Ant* 1-4 "the material has been entirely recast with the object of bringing the Biblical narrative into conformity with the style and psychology of the Greek novel."
By this, Cohen refers not only to the stories that easily lent themselves to such embellishment, e.g., Joseph and Potiphar's wife, but even, it would seem, to the description of the Tabernacle worship. She refers specifically to Ant. 3.150, comparing it with Exodus 27: 2-3. Her point is not as clear as it might be because her parallel quotations are in English with little detail being provided from the Greek of Josephus, or from the Hebrew or Greek Biblical texts.

She writes her evaluation of a few aspects of Josephus' Tabernacle account:

The lists of vessels differ markedly, with only the cups, common to Josephus and the Septuagint (though even these are not found in the Massoretic text). In the AJ the vessels are of gold (apparently thought to be a more appropriate metal), instead of the Biblical brass, and the 'altar horns' are ignored altogether. Whereas in the Bible the main sacrifices are made upon the βωμός--altar for flesh offerings, this was minimized in Josephus--as a study of this section shows. The βωμός κάλκεος--bronze altar--is, it is true, mentioned and summarily described in section 149, (immediately following the θυσιαστήριον--incense altar--in the preceding section), but the vessels that are 'set over against the altar' in the very next section (the one here quoted), are of the type appropriate for the BURNING OF INCENSE and the MAKING OF LIBATIONS (sic) rather than the 'shovels, basins and flesh-hooks' of brass found in the Bible, which are essential appurtenances of animal sacrifice. A comparison of the idealized description in Josephus with the ideas on the subject current among the Hellenistic novels must go back to an earlier period." It might be noted that though Cohen writes of the influence of the "style and psychology of the Greek novel," she does not propose that Josephus was writing what we might call today a novel based on Biblical stories and characters.

Cohen concludes: "The entire section describing the Tabernacle and its appurtenances is arranged topically rather than according to Biblical order. The incense altar described in sec. 148 is based on Ex 30: 1 ff, and immediately following our section is material culled from Ex 28."44

It remains to be demonstrated that Josephus' deviation from the strict Biblical order can be attributed to models borrowed from the "Hellenistic intelligentsia of Josephus' day." There is little in the Tabernacle account that lends itself to novelistic embellishment.

Thomas W. Franxman has compared Josephus' Antiquities with the Hebrew Genesis.45 Franxman is concerned with a kind of comparison that reveals where Josephus has expanded on Genesis (ten segments), where he has compressed the Biblical story (twelve segments), and where there is a balance between Josephus and "the original." He does not investigate other translations of the Bible, or paraphrases, that may have been available to Josephus.46

Harold Attridge has summarized the proposals that have been offered on Josephus' Biblical text in his doctoral thesis, The Interpretation of Biblical History in the "Antiquitates Judaicae" of Flavius Josephus.47 These proposals may be summarized thus: 1. A

---

44Ibid., pp. 322-23.
46Ibid., pp. 285-89.
47Harold Attridge, The Interpretation of Biblical History in the
few earlier scholars maintained that Josephus used only the Hebrew text. 2. Some claimed that he used the LXX exclusively. 3. Some maintained that he used another version entirely, which would account for at least some of the non-scriptural material. 4. Most have maintained that Josephus used a combination of the Hebrew text, the LXX, and perhaps an Aramaic targum as well, with a different primary source in different sections of the work. 48 I concur with this last opinion.

Attridge's remarks on the Tabernacle section of the Antiquities are restricted to his "Excursus: 'Nature' in the Moralizing of the Antiquities." Here Attridge writes: "In the simple description of the structure of the tabernacle, it was already noted that its partition was 'an imitation of universal nature' (3.123)." He observes that the symbolism of the Tabernacle and the vestments of the priests corresponds to nature, e.g. the "tapestries woven of four materials denote the nature of the elements." 49

Biblical Scholarship on the Tabernacle Account of Exodus

Since this study is concerned with the Biblical text Josephus used in retelling the Tabernacle account, I shall now turn to a survey of the Biblical scholarship that has been devoted to the Exodus Tabernacle chapters. In particular I shall mention the study by David Russell Nelson that has taken close regard to Josephus' Antiquities.

The account of the Tabernacle in the Book of Exodus has


48 Ibid., pp. 29-32.
49 Ibid., p. 141.
unusual textual difficulties. Origen wrote of this problem in his well-known letter to Julius Africanus: "What need is there to speak of Exodus, where there is such diversity in what is said about the tabernacle and its court, and the ark, and the garments of the high priest and the priests, that sometimes the meaning even does not seem to be akin?"50

Origen referred to the differences between chapters 25-31 (=MT I, Gk I), where Moses tells of God's instructions regarding the Tabernacle, and chapters 35-40 (=MT II, Gk II), where the actual construction is described. MT II is not a mere reflection of MT I. Whereas Gk I is a fairly close translation of MT I, not only is Gk II not reflective of Gk I, it is unlike MT II. The dissimilarity found in Gk 36: 8-38: 20 is particularly striking.

Prior to Nelson's work, two kinds of solutions were offered to this textual problem. The first kind of solution focused on a changing Biblical text. The second, having particularly to do with the Greek text, focused on the translators' idiosyncrasies.

Julius Popper

Julius Popper's Der biblische Bericht über die Stiftshütte explained the difference between MT I and MT II by proposing that MT II was added to the developing text to show that the commands given in MT I were carried out.51 The stages of development


51Popper, Der biblische Bericht über die Stiftshütte, pp. 99 f, 123-24.
included a revision of the original form by the "men of the Great Synagogue" that was the Vorlage of the original Septuagint. The Vorlage of the original Septuagint consisted of the material now found in Gk I and all of Gk II with the exception of 36: 8-38: 20. This section Popper reckoned to be a later addition because of its freer literary style and because of the absence of the phrase "as God commanded Moses," (כְּֽכָּנָּרִיָּהוּוָּֽאְרָּדְדוּלָּא) found in 39: 1-40, as well as in MT I.52

Popper proposed that the development of the Tabernacle account began with MT I, part of the original Pentateuch. This was revised by the "men of the Great Synagogue" into a form that was then used as the Vorlage of the original Septuagint, translated in Egypt under Ptolemy Philadelphus. This included Gk I and the Gk II translation of MT II 35: 1-36; 8: 39-40. After this the Hebrew Bible was edited to harmonize MT I with MT II. The process of growth of the text then included stages represented by the Greek translation of MT 36: 8-38: 20, MT II, and the Samaritan Pentateuch.53 The Samaritan Pentateuch, however, he took to be a far inferior work to the text-tradition that led to the MT. He wrote: "Indeed, we must also recognize the faithfulness and piety of the Palestinian Scripture transmission, which was unable to erase or distort (like the parallel


52Ibid., pp. 144-151. Nelson, Studies in the Development of the Text of the Tabernacle Account, pp. 4-5. Popper notes (p. 204) that all usages of this phrase do not necessarily mean that they are from the same time period.

53Nelson, pp. 6-7. Popper, pp. 179-181. In this discussion I have drawn extensively on the summary found in Nelson.
Samaritan one) the original form of the text on the basis of more recent insights, but offered and dutifully preserved both the old and the new, faithful and unembarrassed, like a natural structure."\(^{54}\) The "levelling tendency" of the Samaritan Pentateuch was, Popper stated, far inferior to the natural growth of the MT.\(^{55}\)

Popper's views were widely influential. With the modifications offered by Abraham Kuenen,\(^{56}\) Popper's understanding of the development of the Tabernacle account influenced the work of several scholars in the later years of the nineteenth century and the early years of the twentieth century.\(^{57}\)

A.H. Finn

A.H. Finn, while not mentioning Popper by name, challenged some of the views Popper advanced. In his article, "The Tabernacle

\(^{54}\)Popper, p. 99. "Ja wir müssen auch hierin die Treue und Pietät der palästinensischen Schriftüberlieferung anerkennen, die es nicht vermochte, wie die mit ihr gleichlaufende der Samaritaner, die ursprüngliche Textgestalt durch den jüngeren Anstrich zu verwischen und zu entstellen, sondern uns beides, Altes und Neues, getreu und unbefangen, wie die Gebilde der Natur, darbietet und gewissenhaft erhalten hat." In this very literal translation I had the aid of Dr. Prof. Norbert Muller.


Chapters," he examined and refuted the three contentions that 1. The translators of Gk II were not the same as for Gk I; 2. The Vorlage of Gk II was not the same as MT II; and 3. That chapters 30, 31, 35-40 were later additions to the original text of Exodus. 58

The case for 1, taken from the studies of Swete, Driver and McNeile, he stated, "is based solely on the fact that in some cases the translation of certain Hebrew technical terms in Group II differs from that in Group I." By "Group I and Group II" Finn means Gk I and Gk II. Refuting this, Finn observed first, that in both Gk I and Gk II the translators varied their renderings in the same context; second, that not all the evidence had been taken into account; third, that "there is evidence that the translators of Group II were acquainted with the translation of Group I;" and fourth, that "there are indications that the translators were the same throughout." 59

Arguing against 2, he asked how it could be asserted that the translators were different for Gk I and II on the basis of different vocabulary, if it were assumed that the Vorlagen of the two sections were not the same. 60

Finn defended the priority of the full MT to the LXX by making a catalogue of the variations between the Hebrew and Greek in both sections of the Tabernacle account. 61 He concluded that "The evidence taken as a whole rather points to the conclusion that the variation in both Groups is due to the translators; and that in cc.

59 Ibid., pp. 450-57.
60 Ibid., p. 457.
61 Ibid., pp. 457-470.
xxxvi-xxxix the Hebrew has preserved the true order, from which the Greek has been derived by a process of rearrangement."

Finn, it might be noted, exhibited a reserve in discussing the Biblical text that disappears in scholars of later generations. He began his argument against the view that the second part of the Tabernacle account was a later addition thus: "The two inferences already considered. . . are only of any real importance in so far as they would serve to confirm a third and graver inference, viz. that the Massoretic text contains a large amount of matter which does not belong to the original book but was added subsequently."63

He attributed differences between the MT I and MT II to the literary intent of the writer of each section. And the differences between Gk II and MT II were the result of faulty translation.64

D.W. Gooding

Gooding's The Account of the Tabernacle focuses on the Greek Exodus. He came to conclusions regarding the Vorlage and the translation of Gk I and Gk II similar to those of A.H. Finn, although he did not discover Finn's article until his own study was nearly complete.65 He investigates Gk II particularly closely because here are found the greatest divergences from both Gk I and MT II. He notes the disregard for consistency by the Greek translators in rendering technical terms. After examining the Greek Pentateuch as a whole, Gooding found that "The Septuagint surprisingly makes no

62 Ibid., p. 470.
63 Ibid., p. 470.
64 Ibid., pp. 481-82.
attempt at a consistent translation of technical terms; in fact its renderings are often so varied that the variation cannot be due to carelessness, but must be the result of deliberate style.“

Since the Hebrew Exodus is consistent in the terms it uses to describe the Tabernacle,
the lack of consistency in the Septuagint is confusing. Sometimes, Gooding finds, the Septuagint is not even accurate. For example the same Greek word, θυσία translates πυρὶ in Exodus 29: 41, and πυρ in 29: 42. In another group of verses εἰσφορα translates both ἡμερὴ in 30: 13, 15, and συμφράζω in 30: 16. At other times, the translator is "quite wrong," as in 25: 4, where νυμ θυρίς (scarlet: literally, worm-scarlet) is translated κόκκινον διπλοῦν.

We will have occasion to interact with Gooding in the body of this study. He attributes the differences between the Greek Exodus and Hebrew Exodus not to different Vorlagen, nor to different translators, but to simple carelessness. Of Gk II, where the differences are extreme, he writes: "The Greek of the second section, in spite of its abbreviations, paraphrases and major differences of

---

66 Ibid., p. 8. In a note, Gooding calls attention to Swete's view that the variation in translation of technical terms DID result from carelessness.
68 Ibid., p. 19. Gooding observes that in this the translator is like the translator of Leviticus.
69 Ibid., p. 20 Here it seems that the translator is not so much wrong as he is simply woodenly literal. The Greek here means "double scarlet," with διπλοῦν translating νυμ. Cf. John W. Wevers, Notes on the Greek Exodus, Septuagint and Cognate Studies 30 (Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1990), pp. 392-93, where he writes: "νυμ θυρίς refers to the worm producing a scarlet color, the coccus ilicis, and so by extension to stuff dyed scarlet, scarlet cloth. Exod here interprets as κόκκινον διπλοῦν "doubly scarlet," taking the free noun as related to νυμ "second," though at the same time aware that it also means "scarlet." In a note, Wevers writes: "Aq rather bizarrely renders the bound word by σκύλος "worm" which is what the isolate word may mean but in the context it is rather meaningless. The Three all take νυμ as related to the root νυμ, Aq rendering it by διάφορον and the other two by διαφές."
order, was following in its detailed order a Hebrew text materially the same as the M.T., and, that being so, the most reasonable way to explain the proportions of the translation of the second section was to assume that it was in the main by the same translator as the first section. 70 However, an editor other than the translator, who did his work prior to Origen, "very near the fountain from which the stream of the Greek text has flowed," rearranged the Greek text. 71

Concerning this editor, Gooding writes:

The truth about the whole matter is that while order of a kind can be perceived behind the rearrangement of the Greek text, the order is very general and the rearrangement is only roughly done. And what is true of the main order is true of the detailed work. Chapter xxxviii. 18-20 is very unsatisfactory and incomplete, judged only as a list of metal work, which it clearly intends to be (pp. 47-51), let alone its howlers. Then no attempt has been made to reconcile its detailed information with the surrounding chapters, or to avoid needless repetition (pp. 40-41). Again the rearrangement of the list in xxxix. 14 f to group together the fabrics is imperfectly done and, seen in the light of the Hebrew which the list originally translated, it borders on the absurd. And both this list and the one in xxxviii. 18-20 show that the editor either did not know Hebrew well, or else did not trouble to consult the Hebrew underlying the original before rearranging the Greek. We therefore may not expect the present Greek order to reveal some consistent, highly detailed and accurately worked out plan; such a feat was beyond the intention, if not the ability, of the editor. 72

70 Ibid., p. 100.
71 Ibid., p. 100.
72 Ibid., p. 101. In a letter to me from Gooding, dated 11th February, 1988, the author states that "If I were studying this topic afresh... I would pay more attention than I did at that stage to the references to the text of the Tabernacle chapters in the Torah, that one finds in the Talmud and in the Midrashim... whatever the difficulties of dating, it is certain that we can find
D.R. Nelson

Nelson, after surveying the conclusions of Popper, and his followers, and the quite opposite conclusions of Finn and Gooding, offers a new approach to solving the question of the text of the Tabernacle chapters. He states that "it remains to be demonstrated whether more than one translator is at work,"\(^{73}\) thus challenging the conclusions of Gooding. He reopens the question about the Vorlage of Gk II. And with regard to the differences in order between MT/Gk I, MT II, and Gk II, he writes "it remains to be demonstrated whether the difference in order is the result of a growth in the text or the result of the literary style of the Priestly writer."\(^{74}\) He brings to this study the new evidence provided from the caves of Qumran and other Palestinian locations.

In the first chapter, Nelson compares 141 Hebrew words from the Tabernacle chapters with their Greek translations in Exodus, I Kings 6-8, II Chronicles 3-6, Josephus' Antiquities, and the Kaige Recension. He concluded from this comparison,

that the Old Greek lies behind both Greek I and Greek II. In the central part of the account which describes the building of the tabernacle, Greek II maintains its Old Greek readings throughout. The parallel verses in Greek I, however, show much evidence of having been revised by a Palestinian hand. . . this same Palestinian hand revised chapters 35: 1-36: 8a, 39, and 40 of the Greek II.

The Palestinian Greek which underlies the revision of

much help in understanding some of the peculiarities of the Septuagint text of the Tabernacle in the Talmud and Midrashim, but which doubtless existed long before the Talmud was officially written down."\(^{73}\)

\(^{73}\) Nelson, Studies in the Development of the Text of the Tabernacle Account, p. 12.

\(^{74}\) Ibid., p. 12.
the Old Greek has its nearest parallels in 2 Chronicles and in Josephus. When compared with the Kaige recension, the readings agreed only when 2 Chronicles and Josephus agreed. Therefore, while sharing a common Palestinian background, the Palestinian Greek of the Tabernacle Account does not belong to nor has it been influenced by the Kaige recension.

This led to the conclusion that there were two hands at work in the Tabernacle account. The earliest level was the Old Greek, maintained in the core of Greek II. A later Palestinian revision occurred, which is preserved in Greek I and parts of Greek II.75

The second chapter of Nelson's thesis looks at the reasons for the view that there were two Greek translators in the Tabernacle chapters. Here he traces evidence for the view that the text was in a process of development. He sides with Popper, against Gooding, in attributing different Greek vocabulary to a changing Vorlage, rather than to carelessness in translation.76

Nelson describes Josephus' Biblical text;

In his Jewish Antiquities 3. 102-207, Josephus followed a Palestinian Greek text which was related to the Greek of Gk I and non-core Gk II. In spite of his many personal glosses on the text, he appears to be following a text close to the present MT. The inclusion of references to the holy of holies (3.125) as in 26: 33 (26: 33) [which does not have a parallel in Gk II], the tablets of the Law (3.138) as in 25: 16, 21 (25: 15, 20) [which has no parallel in Gk II], and the loaves of bread on the table (3.142) as in 25: 30 (25: 29) [which has no parallel in Gk II] make it clear that Josephus has the revised text of the Tabernacle Account before him. This would agree with the findings of the Qumran fragments that in the Herodian period the standard text was that of a MT type. With that in mind, Josephus'

75Ibid., pp. 129-130.
76Ibid., p. 168.
omission of specific details, such as omitting the horns of the altar of burnt sacrifice (3.149-150) in 27: 2 (27: 2) [which has a parallel in MT 38: 2, but none in Gk II] cannot be taken as absolute proof that they were absent from Josephus' text.77

Nelson concludes the second chapter by asserting that the Vorlage of the Old Greek had been revised, and the process of revision moved in the direction of the "emerging MT."78 The reason for the revisions found in the Greek Tabernacle chapters is that the Vorlage was being revised.

The third, and final chapter of Nelson's thesis cites further evidence to support the conclusion of chapter two. Here, again, he draws conclusions on Josephus' Tabernacle account:

In discussing the contents of Josephus' account in his Jewish Antiquities 3. 102-207 regarding the building of the tabernacle, it was pointed out that he used a text which followed the present MT. After reviewing the general order which Josephus followed, it becomes clear that he mixed his order between MT I and MT II. Following is a brief outline of the order of his account.

a. Materials used and offering taken (102-103)
b. Workers (104-107)
c. Court (108-114)
d. Tabernacle (115-130)
e. Tent (131-133)
f. Ark (134-138)
g. Table (139-143)
h. Lampstand (144-146)
i. Altar of incense (147-148)
j. Altar of Burnt Sacrifice (149-150)
k. Garments (151-178)
l. Symbolism of Objects made (179-187)

77 Ibid., pp. 282-83.
78 Ibid., pp. 287-88.
m. Appointment of Aaron as high priest (188-192)
n. Coverings for the tabernacle and objects (193)
o. Tax (194-196)
p. Anointing oil and incense (197-199)
q. Craftsmen (200-201)
r. Cloud enters the tabernacle (202-203)
s. Dedication (204-207)

A comparison of this list with that of the chart at the beginning of this chapter demonstrates how Josephus follows one order and then another. Except for describing the court first Josephus follows the order of MT II in items a-k; apparently he describes the court first merely to emphasize the tabernacle. Next, he adds his own comments (items l and m). In mentioning the coverings to protect the objects while they are being transported, he appears to follow Numbers 4 (item n). He continues with material from MT I in items o-q. For his closing he combines material from MT II (item r) and MT I (item s). Therefore, while Josephus follows the order of MT II for his general order, he alters and mixes his order with material from MT I, Numbers 4, and his own explanations in order to emphasize certain aspects of the account.79

Nelson concludes that the three essential reasons for the changes in the order of the Tabernacle account are: "1. A change in order may have resulted from a change in text. 2. The order may also have been rearranged for literary reasons. 3. Finally, changes in order may be generated by copyists."80 The change in the development of the Tabernacle account, Nelson holds, was from MT II to MT I to Gk I.81

The view that the emerging MT governed the changes occurring in the development of the Greek Exodus is supported by Kevin G.

79Ibid., pp. 356-57.
80Ibid., pp. 357-58.
81Ibid., p. 359.
O'Connell's *The Theodotionic Revision of the Book of Exodus.* While citing evidence, here and there, from the Tabernacle chapters, he makes a particular study of MT 28: 22-30, the Greek parallel of which is 28: 22-26, where "Theodotion took over an earlier revision of the OG and adapted it further toward the present MT." Proposed Contributions of this Dissertation

The study that follows has particularly to do with Josephus' text, rather than with either the MT or with one or other form of the Greek Bible. Rather than Josephus being consulted as a witness to the Biblical text, the Biblical text will now be consulted as a witness to Josephus. There are clear indications that Josephus had before him both the Hebrew and the Greek. Josephus provided transliterations of various Hebrew words throughout the Tabernacle account, which indicates he was using a Hebrew text of Exodus. When it is discovered that the terminology he uses to describe the parts of the candelabrum (3.144-146) is the same as that found in LXX, it is evident that he is intimately acquainted with the Greek text of Exodus. That there should be such clear examples of his using both the Hebrew and the Greek forms of the Biblical text, when he generally avoids reproducing his sources verbatim, indicates that he must have sifted the information from his sources with some care. That there is this evidence of using both the Hebrew and Greek forms of the text qualifies the observation of Nelson that Josephus


used MT I and II in the way that Nelson proposes.84 Josephus' mixing-in of various legends and explanations of cosmic significance in the Tabernacle that can be traced to Philo or found in later Jewish sources indicates how Josephus was a participant in a larger hagadic enterprise. Josephus may have served as the unacknowledged source of some legends, or he may be a link in the transmission of these legends.

Thus the materials I will investigate will go beyond those used in previous studies by Nelson and Gooding to include rabbinic materials,85 even though these materials are later than the

---

84 Cf. note 76 above.
85 The Rabbinic documents that I have consulted are: 1. Targum Neofiti I, Tomo II, Exodo, ed. Alejandro Diez Macho (Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Cientificas, 1970), which is a "palimpsest manuscript discovered by Prof. A. Diez Macho in the Vatican Library." (John Bowker, The Targums and Rabbinic Literature [Cambridge: At the University Press, 1969], p. 16). Prof. Macho claims that "Neofiti represents the Palestinian Targum at a very early state; in his view it demonstrates that the Palestinian Targum is of pre-Christian origin even though Neofiti is a first or second century A.D. recension of it" (p. 16). Citing M. McNamara, Bowker remarks on the importance of Targum Neofiti: "The early date of Neofiti: the close connection of the Mishnaic and other rabbinic texts with our present MS of Neofiti is particularly striking. . . Could it be that in Neofiti we have an official or semi-official text, one that would have taken in Palestinian Judaism the place that Onqelos enjoyed in Babylon? Such an hypothesis would explain how closely the citations follow on Neofiti. It would also give a reason for the rabbinic recension that appears clear in Neofiti. . . and will explain why no Targum Onqelos citations appear in writings of Palestinian Jewish provenance" (pp. 18-19). 2. Targum Onkelos. Alexander Sperber, ed. The Bible in Aramaic, Volume 1, The Pentateuch according to Targum Onkelos (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1959). This was long considered the official Babylonian version of the Palestinian Targum" (Bowker, p. 22). Bowker offers a possible solution to the identity of Targum Onkelos, suggesting that it was a "deliberate attempt to make an Aramaic translation, and that it may well have been a part of the general attempt in Judaism from the second century A.D. onward to provide authoritative translations as a safeguard against Christian interpretations of scripture based on LXX" (pp. 24-25). 3. The Mishnah. סדרים : מסכת עספים , ed. Maurice Simon, ed. I. Epstein (30 vols., New York: Traditional Press, n.d.). 4. The Babylonian Talmud, (English-Hebrew) trans. Maurice Simon, ed. I. Epstein (30 vols., New York: Traditional Press, n.d.). 5. Midrash Rabbah, ed. M. Mirkin (9 vols, Tel-
Antiquities. As Hermann Strack has observed, "it is exceedingly
difficult to ascertain the date of composition [of the rabbinic
midrashim]. The greater part of the important works are no longer
available in their earliest form."86 Similarly, the Talmudim contain
material that is very early. Orthodox Jewish scholars teach that oral
law began with the giving of the written law on Mt. Sinai.87 I shall
give several instances in which there are hagadic extras in Josephus' Tabernacle account with parallels in this undatable body of tradition.

I shall also consult the Samaritan Pentateuch,88 which, as G.W.
Anderson has written, "was essentially conservative... preserved in
an archaic script and [to which its scribes] devoted great pains to the
task of transmitting it accurately."89 Although Josephus' use of the Biblical text displays considerable freedom, so that his paraphrases are hard to anchor in any particular textual tradition, it is historically proper to keep in mind forms of the Biblical text extant in his day in a form probably very close to the form in which we have it today.

I have also taken note of 4QpaleoExodm,90 which is a form of


87Ibid., p. 10.
88Der Hebraeische Pentateuch der Samaritaner, ed. August Freiherrn von Gall (Giesen: Verlag von Alfred Toepelmann, 1918).
90Columns xxvi-xxvii, xlii-xliv of 4QpaleoExodm have been graciously provided to me by the courtesy of Patrick W. Skehan, Eugene Ulrich, and Judith E. Sanderson before publication in Discoveries in the Judean Desert.
Exodus copied in the archaic script, which was part of "a revival motivated by a desire on the part of some Second Temple Israelites to return to their 'roots'." I have included this form of Exodus in my investigation of Josephus' Biblical text because it represents part of the textual activity of his day, even though, because of the fragmentary form of this text in the columns pertinent to the Tabernacle, and because of its closeness to MT, it really offered little of use in the attempt to discern Josephus' textual sources.

I shall look closely at several of Philo's discussions of the Tabernacle material because Philo's objectives in retelling the story of his people are tangential if not parallel to Josephus' objectives. Though Philo was not perceived by his own people in a negative light, as Josephus was, he wrote as a Jew living as an alien in another

Judith E. Sanderson tells of fifteen Exodus scrolls that were found at Qumran, none of which has yet been published. 4QpaleoExodm, Dr. Sanderson states, is "the most extensive, the most unusual, and the most significant of the fifteen." An Exodus Scroll from Qumran: 4QpaleoExodm and the Samaritan Tradition, Harvard Semitic Studies 30 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986), p. 1. Cf. Geza Vermes, The Dead Sea Scrolls: Qumran in Perspective, 2d ed., (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1981).


92Philo, with English trans. by F.H. Colson (10 vols. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1984), and Philo Supplement II, Questions and Answers on Exodus, trans. by Ralph Marcus, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1970). Josephus seems to draw principally on Life of Moses, whereas Philo scatters references to the Tabernacle throughout various of his works, thus Philo's broader allegorical perception of the Tabernacle may have been missed by Josephus. The books in Josephus' day were scrolls, making them tedious to consult. Furthermore, Josephus was not equipped, as modern scholars are, with indeces and cross-referencing of sources.

93E.R. Goodenough has noted that Philo's Life of Moses "has always been taken as another apology for the Jews, this one addressed to friendly rather than hostile pagans, who would like to know who the great Moses was of whom Jews were so proud, and what he did." An Introduction to Philo Judaeus (New York: Barnes & Noble, Inc., 1940), p. 33. Philo's discussion of the priestly vestments in Special Laws 1. 82 f draws on the Exodus rubrics.
land. His works were read by Jews and non-Jews, just as Josephus' works were.

I have consulted Pseudo-Philo's\textsuperscript{94} \textit{Biblical Antiquities} because this work, having to do with Israel's history, was composed at about the same time Josephus was writing.

Since Josephus wrote for a non-Jewish readership as well as for his own people, I shall look at classical Greek sources, in particular at those that describe cultic settings, for clues to his revision of the Biblical account. This kind of investigation has been pursued elsewhere, for narrative sections having to do with Biblical personalities,\textsuperscript{95} but so far Josephus' description of the worship life of

\textsuperscript{94}Pseudo-Philon \textit{Les Antiquités Bibliques}, Tome I, Introduction et Texte Critiques par Daniel J. Harrington, Traduction par Jacques Cazeaux (Paris: Les Éditions du cerf, 1976). \textit{The Biblical Antiquities of Philo}, trans. M.R. James, Prolegomenon by Louis H. Feldman (New York: Ktav Publishing House, Inc., 1971). The dating of \textit{The Biblical Antiquities} of Pseudo-Philo, according to D.J. Harrington, is hard to assign surely. "The parallels between Pseudo-Philo and 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch... could suggest a date after A.D. 70... The presence of what may be called a 'Palestinian' biblical text (rather than 'Babylonian' or 'Egyptian' according to the categories of F.M. Cross, Jr. make the latest possible date around A.D. 100." \textit{The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha}, edited by James H. Charlesworth (2 vols. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1985), II, 299. Hence, the writer of \textit{The Biblical Antiquities} was a contemporary of Josephus'. In particular, this is of interest in \textit{Ant.} 3. 196 where both Josephus and \textit{The Biblical Antiquities} give a number in the census different from Exodus. Josephus and \textit{The Biblical Antiquities} do not, however, provide the same information here.

ancient Israel has not been investigated with an eye to the effect of classical and pagan models on him.

Since Josephus rewords his sources in the places where his sources seem to be well established, the task of tracing Josephus' ideas to their font is difficult. So, the project at hand must often be described as informed conjecture. Perhaps some useful contribution will nevertheless be made to the question of how Josephus retold one aspect of the story of his people, the Jews.
Chapter II

THE TABERNACLE

Josephus' Apologetic Motive

Josephus begins the Tabernacle section with a distinctly different twist from the Biblical account. Whereas in the Bible the Israelites who brought the Tabernacle did so with gladness of heart toward God (MT יִרְאוּ יִרְאוּ, LXX οἶς ἀλ δόξη τῇ καρδίᾳ 25: 2 καταδεχόμενος τῇ καρδίᾳ, 35: 5), in Ant. 3. 102 their rejoicing is focused on Moses (Οἱ δὲ χαίροντες οἴς τε ἐώραν καὶ οἶς ἥκουν τοῖς στρατηγοῖς). Josephus accentuates Moses because Israel's great law-giver was already highly esteemed in the pagan world.

1 LXX translates παραχάς in 25: 2; ἀφαίρεμα, ἀπαρχᾶς Ονκελος Νεοφίτος, Neofiti in 35: 5. Samaritan Pentateuch, Onkelos, Neofiti. The change in emphasis is characteristic of Josephus, who, from the beginning of his account of Moses' life, describes him with extraordinary grandeur. His birth (2. 210 ff) is announced beforehand with the prediction that he shall "be remembered, so long as the universe shall endure, not by Hebrews alone but even by alien nations" (2. 216) John Gager cites Hecataeus of Abdera's extended fragment found in Photius' Bibliotheca, "which is in turn an excerpt from Diodorus Siculus," in which Hecataeus writes: "He says that this priest [Moses] issues the orders (of the deity), in the assemblies and other gatherings and that in this respect the Jews are so obedient that they fall on the ground and worship the priest who has interpreted (the divine commandments) for them." Moses in Greco-Roman Paganism (Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon Press, 1972), p. 27. Ben Zion Wacholder states that Hecataeus of Abdera provided the model for most subsequent pagan and Jewish descriptions of Moses. Eupolemus; A Study of Judaeo-Greek Literature (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion, 1974), pp. 85-96. Sister Mary Ruth Graf comments in her dissertation, The Hellenization of Moses (Ph.D. dissertation, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio (1976)), that "Josephus insists that the laws are God's laws (Ant. 3. 85-87), but he also makes frequent reference to them as Moses' laws" (Ant. 3.102-187). p. 137. She summarizes: "He idealizes Moses as a sage who approached divinity in virtue." p. 140.

2 Cf. Philo, Life of Moses 1.1: "I intend to write the life of Moses, whom some call the lawgiver of the Jews... For while the fame of his laws has spread throughout the world and reached the ends of the earth, not many know him as he really was. Greek authors have not wanted to record him as worthy of
Moses has just announced to the people the plan he received from God while on the mountain, so that their delight might well be in the information they have received from God, but in 3.99, Josephus recounts their delight at seeing him (χαράς δ’ ἐνέπλησε τὴν στρατιὰν ἐπιφανείς) before telling of the information he brought from God.

Josephus, by contrast with the other versions, does not here refer to the contributions brought by the people as either ἀπαρχάς or ἀφαίρεμα.3 He gives no name to these spontaneous offerings.

Why did Josephus take away this element from the Exodus account? Was it simply adventitious, the result of a flawed memory? Was it for apologetic reasons, with a view to non-Jewish readers? Or did he have in mind the reaction of his fellow Jews, and in particular, Pharisees, with their developing sense of halakah?

The reason for this may be, with regard to non-Jewish readers, that since these contributions were not the ordinary offerings brought in Israelite worship, it would have appeared odd to the non-Jew who did not know the Biblical words, to read a technical term (ἀπαρχή) describing these offerings that had nothing to do with sacrifices.4 He might have transliterated the Hebrew term, תֹּבְרָה, as memory, in part out of envy and also because in many cases the ordinances of local lawgivers are opposed to his.” Cf. also John G. Gager, Moses in Greco-Roman Paganism, SBL Monograph Series, 16 (Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon Press, 1972), passim.

3 Josephus uses ἀπαρχή ten times in Ant. to refer to "first-fruits" (3.235, 250-51; 4.70-71, 226, 242 [MSPL]; 5.26; 9.273; 12.50). Three times it seems to mean simply "offerings" (7.378; 16.172; 14.272). He uses ἀφαίρεμα only once (14.227).

4 Ἀπαρχή was a widely used term in describing first-fruit offerings in cultic settings in Greek classical literature. The word is found twice in Polybius’ History, twenty-four times in the works of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, four times in Herodotus, twice in Thucydides, thirty-six times in Plutarch, eight in Euripides, four in Sophocles, five in Plato, twice in Homer's
he would later transliterate Hebrew terms in describing the
vestments worn by the priests, thus giving a special cultic
significance to this pious act of his people. But, rather than giving
these offerings a name, Josephus simply dispenses with the name. In
fact, Josephus says that it was at the peoples' pleasure that they
brought these contributions (ἐκάστου καὶ παρὰ δύναμιν
φιλοτιμησομένου 3.104). The peoples' pleasure in doing this certainly
is found in Exod. 36:3-6 which states that the people kept on
bringing all their ναύρη "morning by morning," until they had brought
more than was needed. But Josephus excludes Moses' command.

Josephus may well have had apologetic intent as he thus
heightens the piety and public mindedness of the people who do not
need Divine commands to prompt their generosity. On their own
accord they respond to the need for materials to construct the
Tabernacle. As Josephus felt compelled to defend the religion of his
people from attacks of "authors of scurrilous and mendacious
statements about us" (Apion 1.4), it was advantageous to show how
pious and public-minded was the religion of his forbears.

Sevenster has written of the ἀμιξία, the "non-mingling with the
Gentiles," that hindered the success with which Jews fit into society
in the ancient world. Josephus quotes Manetho's libel: "By his
[Moses'] first law he ordained that they should not worship the gods
nor abstain from the flesh of any of the animals held in special

---

5 J.N. Sevenster, The Roots of Pagan Anti-Semitism in the Ancient
reverence in Egypt, but should kill and consume them all."6 Greek religion, as Burkert has written, was "public religion to an extreme degree. Sacrificial processions and communal meals, loud prayers and vows, temples visible from afar with splendid votive displays--this is the image of *eusebeia*. . . Whoever refuses to take part incurs suspicions of *asebeia*."7 Roman religious sensitivity, Sevenster noted, was also offended by the Jewish inability to fit in. He quotes the third-century C.E. Philostratus: "The Jews have long been in revolt not only against the Romans, but against humanity; and a race that has made its own a life apart (βίον ὀμιχρόν) and irreconcilable, that cannot share with the rest of mankind in the pleasures of the table nor join in their libations or prayers or sacrifices, are separated from ourselves by a greater gulf than divides us from Susa or Bactra in the most distant Indies."8

Josephus illustrates how his Israelite ancestors, once allowed freedom from an oppressive captor-nation, were far from mean-spirited. This early moment in their saga was preceded by deliverance from the Egyptian army through a miracle at the Red Sea. This deliverance had a parallel in the wars of Alexander the Great, when God made the Pamphylian Sea recede for his troops as an aid to conquering the oppressive Persian Empire.9

---

6 *Apion* 1.239.
9 *Ant*. 2.348.
remarks on Alexander's miraculous deliverance, in order to relieve some of the odium deriving from that special uniqueness that the Jews claimed was due to the special favor of their God. Once delivered, the Israelites' freedom provided the opportunity for their essential piety and public-mindedness to flower. Here Josephus provides an answer to the accusation that the Jews kept to themselves.

Furthermore, it may be that Josephus, in avoiding any mention of the words ἀπαρχή or ἁφαίρεμα, was avoiding a complex halakic issue with his fellow Jews. Implicit in the bringing of the materials was the matter of vows the people made in response to the divine command to bring their נזיר. The Mishnah (Ned. 1: 1) reads: "Any substitute for [the form of words used to utter] a vow, ban, oath, or Nazirite-vow is as binding as the vow, ban, oath, or Nazirite vow itself." This tractate goes on to read (Ned. 2: 4) that "To vows not expressly defined the more stringent ruling applies, but to vows expressly defined the more lenient ruling applies."

In Exodus 19: 8 the people had vowed: "All that the Lord has spoken we will do." This was an undefined vow, subject to a strict ruling. Thus, the command of the Lord that followed in Exod. 25: 2, "Speak to the people of Israel, that they take for me an offering (נזרה)," became for them a strict vow due to the undefined vow they had made earlier. Presuming that this mishna derives from the legal sensitivities of rabbis in Josephus' day, if he had substituted even a Greek word in this place, he would have involved the Israelites in a vow with strict definitions in the halakic reasoning of his own day. This would have added to the Tabernacle account an aspect violating
the halakah in Josephus' day. In giving no name to the offerings the people brought, Josephus avoided a halakic blunder. No command or law is involved in Josephus' account.

In the narrative that follows I shall proceed through Josephus' account of the Tabernacle section by section, first setting forth Josephus' description, then drawing such comparisons as are fitting from the various other settings of the Tabernacle account I have described above.

The Materials

Josephus (3.102), without intimating that any command had previously been given by God, states that the people brought silver (ἀργυρον), gold (χρυσόν), bronze (χαλκόν) and wood of the finest material, not susceptible to decay (ξύλα τῆς καλλιστῆς ολῆς καὶ μηδὲν ὑπὸ τῆς σήψεως παθεῖν δυνάμενα), which may not only be an expansion of LXX ξύλα ἀσηπτα, but also a reflection of the baraita in BT Succah 45b: "Scripture expressly states, 'Acacia wood standing up' (םירבד הפסש ישמע) implying that they will stand for ever and to all eternity."10 They also brought goat's hair (αἰγείος τέ τρίχας), sheep

---

10 Three explanations of צידב in BT Yoma 72a are: 1. the [boards/frames] should stand up, even as they grow; 2. they kept up [the gold] they were overlaid with; 3. their hope [of restoration] is gone, their expectation is frustrated, therefore the text says: 'Standing up', i.e., standing up for ever and ever." Cf. the comments of Weill in Théodore Reinach, Oeuvres Complètes de Flavius Josèphe, trans. Julien Weill (7 vols. Paris: Ernest Leroux, Éditeur, 1900-1932), I, 166-67. Étienne Nodet, Flavius Josèphe, Les Antiquités Juives (Livres I à III, Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1990), II, 148. note 3 remarks that in rabbinic tradition, because there were no acacia trees in the desert, the acacia wood they had with them they had brought from Egypt. He does not here cite where in the rabbinic tradition he finds this. Ginzberg records the legend that when Jacob reached Egypt, "he planted a cedar-grove and admonished his sons to do the same, saying: 'You will in the future be released from bondage in Egypt, and God will then demand that you erect Him a sanctuary to thank Him for having delivered you. Plant cedar trees, then, that when God will bid you build Him a sanctuary, you may have in your possession
skin (δορὰς προβάτων), and wool (ἐριὰ) died in a variety of colors: blue (υακίνθω), dark red (φοίνικι), purple (πορφύρος ἀνθος), and white (λευκήν).\textsuperscript{11} as well as fine linen ornamented with precious stones (λίνου βύσσου λίθους τε τούτος ἐνδεδεμένους), and many spices (θυμιαμάτων τε πλήθος).\textsuperscript{12} When Josephus summarizes this list in 3.108, he mentions only gold, bronze, and the woven materials (τῶν ψαντῶν).

the cedars required for its construction. . . . not all the twenty-four species of cedar might be used for the Tabernacle, . . . but only the species shittim might be used. For God, who foresees all, knew that Israel would in the future commit a great sin at Shittim, and therefore ordained that shittim wood be used for the Tabernacle to serve as atonement for the sin committed at Shittim. Shittim furthermore signifies 'follies,' hence Israel was to construct the place of penance for their folly in adoring the Golden Calf, out of shittim wood, to atone for this 'folly.' And finally, the letters of which the word 'Shittim' is composed, stand for Shalom, 'peace,' Tobah, 'good,' Yesh'uaah, 'salvation,' and Mehillah, 'forgiveness.' III, 164-65. VI, 66, note 344, which cites Tan. Terumah 9-10; Tan. B. II, 91 and 94-95; ShR 18: 10, 33: 8, and 35: 1, and 94: 4. Shu'aib, Terumah 37b, quotes an unknown Midrash to the effect that the Shittim-wood for the tabernacle came from paradise, whence Adam took it with him when he was driven out of that place. Subsequently it came into the possession of Abraham, who bequeathed it to Isaac. The latter, in turn, bequeathed it to Jacob, who took it with him to Egypt. At the Exodus, the Israelites took it with them to the desert. According to Targum Jerushalmi Exod. 26: 28, the middle bar was made of the wood taken from the tree which Abraham planted at Beer-sheba. The angels felled this tree when the Israelites crossed the Red Sea, and threw it into the waters thereof, while an angel proclaimed: 'This is the tree which Abraham planted in Beer-sheba.' Josephus does not include in his retelling any of this various lore. His use of legendary material is restrained.

\textsuperscript{11} Though the white is not ever used in the Tabernacle, or priestly vestments.

\textsuperscript{12} Ant. 3.102-103. Josephus omits mention of the lamp oil, anointing oil, and incense here. But Josephus does include the spices. Either he included these from memory, or they were there in the source he followed. If he writes from memory, perhaps he simply forgot to mention the oil. The oil is mentioned in 3.197-99. In Exod. 30: 22-33, exact quantities of spices are given, from which is made the oil for anointing. Nelson points out that Kuenen believed chapters 30-31 were later additions to Exodus, a view Nelson rejects. (See above, note 8, chapter 1).

\textsuperscript{13} Thackeray includes in his text καὶ ἄργυρον, which he adopts from the Latin edition of Cassiodorus. This ms tradition alters Josephus' previous order in favor of the order found in the Biblical text.
Both MT and LXX (Exod. 25: 3) record Moses' repetition of the Divine command that the people bring their χρυσόν/ἀπαρχάς. χρυσόν means specifically a "contribution or offering." 14 The same word is used in SP, and its equivalent in Onkelos (אחספם), and Neofiti (אחספם), which suggests that though Josephus deemed the word to be dispensable, the Samaritan and Rabbinic writers did not. 15 Indeed, MT uses the word three times before listing the materials, as do LXX, SP, Onkelos, and Neofiti.

In Exod. 25: 3-7, the order of the materials to be brought by the people is: gold (χρυσόν), silver (ἀργυρίον), bronze (αλκόν), blue and purple and scarlet (ἐνίκτα κεκλωσμένην), twisted linen (κοφρύναι καὶ βύσσον κεκλωσμένην). Onkelos and Neofiti read γὰς for χρυσόν, which is a transcription of the Greek βύσσον. The list continues with goat's hair (κόκκινον τρίχας αἰγείας), ruddy ram's skins (ξυλίνα δέρματα κριῶν ἡμαθροδανωμένα), 16 dugong skins (αλλ' ἡμαθροδανωμένα), 17 acacia wood (ἐνίκτα ξυλά άσητα). 18

15Although this word came to have a more specific connotation with reference to the "heave offering," the Bible clearly suggests here nothing more than the offering the people brought in response to the Divine command given through Moses.
16RSV translates this "tanned," which is surely what it means. LXX transliteration literally means "reddened."
17The Hebrew does not specifically mean "goat skin," as RSV translates this. BDB proposes that it probably refers to the skin of the dugong with an Arabic cognate meaning "dolphin." In Ezekiel 16: 10, it is used with reference to the leather used for a woman's sandals. I conjecture that LXX translates it "blue" because this may have been the color of the leather commonly used for women's sandals. Onkelos and Neofiti read γάς with a marginal gloss
reading יָתַן דַּוְיֵקָה. Jastrow cites BT Shabb. 28a, which explains that the reason MT שִׁירָה is translated עֵמָשַׁת שִׁירָה is that "it glistened with many colors" (p. 1008). The Talmud here cites R. Nehemiah in explanation of שִׁירָה וְרָאָה נַפְשָׁת who said that it meant "like a squirrel's" הָרֹא שָׁה. H. Freedman, translator of the Soncino edition, explains: "It is doubtful, however, whether a squirrel is meant, as the context shows that a striped (or speckled) animal of many colours is referred to. Kennedy described the dugong as "a seal-like mammal found in the Red Sea." "Tabernacle," HDB IV, 659. Ginzberg recounts that the skins used in the Tabernacle were from the animal Tahash, that was used exclusively for the Tabernacle. It was so large that out of one skin could be made a curtain thirty cubits long. This species of animal disappeared as soon as the demands of the Tabernacle for skins were satisfied. The Tahash was like the unicorn, with one horn on its forehead, and was gaily colored like the turkey-cock, and belonged to the class of clean animals (BT Shabbat 28b). One is tempted to raise the question if this animal was like the now extinct dinosaur. A baraita here compares the "tahash of Moses' day" to the בֶּן-ר, a one-horned, wild beast. Cf. Jastrow, where he cites Numbers Rabbah 6:3, BT Yebamoth 102b, and Koholeth Rabbah 1:9, where R. Judah says that the skins used to cover the Tabernacle were violet-colored skins. R. Nehemiah says they are ermine, and R. Johanan says "The Holy One, blessed be He, showed Moses a large species of animal, the skin of which he used for the requirements of the Temple. [God] then stored it away [note: for the hereafter when its skin would be used as clothing for the righteous]. The name of the animal was keresh." The Midrash Rabbah, trans. H. Freedman and M. Simon (5 vols. New York: The Soncino Press, 1977), IV, 32-33.

There is a direct Greek equivalent for the Hebrew נָץ, ἀκακία, for which LSJ gives the meaning, or transliteration, "Shittah tree, Acacia arabica." (p. 46). It is a term that is found in the first century C.E. Greek source, Dioscorides Medicus, according to LSJ. Philo (Life of Moses 2.77) leaves out any preceding description of the materials Moses used. He begins by describing the κέδρου τῆς ἀναστομάτης, "pillars of cedar not likely to decay." (See below in this note concerning the material from Midrash Rabbah Exodus on the acacia as one of seven kinds of cedar.) But in Questions and Answers on Exodus 2.53, Philo says: "it was natural that the material of which it was made should by some necessity be unlikely to decay and be corrupted, since the Law, of which it was the repository, was also incorruptible. In the second place, the sanctuary and all the order of things arranged in it were ordained not for a limited time but for an infinite age. For this reason the artificer, namely the divine Logos, chose the most lawful material, especially that which could remain permanently with it. That is the literal meaning. But this is the deeper meaning. In reality nothing terrestrial is undecaying or incorruptible. Accordingly, when (Scripture) says "undecaying wood," it alludes symbolically to the parts of the world attached to one another, of which it consists and is compacted and which hold fast to one another. To me it seems that (this property is found) also in the rational virtues of the soul, each of which happens to be unwithered and unaging and incorruptible."
the fragrant incense (σμύρνη ἀρετῆς/εἰς τὴν σύνθεσιν τοῦ θυμιάματος). Then Exodus lists the onyx stones (σιφών/λίθους σαρδίου/Onkelos ἅβραμ, transliterating the Greek βηρυλλος/Neofiti "interprets" with ἱππος), and those for setting in the ephod and breastpiece (εἵνεκα λίθους σαρδίου καὶ λίθους εἰς τὴν γλυφὴν εἰς τὴν ἐπωμίδα καὶ τὸν ποδήρη). Josephus begins his list as MT and LXX with gold, silver, and bronze. After that, he departs from following either Biblical list. Like the Greek text as it was in his day, he omits any mention of the

19 The Greek here of MT Exod. 25: 6 is found in neither the Cambridge Septuagint nor the Göttingen Septuagint, but it is found in the cursive mss b, f, i, listed in the critical apparatus of the Cambridge Septuagint. The critical apparatus of Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia here notes that this verse is missing in (> LXX AB, that is, codices Vaticanus and Alexandrinus. Wevers makes no comments on the absence of MT v. 6 in LXX. One may wonder how it was that this was not in the original Greek translation, when the verses before and after are translated carefully. No doubt this verse that presents the oils and incense was not in the Greek text available to Josephus. This verse is one of many lacunae in 4QpaleoExodm. (This needs to be compared with the Megillat Sammanim, the "Roll of Spices," which treats of the preparation of incense in the Tabernacle and Temple.)

20 Nelson writes concerning the ξύλ: "The gem to which this word refers is mentioned more frequently than any other gem in the Tabernacle Account, but its exact meaning seems to have been uncertain to translators and has led to a number of translations. In the Tabernacle Account it is translated by σμαράγδος, σαρδίου, and βηρυλλος. Josephus translates the same word by σαρδόνυχες and either οὐνξ or βηρυλλος (cf. note 303, Jos. Ant. 3. 165, 185 read σαρδόνυχες. In 3. 168 Josephus lists both οὖνξ and βηρυλλος for ξύλ and πέτρι. Since either Greek word translates ξύλ in other sources, it is difficult to determine whether Josephus is still reversing his order or has returned to the MT order" (p. 156).

21 John W. Wevers comments on these lists: "The list of contributions to be taken from the Israelites are the same in MT of A and B both having 16 items; the only difference in the two texts concern the absence of a waw before items numbered 12, 13 and 15 in the A text. The texts of [LXX] Exod A and B are identical except for item 6 which is glossed with διασενθημένον... Both lists omit items 11, 12 and 13; these are the supplies for the lampstand and the incense altar and are probably omitted because they are not construction materials. Over against MT Exod lacks a conjunction before nos. 2345 and 6; a κατ is supplied in the tradition in each case for which hex is usually the source." Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus (Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1990), p. 392.
contents of MT Exod. 25: 6, which lists the oil and incense. This may be an indication that here he was looking at LXX, or it may be just another one of his freely chosen editorial omissions.

He mentions next the wood and goat hair. Rather than mentioning the colors as independent entities, he says that the sheepskin and wool were dyed with the four colors. He changes the order of the colors from blue, purple, scarlet, and linen, to blue, scarlet, purple and white. Though he mentions "white" here, where Exod. has linen, he never brings this up in the description of the Tabernacle. Whereas in the Biblical lists, linen is introduced as a color, Josephus introduces it as a cloth, some of which is already ornamented with precious stones.

Last of all, Josephus mentions the spices, while the Biblical lists mention the various precious stones. His paraphrasing of LXX interpretation of the wood as ξύλα τε τῆς καλλίστης ίλης καὶ μηδὲν ύπὸ τῆς σῆμεως παθεῖν δυνάμενα bears more than a passing resemblance to the baraitha found in BT Succah 45b. While the baraitha may simply be an explanation of the significance of ἀνάμνης, emphasizing that the wood would remain standing a long time, it may draw on the Greek ἀοὴπτα, which describes something about the wood's fundamental quality. While I do not infer deliberate influence from the baraitha on Josephus, or from Josephus on the baraitha, the similarity of explanations is noteworthy.

A suggestive difference between Exod. and Josephus is that he states that the offerings the people brought were not prescribed, but were their own freely offered contributions. Perhaps his reason for omitting the Biblical list of offerings that was commanded to be
brought by the people is apologetic. To fellow Jews, who knew the Biblical prescriptions for the Tabernacle, he might have assumed that they would automatically read-in "as God commanded." Furthermore, in excluding mention of the ἀπαρχή or ἀφαίρεμα, Josephus may have avoided a halakic issue. Non-Jews reading his summary would not be prompted to think ill of the Jews because of another reminder of their self-consciously unique relationship to God.

Tabernacle or Temple?

Josephus makes a comment about the Tabernacle, after describing the materials the people brought for its construction, that has the effect of increasing the dignity of the desert structure for which Moses was the construction manager. Josephus writes, "the tent was nothing but a portable and traveling temple" (ἐγὼ δὲν μεταφερομένου καὶ συμπερινοστοῦντος ναοῦ 3.103). He made reference to the Tabernacle as a temple no fewer than seven times in his Tabernacle account.22

LXX refers to the Tabernacle as a temple in the poetry of some of the psalms attributed to David, who was refused permission by

---

22 *Ant.* 3.103, 125, 129, 130, 139, 142, and 202. In subsequent references to the sacrifices and other cultic activities, Josephus continues to refer to the Tabernacle as ναὸς, e.g. 3.242, 243, 245 as he describes the burnt offerings; 3.270 as he tells of the test a woman accused of adultery must endure; 3.278 simply referring to the sacred Place in which the priest must be free from any defect. The references in *Ant.* 4 come by way of outlining various laws (4.200, 201, 203, 313, 314). The Tabernacle at Shiloh is likewise referred to as ναὸς (5.68). When, however, the Tabernacle was brought across the Jordan into Canaan Josephus referred to it as σκηνή (5.17), as well as when it was first set up at Shiloh (5.79), in Phineas' speech following the crossing of the Jordan (5.107), and elsewhere (5.112, 150, 343-45; 6.66). In 7.86 the ark is brought temporarily into a σκηνή (here meaning simply "tent" rather than Tabernacle) after David rescues it from the Philistines, and brought it to Jerusalem.
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God to build a temple. Ναὸς occurs nine times in the psalter prior to Psalm 72. For example, in Psalm 17: 6, we read: ἥκουσεν ἐκ ναοῦ (MT 18: 7 ἁρυί) αὐτοῦ φωνῆς μου; and in 26: 4 the psalmist, presumably David, expresses considerable longing for the temple: μίαν ἡτησάμην παρὰ κυρίου. . . ἐπισκέπτεσθαι τὸν ναὸν (MT 27: 4 ἁρυί) αὐτοῦ. Perhaps these poetic references to the Place where God lived with Israel as His "temple" gave occasion to Josephus (and Philo) to refer to the Tabernacle as a temple.

MT also used the term ἁρυί in I Sam. 1: 9; 3: 3 with reference to the structure that contained the Ark at Shiloh. The song of David recorded in II Sam. 22: 2 f, with its parallel in Psalm 18, reads: ἂρυί ἡλιθίας σου ἡτήσαμαι, "You have heard my voice from your temple." But these references date from a later period, long after the Temple of Solomon had been built.

Before Josephus, Philo referred to the Tabernacle specifically as φορητὸν ἱερόν, a "portable temple." While he used σκηνή for the most part, he often used ναὸς or a compound word including ναὸς (πρόναον, νεωκόρων). In Questions and Answers on Exodus 2.83, he writes specifically, "For the tabernacle is a portable temple of God and a stationary or fixed one." Philo seems to be leading into the allegorical lesson he intended to teach.


24 Life of Moses 2.89, 136 (ναὸς), 101 (πρόναον), 174, 159 (νεωκόρων). Philo is quite unambiguous in the comparison of the Tabernacle to a temple in 2.89: ἧμεν οὖν σκηνῇ καθάπερ νεῶς. . . κατεσκευάσθη.
"And (similarly) those things which are below heaven are mutable and changeable, while heaven alone is unchangeable and self-consistent and similar to itself. . . Since they were passing through a wilderness where there were no courts or houses but (only) tabernacles which were made for necessary purposes (such as) giving the help of warmth against the cold, he thought it right that there should be a most holy temple to the Father and Creator of all things. Moreover, he showed that the divine name, which is in need of nothing, dwelt together, so far as one might believe, with those who were in need of a tabernacle, to receive piety and worthy holiness" (2.83)

Josephus may have drawn from Philo the idea of the Tabernacle as υπάρχεται και συμπεριοπτὸν τόυ ναοῦ. It is not crystal clear what determined Josephus' use of θύρη or ναὸς in a given place. It appears, however, that when the Tabernacle is being described in a particular location, functioning as the Place where Israel's worship had its focus, then Josephus calls it ναὸς. Before the Tabernacle is built, or when it is in transit, then this portable temple is called θύρη.

The prestige of the Tabernacle was summoned for the benefit of the first Temple, according to Eupolemus, the second-century B.C.E. Jewish diplomat.25 He mentions that King Solomon used the pattern of Moses' lampstand from the Tabernacle in making the ten golden lampstands for the Temple.26 Wacholder comments that "Eupolemus went out of his way to stress that the desert tabernacle served as a

25 Maccabees 8: 17; II Maccabees 4: 11
blueprint for Solomon."  

27 As Eupolemus enhanced the glory of Solomon's Temple by including elements of the glory of the first sacred Place in Israel's history, so Josephus imputed to the primitive desert Tabernacle the prestige of the Temple by referring to it as a temple.

Eupolemus’ mentioning of the pattern of the Tabernacle lampstand serving as the blueprint for the lampstand in Solomon's Temple was part of a glorification of Moses in Hellenistic Jewish writers that Wacholder attributes to the encouragement they found in the writings of Hecataeus of Abdera, the fourth-century B.C.E. Egyptian philosopher-historian. He linked Moses with Mneves (Menes), "the founder of the Egyptian state."  

28 Josephus cites Hecataeus' book about the Jews, quoting from it a description of the Temple (οἶκημα μέγα) with its altar (βωμός), and lampstand (λυχνίον). He reported that in it were found no statues, votive offerings, or plants, and that the priests, who never touch wine in the Temple, kept it ceremonially pure.

29 The Tabernacle Architects


29 Against Apion 1.183-200, 214. For bibliography on Hecataeus, see Carl R. Holladay, Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors, Vol. I: Historians (Chico, Ca.: Scholars Press, 1983), p. 291, note 1. Holladay states that the earliest reference to Hecataeus' work On the Jews is in Josephus' Against Apion 1.183. An abbreviated form of this appears in Eusebius, Praeparatio Evangelica IX.4. Apion also mentions the Jews in his On the Egyptians, which is found in Diodorus Siculus, History, Book I. In I,28,2 he mentions that the Jews were emigrants from Egypt. In History XL,3,1-8 Diodorus gives more details about the Jews.
Whereas the Exodus Tabernacle account makes plain that the choice and architectural skills of Bezalel are the work of the Divine Spirit, Josephus explains this as though there were no particular supernatural element in the design of the Tabernacle. He says that Moses set architects over the project. Josephus seems to diminish the supernatural element in this choice by first, implying that the architectural skills were the natural endowment of Bezalel, rather than a gift given to him specifically for the purpose of designing and building the Tabernacle, and second, by saying that though the architects were chosen according to the Divine command, the choice would have been that of the people anyway.

The Talmud records a similar tradition in the name of R. Isaac, who says, "We must not appoint a leader over a Community without first consulting it, as it says: See, the Lord hath called by name Bezalel, the son of Uri. The Holy One, blessed be He, said to Moses: Do you consider Bezalel suitable? He replied: Sovereign of the Universe, if Thou thinkest him suitable, surely I must also! Said [God] to him: All the same, go and consult them. He went and asked Israel: Do you consider Bezalel suitable? They replied: If the Holy One, blessed be He, and you consider him suitable, surely we must!"
Comparing Josephus with the saying of R. Isaac in the Talmud, R. Isaac clearly emphasizes the Divine element, by reporting a conversation between Moses and God, as a result of which Moses consulted the community of Israel. Josephus mentions no such conversation between Moses and God, nor does he say that Moses ever actually consulted the people.

Of course, Josephus' style is laconic, while the Talmud is expansive. Though it seems Josephus is aware of a tradition similar to the one found in the Talmud, Josephus' intention is not the same as R. Isaac's. He intends to say that the people were not, in fact, consulted, but if they would have been, they would have concurred with Moses. The Talmud says the people were consulted, but it was at the Divine prompting, and they conceded to the Divine will rather than expressing their own. The Talmud emphasizes the Divine element, while Josephus emphasizes the natural.

Ironically, as Professor Feldman has pointed out, "Josephus criticizes the Epicureans for excluding Providence from human affairs," yet here he diminishes the effect of Divine Providence on the affairs of his own people, when the Scriptures plainly stress the Divine element at this point.

Philo, by contrast, accentuates the extraordinary communication from God to Moses regarding the Tabernacle. Twice

work of the Tabernacle extended even to the animals." This comes in a play on words of the Hebrew בַּהֲמוֹת in 36:1, interpreting it as בַּהֲמוֹת, the behemoth, or simply "cattle."

within the opening lines of his Tabernacle account, Philo states that God instructed Moses concerning the construction of the Tabernacle. Philo does not mention Basael or Elibaz by name in Life of Moses, but he alludes to them.

Josephus exceeded necessity in diminishing the Divine element in the architectural design of the Tabernacle. It is reasonable that Hecataeus, an Egyptian, should describe the work of the Tabernacle by saying; "He [Moses] selected those who were the most accomplished and capable of governing the entire people and appointed them as priests; he assigned them to be responsible for the temple as well as the sacrifices to and worship of the deity." It is odd, however, that Josephus should have minimized the Divine element, even if targeting apologetically a Gentile readership. If Hecataeus, a non-Jew said of the source of the laws Moses gave to Israel, that "Moses heard these things from God and announced them to the Jews," it would seem that Josephus, a Jew, would not be reluctant to attribute to God something that Exodus, his source, clearly states was from God. Furthermore, since Josephus did not see

---

35 Life of Moses 2.71,74. In Questions and Answers on Exodus 2. 49 he writes that Moses was on the Mountain where "was constructed in words the portable temple, which is called the Tent of Testimony." This accentuates even more that the project of building the Tabernacle was totally the work of God.

36 Life of Moses 2.141. "When he had been taught the patterns of the holy tabernacle, and had passed on the lesson to those who were of quick understanding and happily gifted to undertake and complete the works in which their handicraft was necessary. . ." In Allegorical Interpretation 3.95, however, Philo wrote that God announced Bazalel by name as the chief architect. Also, in On Noah's Work as a Planter 26-27, Philo refers to Bezalel as second in rank to Moses, and gives the meaning of Bezalel as ἐν σκιαῖς ποιῶν, "working in the shadows."

37 Gager, Moses in Greco-Roman Paganism. p. 27. Emphasis mine.

38 Ibid., p. 27.
fit to diminish the miraculous element in describing God's giving of the tables of the Law, which he said, were written by the hand of God, it is difficult to understand why he chose to diminish the supernatural element in the preparation for the building of the Tabernacle.

Josephus (3.105) states that Moses appointed two architects (ἀρχιτέκτονας) for the building of the Tabernacle. Their names were Basael (Βασάνους), son of Uri (Οὐρίς παῖς), of the tribe of Judah (τῆς Ἰουδαὶς φυλῆς), a grandson of Moses' sister Miriamme (υἱὸς δὲ Μαριάμης τῆς ἀδελφῆς τοῦ στρατηγοῦ), and Elibaz (Ελίβαζος), a Danite, son of Isamach (Ἅβαζος) (δὲ Ἰσαμάχου). The initial Biblical reference to these two men gives Basael prominence, with Elibaz as his helper. Later, the two men are presented more as equals, though Basael is clearly primus inter pares. Josephus calls the two men "architects," a designation that summarizes in a word the elaborate description of them found in Exod. (31: 1-6/36: 1/37: 20). LXX here

39Ant. 3.101. "He showed them two tables on which were graven the ten words, five on either of them; and the writing thereon was from the hand of God (καὶ χεῖρ ἂν ἐπὶ τῇ γραφῇ τοῦ θεοῦ)."

40Ant. 3.105. The names of the two architects appear in various forms. Neise lists variants of Βασάνους (βεσάνους SP, βεσαλένους L, Βεσάλουν E, and basahel Lat.). A variant of Ἰσαμάχου is Ἰσαχαμου SP. Weill comments on the difference between the name of Elibaz's father as it appears in Josephus and the Bible. "Les premières lettres sont peut-être tombées dans le texte de Josèphe, à moins qu'il ne les ait supprimées dans le souci de grézier, séduit par l'allure grecque du mot Ἰσαμάχου." Oeuvres Complètes de Flavius Josèphe, I. 167, note 4. Nodet remarks that Josephus omits "son of Hur," which may reflect the Biblical text Josephus had. II, 148, note 5. Wevers, Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus, p. 588, note 28, alludes to the discussion in The Text History of the Greek Exodus VII. K. for a discussion of Οὐρί υἱὸς. This volume is yet in press, so I have not seen this discussion).

41Exod. 31: 1.
42Exod. 31: 6 Ἐλίβαζος.
43Exod. 35: 32.
uses the same term, both in its verb and noun form, in the parenthetetic summary of Basael's task: ἀρχιτεκτονεῖν κατὰ πάντα τὰ ἔργα τῆς ἀρχιτεκτονίας (35: 32).

Although Exodus gives Basael prominence over Elibaz, Josephus describes them here as equals. While this may have been merely a literary convenience in his general summary of the Biblical material, perhaps Josephus mentioned the two men together because he was already aware of a Rabbinic tradition on these two men found later in the Midrash Rabbah.

In the Midrash Rabbah, Exodus (Ki Thissa), Bezalel, along with several illustrious men in Biblical history, is called by several different names, a factor in his greatness. The last of Bezalel's six names is Lahad because he gave glory (hod) and splendor to Israel, for the Tabernacle was their glory. Another reason of [his being called] Lahad was given by R. Abba b. Hiyya: Because even the smallest (ha-dal) of the tribes associated itself with him. R. Hanina b. Pazzi said: No tribe was greater than Judah and none more lowly than Dan, which descended from one of the maidservants. God said: "Let him [Dan] come and be associated with him [Judah], so that no man may despise him or become arrogant, for both great and small are equal in God's sight; Bezalel comes of the tribe of Judah and Ahaliab from Dan, yet [the latter] is associated with him." R. Hanina said: The great and the small are equal, and one should never ignore his help. The Tabernacle was constructed by these two tribes and the Temple likewise [was the work of two tribes], for Solomon was of the tribe of

44 Though in Ant. 3.200, Josephus writes τοὺτων μέντοι Βεσελέηλον συνέβη κριθήναι τὸν κράτιστον, Bezalel was the better of the two.
Judah, and Hiram was the son of a widow of the tribe of Naphatali (I Kings 7: 14).45

Once again, Josephus' account has a reflection in a later Rabbinic work, which may allow the inference that Josephus was aware of the tradition that raised Elibaz from his lowly place as a Danite, to parity with the Judahite, Basael. But Josephus gives no clue that he does this for the same reasons as explained in the Midrash.

The Response of the People

Thackeray has noted the difference between Josephus and Exodus on the response of the people to the command to bring offerings for the construction of the Tabernacle.46 Exodus says that the people brought an abundance of materials, while Josephus says the people, both men and women, not only contributed exuberantly, but also volunteered in such numbers that Moses had to restrain them.47 Here Josephus paraphrases Exod. 36: 6, which both in MT

45The Midrash Rabbah, translated by H. Freedman and Maurice Simon (5 vols. London: The Soncino Press, 1977), II, 465-66. (Exodus, Ki Thissa, XL, 4). Rabbi Abba ben Hiyya was a fifth generation Tanna (2nd century), a disciple and friend of Rabbi, Judah Hanasi, according to Hermann Strack, Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash (New York: Atheneum, 1974), p. 119. Although a tradition may be reported under the name of a particular rabbi, it is difficult to assess when the tradition began. Josephus was not accustomed to mentioning the sources of alterations he makes in the Biblical stories. BT Sanhedrin 69b refers to Bezaleel making the tabernacle:

46Josephus IV, 367, note d.

47Cf. Exodus 36: 3b ἔτοι τά προσφέρομενα παρὰ τῶν φερόντων τὸ πρῶτο πῶς. Josephus writes: τὸ δὲ πλῆθος οὗτος ὑπὸ προσβοῦσα τοῖς ἐγχειρομένοις ἐπῆλθεν, ὡστε Μωυσῆς ἀνείρξεν αὐτοὺς ὑποκηρυχάμενος ἀρκεῖν τοῖς ὄνταις 3.106. This eagerness to participate in the building of the Tabernacle would have appeared good to Josephus' non-Jewish readers. As Walter Burkert has written of Greek religion of classical antiquity: "Eusebeia. . . guarantees the integration of the individual into the community. Whoever refuses to take part incurs suspicions of asebeia." Greek Religion, p. 276. The lack of inclination of his people to take part in the civil religion of Rome might be off-set by their enthusiastic participation in their own, as a people in the dawn of their own history as a nation.
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and LXX seems to say that the people's freely offered work was in bringing the offering, but which Josephus interprets to mean volunteering for the work on the Tabernacle itself. The men, presumably are referred to when Josephus writes τὸ πλήθος, and the women he designates specifically by: ἡφιλοποιοῦντο δὲ γυναῖκες περὶ τε στολὰς ἱερατικὰς καὶ περὶ τὰ ἀλλα ὀσων ἐχρηζε τὸ ἔργον κόσμου τε καὶ λειτουργίας ἕνεκα τοῦ θεοῦ (3.107).

The Celebration Before the Construction of the Tabernacle.

Whereas the Exodus account precedes the building of the Tabernacle with the sad tale of Israel's worshiping the golden calf, an incident that first became known to Moses as he descended the mountain and heard the sounds of merriment (Exod. 31: 18), Josephus precedes the building of the Tabernacle with a command from Moses for a feast and sacrifices. Did Josephus transpose the idolatrous merriment of the Israelites into feasting and sacrifices as though at Moses' command?

In I Kings 8: 52-65, King Solomon offered sacrifices and held a feast in celebrating the completion of the first Temple. Josephus summarizes that event, telling of those who saw its magnificence: καὶ θυσιῶν ἐπ' αὐτῷ μεγάλων καὶ ἐορτῶν μεταλαβόντες. He uses the two terms ἐορτην. . . καὶ θυσίας together one other time in recounting the speech of Nicholas of Damascus to Agrippa, defending the Jews. Josephus lists τὰς πομπὰς τὰς θυσίας τὰς ἐορτὰς as customs

---

48Ἀβέρας ἀπὸ ἀποκριμένη σφήκη ἀνώριτη πρωτεύουσα ἐν Χαράβιῳ πιὸ ἡ Ἁγία σοι Ἀνὴρ καὶ γυνὴ μηκέτι ἐργαζόμενος εἰς τὰς ἀπαρχὰς τοῦ ἀγίου (Exod. 36: 6).
49Ant. 3. 108. ἐορτην. . . καὶ θυσίας.
50Ant. 8.125.
so precious to the Jews that they would prefer to give up life rather than τὰ πάτρια ἔθη.

In I Esdras 5: 50-52 the celebration of τὴν τῆς σκηνοπηγίας ἐορτῆν, the Feast of Booths, is accompanied by θυσίας, but this juxtaposition of the words ἐορτή and θυσία seems unlikely to have been the precedent for Josephus here. But in II Maccabees 10, the purification of the Temple desecrated by Antiochus Epiphanes is accompanied by sacrifices, after which there was an eight-day period of feasting such as took place at the Feast of Booths. Sacrifices and feasting are prominent in this episode that was precious in the saga of Israel's sacred Place.

Josephus describes the delight of the people as they anticipated the building of the Tabernacle in terms reflecting the joy expressed in Scripture at the completion of Solomon's Temple, as well as at the time when the Temple was reconsecrated after its desecration at the hands of Antiochus Epiphanes. He is adapting to the celebration of the earliest Israelite sacred Place the celebrations that took place following the consecration of later Temples.

The Tabernacle Court

Kennedy has written of the overall symmetry in the lay-out of the Tabernacle court found in the priestly document in the Pentateuch. He states that "Nowhere is this fondness for symmetry and proportion so evident as in the measurements of the tabernacle.

51 Ant. 16.35.
52 Josephus uses this term in four places: War 2.515; Ant. 4.209; 8.225; and 15.50, which is found in LXX in Deut. 16: 16; 31: 10; Zech. 14: 16, 18, 19; I Macc. 10: 21; II Macc. 1: 9, 18.
Three, four, seven, ten, their parts and multiples, dominate the whole (sic)."\(^{53}\)

In Josephus' account, however, this concern for symmetry does not appear until he makes his "allegorical" description of the interior of the Tabernacle proper (3.123).\(^{54}\) Josephus describes the Tabernacle as if to lead the reader on a tour of it. Approaching the Tabernacle, one enters by the outer court, which he calls the αἰθριον. The prophet Ezekiel (40: 5) also began to tell his vision of the Temple by describing the wall surrounding the Temple. M. Middoth follows the same plan in telling of the measurements of Herod's Temple, though this temple was far more developed than the simple desert Tabernacle. Whereas in Exodus the court is described following the description of the altar of sacrifice, an element of the Tabernacle furnishings Josephus leaves out of the court narrative, in which it was located.\(^{55}\) Josephus describes the court first because it was the first part of the Tabernacle that one would come to. This would begin a clear picture of the Tabernacle complex for a Gentile reader.

Josephus uses αἰθριον with regard to the Tabernacle court, and once to describe the portico of a Roman theater.\(^{56}\) The Hebrew נֵץ is translated in LXX αὐλή here as well as in the accounts of the Temple courts in I Kings 6: 36 and II Chronicles 4: 9 f. Josephus does not use

\(^{54}\)See Chapter V where I shall discuss Josephus' allegory.
\(^{55}\)MT I and LXX I (27: 9-19), and MT II (38: 9-20) at the conclusion of the description of the Tabernacle furniture, and just after the description of the priests' garments in LXX II (37: 7-13) no doubt due to its relative lack of importance, compared to the Tabernacle proper.
\(^{56}\)Ant. 3.108, 114, 204, 243 with regard to the court, and 19.90 with regard to the Roman theater portico. In the last example αἰθριον may be virtually a transliteration of the Latin atrium, that would have been used to describe this portico.
Frequently Josephus uses αὐλή to mean "palace." 58 Twice Josephus refers to the court area of the Tabernacle as περιβόλος. 59

Why does Josephus use αἰθριον? LSJ proposes that this word is an adaptation of the Latin atrium, citing three examples, one of which is from Josephus here. 60 Conversely, Lewis and Short report that the Latin atrium is, "according to Scaliger, from αἰθριον, subdiale, since it was a part of the uncovered portion of the house (but the atrium of the Romans' was always covered)." 61

In LXX αἰθριον is found in Ezekiel's vision (9: 3), apparently as a synonym for αὐλή (8: 16). In mss A, S, and R, but not B, 62 αἰθριον is found in 9: 3 as the place to which the δόξα θεοῦ τοῦ Ισραήλ goes after rising up from the cherubim. Again in mss A, S, and R, but not B, in Ezek. 10: 18 one finds: καὶ ἐξῆλθεν δόξα κυρίου ἀπὸ τοῦ αἰθριον τοῦ οἴκου, with αἰθριον translating θηρίον=threshold. In 40: 14 it translates ἁγία. It translates θηρίον in 40: 15, and in 40: 19 the two phrases: τὸ πλάτος τῆς αὐλῆς τοῦ αἰθριον τῆς πυλῆς and ἐπὶ τὸ αἰθριον τῆς πυλῆς translate αἱρετικήν ῥαπτὴν λίθον and ἑρωθήκεν εἰς ἄλλο.

---

57 War 5.227.
58 Life 46, 66, 295, κ.τ.λ.
59 Ant. 3.111, 114.
60 LSJ, p. 37. The other two examples are from the second century C.E. writer Lucian's Anacharsis 2, and P.Oxy 268.22, which dates from the first century C.E. Weill writes here that Josephus uses the word to give a "souce de modernisme." Thackeray's Lexicon to Josephus (Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1930), p. 12, offers the same explanation as Weill. Nodet II, 149, note 5, as LSJ, writes: "FJ emploie αἰθριον, forme hellénisée du latin atrium; Ex 27: 9 "parvis" (ὡς, LXX αὐλή)." II, 149, note 5.
62 A=Codex Alexandrinus, S=Codex Sinaiticus, and R=the Sixtine Edition of 1587.
Here both αὐλή and αἰθριον are used, suggesting that αἰθριον is to be taken rather specifically in the sense of "in the open air," as LSJ gives the meaning of the adjective αἰθριος. The court was an open space, with no overhead covering, surrounding the Tabernacle.

Philo writes in *Life of Moses* 2.80 of τῷ ὑπαίθρῳ... ὀ κέκληκεν αὐλήν. Then in §94, 106, and 146 he refers to the placement of the altar, opposite the entrance to the court, ἐν ὑπαίθρῳ, which suggests the same setting Josephus describes. Josephus used the cognate words αἰθήρ ("ether, the heaven, as the source of the soul") and αἰθριος ("clear of weather"). Although the Vulgate was translated later on, and the Cambridge LXX apparatus does not list a variant αἰθριον, parallel to the Latin atrium, the command to build this element of the Tabernacle in the Vulgate is: facies et atrium tabernaculi (27: 9), after which comes the carrying out of the command: erexit et atrium per gyrum tabernaculi (40: 31).

Perhaps, as Weill and Thackeray suggest, Josephus was giving a hint of modernity to his vocabulary, thus catering to his hoped-for Graeco-Roman readership. But perhaps Josephus had more in mind.

Since the word is found in the vision of the Temple in Ezekiel, and since there is an Aramaic equivalent to be found in Targum Isaiah, perhaps Josephus was simply drawing on a fund of words that he had heard in the synagogue, as the Scriptures were read.

The prophet Ezekiel was evidently important in the Rabbinic understanding of the Temple. In M. Middoth, of the seven occasions

---

63 Thackeray, *Lexicon*, p. 12 (War 2.54; 6.47; Apion 2.11).
64 Ibid., p. 12. Jastrow lists the word מָשָׁק, meaning "watchman" that is found in Targum Isaiah 9: 13; 19: 15. The place in which the watchman would do his duty would be the αἰθριον.
when a scripture citation is preceded by "it is written," four of the citations are from Ezekiel.

Targums Onkelos and Neofiti used מַתְגִּיר when the Hebrew רָעִי was available, and still in use in the vocabulary of the time. Was this merely for the sake of variety? Jastrow suggests that there was a drift in the meaning of רָעִי such that it suggested the idea of "private property," and it even had the meaning of "cemetery." Perhaps it was because the meaning of the word was changing that the Targumim use מַתְגִּיר.

Since Josephus uses αὐλή customarily to refer to a palace, or to a courtyard of a secular space, perhaps he intended ἀξιμίαν to serve a special function, a special choice of word for the courtyard of the Tabernacle, drawn from the precedent of Ezekiel.

Josephus' description (3.108) of the dimensions of the court is the same as MT and LXX Exod. 27: 18. Josephus: "in breadth fifty cubits and in length a hundred" (τὸ μὲν ἑδρὸς πεντήκοντα πηχῶν ἑκατὸν δὲ τὸ μῆκος)/ LXX: "the length of the court one-hundred by one-hundred, and the width fifty by fifty" (τὸ δὲ μῆκος τῆς αὐλῆς ἑκατὸν ἕφ’ ἑκατὸν, καὶ ἑδρὸς πεντήκοντα ἐπὶ πεντήκοντα).

Since the vocabulary in Josephus and LXX is virtually the same, and since Josephus nowhere gives the details of the orientation of the court, as is found in MT and LXX, it is arguable that

---

65Middoth 2: 5--Ezek. 46: 22; Middoth 3: 1--Ezek. 43: 16; Middoth 4: 1--Ezek 41: 23; Middoth 4: 2--Ezek. 44: 2. Though Ezekiel is clearly important in Middoth, the rabbis at Jamnia debated its place in the canon. In BT Shabbath 13b we read that "but for Hananiah b. Hezekiah, the Book of Ezekiel would have been hidden for its words contradicted the Torah." Cf. the same in Hagigah 13a and Menahoth 45a.

66MT Exod 27: 9-13; 38: 9-13

Josephus drew upon LXX Exod. 27: 18 at this point.68 The east and west sides are fifty cubits, the north and south, one hundred cubits (27: 9-13). Josephus does not give the compass orientation of the court, as MT and LXX do; he simply gives its dimensions fifty cubits in width and one hundred cubits in length. Josephus' understanding of the orientation of the court is derived from his later explanation of the orientation of the Tabernacle itself (3.115). The shorter two sides of the Tabernacle were the east and west; the longer, the north and south. The similarity of Josephus' vocabulary to LXX suggests he was reading from LXX at this point.

Josephus, with LXX, gives the height next as he tells of the length of the poles supporting the curtains surrounding the court.

68 MT 27: 9 ἔμ, 27: 11 νῆσος, 27: 12 στώ; 27: 13 θεία. LXX 27: 9 λίβα (south, but also means west, cf the expression λίβα εἰς ἀπηλιών, "from West to East,"), 27: 11 ἀπηλιών (east), 27: 12 πρός θάλασσαν (west), 27: 13 πρός νότον (north). MT 38: 9 βόραν, 38: 11 νῆσος, 38: 12 στώ; 38: 13 θεία. LXX 38: 9 βορράν, 38: 9 νότον, 38: 10 πρός θάλασσαν, 38: 12 πρός ἀνατολάς. NB: Whereas MT II is the same as MT I, LXX II uses different words for west (λίβα) and east (ἀπηλιών) from LXX I. Furthermore, LXX I and II do not have the same order of directions of the compass as MT. The order in Onkelos is ὄριον ἄνατολι (south 27: 9/38: 9), ἄνατολι ἄνατολι (north 27: 11; 38: 11), ἄνατολι ἄνατολι (west 27: 12/38: 12), and ἄνατολι ἄνατολι (east 27: 13/38: 13). The order in Neofiti is ὄριον ἄνατολι, ἄνατολι ἄνατολι, which follows the order of MT and Onkelos, although the word for "east" differs from Onkelos and MT. The remnants of 4QpaleoExodm include 27: 9 ἔμ, 11 νῆσος, and 13 θεία (col. XXX). Cf. Nelson, Studies in the Development of the Text of the Tabernacle Account, pp. 210-212 for a summary of the textual varieties found in the Greek Exodus. Gooding, Account of the Tabernacle, pp. 23 f discusses this problem. He writes: "It is fairly certain that the Greek order was originally (and correctly) πρός νότον, πρός βορράν, πρός θάλασσαν, for in v. 35 of this same ch. xxvi, πρός νότον stand for περι, and πρός βορράν for περι. Nelson documents the variety of this textual problem, and summarizes his conclusion: "The MT order appears to be original and has the support of the Old Greek and most of the Gk I witnesses. The Palestinian texts, however, followed a tradition where the order began north-south" (p. 212). In note 80, p. 304, he writes: "Josephus (Ant. 3.115) presents the order: east, south, north, and west. His placement of east first, however, seems deliberate in order to mention the entrance to the tabernacle. Therefore, his text Vorlage would have been the same as the MT with regard to the order of the directions."
KaµaKαξ δὲ ἔστησε χαλκέας πενταπήχεις τὸ ύψος. 69 LXX gives the height of the court's encircling curtain, rather than the length of the poles. LXX uses στύλοι to translate MT στήλ. 70

Kaµαξ is found only once in LXX, in II Maccabees 5: 3, where it means "spear." All of the occurrences of κάμαξ in Josephus are found in Ant. 3.109-113. Philo uses κίων71 in one place, and στύλος directly afterwards to describe the poles supporting the curtain surrounding the court. 72

Josephus mixes terminology suitable to describe a column in a temple with terms suitable to describe a spear, as he gives the details of the κάμακες. As a general in the Galilean campaign against the Romans, Josephus would have had ample opportunity to see spears, perhaps used to support curtains separating small areas within a military camp. The κάμακες are like columns in that they have capitals (κιονόκρανα) and bases (βάσεις). But they are like

69 Inadvertently, Thackeray translates πενταπήχεις "fifty cubits" rather than "five cubits."
70 MT 27: 10/38: 10. LXX 27: 10/38: 8. Nelson draws together the evidence from the Biblical text: "τίμων: This Hebrew word for 'pillar' is translated throughout the Tabernacle Account by forms of στύλος. In all but one example, I Kings and 2 Chronicles translate the same. In 7: 18(7: 6)/3: 16(3: 16) - I Kings uses κρεμαστον. When speaking of the pillars of the tabernacle, Josephus uses κιονες. However, when he refers to the pillars of the court, he uses καµαξ. The Old Greek is certainly στυλος "(p. 83).
71 Life of Moses 2.89, 90.
72 Josephus uses the word κιονόκρανα once again in 15.414 to tell of the capitals on the columns (κίονες) of the Temple as it was in his own day. There he writes: κιονοκρανων αὐτοίς κατὰ τὸν Κορινθίων πρόπον ἐπεξειρασμένων γλυφαῖς ἐκπληξιν ἐπιστούσαι. διὰ τὴν τοῦ παντὸς μεγαλουργίαν. LXX is sparing in the use of κιόνων. It is found there in Judges 16: 25-29, which tells of the pillars in the Philistine hall that Samson broke. It finds an odd use in I Kings 15: 15: καὶ εἰσήγαγεν τοὺς κιόνας τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν κίονας αὐτοῦ εἰσήγαγεν εἰς τὸν σῖκον κυρίου, ἄργυρος καὶ χρυσός οὗτοι σαι σκέυη. Here the κίονες surely does not mean "pillars," referring instead to gifts. The pillars in Solomon's Temple are called στύλοι, and their capitals are ἐπιθέματα (III Kingdoms 7: 3-4).
spears in that their "bases" are really σαυρωτήρες, spikes that can be stuck firmly into the ground (ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἐρημεισμέναι). 73

The peculiar description Josephus makes of the material of these bases (βάσεις δὲ χρυσοί. . . χαλκαὶ δὲ ἅπαν) may find some explanation in the Midrash Rabbah, 74 where we read: "there were seven kinds of gold used in the Temple: good gold, pure gold, beaten gold, overlaid gold, refined gold, gold of Parvaim, and the finest gold." Josephus may have been describing "overlaid gold" covering the bronze spikes at the end of the pole.

Josephus seems to draw his description of the poles from more than one place in LXX. Like the poles in 27: 17 and 38: 20, the poles in Josephus' Tabernacle are made of bronze, topped with silver-plated κεφαλίδες, 75 with βάσεις that are gold-plated. 76 They are equipped with silver rings (κρίκοι). 77 In Exod. 38: 20 the rings are called ἀγκύλας, actually meaning "hooks." 78

Josephus tells of no ψαλίδες (fillets) on these poles. Neither does LXX Exod. 38: 18-20. Instead, LXX here seems to substitute μοχλός (bar) for ψαλίς (fillet) which translates ῃψη of MT 27: 10/38: 18-19. 79 In the description of the poles that were actually used to

73Ant. 3.109. Nodet observes that Josephus' likening these poles to spears, with metal points, is comparable to the description found in the Iliad 10. 153 and Herodotus 7. 41, but is contrary to a rabbinic tradition found in Melekhot haMishkan 1. 1 (he made the base hollow [יונית]). II, 149, note 7.
74Exodus-Terumah XXXV, 1.
75Gooding discusses this peculiarity in Account of the Tabernacle, pp. 44-47.
76Exod. 27: 10--καὶ ἀι βάσεις περιηγηρωμέναι ἄργυρῳ.
77Exod. 27: 10--καὶ ῃρικοὶ αὐτῶν ἄργυραί.
78Καὶ ἀγκύλας ἐποίησεν ἄργυρας ἐπὶ τῶν στύλων.
79Gooding writes: "It is not clear whether the Hebrew denotes an ornamental band round the pillar just beneath the capital, or whether it means a connecting rod running between the pillars." Account of the
form the court parameter, LXX here describes them with golden bars instead of with the silver fillets mentioned earlier (Exod. 27: 11). MT 38: 19 lists hooks, capitals, and fastenings/fillets, which has no counterpart in LXX.

The μοχλοί (bars) in 38: 18, unlike ψαλίς in 27: 10, are either made of gold or gold-plated (καὶ ἐξορύσσωσιν τοὺς μοχλούς χρυσίῳ). Μοχλός is the only translation listed in HR for νῆρος which in the Tabernacle chapters is part of the support structure for the walls of the Tabernacle. LXX is unclear.

The Targums reflect the uncertainty of LXX. Neofiti renders the latter part of 27: 10 ὀλίγα τοίς καθό περιπλανεῖται κόσμος, "the clasps of the pillars and their fastenings shall be of silver." Onkelos: καὶ ἄσσευται κόσμος κόσμος which has been translated by Rosenbaum and Silbermann, "the hooks of the columns and their cross-bars shall be of silver." Does καὶ κατάβας mean fastening or cross bar? Onkelos, which is thought to be a careful translation of the Hebrew text of its day, is the same as the

Tabernacle, p. 15. He points out uncertainties in the Greek Exodus in the meaning of the word ψαλίς. Here in 27: 10 it seems to mean "fillet." "But," he goes on to say, "in 30: 4 it refers to the rings of the incense altar through which ran the staves that were used to carry the altar. This opens the possibility that the translator intended ψαλίδες in 27: 10 to mean rings, in spite of the fact that elsewhere (e.g. 26: 29) he uses δακτύλοι for the Hebrew word for rings, דקש. Maybe he thought that each of the court pillars was equipped with rings at the top just beneath the capital, from which the hangings were suspended by means of the hooks, that were fastened to the hangings and slipped through the rings. But however it is, ψαλίδες is certainly meant to represent the Hebrew סְקֵל הָשָׁנָה" (pp. 26-27).

80 <Bibliography>
Hebrew at first (יו, hooks), but in the puzzling word cabešıyatok, it is the same as Neofiti, which differs from MT (בכובשיהות).

Jastrow cites two meanings for cabešıyatok: 1. a conquest or dominion, b. ascent, grade, c. (only in plural) means of subduing one's pride; reproof; evil prediction, penitence; 2. fastening, connection, listing as an example the Targum here. Perhaps the word is to be taken in the sense of the first meaning, suggesting the idea of the ascent, the top, or the capital of the pole, as Josephus has it. But Neofiti reflects MT cabešıyatok. Onkelos differs from Neofiti only in the spelling of cabešıyatok. The Targums may reflect the same kind of picture of the poles as Josephus' poles, with rings (or hooks) and capitals, but no fillets.

Although there is ambiguity regarding the description of these poles in LXX and the Targums, Josephus offers a clear, if abridged picture. He describes them, it would seem, accurately as κάμακες; that is, they resemble in length and girth spear shafts, made of bronze. But they are more than mere spear shafts; they have something of the dignity of columns, complete with base and capital. Perhaps the Targums reflect a similar line of understanding of these poles that supported the curtain surrounding the court of the Tabernacle.

All the sources agree that a ring, or hook (κρίκος) was fixed at the top of each pole, to which was attached a cord running from the top of the pole to a stake, much as a tent today is secured. Josephus does not say, as LXX does, of what material the rings are made. This

---

must be an accidental omission, since there is no particular significance to this part of the Tabernacle court’s circumference. Both MT and LXX, as well as SP and the Targums say that they are made of silver.

The encircling curtain was fixed to the κάμακες on either side of the twenty-cubit opening that served as the entrance to the court. These two poles εἰστήκεσαν κατὰ μίμησιν πυλώνοιν ("they stood in imitation of gate-pillars" 3.111). The difference between these two poles that stood at each side of the gate and the poles at the circumference of the court which were ἐρημεισμέναι (planted), seems to be that the former were planted so firmly in the ground that they were able to stand without any supporting ropes, whereas the latter needed the ropes tied to stakes for support. Josephus does not give specific information about the relative thickness of the poles standing around the court compared with the poles on either side of the entrance. But he seems to mean, in describing them as κατὰ μίμησιν πυλώνοιν, that they were more substantial than the other poles.83 The term πυλών implied something grand. These are overlaid with silver, except for the bases, which are bronze. Unlike the bases of the poles surrounding the court, these are not gilded.

The number of poles at the entrance to the court in Josephus' account differs from Exodus. Josephus gives the same dimensions as

83 Diodorus Siculus describes a pylon outside the sanctuary built by the Egyptian King Ramses II: "At its entrance there is a pylon, constructed of variegated stone, two plethra in breadth and forty-five cubits high; passing through them one enters a rectangular peristyle, built of stone, four plethra long on each side; it is supported, in place of pillars (ἀντὶ τῶν κιόνων), by monolithic figures sixteen cubits high, wrought in the ancient manner as to shape." *Diodorus of Sicily*, with an English translation by C.H. Oldfather (10 vols. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1956), I, 167.
MT's east side of the court. But Exodus tells of three pillars supporting the fifteen cubit span of curtain on each side of the entrance, whereas Josephus tells of three in addition to the poles resembling pylons on either side of the entrance. LXX Exod. 27: 16; 37: 13, 14; 38: 16 and 39: 9, 20 mention ἡ πυλὴ τῆς αὐλῆς. Πυλὴ, of course, merely reflects the Hebrew ἡψι. Perhaps Josephus, writing here from memory, mistakenly mentions ἡ πυλὴ as an entity apart from the κάμακες that make up the gateway to the court, thus describing pylons in addition to the Biblical three poles supporting the two fifteen cubit sections of curtain on the east side of the court, where the gate was.

Curiously, LXX Exod 27: 14-15 states that the curtains on either side of the entrance were fifteen cubits high. And the tapestry, or veil (κάλυμμα) before the entrance to the court was twenty cubits high.

---


85καὶ πέντε καὶ δέκα πύλεων τὸ ὑψὸς τῶν ἱστίων τῷ κλίτει τῷ ἐνί. . . καὶ τὸ κλίτος τὸ δεύτερον δέκα πέντα πηχῶν τῶν ἱστίων τὸ ὑψός.

86καὶ τῇ πύλῃ τῆς αὐλῆς κάλυμμα έίκοσι πύλεων τὸ ὑψός. See Nelson's careful explanation of the textual history of this problem in Studies in the Development of the Text of the Tabernacle Account, pp. 214-15. Gooding, Account of the Tabernacle, p. 25, writes "The Greek in v. 16 gratuitously adds to the measurements the words τὸ ὑψὸς, 'in height,' and so represents the gate as being twenty cubits high, that is twice the height of the tabernacle itself! And in vv. 14, 15 it has 'the height of the hangings (shall be) of fifteen cubits,' which makes these hangings five cubits higher than the tabernacle. Once more it is very apparent that the Greek is simply mistaken; it is not dependent on some Hebrew text that was different from the M.T." (See above, chapter 1, n. 11). Perhaps LXX ὑψὸς represents a scribal mistake, substituting ψ for φ. Otherwise, the dimensions are correct as they are found. The screen across the entrance was twenty cubits, wide, however, rather than high. Likewise, the curtains on each side of the entrance were fifteen cubits wide, rather than high.
The curtain surrounding the court in Josephus; account is σινδών δ ἐκ βύσσου ποικιλωτάτη, "linen of finely worked flax."  

Josephus paraphrases LXX ἐκ βύσσου κεκλωσμένης (MT רַפְּחָא יִשְׂרָאֵל) Exod. 27: 9 in his description of the curtain on the two long sides, and on the side opposite the entrance, σινδών δ ἐκ βύσσου ποικιλωτάτη. 

A fine linen tapestry (βύσσινον ὅφος σινδόνος) hung on either side of the entrance in Josephus' account. He is not altogether clear in describing their relationship to the κάμακες attached to the κάμακες κατὰ μίμησιν πυλώνων at the sides of the entrance. He says they ἐν περιηγημένον, that is, the fine linen tapestry was wrapped around the poles.

Josephus, like Exodus, describes another tapestry, richer than those on the two sides of the gates, that hung in front of this entrance. The height, or rather the depth (βάθος) of this tapestry (ὅφος) at the gate, as the rest of the curtain around the court, was five cubits. 

Josephus does not say how this tapestry is supported. This must be pure forgetfulness on his part. In Exodus, it is supported with four pillars. 

Philo ascribed four pillars to the "propylaeum" at the entrance, "on which was stretched a piece of woven work of various colours, made in the same way as those within the tabernacle.

87 Ant. 3.110. Niese cites the variant μαλακωτάτη, "softest," in MSPLat. Pausanias remarks of the βύσσος of Ἡλεία that it was "as fine as that of the Hebrews, but it is not so yellow (ἐστι δὲ οὐκ ὁμοίως ξανθή)." Description of Greece with English translation by W.H.S. Jones (6 vols. London: William Heinemann, 1951), V, v, 2.

88 MT, LXX, SP, the Targums, and 4QpaleoExodm, insofar as the fragments indicate (27: 18), have the same material for all the curtains around the court (27: 9 ἐκ βύσσου κεκλωσμένης/MT 38: 16 רַפְּחָא יִשְׂרָאֵל לִכְלִי כֶּלֶד יִשְׂרָאֵל קָבָר שְׁלֵשׁ). Neofiti ῥάζαν μύλος.

89 Ant. 3.113.

90 Exod. 27: 16, στῦλοι αὐτῶν τέσσαρες/τὸν βραχὺ άγιορέτου.
and of like materials". Likewise, Josephus described it as rich in ornamentation, but he adds the disclaimer that it had no likenesses of living creatures included in the design. He was careful here not to violate the second commandment, prohibiting the making of graven images. When he described the cherubim on the ark (3.137), he was careful to explain that they were "in form unlike to any creatures that man's eyes have seen." He may have wished to disarm any notion that the cherubim were like the griffins that were well-known on the helmet of Athena in the Parthenon. Pausanias described these "beasts like lions with beaks and wings of eagles" in relief (επειργασμένοι) on Athena's helmet.

There is some variation here from LXX Exod 27: 16, καὶ τῇ πύλῃ τῆς αὐλῆς καλυμμα. . . έξ ύακίνθου καὶ πορφύρας καὶ κοκκίνου κεκλωσμένου καὶ βύσσου κεκλωσμένης τῇ ποικίλᾳ τοῦ ραφιδευτοῦ "and the veil for the gate of the court. . .of blue and purple and spun scarlet and spun linen by the weaving of the embroider." Josephus has φοίνικος (scarlet) for LXX κοκκίνου κεκλωσμένου. He ordered

---

91 Life of Moses 2.93 ἐν ἀρχῇ τῆς εἰς τὴν αὐλήν εἰσόδου κατεσκευάζετο διὰ τετράων κιόνων, καθ' ἄν εἵπετο ποικίλοιν ύφασμα τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον τοῖς εἰσώ κατά τὴν σκηνὴν κάκ τῆς ὁμοίας ὑλῆς ἀπειργασμένον.
92 Παύσανιας, Description of Greece, (Attica ) ΠΙ, xxiv, 5-6. The cherubim on the ark, Josephus wrote (3.137), ἦσαν πρόστυμα, that is, were "in bas-relief." (Νοδέτ II, 154--"en bas-relief sur le revêtement d'or."
93 Νοδέτ remarks here that there is a rabbinic tradition (Melekhet haMishkan) representing cherubim on the curtain of the entrance to the outercourt. Cf. Ezek. 41: 18 where there are cherubim and palms. ΠΙ, 150, note
94 Παύσανιας, Description of Greece, (Attica ) ΠΙ, xxiv, 5-6. The cherubim on the ark, Josephus wrote (3.137), ἦσαν πρόστυμα, that is, were "in bas-relief." (Νοδέτ II, 154--"en bas-relief sur le revêtement d'or."
95 In the list of offerings found in Exod. 25: 4, this last is translated literally as κοκκίνον διπλοῦν. Philo, Life of Moses 2.84, lists four colors; ύακίνθῳ καὶ πορφύρα καὶ κοκκίνῳ καὶ βύσσῳ καταχρώμενος (which Colson renders "bright white," which seems to be somewhat of an exaggeration for "colored
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the colors differently: purple, scarlet, blue, and linen. Josephus calls the hanging ήφος, while LXX calls it κάλυμμα. In the second section of LXX Tabernacle account, we find καταπέτασμα (38: 16), instead of κάλυμμα. Κάλυμμα and καταπέτασμα both translate MT הַשָּׁם, which in Exodus is the word used for the hanging that covers the entrance to the court (27: 16), to the Tabernacle (26: 36-37), and to the Holy of Holies (35: 12; 39: 34; 40: 21). In each case הַשָּׁם stands for a hanging over an entry way. Josephus employs ήφος variously to refer to any kind of fabric.

The texture of the tapestry in Josephus' account is described as πεποιημένον πολλάν αὐτῷ συνανθούντων καὶ ποικίλων, that is, being linen. Philo does describe the hanging before the entrance as LXX does; it is no higher than the rest of the curtain surrounding the courtyard. He also calls this hanging καταπέτασμα (2.87). He refers to the entrance as τὸ προσπυλοῖον.

Philosophical coherence. 96 Philo at this point simply states that this tapestry was the same as those inside the Tabernacle. Life of Moses 2.93 ἐπείνετο ποικίλον ήφασμα τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον τοῖς ἐξώ κατὰ τὴν σκηνὴν κάκις ὅμοιος ἥλις ἀπειργασμένον.

Cf. Ant. 3.112=the curtains on the fifteen cubit section beside the entrance to the court; 3.113=the hanging in front of the entrance to the court; 3.128=curtains served by κρίκος; 3.129=the multicolored tapestry, it seems, covering the entrance to the court (τῶν βαμμάτων ήφος); 3.167=the fabric of the priest's breastpiece (ἐσσήν); 5.229=woven material recovered after the defeat of the Midianites and Arabs by Gideon; 8.72=the hanging separating the Holy of Holies from the Holy Place in Solomon's Temple. Here the colors of the hanging are ύδακίνθος καὶ πορφύρα καὶ κόκκος πεποιημένος, blue, purple, and scarlet; 11.18=the covering spread by King Ahasuerus over poles (κιόνων) for the banquet at which he requested Queen Vashti to display her beauty, which moment sets the stage for the story of the Jews' deliverance in the Book of Esther. Josephus often uses φάρσος as a synonym for ήφος; 3.126 where it is used as a synonym for ήφος that appears just previously in 3.125; 3.128, where again φάρσος is used as a synonym for ήφος; 3.130 where it refers to the Tabernacle curtain; 3.131 where it refers to a part of a curtain; 3.161 where it refers to the material of the tunic of the priest; 3.183 where it is found in conjunction with a participial form of the verb ύφαίνω, cognate to ήφος 3.193 where it refers to material used as covering for the Tabernacle; 8.207 where it refers to the cloak worn by the prophet Achias, which he tore into twelve pieces as a sign to Jeroboam of the division of the twelve tribes of Israel. Σίνδων is another synonym found in Ant. 3.110, 112, 129, 131, 153, and 158.
made with flowered embroidery and many different colors. 98 MT and LXX Exod. 27: 16 have ἔπειτα ὧν/βύσσου κεκλωσμένης, ἕνεκ’ ἕως τῆς ποικιλίας τοῦ ραφίδευτοῦ, which corresponds closely to the second section of the Tabernacle account, differing only in the absence of the flowered embroidery. Neofiti translates the colors of the hanging before the entrance: ἀρχάγγελον ἅβατιν βουρτζίσσων (blue and purple and precious crimson material and twined byssus, 27: 16, 38: 18). Onkelos: ἀρχάγγελον ἅβατιν βουρτζίσσων, which reflects MT, leaving out any translation of ἔπειτα, which Neofiti translates ἕνεκ’.

The Tabernacle court contained two items of furniture: the laver and the bronze altar. Nelson has observed that MT/Gk I refer to the altar simply as the altar (τοῦ ναοῦ/θυσιαστήριον); MT II calls it the altar of burnt sacrifice (τὸ ἡμέρας ὁμοσπονδίας), and Gk II refers to it as "the bronze altar" (τὸ θυσιαστήριον τὸ χαλκοῦν), which, with a change in the word for "altar," is the reading followed by Josephus (3.149, βωμὸς χαλκεος). 99 Josephus adds that it was ornamented with gold (τὸ χρυσόφι κεκοσμημένος).

In the first section of the Exodus account, the altar is described before the details of the perimeter curtain are outlined (27: 1-8). The laver is mentioned, seemingly almost as an afterthought (30: 17-21). In the second section the altar of sacrifice is described first, with the laver coming directly afterwards, albeit very briefly (38: 1-

---

98 The translation of this phrase is illusive. Συνανθούντων, from συνανθέω, means "blossom together," according to LSJ. Ποικίλων, "of many colors," stands at odds with the specific mention of the three colors: blue, purple, and scarlet. I take it that Josephus means that the tapestry is embroidered in shapes resembling flowers, using the aforementioned colors.

7, 8). This is followed by a description of the hangings, poles, and the gate at the perimeter of the court.

In Josephus' account, the court perimeter is described first (3.108-113), after which comes a terse remark about the laver. Without mentioning the gold-ornamented, bronze altar of sacrifice, he concludes the court section (3.114) by saying: "Such was the arrangement of the precincts of the outer court" (καὶ ὁ μὲν τοῦ οἴκημα περίβολος τοῦτον τὸν πρόπον ἦν διακεκοσμημένος). He does not mention the altar of sacrifice until much later, in 3.149, seemingly as a postscript, following the last piece of the furniture in the Tabernacle proper, τὸ θυμιατήριον, the incense-altar. Why? It may be because he wished to emphasize the prayers. Prayers were offered by the people in the courts of the Temple.

The Laver

Josephus (3.114) uses a different word for the laver (περίμακτήριον) than the Greek Bible (30: 18 λούτήρα χαλκοῦν). He also places less emphasis on its importance. Exodus stresses that Aaron and his sons must wash hands and feet before entering the

100 Nodet-περίμακτήριον, citing περίμακτήριον in S2P2-Edd. This term is found only here in Josephus. Herodotus uses περίμακτήριον for two "sprinkling bowls," one of silver and the other of gold, sent by Croesus to Delphi. It is among other bowls (κρητήρας) Croesus gave, one of which was to be used at the θεοφανία, the Feast of the Divine Appearance (History 1.51). Later on (3.139), Josephus makes a comment on the table in the Tabernacle, τράπεζαν ἱδρύεται Δελφικαῖς παραδείγματα, "he set a table like those at Delphi." Here Josephus uses a term for the laver which is a term used by Herodotus for one of the bowls at Delphi used for ceremonial sprinkling. LXX Numbers 19: 13, 19 uses the verb περίμακτιζεν for the sprinkling with water required to cleanse anyone who touched a dead person. The related verb περίμακτιζεν is used in Lev. 14: 7, 51; Num. 8: 7; 19: 18, 19, 21 for ceremonial cleansing. So, while Josephus may have drawn on Herodotus for this word, he would have encountered verbal cognates already in LXX. Cf. LSJ's other citations under περίμακτι, περίμακτος, περίμακτηριον, p. 1385.
Tabernacle or serving at the altar of sacrifice on pain of death (Exod. 30: 20). It is an eternal statute (30: 21). LXX reflects MT fully in this emphasis.\(^\text{101}\)

Philo does not mention this sanction of death for not using the bronze laver (λουτήρ χαλκοῦς), but he introduces the zeal of the women who brought their mirrors to be melted down to provide the bronze for the laver.\(^\text{102}\) Here Philo uses the term ἀπαρχή to describe these contributions, which is in line with Exod. 25: 3, MT πρώτη and LXX ἀπαρχή, the "firstfruit" offerings of the people. Philo interprets the mirrors allegorically as symbols of purity.\(^\text{103}\)

Why did Josephus pay so little regard to the laver? First, it may be conjectured that Josephus paid little attention to the laver, which Philo said was made of mirrors brought by the women, because of his apparently low regard for women.\(^\text{104}\) Second, he may have been restrained from describing the laver fully by the severe sanctions described in the Biblical account for failure to use the laver, since this harshness did not make the religion of the ancient

---

\(^{101}\) "When coming into the Tabernacle, they will wash with water and they will not die...and it will be for him an eternal statute, for him and for his descendants after him." Neofiti, Onkelos and SP are essentially the same as MT.

\(^{102}\) Life of Moses 2.136-37. Cf. Also The Migration of Abraham, 98, where after telling of the enthusiastic provision of their jewelry for the the Tabernacle, Philo again describes their giving their mirrors for the laver. Cf. MT Exod. 38: 8/ LXX 38: 26 "He made the bronze laver, and the bronze base of it of the mirrors of the women that fasted, who fasted by the doors of the tabernacle of witness, in the day in which he set it up."

\(^{103}\) Life of Moses 2. 138-140.

\(^{104}\) Cf. Evelyn and Frank Stagg, Women in the World of Jesus (Philadelphia, 1978), pp. 45-48, where the authors argue that Josephus is biased against women. Professor Feldman has shown that Josephus did not play down the courage and beauty of Esther, which he might have done if he was a complete misogynist. "Hellenizations in Josephus' Version of Esther," TAPA 101 (1970), 147, 149.
Israelites attractive. Third, since he also neglects to mention every aspect of the altar, the other item in the court, while he describes fully the furnishings within the Tabernacle, he may have wished to emphasize the interior of the Tabernacle, rather than the court.

The Bronze Altar of Sacrifice

Though the bronze altar was within the outer court, Josephus described it after telling of the altar of incense, which was within the Tabernacle (3.147-148). Since the bronze altar was within the court, I shall comment on Josephus' account of it here, rather than writing of it in the strict order of Josephus' narrative. Even though the bronze altar (βωμός χάλκεος) (LXX θυσιαστήριον) was essential to the purpose of the Tabernacle court, Josephus may have been reminded that he omitted it in its proper place after he wrote of the altar of incense (θυμιατήριον), a word closely resembling θυσιαστήριον, which was within the walls of the Tabernacle.

The altar in Josephus' account is described tersely, and differs from the Biblical description. In this section of Exodus, Nelson has pointed out that "the number of textual problems . . . clearly point to a development of the text within the Tabernacle account."105 Josephus appears to try to follow the Biblical text, with only slight changes:

There was erected moreover in front of the tabernacle an altar of bronze, this too having a wooden interior; each side measured five cubits and it was three cubits high; while likewise adorned with gold, it was plated with sheets of bronze and had a brazier resembling network; the ground

---

was, in fact, the receptacle for all burning fuel that fell from the brazier, the base not extending beneath the whole of its surface. Over against the altar were set wine-cans and cups, along with censers and bowls; these were (of gold). 106

The Biblical description of the altar of sacrifice in LXX Exod. 27: 1-8 is the same as MT Exod. 27: 1-8 up to verse 3, where LXX introduces a στέφανη (crown) and τὸν καλυτήρα αὐτοῦ (its cover), and presents a slightly different list of utensils. Nelson has charted the utensils listed in the MT, Gk, and Hex. Gk II of Exodus, along side MT and Gk of Num. 4, together with Josephus’ list. 107 For a discussion of the differences between these lists, see Nelson’ study. 108

The instruments Josephus lists for the use of the priests in doing the service of the altar are τοῦ χρυσέου οίνοχόα (a gold vessel for pouring out wine), φίαλαι (cups), θυίκας (censers), and κρατήροιν (mixing bowls) “and whatever other objects were made for the sacred services, which were of gold” (ὅσα τε ἄλλα πρὸς τὰς ἱερούργιας πεποίητο χρύσα πάντα ὑπῆρξε 3.150). Josephus’ is unique in listing κρατήροιν (bowls) = Hebrew, יִבְשֶׂ (according to Nelson). Κρατήροιν may be seen as a synonym for βάσιν, = Hebrew נְפֵנַה (Exod.

106Ant. 3.149-50. ἵδρυτο δὲ καὶ πρὸ τῆς σκηνῆς βωμὸς χάλκεος ὑπόξυλος καὶ αὐτὸς ἐκάστην πλευρὰν πέντε πήχεσιν ἐκμεταρρυμένος, τὸ δὲ ψυχὸς τρίπτυχος, ὅμως τὸ χρυσὸ χειρομενός, χαλκείσας λεπίσιν ἔξοχομενος, δικτὸ τὴν ἑσχάραν ἐμφερής. Εξεδέχετο γὰρ ἢ γῆ τὸ ἁπτὸ τῆς ἑσχάρας πῦρ καταφερόμενον τῆς βάσεως διὰ παντὸς ὑπὸ ύποκειμένης. ἀντὶκρῷ δὲ ἐπίθεντο τὸ χρυσὸν οίνοχοα τε καὶ φιάλαι σὺν θυίκας καὶ κρατήροιν...πεποίητο χρύσα πάντα ὑπῆρχε. Niese notes that the Latin omits χάλκεος in the first line. And in the last line χρύσα, Josephus has the support of the Latin aurea, where Exodus 27: 4 reads χαλκᾶ (brass).


38: 23 and Hex. Gk II).\textsuperscript{109} Josephus’ \textsigma\textsigma (censer) = Hebrew \textsigma, is equivalent to \textsigma/\textsigma, found in each of the other Greek lists of utensils. Josephus includes \textsigma (= Hebrew \textsigma) found in MT I/II, but which is missing from all of the Greek forms of the Biblical text. So, Josephus’ list includes four of the five utensils mentioned in the Hebrew text, which is as close to MT as any of the Greek forms of the Biblical text.

LXX describes a border (\textsigma\textsigma\textsigma\textsigma) on the altar, the coverings (\textsigma\textsigma\textsigma\textsigma), cups (\textsigma\textsigma\textsigma), the flesh hooks (\textsigma\textsigma\textsigma), the censer (\textsigma\textsigma\textsigma), and the rest of the implements that were made of bronze (27: 3). Josephus (3.150) concludes his description of the utensils used at the altar by saying that they were all made of gold. Commenting on Josephus’ difference from LXX here, Thackeray, in a note, remarks, “There is a further difference as regards their material; according to Exodus ‘all the vessels thereof thou shalt make of brass,’ but Josephus has the support of the Old Latin version of the LXX (‘aurea’ for \textsigma\textsigma\textsigma) and the text may therefore stand.”\textsuperscript{110} Since the Old Latin undoubtedly followed one form of the developing text, it would seem that Josephus was either privy to the same form of Exod. or he gratuitously made a change that happened to conform with the Old Latin.

\textsuperscript{109}Nelson comments on Josephus’ \textsigma\textsigma: “The \textsigma\textsigma\textsigma\textsigma of Josephus is normally [according to H-R, p. 784] rendered for \textsigma\textsigma, although here it may simply be a variant translation for \textsigma\textsigma, both meaning bowls.” \textit{Ibid.}, p. 238.

\textsuperscript{110}Cf. Thackeray’s note a, \textit{Josephus} IV, 386.
MT's list of implements includes its pots for fat drippings or ashes, shovels, bowls, forks, censers, and the rest of the utensils which too were made of bronze. Of the various forms of the Biblical text cited by Nelson, there is most resemblance between Josephus and MT. Josephus lists four of the five items found in MT (wine-cans, bowls, censer, and cups), and has only three items in common (cups, bowls, and censer) with the rest. Apart from this it is significant that Josephus uses a different word than LXX for altar. Josephus calls the altar βωμός, while LXX calls it θυσιαστήριον. This difference may simply be due to Josephus' independence in retelling the Biblical account in his own words. He reserves θυσιαστήριον for the altar in the Temple.

---

111 Nelson, Studies in the Development of the Text of the Tabernacle Account has thoroughly compared the text of MT and LXX on the vocabulary of the altar instruments, as on other vocabulary questions of the Tabernacle account. For πάτον (pot), see pp. 94-95, along with notes 208-211, p. 149; for βάρος (shovel) see pp. 65-66, along with notes 106-09, p. 140; for νησίμα (basin) see p. 67, along with note 153, p. 145; he does not include τριτιόν (three-pronged fork) in his list on pp. 42-47; for μετυμνίον (tray or pan) see p. 72, along with note 54 on p. 136, which cites Josephus Ant. 3.145, 150, and 174, without comment.

Philo uses βωμός as the generic term for altar, and θυσιαστήριον as the specific name for the altar of burnt offerings in the court.  

While stating, with LXX, that the altar is five cubits square, three cubits tall, and made of wood, coated with bronze, he does not here mention the kind of wood. LXX Exod 27: 1, reflecting MT 27: 1, once again says the altar is made ἐκ ξύλων ἀσήπτων.  

The bronze coating on the altar Josephus (3.149) describes as χαλκείας λεπίσαν ἔξησκημένος, "plated with sheets of bronze." He uses similar terms to describe the coating on the "wooden incense-altar, encased in a sheet of metal" (θυμιαστήριον ξύλινον μέν...στερεὰ δὲ περιελήλατ᾽ αὐτῷ λεπίς (3.147). LXX Exod. 27: 2 reads: "and you will cover them with bronze" (καὶ καλύψεις αὐτὰ χαλκῷ).  

LXX describes the bronze plating of elements of other Tabernacle furniture in various ways. LXX Exod 26: 29 describes the gilding of the Tabernacle poles: καὶ τοὺς στύλους καταχρυσώσεις χρυσίω. Josephus omits mention of the poles. Describing the gold plating on the inside and outside of the ark, he writes: χρυσῷ δὲ τὰ τ ἐντὸς καὶ τὰ ἐξωθεὶν περιελήλαστο πᾶσα (3.135). Josephus, like LXX employed a variety of verbs to describe the coating of bronze and gold on the Tabernacle furniture.  

Josephus adds a detail to the altar perhaps drawn from the description of the altar in Solomon's Temple, as he writes: "likewise adorned with gold" (οὕοίως τῷ χρυσῷ κεκοσμημένος). It is

---

113 Life of Moses 2.106 τὸν δ᾽ ἐν ὑπαίθρῳ βωμὸν εἴωθε καλείν θυσιαστήριον.  
114 LXX Exod. 38: 22 does not mention the wood οὗτος ἐποίησεν τὸ θυσιαστήριον τῷ χαλκῷ.  
115 I Kings 7: 48 refers to the golden altar.
not clear how the gold ornamented the altar, while being essentially plated with bronze.

Josephus makes no mention of the horns (τὰ κέρατα) on the altar here, though he writes of the horns of the altar grasped by Adonias, who attempted to find sanctuary after King David declared his son, Solomon, his successor to Israel's throne (I Kings 1: 50/Ant. 7.361). Presumably, Josephus thought the altar in King David's day was the altar made for the Tabernacle. Josephus does not tell of horns on the bronze altar for Solomon's Temple (Ant. 8.88). 116 II Chron. 4: 1 does not mention horns on this altar (here, as in Josephus, "bronze") either. The altar in the Tabernacle in LXX I (Exodus 27: 2), however, does have horns. LXX II (38: 22-24), as Nelson points out, does not mention the horns. 117 He writes: "If Josephus does not mention horns in either altar section, it is reasonable to expect a similar lack of mention in the Vorlage of Gk II." 118 Josephus may not mention the horns because the text he was using at this point did not mention them.

Josephus vocabulary for the basic elements of the grating is the same as LXX. Josephus (3.149): δικτύῳ τῆν ἑσχάραν ἐμφερής/ LXX Exod. 27: 4: καὶ ποιήσεις αὐτῷ ἑσχάραν ἔργῳ δικτυωτῷ καλκήν. Exod. 38: 24 ἔργον δικτυωτόν. 119 Philo does not provide details of this sort when he mentions the altar. 120

116 III Kingdoms 6: 21 gives the rubric that the θυσιαστήριον was to be covered with gold (περιέσχεν αὐτῷ χρυσῷ).
118 Ibid., p. 239.
119 Thackeray calls attention to a slight difference between ἑσχάρα and the Hebrew נָּאָר: "The Hebrew mikbar is generally taken to be a 'grating' (so
In describing the Tabernacle court Josephus gives a personal account that is informed by the developing Biblical text, by Rabbinic traditions, by Herodotus' vocabulary in describing a gift to the Delphi temple (περιαρχητηριον), and sometimes by his own faulty memory. It is hard to tell whether his Biblical text is Hebrew or Greek because he nowhere consistently follows either the Hebrew or LXX. Josephus follows MT most, but he is also aware of LXX. Josephus clearly makes Moses the most evident force standing behind the Tabernacle construction, while never losing awareness that God's commands governed Moses.¹²¹

The Tabernacle


¹²¹In Burkert's description of animal sacrifices in ancient Greece the artifacts accompanying the sacrifice bear little resemblance to the utensils mentioned in the Tabernacle account. He mentions the garland of twigs worn by priests and victim, ribbons on the victim, gilded horns on the victim. A "blameless maiden" precedes the procession carring on her head a basket in which are the sacrificial knife and grains of barley or cakes. A pitcher of water is also included. He mentions a basin for catching the blood which is then spryed over the altar. Greek Religion, p. 56. Nodet observes (II, 157, note 4) that Josephus (Ant. 3.233-234) omits the libations prescribed with the holocaust (Exod. 29: 40 and Num. 25: 5-6).
The Exodus Tabernacle account describes the parts of the Tabernacle project before telling, virtually as a postscript, of the erection of the completed structure. By contrast, Josephus describes a structure already in place. Josephus' objective was to shed light on Israel's ancient shrine for the benefit of readers, who, for the most part, did not have any background in Israelite history. As I have noted above, Josephus began the Tabernacle account by describing the court, the first element that a visitor would see. Having described the court, with its laver (as I have noted, he leaves the altar of sacrifice till much later, after describing the θυμιατήριον, the incense altar) he turned to a description of the Tabernacle proper. Once again, Josephus begins with the entryway to the tent.

The Tabernacle Entrance

Josephus elaborates on the reason for the eastern orientation of the Tabernacle: "in order that the sun, at its rising, should shed its first rays upon it" (3.115). Whereas MT Exod. 27: 13 stipulates that the opening of the court of the Tabernacle is to be eastward, Josephus only gives the dimensions of the court, fifty by one-hundred cubits. Conversely, though the Exodus Tabernacle account does not expressly command or describe the compass orientation of the Tabernacle proper, Josephus does, for the reason expressed above ("so that the sun, when it rose, might shine its first rays on it.").¹²² He may have tied-in a rubric followed by ancient Israel in

¹²²Nodet observes the difference between Josephus and Exodus, and Josephus' similarity to Ezeliel 43: 4; 47: 1. He notes that "Josephus has perhaps also a remembrance here of the temple of Herod, (Nicanor Gate), cf. §103." He notes that the Egyptian temples were constructed with an eastern orientation because of the importance of the sun to the Egyptian national cult. II, 150,
setting up the Tabernacle (Num. 3: 38 "before the Tabernacle on the east, before the tent of meeting toward the sunrise.) Repeatedly the instruction is given as the Israelites traveled in the wilderness, that the orientation of the camp and of the Tabernacle is eastward. The reason for this is clear. Canaan lay to the east. In telling of the movement of the Israelites, the direction was given πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν ἡλίου.

But Josephus is not describing a practical command, having only to do with the journey eastward to Canaan. Josephus' editorial comment is reminiscent of Philo' view that, in Ginzberg's words, "light appears... as the image of God's wisdom."

Ginzberg writes the legend that "As the sun sets forth on his course in the morning, his wings touch the leaves on the trees of Paradise, and their vibration is communicated to the angels and the holy Hayyot, to the other plants, and also to the trees and plants on earth, and to all the beings on earth and in heaven. It is the signal for them all to cast their eyes upward. As soon as they see the

---


123 Num. 2: 3; 10: 5; 21: 11.
124 Deut. 4: 41; Josh. 1: 15; 12: 1; 13: 27, 32; κ.τ.λ.
125 Louis Ginzberg, Legends of the Jews, (7 vols. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1968), V, 112. He deduces this from Philo's On the Creation 8, 18. Cf. E.R. Goodenough, An Introduction to Philo Judaeus, p. 23, where the author remarks on the importance of the sun to Philo in a day when "the sun was the source of life, human, animal, vegetable, and divine; it was the vivid symbol of God to the philosophers, God himself in popular religion; it was the symbol of thought and perception and, in Philo and the Mystery Religions alike, of revelation and mystic illumination."
Ineffable Name, which is engraved in the sun, they raise their voices in songs of praise to God."  

One is reminded of the exilic prophet Ezekiel's vision of the Temple. In Ezek. 43: 2 we read: "And behold, the glory of the God of Israel came from the east," and again in verse four, "As the glory of the Lord entered the temple by the gate facing east." The pertinence of this was altogether different from the sun-worship described by the prophet as an abomination in Ezek. 8: 16. Here the prophet specifically identifies this light coming from the east as the glory of the God of Israel, whereas Josephus only identifies the light as from the sun. I assume, however, that Josephus' reason for this editorial detail is to suggest that the glory of God entered the Tabernacle as the sun's rays shone in at dawn, as Ezekiel seems to suggest.

Elsewhere Josephus describes the awesome effect of the sun's rising on the Temple. "For, being covered on all sides with massive plates of gold, the sun was no sooner up than it radiated so fiery a flash that persons straining to look at it were compelled to avert their eyes, as from the solar rays."  

Josephus cites the anti-Semite Apion, who wrote of Moses: "Moses, as I have heard from old people in Egypt, was a native of Heliopolis, who, being pledged to the customs of his country, erected prayer-houses (προσευχές), open to the air, in the various precincts of the city, all facing eastwards; such being the orientation also of

---

126 Ginzberg, *Legends of the Jews*, I, 25-26. This seems to be a generalization that Ginzberg draws from a number of sources he lists. Zohar Hadash Bereshit 4, 23a (on Gen. 2: 8) says that God's name is engraved in the sun. This is found also in PRE 6, and in the Baraita de-Ma'aseh Bereshit 50. Cf. Ginzberg, *Legends of the Jews* V, 38.

127 *War* 5.222.
Heliopolis. In place of obelisks he set up pillars (κίονας), beneath which was a model of a boat; and the shadow cast on this basin by the statue described a circle corresponding to the course of the sun in the heavens." 128 Josephus takes exception to Apion's inference that there are images in the προσευχαί, calling Apion's comment a ψεύσμα λόγων. But he does not attempt to refute what Apion says about the eastward orientation of these προσευχαί, nor does he refute the implied assumption, as Gager has noted, that Moses was an Egyptian priest who transferred to Jerusalem a practice learned in Egypt. 129

But the pagan Egyptians, Josephus would have known, were not the only ones in Egypt who found the dawn an auspicious time for pious reverie. Philo tells of the practice of the Therapeutae, who "stand with their faces and the whole body turned to the east and when they see the sun rising they stretch their hands up to heaven and pray for bright days and knowledge of the truth and the power of keen sighted thinking." 130 This was like the practice of the Essenes of Josephus' day, who "Before the sun is up they utter no word on mundane matters, but offer to him [i.e. God] certain prayers, which have been handed down from their forefathers, as though

---

128 Apion 2.10.
129 Gager, Moses in Greco-Roman Paganism, p. 123.
entreating him to rise." The Community Rule (10) may be Josephus' source here, which at one point reads, "With the coming of day and night I will enter the Covenant of God." Excursus: Josephus and Ezekiel

Josephus does not explain why he adds the editorial note about the sun's rays first shining on the Tabernacle entrance, but it may be more than mere coincidence that the closest Biblical likeness to Josephus comment here is found in the prophet of the exile, Ezekiel.

Josephus mentions Ezekiel by name only in Ant. 10 (79, 98, 106, and 141). In 10.79 Josephus says that Ezekiel "left behind two books which he was the first to write about these matters." Josephus' 

---

131 War 2.128. Cf. also Josephus' description of their practice of voiding "wrapping their mantle about them, that they may not offend the rays of the deity (ὡς μη τὸς αὐγὰς ὑβρίζειν τοῦ θεοῦ 2.148. BT Berakoth 61b also speaks to the issue of voiding in the gemara on M. Berakoth 9: 5, "One should avoid showing disrespect to the eastern gate because it is in a direct line with the Holy of Holies."


133 According to the listing of bibliography in Louis H. Feldman, Josephus and Modern Scholarship (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter 1984), the subject of the relationship between Josephus and Ezekiel has been approached only by Moshe Greenberg in his article, "On Ezekiel's Dumbness," JBL 77 (1958), 101-105, about which Feldman comments: "Greenberg cites a parallel between Josephus' account of Jesus, son of Ananias, who cried his message of woe for seven years and five months (War 6.300-304), and the Biblical account of Ezekiel, whose dumbness lasted seven and a half years (Ezekiel 3: 24-27); the coincidence, despite Greenberg, is hardly remarkable." (p. 182).
division of Ezekiel into two parts reflects the way some scholars believe LXX Ezekiel was translated from the Hebrew. Thackeray observes that the rabbis also divided Ezekiel into two equal parts of twenty-four chapters. Josephus thus seems to stand within rabbinic tradition and he provides evidence to the propriety of the scholarly opinion that Ezekiel was translated in two parts. Apparently the Greek Ezekiel Josephus was acquainted with was in two parts.

In Ant. 10. 98 Josephus, adding to the sparse description of Ezekiel 1: 1, writes that Ezekiel was taken away to Babylon as a boy (παῖς ὁ νστι). He summarizes the prophet's message in 10. 106: "He prophesied the misfortunes that were to befall the people and wrote them down and sent them to Jerusalem." Then in 10: 141, Josephus tells of the fulfillment of Ezekiel's and Jeremiah's prophecy concerning King Zedekiah. He makes the wry remark that the prophecy was not strictly fulfilled, in that since Zedekiah's eyes were blinded, he did not see the face of the king of Babylon, as it had been foretold. This is the sum of Josphus' explicit references to Ezekiel.

Yet there are thought-provoking similarities between the way Josephus describes the Tabernacle and the way Ezekiel described the


135 H. St. John Thackeray, The Septuagint and Jewish Worship, second edition (London: Oxford University Press, 1923), p. 37. He cites BT Baba Bathra 14b in evidence. Thackeray calls attention to his previous article on the same theme found in JTS 4, 245 ff, 398 ff. It may be noted that in BT Menahot 97a, "the Divine Law" concerning the table in the Temple, is quoted (ץראות) from Ezekiel 41: 22, rather than from the Pentateuch, which suggests the importance here of Ezekiel's vision of the Temple to the rabbis.
visionary Temple that suggest Josephus attempted to appropriate something of the grandeur of Ezekiel's visionary Temple for the ancient Tabernacle.

The differences between the situation and subject of Ezekiel and Josephus are clear: Ezekiel was a prophet whose vision was of a glorious Temple yet to be; Josephus was not considered by his people as a prophet, however much he might have considered himself to be one; and his was a vision of a Tabernacle from Israel's glorious past. Josephus offered no hope for a restored Temple to the Jews; instead he lifted up before the pagan world and his own people the glory that Israel once had (Ant. 1.5).

Despite the differences between Ezekiel and Josephus, Josephus perceived his likeness to Ezekiel in that both were prophets of priestly descent, and both expressed grievances with the Jews of their respective days. The prophet Ezekiel wrote before and after the destruction of the Temple. Before the exile, Ezekiel chided Israel for the internecine bloodshed that would lead to captivity and the destruction of the Temple. In 22: 3, Jerusalem is referred to as "a city that sheds blood in the midst of her." Though Ezekiel's words were issued as warning prior to the destruction of the Temple, and

136 Josephus described his "power of insight into the future" after being captured by Vespasian at Jotapata, when he predicted that Vespasian would be emperor (War 4.629).
139 See also 9: 9; 16: 6, 22, 36; 18: 10; 22: 3-27.
Josephus' *War* tells of bloodshed that happened in the past, leading up to the destruction of the Temple, the theme so prominent in the prophet's mind is obviously the same as that in Josephus' mind.\(^{140}\)

As a moderate general during the war with Rome, Josephus had, he said, protested the policies of Justus, son of Pistus, who not only furthered the ill-fated revolt against Rome, but turned Jew against Jew in the process.\(^{141}\)

In *War* 4. 560-61 Josephus excoriated Simon, son of Gioras, and his henchmen: "The murder of men and the violation of women were their sport; they caroused on their spoils, with blood to wash them down." He chided his compatriots for the στάσις instigated by the λησταί, deeming the war with Rome to be less of a misfortune than the result of the στάσις within. LXX Ezekiel 22: 9 describes similar conditions, using similar vocabulary: "Ἄνδρες λησταὶ ἐν σοὶ ὃπως ἐκχέωσιν ἐν σοὶ αἷμα."\(^{142}\)

Josephus used words more characteristic of

---

\(^{140}\)See also *War* 5.17-20 where Josephus tells of the bloodshed within the Temple. "The dead bodies of natives and aliens, of priests and laity, were mingled in a mass, and the blood of all manner of corpses formed pools in the courts of God... For thou wert no longer God's place, nor couldst thou survive, after becoming a sepulchre for the bodies of thine own children and converting the sanctuary into a charnel-house of civil war." Also *War* 6.372, where Josephus tells of the last days of the resistance when famine accentuated the misery, that the λησταί not only would take bloodied food from the dead, but would have gone so far as to practice cannibalism. In this regard, observe Josephus' hyperbole in *War* 6.541, where he tells of Simon, who "in the extravagance of his rage [was] almost gnawing their very corpses."

\(^{141}\)Life, 33-42.

\(^{142}\)"Men among you who are bandits, how they have shed blood among you!" Josephus laments the στάσις eloquently in *War* 4.397: "While the ship of state was thus labouring under the three greatest of calamities—war, tyranny, and faction—to the populace the war was comparatively the mildest; in fact, they fled from their countrymen to take refuge with aliens and obtained at Roman hands the security which they despaired of finding among their own people." Josephus' passionate disgust with στάσις is similar to that of Dionysius of Halicarnassus who called it the greatest of evils (*Roman*...
Ezekiel than of any other of the Biblical prophets. Josephus deplored the ἄσεθεία143 and the ἀδικία144 among the masses, who were exceeded in their lawlessness and cruelty by the Sicarii, who were themselves outdone by John of Gischala.145 Josephus writes as a prophet after the event, telling of the reason for the calamity that came to the Jews at the hands of Rome.

**Antiquities** 1.85.4; 86, 1). Dionysius said it was prevented by good laws (2.76,3). He idealized the Roman avoidance of "mutual slaughter." "So secure was the Roman's harmony, which owed its birth to the regulations of Romulus that they never in the course of 630 years proceeded to bloodshed and mutual slaughter... they settled their disputes in a manner befitting fellow citizens" (2.11.3). He wrote that "concord is a source of strength to weak states while mutual slaughter reduces and weakens even the strongest" (4.26,1). Attridge has written that "Josephus adopted the model of Dionysius at least in part because of the warrant which that model provided for writing patriotic and apologetic history" (*The Interpretation of Biblical History in the Antiquitates Judicae of Flavius Josephus*, p. 60). By contrast with his own people's penchant for *stasis*, Josephus admired the Romans for the order they preserved by their strong government.


144 Cf. Ezekiel 3: 18, 19; 4: 4-6; 7: 16, 19; 9: 9; 12: 2; 14: 3, 4, 7, 10; 17: 21; 18: 8, 17-20, 22, 24, 30; 21: 2-25, 27, 29; 22: 7, 25, 29; 24: 23. Although ἔθικεία appears 8 times in Isaiah, and 19 times in Jeremiah, it is found 44 times in Ezekiel. Attridge writes that "The most common virtue to be proffered as an object of emulation is surely 'justice' (δικαιοσύνη). It is so common as to be virtually without content. Δικαιοσύνη is applied by Josephus to almost every positively evaluated figure in biblical history. The term thus functions as the most inclusive designation for virtue in general. If there is any limitation to its range, it is that it applies to relations among men, while 'piety' (ἐνθυμοσύνη) is used for man's relationship with God. The fact that the two terms often occur together probably indicates that they do delimit one another in precisely this way." p. 115.

145 Cf. *War* 7.263, 268. "In this [ἀνοηία] the so-called Zealots excelled, a class which justified their name by their actions; for they copied every deed of ill, nor was there any previous villainy recorded in history that they failed zealously to emulate."
The Temple of Ezekiel's vision is described with all the expansiveness befitting a vision. Admittedly, there are few correspondences between Ezekiel's Temple and the Tabernacle Josephus described. However freely Josephus often embellished hagadic elements of Israel's past, in the Tabernacle account he may be accused more of not giving every detail rather than of adding to the Biblical account. His is an abridgement clearly based on what was in the Biblical text of Exodus. Josephus chose to change the order in which he described elements of the Tabernacle, to choose his own terminology for its various elements, and to tell of the significance of its parts in a way suitable to his special purposes.

Taking these differences between Josephus and Ezekiel into account, it is noteworthy, nonetheless, that Ezekiel, as Josephus after him, began with the court surrounding the Temple, referring to it as τὸ ἁγαθοῖον, as Josephus does. Ezekiel writes of τὸ πυλώνος, that is, of the eastern gate of the Temple court (40: 9, 11), which is the only place in LXX where such terminology is used of the gate of the Temple court. This compares with Josephus in Ant. 3.111. And, as has been noted above, Ezekiel's description of the eastern gate of the Temple, through which "the glory of the Lord entered the temple by the gate facing east (43: 30-5), gives a special purpose to the eastern gate like that mentioned by Josephus.147

Though it is not possible to enter into Josephus' mind to discover the reason why he added the detail about the sun's first rays lighting on the eastern gate of the Tabernacle, one is tempted to infer that since the vision of Ezekiel was surely known to Josephus, and since Josephus heightens the glory of the Tabernacle in this remark, and since it was politically inexpedient to speak, as Ezekiel did, of a glorious Temple yet to come, Josephus read the glory of Ezekiel's vision of the Temple back into the Tabernacle built by Moses, his ancestor who was so widely admired, even by non-Jews.
The Tabernacle Superstructure

Josephus (3.115) wrote that the Tabernacle was thirty cubits long by ten cubits wide. He does not clarify if this describes the inside or the outside of the wall. Cassuto states that "the difference between the outer and the inner dimensions is quite small and without significance." Up until A.R.S. Kennedy wrote the article "Tabernacle," in the Hastings Dicitionary of the Bible, it was customary to think of the surrounding structure of the Tabernacle as made of "boards," that is, of flat pieces of wood without speculation on their thickness, which would make the issue of the difference between the inside and the outside circumference of the Tabernacle of negligible importance. Kennedy argued that the surrounding the Tabernacle were "frames" rather than boards.

What were these קָּשֶׁת? Since קָּשֶׁת appears only once in Ezekiel 27: 6, outside of a context that describes the Temple, there is little evidence in the Bible to bring to bear on this question. The citation in Ezekiel 27: 6 קָּשֶׁת קָּשֶׁת בֵּית שֵׁם אֲשֶׁר מָצֵּאץ which Zimmerli translates "Your deck (?) they made from <cypresses>


150Exod. 27: 15
(?)” offers little help. He notes that in "Ex 26: 15 ff and elsewhere in the description of the Tent of Meeting [it] means "a plank," a view which is like the older understanding reflected in the King James Version of Exodus. "Deck" is an educated guess that fits in with the ship-imagery of Ezekiel's message at this point. The sides of Israel's "ship of state" are made of abinet (planks, v. 5). The Targum of Ezekiel proposes that the prophet means to say in v. 6 "the frames of your doors they made of boards of box-wood." The Targum on Ezekiel 27: 6 proposes an understanding of the meaning of abinet like that offered by Kennedy.

Josephus (3.116) translated the Hebrew abinet, κίονες. LXX translated it ointed, and Philo, whose Bible was LXX, chose to use here a synonym for ointed, κίονες, the very word Josephus used. Josephus, it may be remembered, used καμαξ, a word that is mostly poetic, to describe the abinet supporting the curtains around the court, while Philo substituted, once again, κίονες for the LXX ointed there. This use of ointed and κίονες leads quite naturally to the

151 Zimmerli, Ezekiel, II, 43-44, note 83.
152 Ibid., p. 43.
153 Samuel H. Levey, ed. and trans. The Targum of Ezekiel (Wilmington, Delaware: Michael Glazier, Inc., 1987), p. 80. The Targum of Ezekiel has been dated all the way from the time of the Qumran scrolls (2nd century B.C.E.) to the time of the Jerusalem Talmud (5th century C.E.). But Levey writes: "Regardless of the date of their [i.e., the Targumim generally] origin, what is certain is that being a vernacular rendering delivered orally, they were subject to some modification from time to time, but only by the Rabbinic authorities who guided the synagogue ritual" (p. 2). Kennedy translates Ezekiel 27: 6, "thy panels are of ivory inlaid in boxwood," which he argues "suits admirably" the sense of the Exodus Tabernacle account. "Tabernacle," p. 660.

154 Κίονες is found often in Homer's Odyssey, in Herodotus, and in classical literature generally.
155 Στύλος meaning the same thing as κίονες is rare in prose, according to LSJ being found only in Herodotus 2.169.
assumption that "pillars," or "columns" were at the circumference of the court and of the Tabernacle in Philo's description, in LXX, while in Josephus' Tabernacle account these columns are found only in the Tabernacle proper. Κύμακες are found around the court.

Though Josephus (3.116) uses the term κύμακες, he clearly does not have ordinary pillars, or boards, in mind. He says they were rectangular in shape (τετράγωνοι μὲν τὸ σχῆμα), "one cubit wide and four fingers thick," or "a third of a span" (τρίτον σπιθαμής 3.119), and stood ten cubits high. They were covered inside and out with plates (λεπίδες) of gold (3.117). This suggests not merely gold leaf, but a plating somewhat thicker than leaf. He described structures that may be similar to the frames that Kennedy proposed, that were six inches thick with cross-bars three inches thick.

Philo, who, it can be said with some assurance, was not fluent in Hebrew, derived his picture of the Tabernacle from LXX. He

156 Josephus uses the word σπιθαμής six times in the Tabernacle account (3.119, 135 [2x], 139, 163, and 174). It is found in LXX three times in giving the dimensions of the breastplate of judgment worn by Aaron (Exod. 28: 16 [2x], and 36: 16).

157 Among the meanings of λεπίς found in LSJ, meaning "4," -- "plate," (of gold or silver) as found in Polybius, Historicus, 10. 27, 10 applies to Josephus' intentions here. p. 1039.


159 Concerning Philo's knowledge of Hebrew, it is instructive to note what Harry Austryn Wolfson has written on this subject in Philo (2 vols. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1948), I, 88-90. He writes: "It is not to be inferred... that Philo had no knowledge of Hebrew. Writing in Greek for Greek readers, he would naturally quote the translation familiar to his readers, even though his knowledge of Hebrew was such that he could himself without too much effort provide his own translation... That he had a knowledge of Hebrew may be derived from the following facts. First, sometimes his interpretation of a verse turns upon the wording of the original Hebrew which is not represented in the Septuagint (p. 88)." As one example, Wolfson cites Philo's rendering of Deut. 19: 14, "Thou shalt not remove thy neighbor's landmarks which thy forerunners have set," in which Philo's πρότεροι "is a more literal translation of the Hebrew rishonim than the
comments that these pillars (κιόνες) had "no interval left between them, but each joined and fitted on to the next, so as to present the appearance of a single wall." Philo was apparently more concerned with the allegorical meaning and symmetry of the Tabernacle, than with its logistics. He did not elaborate on how the pillars were made.

Seventy of the Philo (p. 190). Another example is found in Ebr. 11, 44 and Virt. 30, 164; Spec. 1, 51, 279, where Philo "describes [God] as lightgiving (φωσφόρος) or the "intelligible sun," the latter term evidently based upon a combination of Plato and of the scriptural verse, which in the masoretic Hebrew text reads "For the Lord is a sun and a shield," when the Septuagint reading is "Because the Lord loveth mercy and truth( Psalm 84: 12)" (p. 211, see notes 50, 51, and 53). Second, Philo's "etymologies of proper Hebrew names, though containing some errors, show that he had a knowledge of Hebrew, for only one who had some knowledge of Hebrew could unconsciously make such errors, and only one who had a thorough knowledge of the language could deliberately allow himself to depart from the true meaning of words." Wolfson acknowledges that Philo may have used Greek translations closer to the Hebrew original than LXX, or he may have drawn his knowledge of Hebrew from others who knew it. He argues that "there can be no doubt that provision for instruction in that language [Hebrew] was made by [Alexandrian Jews] and the more learned among them had a knowledge of it." He concludes: "The question therefore is really not whether Philo knew Hebrew, but rather to what extent he knew it. . . he knew enough of it to read Scripture in the original and to check up on the Greek translation whenever he found it necessary." pp. 89-90. NB note 27, page 90 where Wolfson includes a brief bibliography of writers on the question of Philo's knowledge of Hebrew. In the revision of Schurer's The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ, III, 479, note 27, we read: "The question of Philo's knowledge of Hebrew should be left open, cf. E. von Dobschütz, Philo, Dicr. Ap. Chr. II (1918), 229a." In III, 873-74, we read: "It has been argued that his Hebrew etymologies indicate first-hand knowledge of the language, but others regard the spurious nature of these etymologies as proof of Philo's ignorance of Hebrew; it is possible that he relied on some sort of etymological handbook." Note 12, p. 874 provides an extensive bibliography on the subject of Philo's knowledge of Hebrew, with the opinions ranging from Wolfson's view that Philo knew enough Hebrew to check the Greek translation, to Nikiprowetsky's view that Philo knew no Hebrew.

160 Life of Moses 2. xvi, 78. μηδὲν ἐν μέσῳ διάστημα ποιούμενος, ἀλλ' ἐξῆς ἐφάρμοζον καὶ συνάστυν, ἵν' οἱ τεῖχοι δήσει μία προφανείται.

161 Samuel Sandmel has written that Philo "dissolve[s] the history in Scripture." The spiritual meaning of Scripture is the essential for Philo, not the facts themselves. Philo of Alexandria (New York: Oxford University Press, 1979), p. 25. Goodenough has written that "for Philo Judaism had no history or
Josephus (3.117) wrote that each "pillar" had two στρόφιγγες\textsuperscript{162} at the bottom, which were driven into two bases (ἐλαυνόμενοι κατὰ δύο βάσεων). The pillars were gold-plated, and the bases into which the pins were inserted were made, apparently entirely, of silver (3.116-117). Rings of gold (κρίκους εἶχε χρυσέους) rooted, it would seem, like screws reaching into the wood beneath the gold-plating of the pillar, were to be seen on the outside of each pillar.

Josephus does not say how many such rings were to be seen on each pillar, but it would seem he pictured one long row of parallel rings, fixed presumably at the top, on each of the two long sides of the Tabernacle. Gold-plated rods (ἐπίχρυσοι σκυτολίδες), five cubits long, connected one to the other "artificially" (τεχνητῷ) by a pin fixed into something resembling a shell (στρόφιγγι κοχλίου τρόπον δεδημιουργημένῳ) that is, like a screw turning into a "nut," as Thackeray puts it (3.120). These connected rods passed through the rings on either side of the Tabernacle, so that once anchored at the rear, the walls were secure. Josephus uses στρόφιγγι shortly after this (3.135) in a slightly different sense, to refer to the golden rings on the Ark of the Covenant. The term refers specifically to the manner of attachment of the implement being described. It is imbedded, screw or dowel-like.

The rear wall (τὸν οπίσθεν τοῖχον) of the Tabernacle that secured the north and south walls, was held in place, in Josephus account (3.121), by one rod (φάλαγξ) ten cubits long, extending across

\footnote{LSJ translates στρόφιγγες "pivot, axle, or pin."}

 development or fundamentally important literature between Moses and his own time." By Light, Light, p. 78.
the width of the Tabernacle, to which the smaller gold-plated rods (ἐπίχρυσοι σκυταλίδες) on the two long sides of the Tabernacle were attached at the corners. He describes the connection as a male/female connection (συνέβαινεν αὐταῖς γυναῖκες τῷ θηλεί τοῦ ἄρρενος συνελθόντος 3.121). Josephus says that the ends of the σκυταλίδες were attached by being inserted sideways into the ends of the φάλαγξ. Thus Josephus describes three sides of the Tabernacle, the north, south, and west walls.

At the front, that is, the east side of the Tabernacle there were five gold pillars resting on bronze bases (... ἐξ οὗ τὴν εἴσοδον ἦσαν πεποιημένοι, κίόνες ἔστασαν χρύσεοι χαλκεῖας βάσειν ἐφεστώτες τῶν ἀριθμὸν πέντε 3.124). The dimensions of these pillars are not given, but one may infer that they are to be thought of as similar in proportion to the pillars within, that separated the sanctuary from the rest of the Tabernacle. These, Josephus says, were "constructed like the rest and resting upon similar sockets, but placed slightly apart" (διαλείποντας ἄλληλαν κα' ὀλίγον 3.122). Since there were four pillars spaced in a ten-cubit distance, there was a one-cubit space between each pillar within the Tabernacle. Each stood ten cubits high, and measured one and one half cubits across. Each was made of wood, covered with gold. They were fixed in silver bases.

The five pillars on the east were made of gold, and were fixed in bronze bases, rather than being constructed of gold-plated wood, with silver bases. These did not form a wall. Slightly less space was available between these five pillars than there was between the four pillars within the Tabernacle. The lower half of the front was left open for the priests to enter. People outside could see through this
opening, particularly on feast days (3.128). The top half was covered by a beautiful linen curtain, colored purple, blue, and crimson (3.124), that was fixed to the pillars by rings at the corner of each pillar (κατὰ γωνίαν ἐκάστου κίονος κρίκου κατέχοντος αὐτό 3.127). This front was covered only during inclement weather. Then, another linen curtain, that was ordinarily kept furled, would be released to cover the entrance (3.129).

Exodus gives a somewhat different description of the structure of the Tabernacle. As I have already noted, Exodus begins with the several coverings of the Tabernacle rather than with the supporting structure. The dimensions *per se* of the Tabernacle are never given. Instead, we read that the "upright frames (ὁμοίως ..., ὑποστήριγμα), made of acacia wood (ἐσωθήν), ten cubits tall (ἡκοττάων ὕψος), one and one half cubits wide (πλευράς ἑπτακόσια ἄρθρα ἐπί ἑξάκοσιον ἔως Exod. 26: 15-16; 36: 20-21).

LXX follows MT closely for 26: 16-17. The same word (στύλοι) is employed in LXX to translate both ὑποστήριγμα of the Tabernacle proper and the ὑποστήριγμα of the court. LXX does not include any mention of these στύλοι in the second section.

---

163 Pausanias describes a woolen curtain (παραπέτασμα ἔρεοδον) in front of the temple at Olympia, adorned with Assyrian weaving (κεκοσμημένον ὑφάσμα αὐτοῦ Ἑσσυρίας καὶ βασίλειον πορφυράς). This curtain is not drawn upwards to the roof as is that of the Temple of Artemis at Ephesus, but is led down to the ground by cords (V, xii, 4-5). Though Pausanias wrote more than one-hundred-fifty years later than Josephus, Josephus may well have known of the temple at Olympia, which would have been a noteworthy memory for his well-educated non-Jewish readers to associate with the Tabernacle.

164 The "pillars" in the court are perhaps better termed simply "upright poles" (ὑποστήριγμα) since ὑποστήριγμα is used as an adjective describing the frames of the Tabernacle.

165 Cf. Gooding, *Account of the Tabernacle*, pp. 74-75 for a discussion of this "minus" of the second section of the LXX Tabernacle account.
Two pins (נור, ἀγκωνίσκοι 26: 17)\textsuperscript{166} were on each frame, fitting into silver bases (ἡφαίστεια, βάσεις ἀγγυρᾶς, 26: 19). This supported the frames from beneath. It is not altogether clear how their acacia wood bars\textsuperscript{167} secured the frames from above. There were five bars for each of the north, south, and west sides. The middle bar, half-way up the frame\textsuperscript{168} apparently extended the length of the two long sides, and the width of the west side. No mention is made of how these bars are connected so as to stabilize the Tabernacle. The other four gold-plated bars on these three sides of the Tabernacle apparently passed through the gold rings\textsuperscript{169} attached to the frames. Kennedy is worth quoting at this point as he offers this explanation of these bars:

To provide the necessary rigidity for the frames the simple device is adopted of running five wooden bars along the three sides, passing through rings attached to the woodwork of the frames. Much needless discussion has been raised over the expression "the middle bar in the midst of the boards (v.28), which has been taken by various writers to mean that the middle bar of the five is intended to pass from end to end through a hole pierced in the heart of the massive "boards" of the traditional theory... But the phrase is merely an epithet, after P's well-known manner, explanatory of the bar in question, the distinguishing feature of which is that it runs along the whole length of its side, north, west, south, as the case may be, in contradistinction to the remaining four, which we may presume run only half-way along--one pair at the top, the

\textsuperscript{166} The Hebrew נור means "hand," but has other special uses as well. Here the נור refer to the anchoring pins sticking down from the "frames" into the bases beneath. The Greek ἀγκωνίσκος may mean "ends," or "arm." Its meaning must be clarified from the context.

\textsuperscript{167} 26: 26/36: 31 בַּעַרְיָה שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שֶׁשֶׁ שוּפָטִים
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other pair at the bottom of the frames. This arrangement of the bars suggests that the frames were provided with three cross-rails—one at the top, rounded like the ends of the uprights to avoid injury to the curtains, another in the middle, and a third immediately above the bases. We thus obtain a double row of panels right round the dwelling.170

It is clear that Kennedy's translation, "frames" is not so much a translation of נַעְרָי, as it is a description of the assembly he understands was made from the five bars. His word, "frames," has been widely accepted, however, as the meaning of נַעְרָי.

The first section of LXX reflects MT closely. Neofiti refers to the MT נַעְרָי (bars) as מִי which means "door-bolts" according to Jastrow, though Martin McNamara and Michael Maher, the English translators of Macho's edition of Neophiti, reflect the customary translation of the Hebrew מִי: "bars."171 Here מִי stands for the MT נַעְרָי, for which Jastrow gives the meaning "tablet, board." It is the word used for the tablets on which the Ten Commandments were written (Berakoth 8b). Onkelos renders מִי, "bolt," or "bar;" and נַעְרָי, "plank." Jastrow does not list מִי, so I conclude that Neophiti and Onkelos used words appropriate to translate the Hebrew before them.

Josephus describes a Tabernacle that apparently has the same dimensions at the top as at the bottom. But MT Exodus (26: 23-24/36: 29) says that the corner frames at the rear were separated at the bottom and joined at the top; thus making the Tabernacle slightly

---

171 Neophiti I, p. 485.
wider at the ground level than at the top.\textsuperscript{172} LXX is different from MT at this point. Although the meaning of LXX Exod. here is not fully clear, it may offer a clue to why Josephus mentions nothing about this difference between the top and the bottom of the Tabernacle wall.

LXX Exod. 26: 23-24 reads: "And you will make two pillars on the corners of the tent to the rear, and it will be equal below, and they shall be equal in the same place (κατὰ τὸ αὐτὸ) at (ἐκ) the capitals where they meet (εἰς συμβλησιν μίαν).\textsuperscript{173} Verse 24 concludes: "You will make the two corners in this way; they will be equal."\textsuperscript{174} The difference between MT and LXX here must be deliberate. Perhaps the LXX translators were concerned with the need for absolute symmetry in the Tabernacle, as Josephus apparently was. Josephus' omission of this detail regarding the difference between the top and the bottom is either inadvertent or due to the influence of LXX at this point.

Having looked at the Biblical text as it was available to Josephus, the inference may be drawn that Josephus' difference from Exodus is due to his attempt to explain something that is not clear in MT or LXX. Kennedy's explanation of the "frames," is certainly reasonable. But, he appears to make the "frames" to consist of the bars, rather than allowing the bars to provide support for the "frames," as the Bible seems to, and as Josephus clearly does.

\textsuperscript{172} Cf. Kennedy's illustration of this and the discussion in his article, "Tabernacle," p. 661.

\textsuperscript{173} καὶ δύο στύλους ποιήσεις ἐπὶ γωνίαν τῆς σκήνης ἐκ τῶν ὁπισθών, καὶ ἔσονται ἐκ ίου τό αὐτὸ ἔσονται ἑσοὶ ἐκ τῶν κεφαλίδων εἰς σύμβλησιν μίαν.

\textsuperscript{174} ἀντω ποιήσεις ἀμφοτέρας ταῖς δυσὶ γωνίαις. ἱσαι ἐστωοςαν.
Josephus, by distinguishing two kinds of "bars," or "rods," σκυταλίδες and φάλαγξ, 175 preserved the two kinds of bars or rods found in Exodus. The σκυταλίδες passed through the golden rings on the north and south walls; the φάλαγξ, on the west side, larger in size, formed the anchor to which the smaller lateral bars were secured. Josephus changes the "five bars" to a side into five-cubit long bars, joined, each to each, on the north and south sides of the Tabernacle to form a twenty-cubit-long bar. The bar on the west side, however, was fully ten cubits long. Here he integrated the elements of the Exodus account creatively, to be sure. Since the picture in the Exodus account is hard to visualize, Josephus may be seen as attempting to present a more easily visualized description.

When Josephus used κίων to translate υτ-ρ, he did not thereby transform the κίων into columns, as would be found in a temple. Having used the word κίων, he proceeds to describe more fully just what he meant. Rather than being large and round, they were four-fingers in breadth; thicker than "planks," or "boards," but certainly not pillars in the ordinary sense of the word. In his description of their connection by (presumably) smaller bars along the long side, securely fasted to a (presumably) larger bar on the west side, he presents a well-designed structure, able to withstand the desert winds, and easily disassembled for transportation.

Exodus does not set forth these dimensions neatly. First of all, Exodus tells of the curtains covering the Tabernacle before describing the supporting structure. The covering layers of curtain are

175 Literally, "phalanx, battle line" (LSJ, p. 1913).
seemingly more essential to the Tabernacle than the frames in the Biblical account, as well as in the Targums and the other versions.

Josephus and Philo emphasize the walls, made up of the gold-coated frames, perhaps as a further support to their description of the Tabernacle as a Temple.

Second, the command pertaining to the dimensions of the Tabernacle was given in terms of the measurements of the "frames" or "boards" rather than in terms of the length and width of the Tabernacle per se. The שֶׁמֶךָ should be ten cubits long (MT 26: 15/36: 20; LXX 26: 16)\(^\text{176}\) and one and one half cubits wide. The north and south walls, then, comprised of twenty שֶׁמֶךָ, were thirty cubits long on the inside, but thirty-one on the outside, but the west wall of the Tabernacle, made of six שֶׁמֶךָ, plus the one corner שֶׁמֶךָ, on either side, that is eight "frames (MT 26: 25/36:30) would total twelve cubits!\(^\text{177}\)

Kennedy translated these as "frames of wood," rather than as "boards," as the KJV has it. His translation has been followed in the RSV and in most recent translations.

Although Josephus calls these "frames" κιόνες, clearly he does not have pillars in mind, even as LXX translators did not. Pillars stand independently as supports to a ceiling, or some other structure. Josephus (3.117) writes: "The western wall (δύσιν τοίχου) had six

\(^{176}\)Missing from the second section of LXX. Cf. Gooding, Account of the Tabernacle, pp. 74-77 for a discussion of this minus in LXX.

\(^{177}\)Kennedy writes: "With an inside area of 30 x 10, requiring on the traditional hypothesis an outside measurement of 31 x 12, the symmetry of the whole sanctuary is ruined. "Tabernacle," p. 661. He arrives at 31 cubits for the length of the outside by computing that the frames were six inches wide, resulting in one foot greater circumference on the outside than on the inside. He writes "P has omitted to give the third dimension: a frame has, strictly speaking, no thickness!" p. 660.
pillars, and all so perfectly united. . . they seemed to coalesce into a single wall. Philo states that the width was ten cubits with (σύν) the thickness (βάθος) of the pillars, which thickness I take to be the combined width of the pillars, measured from the inside. In Questions and Answers on Exodus 2.89, he writes of the unity of the pillars comprising a wall. He then provides the allegorical meaning for the bar.

The Tabernacle Interior

Josephus' description of the division of the interior of the Tabernacle (3.122-124) is more explicit than that of Exodus. He writes (3.122) that "internally its length was divided into three parts." Situated ten cubits from the innermost part (τὸ τοῦ μυχοῦ), which means the west wall, the wall opposite the front that faced east (3.115), were set up four pillars (τέσσαρας ἱστησι κίονας), that separated the sanctuary (ἀδυνον) which occupied two-thirds of the inner space.

---

178συνήθειαν δ' ἀλλήλοις ἀκριβῶς ἀπαντεῖ, ἀστε μεμυκότων τῶν ἀρμῶν ὡς ἕνα δοκεῖν εἶναι τοῖχον.
179Life of Moses 2.xix, 91.
180"Above this straight line of the single walls there is a bar between the twenty pillars to take firmer hold of their joining. For by 'the bar' He indicates the Logos ascribed to necessity, which in heaven above tends toward heavenly things. For by these everything is held together as by an indissoluble bond."
181Thackeray at this point, note a, is in error in interpreting this as "the east wall."
182Ἀδυνον was the term used by Pausanias for the innermost part of the Temple of Apollo at Delphi, into which few people went (ἐς δὲ τοῦ ναοῦ τὸ ἐσωτάτῳ, παρίσοι τε ἐς αὐτὸ ὀλίγοι) Pausanias, Description of Greece, with an English translation by W.H.S. Jones (6 vols. London: William Heinemann, 1931), X, xxiv, 5. Philo, in Life of Moses 2. 95 writes that the ark was placed "in the untrodden ground of the sanctuary (ἡ δὲ κιβωτὸς ἐν ἀδύτῳ καὶ ἀβάτῳ)."
Somewhat later (3.125) in describing the overall arrangement of the interior of the Tabernacle, he calls the άγιον τοῦ άγίου τὸ άγιον, "the holy of holy," distinguishing it from the Temple (ναός) as a whole, which he calls άγιον, "holy (place)." LXX Exod. 29: 37 cites the singular term άγιον τοῦ άγίου with reference to the θυσιαστήριον (altar), meaning simply that it is "most holy." MT and LXX customarily give this term, with reference to the most sacred interior place of the Tabernacle, in the plural, συνέβαλον, τοῦ άγίου τῶν άγίων.184 Josephus may use the singular τοῦ άγίου τὸ άγιον, confusing the singular term in LXX used to describe the furnishings with the plural term τοῦ άγίου τῶν άγίων used to describe the Holy of Holies.

Josephus (3.123) offers his first explanation of the symbolism in the Tabernacle in telling that the dividing up of the Tabernacle "into three parts" (3.122) was "an imitation of universal nature (τὴν μέντοι διαμέτρησιν τὴν τοιαύτην τῆς σκηνῆς καὶ μίμησιν τῆς τῶν ὀλων φύσεως συνέβαλεν εἶναι). As Attridge has noted,185 in Ant. 1.24, Josephus wrote that everything God revealed to Moses was "set forth in keeping with the nature of the universe" (πάντα γὰρ τῇ τῶν ὀλων φύσει σύμφωνον ἔχει τὴν διάθεσιν). Josephus continued to write: "Some things the lawgiver shrewdly veils in enigmas, others he sets

---

183καὶ ὁ μὲν πᾶς ναὸς άγιον ἐκεῖστο, τὸ δ' ἄρατον τὸ ἑντὸς τῶν τεσσάρων κιόνων τοῦ άγίου τὸ άγιον.
184MT Exod. 26: 33, 34. In 29: 37; 30: 10, 29, 36 it refers to elements of the Tabernacle furniture as "most holy." LXX 26: 33, 34; The altar of sacrifice is referred to in 30: 10 as άγιον τῶν άγίων. This term is also found in 30: 29, 36 to describe collectively the altar, table, with their furnishings, the laver, and the incense as "most holy."
forth in solemn allegory (τὰ μὲν αἰνιγμένου τοῦ νομοθέτου δεξιῶς, τὰ δὲ ἀλληγοροῦντος μετὰ σεμνότητος). The division of the Tabernacle was a "solemn allegory" a further piece of evidence, needing to be explained for the benefit of his non-Jewish readers, and perhaps even for the benefit of his uninformed Jewish readers, that reinforced his certainty that God's Law was in keeping with nature.

This was an element in Josephus' reasoning in which he exhibits a correlation between his Pharisaism and Greek Stoicism.\(^\text{186}\)

\(^\text{186}\)Cf. Life 12, in which Josephus explains that there are points of resemblance between the Pharisees and the Stoic school of philosophy. Bertil Gärtnер, The Areopagus Speech and Natural Revelation, trans. by Carolyn H. King. (Uppsala: Acta Seminarii Neotestamentici Upsaliensis, 21, 1955). Of this work, Feldman writes: "Gärtnér pp. 116-133 compares the concept of the knowledge of God in Philo, in the Wisdom of Solomon, and in Josephus. He finds (pp. 215-217) that Josephus (Apion 2.190) uses the terms ἀντάρκτεια, ἀναραξία, and ἀπάθεια in the same was as Plato and Philo." Josephus and Modern Scholarship, p. 417. For Josephus' dependence on Philo, see the bibliography on pp. 410-412, with the annotations on pp. 413-418. In particular, Jean Daniélou, La symbolique du temple de Jérusalem chez Philon et Josèphe, in Le symbolisme cosmique des monuments religieux. Actes de la conférence internationale qui à eu sous les auspices de l'IS. M.E.O. à Rome, Avril-Mai 1955 (Série orientale, no. 14). Roma, Instituto italiano per il medio ed estremo oriente 1957, pp. 83-90. Cf. also Ursula Früchtel, Die kosmologischen Vorstellungen bei Philo von Alexandrien; ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Genesisexegese (Leiden, 1968). G.F. Moore, in "Fate and Free Will in the Jewish Philosophies According to Josephus," HTR 22 (1929), observes that Josephus' use of the term "Heimarmene" (sic), for which there was no Hebrew equivalent word or concept (p. 379) was in keeping with its current philosophical definition, a definition offered by the Stoics (p. 376-389). Moore observes that Philo's ideas on astral fatalism in On the Migration of Abraham adapt the Stoic doctrine of fate (p. 380). The Stoic view is found still more broadly in the Psalms of Solomon, that date from the mid-first century B.C.E., in the Tanhuma Midrash on Exod. 38: 22 (Pekudé, § 3), and in the Talmud (Niddah 16b) (pp. 380-81). Moore expresses a pessimistic view of Josephus' philosophical sophistication: "Josephus acquaintance with philosophy will hardly have been sufficient to make him aware how incompatible it [Heimarmene] was with Jewish religious thought. One may even imagine that, in the singular clause in which it is said that the Pharisees εἰμαρμένη τε καὶ θεός προσάπτουσι πάντα, the words καὶ θεός are a correction introduced at the instance of Josephus to give God something to do with it. It is, of course, possible that in conversation with his literary advisers Josephus himself used the word 'Heimarmene', understanding by it, as a Jew, divine determinism, not Fate in the Stoic sense" (p. 383). Moore attributes Josephus correlation
Louis Feldman has written of Josephus "treatment of such biblical figures as Abraham, Moses, Joseph, Saul, David, and Solomon [that] all represent the Hellenistic (especially Stoic) ideal of the sage; and Josephus is eager to show his audience, which consisted predominantly of non-Jews, . . . that Jews are in no way inferior to the philosophers and wise men produced by the pagans." If indeed the infiltration of the Stoic world-view was so strong in the Jewish intelligentsia, it is no wonder that Josephus explained the meaning of the Tabernacle in Stoic terms. This was an apologetic tactic in his description of the Tabernacle that was in keeping with his description of the Biblical heroes in terms of Hellenistic ideals of virtue.

Before Josephus, Philo used this device in correlating the laws of God and nature. Philo wrote: "the world is in harmony with the Law, and the Law with the world, and . . . the man who observes the law is constituted thereby a loyal citizen of the world." Sandmel between the Stoics and the Pharisees, on the doctrine of fate to Josephus' indebtedness to Nicolaus of Damascus (p. 384).


188 On the Creation 3. καὶ τοῦ κόσμου τῷ νόμῳ καὶ τοῦ νόμου τῷ κόσμῳ συνάδοντος, καὶ τοῦ νομίμου ἀνήρως εὐφόρος οὐτός κομματίζεται. Noet calls attention to Tanhuma Pequidé 2 and Midrash Tadshe 2 where the Tabernacle is compared to the work of creation. p. 163. In On Drunkenness XXXIV (§134) Philo refers to the tabernacle as "a symbol of incorporeal virtue (ἀρετῆς ἀσωμάτου), while the altar is a symbol of its sensible image (ἀίσθησις εἰκόνος). Ginzberg, Legends of the Jews III, 151 states that "the Tabernacle in its
writes of Philo: "Creation by God . . . signifies that the world is in harmony with the Law and the Law with the world. Because of this harmony, the man who observes the Law 'is constituted thereby a loyal 'citizen of the world,' regulating his doings by the purpose and the will of 'nature.'" 189

Philo gives an allegorical explanation of the colors of the curtains covering the Tabernacle in Life of Moses 2. 88 that describes how they reflect the same universal reality.

"In choosing the materials for the woven work, he [Moses] selected as the best out of a vast number possible four, as equal in number to the elements--earth, water, air, fire--out of which the world was made, and with a definite relation to those elements; the byssus, coming from the earth, purple from the water, while dark red is like the air, which is naturally black, and scarlet like fire, since both are bright red. For it was necessary that in framing a temple of man's making, dedicated to the Father and Ruler of All, he should take substances like those with which that Ruler made the All. 190

Writing of the Temple in The Special Laws I, 66, Philo says:
"The highest, and in the truest sense the holy temple of God is, as we must believe, the whole universe." Again in Questions and Answers separate parts corresponded to the creation of the six days." Documentation for this section in vol. III is found in vol. VI, 62-63, note 321, where Ginzberg cites Tanhumat Pekude 2; Midrash Aggada, Exod. 38: 21; Yelammedenu in Yalkut I, 719, and supplement No. 54 (=BHM VI 89); Shu'ain, Pekude 41c. He writes: "The Tabernacle is also explained to be, in its form, a symbolic representation of the human body, see Shu'ain, Terumah 36b-36c, and Shabbate ha-Leket 3 (BR is given as the source of this passage); Tadshe 2 and 10." 189

189Samuel Sandmel, Philo of Alexandria, p. 53.
190τό ας δὲ τῶν ύφασμάτων ἡλικάς ἀριστέρας ἔπεκρινεν ἐκ μυρίων ὅσων ἐλόμενος τοῖς στοχείοις ισαρίθμους, ἐξ ὧν ἀπετελέσθη ὁ κόσμος, καὶ πρὸς αὐτὰ λόγῳ ἐχούσας, γῆν καὶ ὕδωρ καὶ ἀέρα καὶ πῦρ. ἢ μὲν γὰρ βύσσος ἐκ γῆς, ἐξ ὅθατος δ' ἢ παρθένα, ἢ δ' ὑάκινθος ἀέρι ὁμοιότατοι—φύσει γὰρ μέλας οὕτως—, τὸ δὲ κόκκινον πυρὶ, διότι φοινικοῦ ἐκάπτερον. ἢν γὰρ ἀναγκαῖον ἱερὸν χειροποιητὸν κατασκευάζοντας τῷ πατρὶ καὶ ἡγεμόνι τοῦ παντὸς τὰς ὁμοιὰς λαβεῖν οὐσίας, αἰς τὸ ὄλων ἔδημιουργεί.
on Exodus 2. 51 Philo explains that the sanctuary signifies the world, and in 2.52, Philo answers the question: "What is the meaning of the words, "Thou shalt make, according to all that I shall show thee on the mountain, the patterns of the tent and the vessels?"--"That every sense-perceptible likeness has (as) its origin an intelligible pattern in nature. . . For it was indeed proper and fitting to reveal to an intelligent man the forms of intelligible things and the measures of all things in accordance with which the world was made."

Craig Koester has written that "the cosmological interpretation originated with the temple furnishings and was only later applied to the tabernacle,"¹⁹¹ but it would seem that for Philo and Josephus, it was the Temple itself, before the furnishings that provided the cosmological imagery that was applied to the Tabernacle. Though, as Seth Schwartz has noted, Josephus does not give a detailed account of the symbolism of the Temple as he does for the Tabernacle. He does, however, write about articles within the Temple. Schwartz writes: "that the articles inside the Temple are said to symbolize parts of the cosmos may imply that for Josephus the Temple as a whole symbolized the cosmos as a whole.¹⁹² He concludes that both Philo


and Josephus "drew on priestly traditions which Josephus presented unadorned, and Philo in a characteristically philosophical manner."{193}

The third section of the Tabernacle, the part which the ordinary priests could not enter (δ τοὶς ἱερεύσιν ἦν ἁβατον), Josephus wrote (3.123), "was like heaven devoted to God," while the other two-thirds of the Tabernacle was "even as earth and sea... accessible to men." Oddly, Philo seemed to describe just the opposite. He wrote: "I have said that the simple holy (parts of the tabernacle) are classified with the sense-perceptible heaven, whereas the inner (parts), which are called the Holy of Holies, (are classified) with the intelligible world."{194}

Josephus' view seems more reasonable. If indeed he adopted the idea of associating the Holy of Holies with heaven from Philo, not being a subtle philosopher, though perhaps considered to be a philosopher by some,{195} he failed to appreciate the subtlety of Philo's allegory, with the result that he explained things opposite to the way Philo explained them. It is more immediately understandable that

---

{193}Schwartz, Josephus and Judean Politics, p. 42.
{194}Questions and Answers on Exodus 2. 94. Philo's words are τάττασατι κατὰ τὸν αἰόθητον οὐρανὸν.
{195}Professor Feldman has noted that Nehemiah Brüll ("Eine talmudische Nachricht über Josephus" In: Jahrbücher für Jüdische Geschichte und Literatur 4, 1879, pp. 40-42) and Hayim Leshem, ("Flavius on the Antiquity of the Jews Compared With the Greeks," Mahanaim 112, 1967, pp. 92-95) "find a hidden reference to Josephus in a minor Talmudic tractate, Derekh Erez Rabbah 5, which speaks of a nameless philosopher who is visited by four rabbis when they come to Rome to protest the Emperor Domitian's decision to kill all the Jews in the Roman Empire." Feldman writes that "one of the rabbis, Gamaliel, objected to visiting the philosopher, and this may be understood in light of the fact that Gamaliel's father had tried to remove Josephus from his Galilean command." Flavius Josephus Revisited: the Man, His Writings, and His Significance, Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1984), II, 21, p. 779. Thackeray remarked that "the deeper philosophy of Philo [was] beyond his grasp." Josephus, the Man and the Historian, p. 94.
the sanctum sanctorum would be like heaven than the place the ordinary priests could enter routinely.

Whereas the Exodus account of the Tabernacle accentuates the veil at the entrance to the Tabernacle, and the hangings separating the holy place from the Holy of Holies, mentioning the supporting posts for the hangings at the end (MT/LXX Exod. 26: 32, 37; MT 36: 36, 38/LXX 37: 4, 6), Josephus (3.122, 124) describes a sanctuary in which the conspicuous features in its division are the posts supporting the curtains (κίονες). Josephus described five golden pillars, on bronze bases at the front of the Tabernacle (3.124), and four pillars (3.122) which separated the Holy of Holies at the rear of the Tabernacle. Josephus wrote that these four pillars were made like the others (δομιώς τοῖς ἄλλοις εἰργασμένους), which means that they were made of gold, set on bronze bases. This emphasis on the pillars was no doubt intended to create the impression of the Tabernacle as a Temple rather than as a less impressive structure, a mere tent.

It may have been an oversight on Josephus' part to omit mentioning that these pillars were made of acacia wood, overlaid with gold, as Exodus reads. On the other hand, if Josephus was conscious of Philo's thoughts on these posts, he would have had the impression, as Philo wrote, that "The four columns are made solid." Philo does not say they are solid gold, however. The pillars in Josephus' description were impressively, but impossibly grand;

196 Questions and Answers on Exodus, 2.93.
pillars made of gold would have been impossible to carry in the wilderness sojourn.

Josephus' description of the first layer of covering of the Tabernacle differs from the description found in the Greek Exodus, but seems to be developed from it. The differences may be explained as either editorial embellishment or as the result of a moderately flawed memory.

He writes (3.124): "They covered (κατεπετάνυσαν) the Tabernacle with curtains (ὁφεσι) of fine linen (βύσσου), of purple (πορφύρας), of blue (υάκινθου) and of scarlet (φοίνικος), of dye blended together (βαφής συγκεκραμένης) After a brief comment on the pillars dividing the Tabernacle interior, and the terms used with reference to the two divisions, Josephus (3.126), in a description not found in Exodus, says that the covering (τό φόρος) was adorned (ὁραῖον) "with every manner of flower earth produces, and interwoven with all other designs that could lend to its adornment, save only the forms of living creatures."199

In MT/LXX Exod. 26: 1-14; MT 36: 8-19 the first layer of the covering (αὐλαίας) of the Tabernacle is made of spun linen (βύσσου κεκλωσμένης) blue (υάκινθου), purple (πορφύρας) and spun scarlet (κοκκίνου κεκλωσμένου).200 At the end of this list of details

197 Philo, Life of Moses 2.xvii, 84--ὑφάσμασιν.
198 For συγκεκραμένης, Niese gives the variants: συγκεκραμένος (R), συγκεκραμένοι (O) and συγκεκραμένος MSPL [in Niese's note on this last word a medial sigma rather than a final sigma is found at the end.] .
199 Thackeray's translation of δαα γήθεν ἀνέχεται, διαπεποικιλένων τοῖς τε ἄλοις ἀμαίν ἐνφασισμένον, δαα κόσμον ὐδηγέν ἐμελέε, πλήν θων μορφής.
200 The colors Philo lists for the covering of the Tabernacle are the same as LXX. Cf. Life of Moses 2. 84-87. Philo offers allegorical explanations for the dimensions of the curtains as well as for the colors.
concerning the curtains stands the rubric: χεροῳβῆμ αὐτὰς (26: 1) "with cherubs in the workmanship of a weaver you will make them". 201

Apart from using the words ὑφη for αὐλαία, φοίνιξ for κοκκίνος, adding κεκλωσμένη to βύσσος and appending the editorial βαφῆς κεκλωσμένης, changing the order of the colors mentioned, adding the embroidered flowers, and omitting the cherubim, Josephus' description of this curtain resembles the description of the first curtain in LXX. Although these differences are not insignificant, if Josephus' editorial additions and changes are disregarded, it is apparent that Josephus is writing about the same covering being described in LXX Exod. In each case there are four colors describing the covering, and the four colors are the same, though Josephus substituted a synonym φοίνιξ for κοκκίνος. Since Philo 202 used the word ὑφάσμα, which is cognate to ὑφη, and omitted mention of the Cherubim on the covering, as Josephus did, it is not unreasonable to infer that Josephus may have taken his lead from Philo here; though this is less than overwhelming evidence.

Josephus' elaboration on the flowered embroidery simply accentuated the beauty of the Tabernacle covering, even though this would not be seen, due to the additional layers of material put over it. As Thackeray has remarked, Josephus probably omitted the cherubim because "He is concerned, as apologist, to give no handle to 201 John Wevers notes that "A popular variant has changed ἐργασία to the accusative, presumably taking χεροῳβημ ἐργασίαν as a phrase meaning "cherub workmanship," an error caused by copyists unaware that χεροῃβημ was a Hebrew plural noun." Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus, p. 412. 202 Life of Moses 2. xvii, 84-88.
current slanders about Jewish worship of animals; and when later
($\S$137) he cannot avoid a mention of cherubim, he is careful to note
that they are unlike any creatures that man's eyes have seen."$^{203}$
Nodet offers the explanation that Josephus may have considered the
word כֶּרְבֶּם as derived from כֶּרֶב (or כֶּרֶב), from which he drew his
explanation of the profusion of flowers (3.126) on the covering.$^{204}$
This seems unlikely. Josephus was no neophyte in the language of
the Bible. The Targums reflect MT closely here.

Josephus apparently describes more layers of coverings for the
Tabernacle than Exodus. Exodus 26: 1-14 describes three coverings,
while Josephus tells of four. The coverings in Exod. are: 1. vs. 1 f of
fine twined linen, 2. vs. 7 f of goats' hair, and 3. vs. 14, of ram and
goatskin. In addition to the elaborately embroidered covering over
the Tabernacle, which reflects 1. above, Josephus (3.128) describes
first, a linen covering (λίνεον... φάρσος), that could either be left
unfurled as a covering over the entrance, or rolled up, so as to allow
people to see into the Tabernacle, particularly on notable, i.e., festival
days (ἐν ταῖς ἐπισήμοις ἡμέραις). While it would seem that Josephus
means that people could see into the Tabernacle when this linen
covering was rolled up, he states (3.129) that when the weather was
inclement, it was unfurled to cover and protect the "dipped curtain"

$^{203}$Josephus IV, 375, note e.
$^{204}$Nodet observes that the Vulgate here translates the Hebrew
varietas, (pulchra varietate). He calls attention to §91 where Josephus insists
on a strict understanding of the second commandment, and §113 where
Josephus explains that on the tapestry before the gate of the court, was a
beautiful, multi-colored, embroidered curtain, which did not have anything
representing the form of an animal, yet in §137 Josephus mentions the
Cherubim. Nodet II, 152.
In this addition, he imputes to the Tabernacle a design found on the Temple of his day, as though the Tabernacle were the source of the Temple custom of putting a curtain in front of the entrance.

A second additional covering (3.130), apparently of wool (3.131 ἐκ τῶν ἐφίων), lay on top of the linen covering. This covering was made up of ten curtains (δέκα φάρση), four cubits wide and twenty-eight cubits long, with golden male to female couplings. This covering reached over the top, extending to one cubit from the ground all around.

A third covering (3.131), made of eleven curtains of woven hair (ὑφασμένας δ' ἐκ τριχών) also four cubits wide to a section, but thirty cubits long, reached to the ground on each side of the Tabernacle. The eleventh curtain served as a porch at the door of the Tabernacle. This covering reflects Exod. 26: 7-13. 26: 9 reads "thou shalt double over the sixth curtain in the forefront of the tent, which, as Thackeray writes, Driver suggested formed a "valence" of two cubits length.

---

205Josephus uses βάμμα in four places, all in the Tabernacle account: 3.129, 159, 163, and 171, to mean "colored." Since this word is cognate to the verb βάπτω, it would seem to be an odd word to give the meaning he intends, since this was an embroidered covering, rather than a covering that would have had the random hues of a fabric dipped in a dye made of multiple colors.

206Nodet observes the same thing in II, 152, note 6. He remarks that in the desert there was little snow. He finds an analogous anachronism in the midrash halakha, where the term רצץ מכסה "this is what they deduced" provides for a later verse support from an autonomous oral tradition.

207Nodet here cites the reading δώδεκα of mss MSPL.

208Χρυσείους ἑχοντα γιγαντίους ἐπὶ συναφῆ θηλείας τε καὶ ἔρενος συνείλεκτο.

209Josephus I, 379, note a.
A fourth covering (3.132) made of skins (διφθερών), is superimposed over the previous three coverings of "textiles" (ὑφανταίς), to protect them from the elements. This reflects, though in an abbreviated fashion, Exod. 26: 14--"rams' skins dyed red, and blue skins" (δέρματα κριῶν ἤρυθροδανωμένα, καὶ ἐπικαλύμματα δέρματα ύακίνθινα).

Even though the beautiful embroidered covering was covered by these additional layers, remarkably, Josephus said that "Profound amazement struck all who beheld these from afar, their colours seeming so exactly to resemble those that meet the eye in the heavens." This imputation of celestial glory to the outside appearance of the Tabernacle completes Josephus' description of the Tabernacle itself.

---

210 Ant. 3. 132.
Chapter III

THE TABERNACLE FURNITURE

Since, as David Nelson has pointed out, there is considerable difference between the Hebrew and the Greek Bibles' presentation of the Tabernacle,¹ the Biblical material available to Josephus was varied. Thus, his promise neither to add to nor to omit anything from the Scriptures² was no mean feat to fulfill! When Nelson examined Josephus' account of the furniture in the Tabernacle along side the two Greek and two Hebrew forms available to him, he concluded that

... Josephus follows one order and then another. Except for describing the court first, Josephus follows the order of MT II in [sections 102-178]; apparently he describes the court first merely to emphasize the tabernacle. Next, he adds his own comments [in sections 179-192]. In mentioning the coverings to protect the objects while they are being transported, he appears to follow Numbers 4 [section 193]. He continues with material from MT I in [sections 194-201]. For his closing he combines material from MT II [sections 202-203] and MT I [sections 204-207]. Therefore, while Josephus follows the order of MT II for his general order, he alters and mixes his order with material from MT I, Numbers 4, and his own explanations in order to emphasize certain aspects of the account.³

After describing the construction of the Tabernacle Josephus proceeds directly to the furnishings. His plan apparently, was to tell of the Tabernacle complex, working from the outermost to the

¹ Nelson, op. cit., pp. 323-24. Professor Feldman has pointed out that Josephus also apparently used an Aramaic targum as well as the Greek and Hebrew texts in retelling the Biblical story. "Mikra," pp. 458-60.

² Ant., I. 17.

³ Nelson, op. cit., p. 357.
inmost part, which is the order he followed in describing Herod's Temple (War 5. 184 f, Ant. 15. 380 f). Goodenough referred to Philo's De Vita Mosis as "his primer for proselytes." Though it might be presumptuous to think that Josephus envisioned making proselytes to Judaism through writing his Antiquities of the Jews, he did envision making Judaism clear and attractive to Gentile readers.

One might wonder why Gentile readers would be interested in a description of the Tabernacle. It is clear that the author of the Letter of Aristeas (51 ff) was confident that his readers would be interested in Jerusalem and its Temple. Josephus apparently assumed there would be a like interest in the Tabernacle.

Josephus' description of the Tabernacle is methodical. Thus he describes the court before telling of the Tabernacle proper. As I have previously noted, this is the order of the description of the Temple measurements in Mishnah tractate Middoth as well.

The laver was presented in Chapter II that had to do with the court. Although in the Tabernacle the altar of sacrifice was found in the court, and certainly was very significant to the purpose of the Tabernacle, Josephus tells of it almost, it would seem, as an afterthought, at the end of his description of the furnishings within the Tabernacle.

---

I can see no reason why Josephus did this. He must have overlooked the altar of sacrifice during the time he was composing the description of the Tabernacle court, and then detected his oversight as he came to the end of his description of the furnishings inside the Tabernacle, being reminded of the θυσιαστήριον (altar) by its resemblance to the word for incense altar, θυμιατήριον. However he substituted the generic term βωμός for θυσιαστήριον (3.148).

In LXX Exodus 38: 26 one detects the hint that the laver may have been made last ("He made the bronze laver... in the day in which he set it [the tabernacle] up.") Mishnah tractate Middoth (3: 1-6)\textsuperscript{5} describes only the altar of sacrifice and the laver of all the Temple furnishings. The comment on the laver is laconic, merely mentioning its position between the porch and the altar. I have written of the laver and the altar together in the earlier account of the court.

Philo groups together the various furnishings in a summary statement: "With these were also made the sacred vessels and furniture, the Ark, the candlestick, table and the altars for incense and burnt offerings."\textsuperscript{6} He omits any mention of the laver here as well as in the Questions and Answers on Exodus, and The Special Laws I, where he describes the pertinence of other elements of the sacred furnishings. One can only assume that Philo was

\textsuperscript{5}For the laver Cf. also M. Yoma 3: 10; 4: 5; Sukkah 4: 10; Sotah 2: 2; and Tamid 1: 4, 2: 1, and 3: 8. For the altar cf. M. Erubin 10: 15; Shekalim 4: 4, 9; Yoma 1: 8; 4: 3; 5: 5,6; Sukkah 4: 5; 5: 5; Nedarim 1: 3; Gittin 5: 5; Kiddushin 4: 5; Eduyoth 7: 9; Zebahim 9: 1 etc; Menahoth 4: 1; Arakin 8: 7; Temurah 7: 1; Meilah 3: 5; Tamid 1; 2, 4; 6: 1; 7: 3.

\textsuperscript{6}Life of Moses 2. 94.
writing from memory, and simply forgot to include the laver in this list, as Josephus may have forgotten to mention the altar of sacrifice in his preoccupation with describing the details of the court of the Tabernacle.

Yet, as I have previously noted, Philo mentions the laver and interprets the Biblical description in Life of Moses 2.136-140 and The Migration of Abraham 98. In these two places he writes expansively on the symbolism of the mirrors brought by the women, which were melted to make the laver. Philo explained the purpose of the laver: "Those who are about to perform sacred rites, as they are washing hands and feet, that is, the purposes which they take in hand and which form the base and support of the mind, may be helped to see themselves reflected by recollecting the mirrors out of which the laver was fashioned: for if they do this they will not overlook any ugly thing shewing itself in the apperance of the soul" (Migration of Abraham 98).

The Ark of the Covenant

Without a syntactical break, following the Tabernacle narrative, Josephus writes: Γίνεται δὲ καὶ κιβωτὸς τῷ θεῷ "And there was made an Ark for God" (3. 134). The term κιβωτὸς τῷ

7In War, 5. 219, when Josephus tells of the ἐνδοτήτω (inmost place) of the Sanctuary that was called ἅγιον δὲ ἅγιον (literally, "Holy of Holy," rather than "Holy of Holies") of Herod's Temple, he says "it was altogether empty" ἕκαστο δ' ουδὲν δὰλας ἐν αὐτῷ The Holy of Holies of Herod's Temple had neither the Ark of the Tabernacle nor the large cherubim of Solomon's Temple. In II Maccabees 2: 4-5, it is said that Jeremiah hid the tent, the Ark, and the altar of incense in a cave. Cf. Ginzberg IV, 320-21, and VI, 410-11. In the latter reference, Ginzberg notes the legend in Rest of the Words of Baruch 3 that is based on the reference in II Maccabees. In the Apocalypse of Baruch 6: 7-10, 'Baruch sees an angel descend into the holy of holies and take from there the veil, the holy Ark, the mercy seat, the two tables, the holy raiment of the priests (the high priest?), the altar of incense, the forty-eight precious stones.
8 It would appear that Josephus deliberately chose the dative case (τοῦ θεοῦ) in introducing the Ark of the Covenant as a means of emphasizing again the purpose of the Ark as a place for the presence of God in the Tabernacle. At the beginning of the Tabernacle section (3. 100), we observed that Josephus said the purpose of having this sacred place was so that "He himself, frequenting the tabernacle, may be present at our prayers." Philo comes very close to describing the reality of the divine presence on the Ark.

Although Josephus paraphrased the Greek Bible's rendering (ξύλων ἀσήπτων) of the Hebrew ἁςψιζει in describing the wood brought by the people for the construction of the Tabernacle (ξύλα

wherewith the priest was adorned, and all the holy vessels of the tabernacle." Those who tried to map where Jeremiah had taken them failed to do this successfully. This apparently explains the absence of the Ark in Zerubbabel's Temple that Herod made so extravagant later on. The Ark was placed between the wings of the large cherubim in the Holy of Holies of Solomon's Temple (1 Kings 8: 7). In Ant. 8. 71 Josephus refers to this as the ἄγαν 71. In this ἄγαν he describes the large cherubim as is found in I Kings 6: 23, with the Ark situated between them (8. 73, 101, 103, 104).

8 See JE, II, 104-105, for listing of the terms found in Scripture with reference to the Ark of the Covenant.

9... αὐτῶς ἐπιφανέν τῇ σκηνῇ παρατυχάνῃ ταῖς ἡμετέραις εὕχαις. In Pesikta Rabbati, Piska 5: 1, we read: "Hence the verse 'I am come into My garden (Song 5: 1) is taken to mean that at the time the Tabernacle was finished, God returned to the world from which, in the wake of Adam's sin, He had removed Himself." Goodenough ventures the opinion, after noting the use of the menorah in ancient Jewish inscriptions, that "the menorah was the symbol of God, and that it symbolized God by virtue of its lights." Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period (13 vols., Princeton: Princeton University press, 1954), IV, 82. We shall note in the appropriate order Josephus' discussion of the candelabrum itself.

10Life of Moses 2. 96. "It [the Ark] appears to be a symbol in a theological sense of the gracious power of God; in the human sense, of a mind which is gracious to itself and feels the duty of repressing and destroying with the aid of knowledge the conceit which in its love of vanity uplifts it in unreasoning exaltation and puffs it with pride."
he here adds that the wood for the Ark is \( \xi \upsilon \omega \nu \) "strong wood not subject to decay." He provides (3.134) a Greek equivalent for the pronunciation of the Hebrew word (\( \gamma \tau \omicron \nu \) for Ark, \( \epsilon \rho \omicron \omicron \nu \), which may suggest how this was pronounced in the first century C.E. Professor Feldman has commented that the apparent reason for the epsilon instead of an alpha at the beginning of the word is that the Hebrew has a hataf pathah under the aleph.

The dimensions of the Ark are the same as found in Scripture, though Josephus changes the unit of measurement from cubits (\( \pi \acute{\eta} \chi \varepsilon \omega \nu \)) to spans (\( \mu \acute{\eta} \kappa \omicron \circ \pi \epsilon \theta \alpha \mu \omega \nu \)). Like the Biblical Ark, Josephus' Ark is gold plated, inside and out. Unlike the Biblical Ark, it has no golden wreaths around it.

Since the targums follow MT here, which may reflect the way Josephus would have heard the Tabernacle described in the course of synagogue readings, this omission is of Josephus' choice, or the product of an incomplete

---


12 Professor Feldman made this comment in a personal note.

13 Professor Feldman made this comment in a personal note.

14 Cf. LXX Exodus 25:11 καὶ ποιῆσεις αὐτῇ κυμάτα χρυσᾶ στρεπτὰ κύκλῳ, and the Hebrew equivalent: בַּשְׂכִּיתָא לָהּ תְּר֥וּעָה: NB the difference between the word for "wreathing" around the table and incense altar (ステファニ) and that around the Ark.
memory. Philo did not mention the wreaths on the Ark in *Life of Moses* 2. 95-100. The wreaths were entirely decorative, it would seem, else Philo would have remarked on their meaning. Perhaps Josephus omitted them because, as Philo, he found no particular significance in them.

One element in Josephus' description of the Ark that seems to suggest he followed the Hebrew closely with respect to the Ark, avoiding a Greek "interpretation," is his reference to the top of the Ark as ἐπίθεμα (3. 135) here, and later on, as σκέπη (8. 73, 138, etc.)

The top of the Ark is the "cover," which is a close translation of the Hebrew נְחָב. The Greek Bible (Ex 25: 17) "interprets" נְחָב as ἱλασθήμιον, which is "interpreted" to mean "mercy seat" in the English RSV. 'Ἱλασθήμιον connotes the function of the top of the Ark.

Philo was evidently aware that this was an interpretation, even though He did not know Hebrew well. He refers to the

---


16 Cassuto writes of this translation: "The word καππόρθ is explained by some to mean covering (Arabic كفر, 'to cover'), because the καππόρθ used to cover the Ark; whilst others connect it with the word ἦλθε kippur ['atonement'], since it was particularly associated with the service of the Day of Atonement (Lev. xvi 2, 13-15). In the final analysis the etymology is the same, since even the word kippur signifies the covering up of iniquity, as the thought [though a different verb is used for 'cover'] is expressed in Psa. xxxii 1: 'Blessed be he whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is covered.'" *op. cit.*, p. 332.

17 In Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ*, revised edition, III, 873-74, it is proposed that Philo's grasp of Hebrew must have been "superficial at best."
cover of the Ark as ἐπίθεμα. . . λεγόμενον ἒλαστήριον (Life of Moses 2. 95, 97), which reflects the LXX of Ex 25: 17, "You shall make an ἒλαστήριον ἐπίθεμα χρυσίου καθαροῦ."18 The LXX itself, in adding ἒλαστήριον to ἐπίθεμα, seems to be intentionally interpreting πήρσ. The only occasion in which Josephus uses ἒλαστήριον is in Ant. 16. 182, where he tells of Herod’s building a white, marble memorial at the entrance of King David’s tomb as a propitiation (ἰλαστήριον) for having dared to enter this hallowed spot.

Perhaps Josephus so deliberately avoids using ἒλαστήριον because the Christians used this word christologically (Romans 3: 24-25).19 The Christian community may well have been strong in Rome when Josephus lived there.20 The first of the writings known as the Apostolic Fathers, 1 Clement, was written during

---


19Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ ὃν προέθετο ὁ θεὸς ἒλαστήριον διὰ πίστεως ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ αἵματι.

20Suetonius, in Claudius 25 writes: "Because the Jews at Rome caused continuous disturbances at the instigation of Chrestus, he expelled them from the city." This may represent Suetonius' confusion as to the identity of the Christians, if "Chrestus," indeed, refers to Christ. That he was aware of the distinction between Christians and Jews seems evident from his remark in Nero 16, "Punishment was inflicted on the Christians, a class of men given to a new and mischievous superstition." Acts 18: 2 suggests that Claudius thought of the Christians and the Jews together. It relates that Claudius commanded all the Jews to leave Rome. Of course, at this time in Church history, the Christians did not see themselves as distinct from the Jews. Acts 18: 2 refers to Aquila as a Jew from Pontus.
Josephus' time in Rome. Professor André Paul has argued, in fact, that Josephus' Antiquities was "an anti-Christian manifesto." 21

21 André Paul, "Flavius Josephus' 'Antiquities of the Jews': an Anti-Christian manifesto," New Testament Studies 31 (1985), 473-80. He illustrates this thesis by Josephus' alleged avoidance of the word διαθήκη due to the Christians' emphasis on the καινή διαθήκη, as well as by other changes in emphasis from the Greek translation of the Hebrew Bible that may be explained reasonably as a response to the "particularly menacing evolution" of Christianity in Rome (pp. 475-76). Another possible clue to Josephus' awareness of the developing literature of the Christians in Rome may be found in the Testimonium Flavianum. In this brief, much discussed section of Ant. 18. 63-64, there is a possible parallel between Josephus' description of Jesus as διδάσκαλος ἀνθρώπων τῶν Ἰδονή τάληθε δεχομένων, "a teacher of such men who receive the truth gladly," and a comment on Jesus found in the Gospel of Mark. An ancient Christian tradition ascribes the Gospel of Mark, composed in Rome, to John Mark, cousin of the Apostle Peter. In Mark 12: 38 it is written: Καὶ ὁ πολύς ἄγχος ἠκούει αὐτοῦ ἡδέως, "And the great crowd heard him gladly." Josephus does not use the exact words found in the Gospel of Mark, but the idea is quite the same. It is not unlikely that Josephus had some source before him, perhaps Mark's Gospel. The correspondence between Josephus and the Gospel of Mark at this point is not, it would seem, adventitious. This may be another pointer towards Josephus' sensitivity to and awareness of the developing Christian community in Rome. The Gospel of Mark may have informed this brief allusion to Jesus. See the reply of Professor Feldman to André Paul's thesis in "The Portrait of Noah in Josephus, Philo, Pseudo-Philo's Biblical Antiquities, and Rabbinic Midrashim," Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research 55 (1988), 56-57, note 30. Professor Feldman calls attention to the thesis of Pierpaulo Fornaro, which is similar to André Paul's, found in "Il Christianesimo Oggetto di Polemica Indiretta in Flavio Giuseppe (Ant. Jud. IV, 326)," Revista di Studi Classici 27 (1979), 431-446. There Fornaro suggests that Josephus, in his depictions of the deaths of Enoch (Ant. 1.85), Moses (Ant. 4.326), and Elijah (Ant. 9.28), was carrying on an indirect polemic against the views of the early church about the death and resurrection of Jesus. But, Professor Feldman argues, "if so, we may counter, none of the church fathers, who so admired Josephus, perceived this. We may add that Christianity in Josephus' day seems to have been not sufficiently important for such a polemic. If he were interested in carrying on a polemic, it seems more likely that Josephus would have done so against the Samaritans, whom he hated with a passion and who, indeed, did elevate the personality of Moses beyond the status that he held among the Jews." However, I would reply that since Josephus was writing in Rome, where there were no doubt few if any Samaritans, and where there was a Christian community, it is conceivable that Josephus would have been concerned about this developing sect, still within Judaism. Menahem Stern comments on Suetonius' remark in Claudius 25: 4, "Iudaeos impulsose Chresto assidue tumultuantis Roma expulit" (Since the Jews constantly made disturbances at the instigation of Chrrestus, he expelled them from Rome."), that this "reflects the earliest stage of the diffusion of Christianity within the city of Rome." Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism (3 volumes, Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities,
Josephus adds that this cover ἐπίθεμα . . . εἴχε θαυμαστῶς “was wonderfully [ornamented] with golden hinges στρόφιγξι τε χρυσέοις.” θαυμαστῶς is an adverb modifying προσηνωμένων ("unite with, insert into"), which refers to the golden hinges. Josephus writes that the golden hinges are attached in a wonderful way. This remark on the hinges would seem to be superfluous. The hinges were not decorative; they were functional necessities, though not mentioned in Exodus. It may be that Josephus attributes to the golden hinges the ornamentation actually being referred to in the Biblical text in describing the wreaths on the Ark.

Of course, Josephus could not have been writing from personal experience as a priest who had seen the Ark. Arguing against this possibility is that the Holy of Holies, in Josephus' day, contained no Ark! We do not know what actual Temple service Josephus performed. Perhaps Josephus has in mind a tradition found in the brief song found in the Talmud, which ends by extolling the adorning of the Ark:

Sing, O sing, acacia tree,
Ascend in all thy gracefulness.
With golden weave they cover thee,
The sanctuary-palace hears thy eulogy,

1980), II, 114. Parallels to Suetonius are found in Acts 18: 2, and in the work of the fifth century C.E. historian, Orosius, Adversus Paganos, VII, 6: 15, "Anno eiusdem [scil. Claudii] nono expulsos per Claudium urbe Iudaeos Iosephus refert, sed me magis Suetonius movet, qui ait hoc modo." Stern comments on this that "There is no record of the expulsion in the works of Josephus. Orosius depends here wholly on Suetonius, except for the date." One may well wonder why Orosius would have made reference to Josephus, if indeed, Josephus made no reference to this expulsion. Perhaps some reference to this expulsion was found in the Josephus read by Orosius.
With divers jewels art thou adorned.\textsuperscript{22}

Josephus' remark on the absence of any ἐξοχὴ seems to imply that the cover of the Ark he had in mind was perfectly smooth. But the Ark is enhanced θαυμαστῶς with its gold hinges. Josephus' picture of these ornamented hinges bears little resemblance to the picture in Exodus, which doesn't even mention hinges. He evidently is thinking of the hinges on the Ark being embellished as the writer in Avodah Zarah describes the ornamentation of the Ark itself.

Although the Biblical record does not suggest how the cover of the Ark was attached to it, Josephus says that it was attached with hinges (στρώφυξι). The pertinence of this added feature, in Josephus' attempt to explain the ancient Tabernacle reasonably, would have been to show how the lid was opened to put in the tables of the law.\textsuperscript{23}

Josephus follows the Biblical description of the rings and staves by which the Ark was carried, with two minor differences. First, whereas the Bible (LXX Exodus 25:13; 38: 11; MT 25: 13; 37: 15) says that the staves were made of uncorruptible wood, overlaid with gold (ἀναφορεῖς ξύλα ἀσπιτα καὶ καταχροσώσεις αὐτὰ χρυσίω), Josephus (3.136) calls them σκυταλίδες ἐπίχρυσοι (gold-covered rods), without mentioning the imperishable quality

\textsuperscript{22}Avodah Zarah 24b. The "golden weave" must refer to the wreaths on the ark.

\textsuperscript{23}Perhaps Josephus adds this reasonable explanation of an Ark with hinges to compensate for the miraculous features associated with the Ark which no one in his day had seen. In M.Shekalim 6: 1-2 tells of the fourteen prostrations that members of the House of Gamaliel and of R. Hanina would make in the Temple. One prostration was added to the customary thirteen prostrations in honor of the Ark that lay hidden, according to tradition, opposite the wood-store.
of the wood, as he paraphrases the Greek elsewhere. Σκυταλίδες was the word Josephus used earlier to tell of the rods that bound together the frames inside the Tabernacle (3. 120-121). Second, whereas the first part of the Biblical account, which gives the Divine commands concerning the Tabernacle (LXX Exodus 25: 15; MT 25: 15), states that the staves are to remain fixed in the rings on the Ark, Josephus omits this detail, which is also omitted in the second part of the Biblical account, that tells of the building of the Tabernacle (Exodus LXX 38: 10; MT 37: 4-5). Conversely, when he describes the table in the sanctuary (3. 140), he says the staves (στέλεοι) were not to be removed (οὐκ ἔχαίρετοι), when no such direction is mentioned in Scripture.

The reason for Josephus' omission of this rubric in describing the Ark may be simply that he was using the second part of the Exodus account. Or, he may have had in mind the information provided in Numbers 4: 5-6, "When the camp is to set out, Aaron and his sons shall...cover the Ark of the testimony...and shall put in its poles." This implies, of course, that the poles were not fixed at the sides of the Ark.

When Josephus writes: "It [the Ark] was not drawn by a yoke [of oxen], but was carried by priests" (3. 136), he alludes to Deuteronomy 10: 8 in giving the purpose for the staves: "At that time the Lord set apart the tribe of Levi to carry the Ark of the covenant of the Lord." Josephus here specifies "priests" when the Biblical passage he apparently has in mind says only "Levites." Of
course, the priests were from the tribe of Levi.\textsuperscript{24} Exodus 25: 14 states merely that the purpose of the staves is to carry the Ark, without saying who is to do the carrying, or that it must be carried by priests and not in a cart. This element of the Deuteronomic history suggests that the Levites were the ones who would carry the Ark, whenever it was carried, while not setting this forth as a command.\textsuperscript{25}

II Samuel 6: 3 tells of the Ark being transported by a new cart, which suggests that though the Levites were the only people permitted to carry the Ark, the ancient Israelites did not believe that it was always to be carried by people. The Ark could be, and was, transported in a cart, drawn by yoked beasts ($\zeta\epsilon\upsilon\gamma\omicron\omicron\upsilon\zeta$). Nothing in the tragic account of Uzzah in II Samuel 6 suggests that carrying the Ark in a cart was inappropriate; though Ginzberg cites the Rabbinic opinion that the reason for the death of Uzzah was that “Instead of following the law of having the Ark carried on the shoulders of priests, David had it put on a wagon, and so incurred the wrath of God.”\textsuperscript{26}

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{24}It may be noted that in Apion 1.188, Josephus quotes from Hecataeus of Abdera who says that the priests receive the tithe, when actually it was the Levites. In Josephus' case, this is probably a instance of synecdoche, where the part stands for the whole; that is, the priests stand for all the Levites, the tribe to which they belong.

\textsuperscript{25}Though EJ 5. 763, no. 34, s.v. “Commandments, the 613,” lists this as a commandment (Num. 7: 9).

\textsuperscript{26}Ginzberg, Legends of the Jews, IV, 96. Cf. his reference to Yerushalmi Sanhedrin 10, 29a; BaR 4: 20, ER 31, 157, which reads: “The Ark was suspended in the air, and Uzzah “put forth his hand” to take hold of it. The sinners in Israel then said: “Were it not for Uzzah, the Ark would have dropped down to the ground.” No sooner did they utter these blasphemous words than Uzzah dropped dead. All then became convinced that the Ark was able to support itself without human help. According to Sotah 35a, Uzzah eased himself near the Ark, and as a punishment was smitten dead.” Ginzerg, Legends of the Jews, VI, 257. Cf. also Ginzberg, III, 194-95 where he says “the

\end{footnotesize}
Josephus, one might say, reflects in a nut-shell, the opinion of the rabbis on how the Ark was to be transported. In retelling the Uzzah episode,\footnote{There is no indication in MT or LXX that Uzzah was a Levite; but Josephus (6.18) says that Abinadab and his sons (one of whom was Uzzah) were Levites. Josephus (7.79) seems to indicate that they were priests.} after the Ark leaves the house of Obadaros, to which it brought considerable good fortune, Josephus says “It was carried by the priests” (Ant. 7. 85), whereas the Bible only reads: “And when those who bore the Ark of the Lord...” (II Samuel 6: 13). The Greek Bible, oddly, adds to the MT: Κω ήσαυ μετ’ αὐτοῦ σφεντες τὴν κιβωτὴν ἐπτα χοροῖ (And there were with him bearing the Ark seven dancers...), which may be a midrashic extra drawn from the picture of David dancing before the Ark as it was brought to Jerusalem (II Samuel 6: 16). Perhaps Josephus’ similarity to the rabbis in mentioning the priests here merely is a witness to a common practice of interchanging the two terms, priests and Levites, at this time.

Josephus (3.137) describes cautiously the Cherubim whose wings spread over the cover of the Ark. He omits the detail found in the Biblical account (25: 18) of how the Cherubim were made, and their manner of attachment to the cover of the Ark. In describing the Temple (8. 72) Josephus provides these details of the larger Cherubim in Solomon’s Temple that have no sons of Kohath, the third division of the Levites, received no wagons, for they were entrusted with the transportation of the Holy Ark, which might not be lifted upon a wagon, ..." Cf also the numerous Biblical notices about the priests’ carrying the Ark: Deuteronomy 10: 8; Joshua 3: 13; 4: 9-10, 16, 18; 6: 12; 8: 33; I Chronicles 15: 2. Although there is no indication in MT or LXX that Uzzah was a Levite, Josephus (Ant. 6.18) says that Abinadab and his sons, one of whom was Uzzah, were Levites. Josephus (7.79) seems to indicate that they were priests.
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counterpart in the Tabernacle. Why he described how the latter were made, and not the former, when he never saw either of the two braces of Cherubim, may be due to the heightened sanctity he attributed to the first sacred Place of his people, the one whose design was given to Moses at Mt. Sinai.

In transliterating the Hebrew word חרטובים, rather than attempting to translate this word in some way, he does more than he did in transliterating the Hebrew word for Ark, ארון. In the case of the Ark, Josephus first uses the appropriate Greek term, Κιβωτός, before giving the transliteration of the Hebrew term. He does not do this for the Cherubim. Indeed, Num 8: 73 states: “As for the Cherubim themselves, no one can say or imagine what they looked like.” Liddell and Scott’s Lexicon does not list חרטובים. The very lack of definition or descriptive detail of a transliterated word adds to the mystery of the object described.

Josephus does not mention the Cherubim in his account of Adam and Eve’s banishment from Eden (Ant. 1.51), where they are first introduced in the Biblical record (Genesis 3: 25). Perhaps this was a marvelous element in the Hebrew Biblical saga that he thought unsuitable in this apologetic restatement of his people’s story. Their posture there is hostile, suggesting that the deity of his people was greatly stern toward the forerunners of the human race.

28Mss ROE Lat.
29He mentions חרטובים in five places: Ant. 3. 137; 7. 378; and 8. 72, 73, and 108.
Josephus describes the Cherubim of Solomon's Temple without any reservations, even though in this place they were two free-standing images in the ἀδυνατον:

He set up two cherubim of solid gold, each five cubits in height and each having two wings with a spread of five cubits; for that reason he set them up not far from each other, in order that they might with one of their wings touch the southern wall of the adytum, and with the other the northern wall, while their inner wings joined each other so as to form a covering for the Ark, which was placed between them" (8. 72-73).

This description of the Cherubim, which corresponds closely to LXX III Kingdoms 6: 23-28, except for the LXX saying the Cherubim were gilded olivewood, rather than solid gold, depicts figures far larger than the Cherubim attached to the cover of the Ark in Moses' Tabernacle. There Josephus risked describing what he apparently deemed indescribable in the Tabernacle account. Of course, the Exodus account (Exod. 25: 18) did not describe the Cherubim as fully as III Kingdoms 6: 23-28.

The purpose of the Cherubim on the Ark was to ornament, it would seem, τῷ θρόνῳ τοῦ θεοῦ. Josephus (3.137) says they were molded (προστυπωίς), τῷ or ἐν (dative case-τῷ θρόνῳ) the throne of God. Weill and Nodet translate this literally: "Moïse dit qu'il les a vus sculptés en bas-relief sur le trône de Dieu." This translation takes at face value the definition of προστυπώς in LSJ.30 Yet Nodet observes that "the context suggests that the cherubim were statues."31 The Talmud (Avodah Zarah 43b) forbids making

30Πρόστυπώς=executed in low relief, is in contrast to ξυτυπώς=executed in high relief.
31Nodet II, 154, note 1.
images “of the attendants who are in the highest stratum,” among which were “Ophannim, Seraphim, holy Hayyoth and Ministering Angels.” Josephus appears to be trying to avoid suggesting (to a non-Jewish reader) that the Cherubim are idols. When Josephus declared that even representations of animals are forbidden by Jewish law (Life, 65; Ant. 8. 195) he apparently takes a rigorous stand with the halakah found in the Mishnah at the beginning of Chapter three of Avodah Zarah: “All images are prohibited.”

Perhaps this sensitivity to making images was in Josephus’ mind in choosing προστυπός. Weill proposes, in a footnote, that this is “peut-être ici un souvenir de la vision d’Ezéchiel,” without mentioning what particular reminiscence he has in mind (Weill, ad. loc.). He no doubt make reference to Ezekiel 10: 1, where the prophet writes: “Then I looked, and behold, on the firmament that was over the heads of the cherubim there appeared above them something like a sapphire, in form resembling a throne.”

In Ezekiel 43: 7 the prophet hears the Divine voice: “Son of man, you have seen the place of my throne.” This voice comes from the inner court, which was full of the Divine glory (43: 5).

Presumably by inner court (τὴν αὐλὴν τὴν ἐσωτέραν) we are to

32 Cf. Feldman, “Mikra,” p. 509, 517. The pertinent section of Avodah Zarah reads: “The Torah only prohibited the making of the likeness of the four faces together [i.e. of the heavenly creatures described in Ezekiel 1: 10, each of which had four faces, viz., of a man, lion, ox and eagle]. According to this, a human face by itself should be permitted; so how can it have been taught: ‘Of all faces are permissible except that of a human face’!—R. Judah the son of Rabbi Joshua said: From the discourse of R. Joshua I learnt: Ye shall not make itti [with me]—this should be rendered as though it was] ‘ye shall not make Me’ [othi] (note: And since man was made in God’s image (Gen. 1. 27) the reproduction of the human face is not allowed.)

33 LXX τὸν τόπον τοῦ ὃρωνος μου, MT הַכְּפָרָן.
understand the Holy of Holies. Cassuto reminds us of Ezekiel’s
description of the Cherubim who “carry the Divine chariot, upon
which rests the throne of glory (10: 1).”³⁴ He notes similar
imagery in Psalm 18: 11: “He rode on a cherub, and flew; yea, He
came swiftly;” and in I Samuel 4: 4: “and brought from there the
Ark of the covenant of the Lord of hosts, who is enthroned on the
cherubim;” and again in II Samuel 6: 2: “The Ark of God,
whereupon is called the Name, even the name of the Lord of hosts
who sits enthroned on the cherubim.”

Josephus may be mistaken about the source of the
reference to the Cherubim “sculptured” (προσομπείς) on the throne
of God. He says “Moses,” while his true source is apparently
Ezekiel, who used imagery from I and II Samuel. Ezekiel, as we
have observed previously, despite the reservations about it
expressed by some of the rabbis at Jamnia, was an important
resource for Mishnah tractate Middoth, where four out of seven
times that the introductory phrase, “it is written” is used, the
quotation is from Ezekiel.

To bring in this comment about God’s throne in the early
Israelite Tabernacle, written in the decade following the
destruction of the Temple by Titus, calls to mind the melancholy
remembrance found in Pesikta Rabbati 36: 2:

At this moment, thy pain is like My pain. Ever since
the day that the wicked Nebuchadnezzar came up and
destroyed My House and burned My Temple and banished

³⁴U. Cassuto, A Commentary on the Book of Exodus, trans. Israel
Abrahams (Jerusalem: The Magnes Press, The Hebrew University, 1983), pp
332-333.
My children among the nations of the world--and this I swear by thy life and the life of My own head--I have not been able to bring Myself to sit upon My throne.35

Josephus recalls the first time when God was present with His people on His terrestrial throne located above the Ark of the Covenant.

Whereas the Biblical text says, quite laconically, “And you shall put into the Ark the testimonies which I shall give you” (Exodus 25: 16), Josephus spells out the mode in which these testimonies are present: on two tablets, τὰς δύο πλάκας, on which the Decalogue was written. In 3.101, Josephus said that five words were on each tablet, but here he states that the Ten Commandments are found, as Thackeray put it, ὀπίσθιον χρώσας, i.e., written on both sides. Two and one half commandments were written on each face, front and back. Josephus does not contradict his earlier remark, but the previous description, as Nodet and Weill observed, was more in line with rabbinic tration.36 Josephus does not state how each command was divided to accomplish this.

The Table

35Pesikta Rabbati, like other Rabbinic treatises, is hard to date. William Braude writes that “The date of the Pesikta Rabbati’s compilation in its present form is considered by many scholars to have been the ninth century of the Common Era. . . . The date is debatable. . . . but it is certain that the greatest part of the material in the text goes back to Talmudic times.” Pesikta Rabbati, trans. by William G. Braude, 2 vols (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1968), I, 2-3.

36Nodet II, 148, note 1, observes that Mekhilta de Rabbi Ismael 2.264, in the name of R. Hanina ben Gamaliel, says that five commands were on each of the two tables. Weill, op. cit., p. 166. He goes on to write: “Cette discussion se trouve dans Mekhilta (sur Ex. XX. 16), j. Schekalim, VI, 1; j. Sota, 22d; Ex. Rabba, XLVII; Cant Rabba (sur Cant., V. 14). Joseph ajoute plus loin (§ 138) que les cinq commandements de chaque table étaient gravés deux et demi par colonne. Cette disposition comportant deux colonnes par table ne paraît pas connue de la tradition rabbinique.”
Josephus adds one detail, and two Hellenistic allusions to the Biblical description of the table in the Tabernacle. He mentions only the shewbread and golden vessels filled with incense to be set on the table.

The table and the candelabrum were the two items of the Temple furnishings taken by Titus to Rome, and put in the temple of the goddess Pax. Though it is difficult to know precisely why Josephus periodically uses ναός to refer to the Tabernacle, perhaps he does so here because he mentally identifies the ancient table with the table captured by Vespasian from the Temple.

This table, he says Δελφικῶς παραπλησίαν, with the lower half of its legs being like those the Dorians attach to their couches. What were the tables at Delphi like, and what were the lower parts of the legs like on Dorian couches? And why would Josephus choose to compare the Tabernacle table to these Greek models?

It might be noted that though LXX uses the word ἀδυτον only once, in a place in which the Holy of Holies is not being described (one manuscript of II Chronicles 33: 14 A, translates ἱπεραίων as ἀδυτον), Josephus often refers to the sanctum sanctorum of the Tabernacle as the ἀδυτον, as Philo does (Life of Moses 2. 95).

---

37 Schürer, op. cit., I, 510. and Josephus, War 8. 161, where he reports that Vespasian τὰ ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ τῶν Ἰουδαίων χρυσά κατασκευάσατα σεμνύνωμενος. The table and the candelabrum are mentioned specifically by Josephus a few paragraphs earlier in the list of spoils captured from the Temple (§149-152). These items are pictured, in relief, on Titus' victory arch in Rome.

38 Josephus uses ἀδυτον for the Holy of Holies in: War 5. 236; Ant. 3. 122, 125, 138; 7. 378; 8. 71, 72, 73, 90, 103, 104; Apion 1. 249. In Ant. 3. 125, he also refers to it as τοῦ ἁγίου τὸ ἁγιόν. Philo refers to the Holy of Holies as ἀδυτος (Life of Moses 2. 95).
This is the generic word for the most holy part of a temple in Greek classical literature.\(^{39}\) Plutarch, whom I believe there is sufficient reason to think was known to Josephus, used άδυτον \(^{40}\) less often than other terms such as ιερόν, \(^{41}\) μαντεῖον, \(^{42}\) and χρηστῆριον \(^{43}\) to refer to this sacred place.

One further apparent allusion to the temple at Delphi is found somewhat later in the Tabernacle section, where Josephus uses the word ὄμφαλός to refer to an element in the top part of the head-dress (πίλος) of the high priest. I shall discuss the high priest’s garments in due course, but I now call attention to the use of the word ὄμφαλός, which, though not at all an uncommon word, was the name given to the most sacred object in the temple of Apollo in Delphi. It was taken to be the “navel of the earth.”\(^{44}\) While this may be entirely coincidental, an unavoidable word-choice in Josephus’ botanical excursus on the Hyoscyamus niger, he may have taken this tangent in order to use the word ὄμφαλός.

If there were any Greek cultic shrine whose reputation Josephus might have found useful in adding prestige by

---

\(^{39}\) See the examples in LSJ, p. 25. It is substantive taken from the adjective άδυτος, meaning “not to be entered.”

\(^{40}\) e.g., The Obsolescence of Oracles, 50 (437).

\(^{41}\) The Oracles at Delphi, 17 (402), Isis and Osiris, 2 (352), et passim. Cf. Josephus, War 5, 207 τὸ άγαλμα ἱερόν.

\(^{42}\) Oracles at Delphi, 21 (404). Obsolescence of Oracles, 9 (414). Cf. Josephus, Apion 2, 162... τὸ Δελφικὸν αὐτὸ τοῦ μαντεῖον (which represents a text emended by Nieze because the ms is corrupt here).

\(^{43}\) Oracles at Delphi, 21 (404), 29 (409). The F at Delphi, 2 (385). Obsolescence of Oracles, 9 (414). Josephus does not use this word.

association with the ancient Israelite Tabernacle, it would have been the shrine at Delphi. Peter Hoyle writes of Delphi:

Delphi was not the home of a local deity, but the centre, political as well as religious, of a faith which was essentially Greek. It was the sanctuary of a powerful and sometimes terrible god, but a god found worthy of love and respect by the greatest men of their times, and it was here that he was worshipped. This god was known as Phoebus the 'shining one.' As Apollo he was worshipped by Greeks and Romans alike. He was the only Olympian god whose name was not changed from Greek to Latin.45

There may have been, in Josephus' mind, some striking parallels between the temple at Delphi and the Tabernacle. Burkert has written that "the furnishings [of the temple at Delphi include a table of offerings, incense stands, and occasionally an ever-burning lamp."46 There was no image in the θυτήριον of this temple. Burkert wrote that "The Greeks themselves later proposed the theory that the pure and earliest worship of the gods was without images."47

One is tempted to think that Josephus may have drawn useful parallels between Apollo the sun god, whose temple was at Delphi, and the God of Israel.48 Gager has drawn attention to the

47Ibid., p. 88. See note 53, p. 383 for bibliography on this theme.
48Martin Hengel calls attention to the opinion of the influential Syrian philosopher Posidonius of Apamea (135-50 B.C.E.), which was dependent on the view of Hecataeus of Abdera, that the God of the philosophers and the God of the Jews was the same. Martin Hengel, Judaism and Hellenism, translated by John Bowden (2 vols., Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974), I, 260. While it is precarious to impute a hidden agenda to Josephus, it seems not unreasonable to infer that he found it useful to use the finest elements of Greek monotheism to support his apologetic effort. Cf. the discussion in
mid-first century B.C.E. Latin writer, Varro, who "sought to identify the god of the Jews with Jupiter and praised the Jewish cult for its prohibition of images. In his effort to fit the Jewish deity into the pagan pantheon, he is but one among many--pagans and Jews--to use the technique of theokrasia, that is, the identification of different national deities as a single, universal god." 49 Gager amply demonstrates the "broad and deep penetration of Judaism in the Greco-Roman world of the first century." 50 Josephus may be entering into the discussion from the Jewish side, explaining his people's history for the benefit of an interested readership.

I have noted above Josephus’ fascination with the eastward orientation of the entrance to the Tabernacle, with the sun’s rays striking it in the morning. I have called attention to Ezekiel’s parallel interest in the glory of God entering the Temple, in his vision, from the east (43: 2-4). 51 Hoyle writes of the similar situation of the temple at Delphi:

Hengel, I, 261 f on “The Identification of the God of Judaism with the Greek Conceptions of God.” In Apion 2.112-114 Josephus tells the story told by Apion of an Idumaean, Zabidus, who fooled the Jews into thinking Apollo was visiting their Temple. With a wooden apparatus of some kind over him, with three rows of lights inside, that gave the appearance of stars on the earth (quasi stellae per terram), he got into the Temple and was able to steal the golden head of the pack-ass that was the central object of worship there. While this story, attributed by Apion to Mnaseas, taunts the Jews’ worship, it suggests that a pagan critic of the Jews had the view that among the Jews there may have been some regard for Apollo.

49 John Gager, The Origins of Anti-Semitism (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983), pp. 41-42. The Neo-Platonic doctrine of theokrasia held that the gods of various nations were identical except for their names (p. 95).

50 Ibid., p. 82-88.

51 It should be noted that once every twenty-eigh years devout Jews recite a brief blessing, the Bircas haChammach, a blessing of the sun. The Talmud, Berachoth 59b, says: Our Rabbis taught: He who sees the sun at its turning point [the point at which it was at the moment of its creation (Rashi)].
"The ancient site lies at the foot of the two vast perpendicular cliffs, which face each other across a deep, echoing gorge. The two precipitous cliffs were well named the Phaedriades, "the shining ones", as they seem to catch the burning sunlight of summer and intensify it in a focus on Delphi. One of them is now called Rhodini, or 'rosy one', because at dawn it shines with early light, the other is Phlemboukos 'the flamboyant' and in the afternoon the sun fires the rock face with an everchanging glow of colour."  

Plutarch wrote: “Practically all the Greeks identify Apollo with the sun.”  

He wrote of Apollo: “The god Apollo is not
conversation with many of the highest men in Rome.” “Biographical Note, Plutarch, Great Books of the Western World, 14 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1952), p. v. Gager has written of the distinct likelihood of “a Roman circle of Greek writers and their patrons under Augustus and his philhellenic successor Tiberius. It would not appear that Judaism occupied an important place among the concerns of this circle.” Origins of Anti-Semitism, p. 75. Babbitt writes that Plutarch’s “most important journeyings brought him to Rome, where he spent a considerable time between the years, approximately, of A.D. 75 to 90. . . , where he made many friends among prominent men of Rome” (Ibid., p. xi). Josephus lived in Rome then. Plutarch became a priest at Delphi in 95 C.E., an office he held for the rest of his life. His prestige as a priest and a writer from Delphi would not have been unknown, one would think, to Josephus. Plutarch shared Josephus’ view of the pleasantness of circumstances under Rome’s rule (Cf. War 3. 347, where Josephus cites Nicanor’s argument to him at Jotapata concerning the Romans’ “innate generosity to those whom they had once subdued,” without any remark to the contrary.) . In the latter part of “The Oracles at Delphi,” Plutarch writes: “I am well content with the settled conditions prevailing at present, and I find them very welcome, and the questions which men now put to the god are concerned with these conditions. There is, in fact, profound peace and tranquility; war has ceased, there are no wanderings of peoples, no civil strifes (οίροσεις), nor other maladies and ills in Greece requiring many unusual remedial forces” Moralia, 5. 408. It might be conjectured that Josephus, whose patrons were the Flavian emperors, was acquainted with Plutarch’s essay, “That a Philosopher ought to converse especially with men in power,” Moralia, 10. 776 f., where he writes, “In clasping Soracanus to your bosom, in prizing, pursuing, welcoming, and cultivating his friendship--a friendship which will prove useful and fruitful to many in private and to many in public life--you are acting like a man who loves what is noble, who is public-spirited and is a friend of mankind, not, as some people say, like one who is merely ambitious for himself.” To associate elements in Israel’s history with elements of special interest to Plutarch would have been a useful tactic in Josephus’ apologetic project in the Antiquities. While comparisons have more often been drawn between Josephus and Dionysius of Halicarnassus, or Thucydides, I propose there is seemingly more than an adventitious likeness between Josephus’ situation and that of Plutarch. Delphi’s temple was to Plutarch as the Tabernacle and Temple were to Josephus. I offer the conjecture that Josephus’ projected work περὶ ἔθνων καὶ αἰτων (Ant. 4. 198), often alluded to throughout the Antiquities, might well have been prompted by Plutarch’s Moralia, which covers a host of topics, some of which Josephus may have considered discussing in his projected work. (In support of the view that Josephus projected work on Customs and Causes is found in Apion see Hans Petersen, “Real and Alleged Literary Projects of Josephus,” American Journal of Philology 79 (1958), 259-274. David Altshuler, in “The Treatise περὶ ἔθνων καὶ αἰτων ‘On Customs and Causes’ by Flavius Josephus,” JQR ns 69 (1978-79), 226-232, argues that Josepus project was fulfilled in a rewriting of Ant. 3, with the supplement of Apion 2. Feldman refutes Petersen’s view in an extended note in his translation of Ant. 20, Loeb edition, 10, p. 143. A useful investigation would be the themes in Josephus’ Antiquities that directly accompany his mentioning of this anticipated project. John Gwyn Griffiths has remarked on Plutarch’s “philosophical eclecticism,” which inclined him to treat "the myths
several, made up of an infinite number of things, as we are. He is with reference to no time, but only to the eternal, the immovable and timeless. There is nothing before, nor after, nor more, nor past, nor older, nor younger; but He being One with the ‘Now’ hath filled up the ‘Ever’.54

Josephus certainly would never have admitted any identity between Apollo and the God of Israel, but, for apologetic purposes, it may have been useful for him to borrow from the prestige of the temple of Apollo at Delphi. Why else would he liken the table in the Tabernacle to the famous table(s) at Delphi?55

of other peoples in the same spirit as he did those of the Greeks." Plutarch's De Iside et Osiride (Cambridge: University of Wales Press, 1970), p. 19. He notes that Plutarch shared the attitude of the majority of Greek writers on religion, that they "believed that the gods existed and that they cared for all men; they saw in foreign deities their own gods under different names" (p. 19).

54 Hoyle, op. cit., p. 66. From Plutarch's Moralia. 5. 393 (p. 244 in Loeb edition). In The F at Delphi, Plutarch writes: "But God is (if there be need to say so), and He exists for no fixed time, but for the everlasting ages which are immovable, timeless, and undeviating, in which there is no earlier nor later, no future nor past, no older nor younger; but He, being One, has with only one 'Now' completely filled 'For ever'; and only when Being is after His pattern is it in reality Being... Under these conditions, therefore, we ought, as we pay Him reverence, to greet Him and to address Him with the words, 'Thou art'; or even, I vow, as did some of the men of old, 'Thou art One.'" The similarity of this last remark to the shema is remarkable. LXX Deut. 6: 4--Κύριος εἰς ἄνθρωπον/ Plutarch, The F at Delphi 20--τὸ καί.

55 David Daube calls attention to the phycho logical phenomenon of "transfer," in which "we... credit the one [thing] under notice with features familiar from other, related ones." "Typology in Josephus," JJS 31. 1 (Spring, 1980), 21-22. He goes on to observe that "Historians, desirous of bringing order into chaos, are given to these comparisons: ... Delphi is the ancient Vatican." So, it would appear, Josephus let the known aura of Delphi's temple be the type to suggest the unknown aura of the ancient Tabernacle. Rather than choose the aura of the Temple in Jerusalem, which also would have been known, but which was known as a place that had been desecrated and destroyed, he used a pagan temple with a suitable aura as his type. In Ant. 2.346 Josephus writes that Moses composed a song at the Red Sea ἐν ἔξωμέτρῳ τόνως, "in hexameter meter." This Hellenization of Moses' poem brings to the ancient prophet's composition an elegance comparable to the comparison of the table in the Tabernacle to the tables at Delphi.
Actually, there was one table at Delphi that was famous, the one on which the oracle sat. It was, however, three-legged, a tripod, rather than a four-legged table. The term ἡτός is found in the Mishna (Kel. 22: 1; 24: 6; 25: 1), as well as in other Rabbinic writings (Ex. Rab s. 42; Num. Rab. s. 2; J.T. Ab. Zar III, 42c), with reference to a “three-legged table used as a toilet or a waiter” (Jastrow, en. loc.). The coins of Herod the Great included the tripod among the emblems stamped on them. None of these examples refer to the table in the Temple or Tabernacle, however. But, the Targums refer to this Tabernacle table as נָשָׁם which is derived from a root נָשָׁם meaning “interpret.” The phonetic and semantic resemblance between נָשָׁם and Πυθόνικος, the interpreter of Divine messages, is manifest.

The table in the Tabernacle could not have been a tripod. It had rings attached to the junction of table-top and legs, through which staves were passed. Of course, this would be impossible with a three-legged table.

Josephus clearly gathers to the Tabernacle table the prestige associated with the famous tripod at Delphi, without meaning that the Tabernacle table was three-legged.

---

56 Hoyle, op. cit., p. 61. Cf. Plutarch, The E at Delphi, 2, 6, etc. A scene popular for many vase paintings showed Apollo’s dispute with Herakles who attempted to steal the tripod. G.M.A Richter writes that “the rectangular table with three legs is the prevalent type during the archaic and classical periods.” The Furniture of the Greeks, Etruscans, and Romans (London: Phaidon Press, Ltd., 1966), p. 66.


59 Pausanius tells of the tripod at Olympia on which were displayed the crowns of victors (V, xii, 5). Herodotus writes of the tripod at Delphi (VIII, 27, 82), that rested on the bronze three-headed serpent (IX, 81).
His allusion to the nether part of the legs being similar to those of Dorian couches is also a forensic device to enhance the prestige of the table.\(^{60}\) Poulsen has written that "the Doriens brought Apollo with them [to Lacedaemon], after having earlier received him from Asia Minor." He cites Pindar's song about Apollo who was the leader of the Dorian wanderings.\(^{61}\) The Doriens were most often identified with the Spartans, who had tremendous prestige in antiquity. Josephus provides some evidence to support the contention that they were related to the Jews from the days of Abraham.\(^{62}\) Professor Feldman observes that "the stubbornness of the Jews in their obedience to the law, which is ridiculed by the anti-Jewish Agatharchides (Apion 1. 209-12), would have elicited praise from many of the ancients, since this was a quality possessed by the Spartans (2.225), inasmuch as they had remained faithful for so long to Lycurgus'...\(^{60}\) Pausanius writes of a couch at Olympia, not large, on which were set the crowns for victors (V, xx, 1). Though this is not described as a Dorian couch, it, like the tripod, received the crowns of victors.


\(^{62}\) Cf. Louis H. Feldman, "Pro-Jewish Intimations in Anti-Jewish Remarks Cited in Josephus' Against Apion," JQR 78, 3-4 (January-April, 1988), 208, note 44, which comments on I Maccabees 12: 20 f. In I Maccabees 12: 5 f Jonathan writes to the Spartans, who had not joined the Achaean league against Rome: "Jonathan the high priest, and the rest of the Jewish people to their brethren the Spartans, greeting..." (emphasis mine). Cf. Ant. 13. 166-70. Josephus cites a letter written by Areios, king of the Lacedaemonians, to Onias, in which Areios says "We have come upon a certain document from which we have learned that the Jews and Lacedaemonians are of one race and are related by descent from Abraham" (Ant. 12. 226). This letter goes on to say: "It is right, therefore, that you as our brothers should send to us to make known whatever you may wish." (emphasis mine) For further bibliography on the Spartan relationship to the Jews, see Schürer, op. cit., 1, 184-185.
laws." The Dorian name added luster to the image of the Tabernacle table.

Beyond this imputed prestige, what picture did Josephus wish to project of this table? He describes the dimensions of the table in nearly the same terms as LXX (Josephus 3.139: τὸ μῆκος μὲν δύο πηχῶν, τὸ δὲ πλάτος ἕνος πῆχεως καὶ σπιθαμῶν τριῶν τὸ ὄψος. LXX Ex. 25: 23: δύο πηχῶν τὸ μῆκος, καὶ πῆχεως τὸ εὔρος, καὶ πῆχεως καὶ πῆχεως καὶ ἡμίσους τὸ ὄψος.) He substitutes πλάτος for εὐρος, the equivalent in spans (σπιθαμῶν) for cubits (πηχεως), and changes the word for height from ὄψος to ὄψος. For Josephus, this is very close to outright copying. A similar instance of near copying LXX will be seen below in Josephus' description of the candelabrum.

Strangely, whereas the Biblical text stresses that the table was made of gold, with LXX pleonastically reading ποιήσεις τράπεζαν χρυσῆν χρυσίου καθαρόν, Josephus fails to mention that the table is made of gold. He specifies only that the rods (στέλεοι) were gold-plated wood.

---

63 Feldman, "Pro-Jewish Intimations," p. 209. Dionysius of Halicarnassus wrote of Lycurgas, that he paid visits to Delphi, forming his code of laws under the instruction of Apollo." Roman Antiquities II, lxi, 2.

64 Aristeas 57 also reads ὄψος.

65 Cf. André Pelletier, Flavius Josèphe, Adaptateur de la Lettre d' Aristé, Une Réaction attisante contre la Koiné (Études et Commentaires, 45), (Paris, 1962), where Professor Feldman notes that the author observes that "Josephus, while closely following the Letter, seldom has more than a few words that are exactly identical; in other words, his practice was to vary the wording simply for the sake of varying it." (Professor Feldman wrote this in a personal note to me.)

66 John W. Wevers observes the "more reasonable" description of the table found in MT that the table was plated with pure gold, rather than made entirely of pure gold. Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus (Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1990), p. 401-02.
The legs of the Greek couches illustrated in Richter's classic work on *The Furniture of the Greeks, Etruscans and Romans*, are either "turned legs," or rectangular legs. Those with turned legs usually fasten to the frame from beneath. Those with rectangular legs are connected to the frame at the corners. Josephus states that the tops of the legs on the table in the sanctuary were four-sided (τετράγωνοι).

In describing the tops of the legs in this way, while specifying that the lower parts were Dorian, perhaps we are to understand that the difference between the lower and the upper parts of the legs is that the lower parts were rounded. This describes a contemporary table in an ancient setting, much as Renaissance artists depicted biblical scenes with people dressed in modern garb.

Josephus adds the details of how the legs were attached to the table top, which he here calls the body (σώμα). Josephus uses three terms in *Ant.* 3. 140 to describe the top of the table: σώμα, ἐδαφος, and ἐπιθέμα. 'Επιθέμα is the same term he uses to describe the top of the Ark. The top of the table was surrounded by a ridge that was a hand-breadth high. On this ridge there was spiral ornamentation (ἔλιξ). This reflects the LXX Καὶ ποιήσεις αὐτῇ στρεπτὸν κυμάτιον τῇ στεφάνῃ κύκλῳ (25:

---

68 Cf John W. Wever, *Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus*, p. 398. "The term ἱλαστήριον "propitiatory" is used only for ἡταξιωσόμενος in the Pentateuch. Since this is its first occurrence Exod defines it as an ἐπιθέμα "lid, cover." It lay as a lid on top of the Ark as a kind of plate made of pure gold, its dimensions being coincident with the length and width of the Ark."
69 This seems to be the meaning of κοιλαίνεται δὲ καθ’ ἕκαστον πλευρόν κοιλαίνοις ποικ κατὰ παλαιστὴν τὸ ἐδαφός.
MT prescribes around the table top a הַרְבּוּעָן ׃ (a hand-breath rim), with a גַּלָּמ (border of gold).

The rings were spheres interrupted before the circle was closed by straightening the material into pins (περονίδας) which connected each leg to the table top. Josephus’ rings (κρίκους) resembled croquet wickets, turned sideways, fixed, dowel-like into the legs. It would seem that holes must have been bored into the legs for the ring-pins, which joined (3.141 κοινωθέντας) the legs to the table top. Presumably similar holes were prepared in the table top to receive the other pin of the rings. All of this extra-Biblical explanation was no doubt based on the construction of tables Josephus had seen.

Josephus reverses the Biblical order in describing the elements found on top of the table in the sanctuary. The Bible describes first the utensils, and then the bread. Josephus says less than Exodus about the utensils, and more than Exodus about the bread. Josephus seems to be trying to give a composite picture of what was on the table, bearing in mind not only what was written...

---

70 The Letter of Aristeas describes the border of the Temple table (58): ΣΤΕΦΑΝΗΝ δὲ ἐποίησαν ΠΑΛΑΙΣΤΙΑΙΑΝ ΚΥΚΛΟΘΕΝ. τὰ δὲ ΤΜΑΙΑ ΣΤΡΕΙΠΤΑ, τὴν ἀναγλυφὴν ἔχοντα σχοινίδων ἐκτυπον.

71 Richter describes the joining of various parts of furniture in antiquity: “To join the various parts of a piece of furniture the ancients used wooden dowels and tenons, metal nails, and glue. The wooden tenons and dowels appear to have been the most popular—just as they were in pre-machinery days. The γόμφος is the usual word employed when such fastenings are referred to. . .” op. cit., p. 125. Josephus’ description of rings with pins (περονίδας), leads to the inference that the pins must have been gold-plated, metal dowels. They could not have been pounded into the table legs and top because of the ring, which would have made hammering impossible. Aristeas (61) tells of the pins put through holes that held together the table in the Temple (περόνας πρὸς τὴν ἀνφάλειν).
in MT Exodus, LXX Exodus and Leviticus 24, but what Philo wrote as well.

Josephus goes beyond what is found in Exodus, including the rubric found in Leviticus 24: 5. Philo also adds elements to the bread on the table drawn from Leviticus 24. He says that there was also salt on the table, in accord with LXX Leviticus 24: 7. MT does not mention the salt. This addition of LXX to MT is perhaps in order to follow the rubric found in Leviticus 2: 13: “On every gift of yours you shall offer salt to the Lord your God.”

---

72 Life of Moses 2. 104. In Questions and Answers on Exodus 2. 69, Philo writes: “. . . the table indicates a kind of communion among those who receive a common share of salt and sacrifices. For this leads to loving one’s fellow for one’s own sake.” This suggests that he saw the Table in the Tabernacle sanctuary as a “communion table” between God and man, in a way reminiscent of the Christian eucharist. In The Special Laws 1. 172 f, Philo writes: “But on each seventh day loaves are exposed on the holy table equal in number to the months of the year in two layers of six each, each layer corresponding to the equinoxes. . .” In 1. 289, Philo says, alluding to the requirement in Leviticus 2: 13: “On every gift ye shall offer salt,’ by which he signifies, as I have said before, complete permanence. Salt acts as a preservative to bodies, ranking in this as second in honour to the life-principle.” LXX Leviticus 24: 7 says that on each row of loaves is to be put λίβανον καθαρόν καὶ ἄλα, pure frankincense and salt. MT mentions only the pure frankincense τοῦ πυρίτου. In Questions and Answers on Exodus 2. 71 Philo also mentions censers, libation bowls and ladles. Plutarch says of the Egyptians: “one of the things forbidden them is to set salt upon a table.” Isis and Osiris, 363. It should be noted that salt is added in the “Alexandrian” Greek translation of Leviticus, perhaps not only as an attempt to be consistent with the requirement found in Leviticus 2: 13, but also to accentuate the difference between the Jewish laws and the Egyptian, if indeed what Plutarch writes was a principle followed by the Egyptians, even though mentioning the salt added something to the sacred text. In Questions and Answers on Exodus 2. 71, Philo writes: “Why are there, upon the table, cups and censers and libation-bowls and ladles.” In Who is the Heir 44 (§226), he interprets the aspects of the table: "Its wood is of earth, the incense offered on it of water, . . . while the perfume is of air and part which is ignited of fire; moreover the compound made of frankincense, galbanum, cloves and oil of cinnamon is a symbol of the elements. In the table we have thanksgiving for the mortal creatures framed from these elements, since loaves and libations, which creatures needing food must use, are placed on it.”

is noteworthy that Josephus omits mention of the salt, which, for one who knew the Hebrew, the Greek versions of the Bible, and Philo, would lead to the inference that he gave the greater honor to the Hebrew at this point. Ginzberg observes that "the Rabbis know nothing of salt."74

The Bible (Ex. 25: 30) calls the bread αἵρετος ἀρτοῦς ἐνωπίους, bread of presence, while Josephus (3. 142) calls it merely ἄρτους . . . ἀχύμονς, "unleavened bread," leaving out the "presence," and adding "unleavened." Omitting mention of "presence" here is odd in view of his stress on the Divine presence as the reason for the Tabernacle elsewhere. He may have omitted "presence" in his concern to emphasize that the bread was unleavened, rather than bread baked with yeast.75 This may imply that yeast bread was placed on the table at some time, or that he heard the view expressed that yeast bread was placed there. He may have wanted to correct an erroneous point of view as he writes of "unleavened bread."

Whereas Exodus 25: 30 is laconic,76 mentioning only that "table showbread" (叙利亚 ὁμοία τραπέζαν ἄρτους ἐνωπίους) is to be set before the Lord continually, Josephus' description is expansive, like that found in Leviticus 24: 5, which emphasizes the order

74 Ginzberg, Legends of the Jews VI, 65, note 337, Cf. BT Menahot 11, 5-8.

75 Ant. 3. 100 παρασταγάνη ταῖς ἡμετέραις εὐχαίς. In Ant. 3.255, where Josephus is describing the Jewish feast of Pentecost, he refers to the bread as σῶς ὑπός Ἰούς ἄρτους, "baked bread without leaven," substituting σῶς, which usually means "grain," for ἄρτος. Nodet II, 155, note 3 remarks that "The 'unleavened bread' of Josephus [in 3.142] confirms §255, which seems to be a hint of an actual custom of a known interpretation, because the verse, lacking precision, suggests as well, 'raised bread.'

76 This is followed closely by the Samaritan Pentateuch and targums.
and number of the loaves. They are placed in two parallel rows of six loaves on the table.\textsuperscript{77}

Later on, when Josephus explains the symbolism of the various parts of the Tabernacle, he briefly states that the twelve loaves “signify that the year is divided into as many months.”\textsuperscript{78} In \textit{War.} 5. 217 he explained more specifically that the twelve loaves represented “the circle of the Zodiac and the year.”\textsuperscript{79} I shall describe Josephus' interest in this speculative astral interpretation when I discuss the candelabrum.

Whereas in Leviticus the rubric calls for a pure table (24: 6 MT νηπευμενη την τραπεζαν την καθαραν) and fine flour (24: 5 σεμιδαλις), Josephus omits mention of the table being made of gold, while stating that the bread is to be made of completely pure flour (καθαρον πανο του ολευρον).

Josephus may have inadvertently omitted mentioning that the table was made of gold. He writes (3.140) that the poles used to carry the table were made of wood covered with gold (στελεοι

\textsuperscript{77}Nodet II, 155, note 3 remarks on the placement on the bread that Exodus 25: 29 is interpreted by BT Menahot 97a as describing a radiance (rayonnage) of six superimposed levels (niveaux), more elaborate than a simple layer." BT Menahot 97a reads: "At the outgoing of the Sabbath he used to enter again, lift up the ends of one cake and insert the rods underneath it, and then lift up the ends of another cake and insert the rods underneath it. The four [middle] cakes each required three rods underneath them, the topmost cake required but two rods underneath it for there was no burden upon it, while the bottom cake required no rods at all for it stood upon the surface of the table." The purpose of the rods on the table here is clearly different from anything Josephus describes. For Josephus the rods are only used to carry the table. In the Talmud, the rods are somehow needed to support the bread.

\textsuperscript{78}\textit{Ant.} 3. 182.

which surely implies that he wanted the
table to be thought of likewise as being made of wood with gold
plating over it. This is how he describes the Ark (3.135).

The quantity of the flour used in making the bread, he says
(3.142) is “two assarōn, ἀσσαρὰν (or ἀσσάρας) a transliteration
of עשרת, though MT reads שعة. Though no note is found in the
critical apparatus of the Stuttgart Biblia Hebraica at this point, it
would seem that the Hebrew text that Josephus had before him
read שעת rather than שעת. It may be noted that Josephus’
phonetic transliteration of שעת (ἀσσαρὰν or ἀσσάρας) suggests
that the vocalization of the word was different in his day from the
eleventh century C.E., when the Masoretes pointed the Hebrew
text. He pronounced שעת rather than שעת,

Josephus says ἀσσαρὰς is a Hebrew measure equivalent to
“seven Attic cotylae” (3. 142). LXX Leviticus 24: 5 states that
“each loaf shall be of two tenth parts” (δύο δεκάτων ἐσται ὁ ἄρτος
ὁ ἐς), an uncertain measure reflecting the MT שעת while
omitting the full lexical meaning, “tenth of an ephah.”

Josephus says that the loaves were replaced every seven
days (3. 143), which reflects the directions of Leviticus 24: 8.

Apart from the bread, the only other items Josephus
mentions on the table in the sanctuary were two vessels filled

---

80 Concerning this, Thackeray remarks: “There is an apparent error
of about one half in this estimate. In terms of pints, an assaron or omer = c. 6
1/2 pints (arts. on Weights and Measures in Hastings B.D. and Encycl. Bibl.); an
Attic cotyla = nearly 1/2 pint, 7 cotylae = c. 3 1/4 pints.” Josephus 4, 382. Cf.
Weill, op. cit., p. 174, note 3: Cette assimilation paraît erronée, Le cotyle vaut
01, 27 et lissaron 31,64 (cf. J. Benzinger, Hebräische Archäologie, 1894, p. 179):
or 7 cotyles ne feraient en tout que 11,89. Peut-être faut-il lire dans le grec 27
cotyles (27 X 0,27 = 7,29 = 2. 2,64).
with incense (δύο χρύσεων λιβάνου πλήρεις 3.143),\(^{81}\) which, as Thackeray observes (ad. loc.), corresponds to the carvings on the Arch of Titus. By contrast, Exodus 25: 29 and 37:12 refer to “its dishes (τὰ τρυμβία σάτης), and its censers (καὶ τὰς θυίσκας), and its bowls (καὶ τὰ σπονεία), and its cups (καὶ τοὺς κυαθοὺς), with which you shall offer drink offerings.”\(^{82}\) MT lists τὴράντα its dishes, τὴνδα its pans, τὴνσάρα its jars, and τὴνψάρα its bowls. The RSV translates τὴνδα “dishes for incense,”\(^{83}\) apparently understanding incense to be implied, even though part of the furniture of the Tabernacle included an altar of incense (30: 1-10/37: 25-28), placed in front of the curtain separating the Holy of Holies from the rest of the sanctuary.

Contrary to his practice in telling details of the candelabrum, Josephus does not use any of the words describing the utensils on the table that are found in LXX Exodus 25: 29 or Leviticus 24: 7. In fact, his term, χρύσεωι, is properly a feminine adjective meaning “golden things” which LSJ declares is frequently used “in the Epic dialect especially of what belonged to gods.”\(^{84}\) Perhaps

---

\(^{81}\) Later on (3.147-48), in telling of the incense altar, the word for incense is θυμιάματος.

\(^{82}\) Exodus 37: 12 specifically refers to the furniture of the table (τὰ σκεύη τῆς τραπέζης), whereas 25: 29 uses the relative possessive pronoun σάτης, referring to the table.

\(^{83}\) Cassuto states that all of these utensils were to remain empty so long as they were on the table. “When the priest wished to use them for pouring out libations, he brought them out from the sanctuary to the court, where he filled them with wine, subsequently pouring from them the wine upon the flesh that was on the altar-fire; there were no libations inside the sanctuary (XXX/ 9).” Exodus, p. 339.

\(^{84}\) En. loc., p. 2009. Rengstorf groups χρύσας, χρύσιος, and χρύσαιος as three forms of the same adjective. One or other of these forms appear often in Josephus’ works.
the appearance of two cups on the Arch of Titus, captured from Herod’s Temple, is the principal clue that the golden objects holding the incense that Josephus describes were, in fact, cups, as Thackeray translates χρύσεα. Though, in War 5. 217, Josephus mentions only the twelve loaves on the table. Presumably this would have been the table captured by Titus. Perhaps Josephus omits mention of the cups that were there, in fact. His omitting mention of them may imply he had not seen them personally.

In Ant. 8. 89 Josephus described the quantity of vessels made for the tables in Solomon’s Temple. There he describes, in particular, τὰ σκεύη φιάλαι τε καὶ σπονδεία χρύσεα, the vessels, golden bowls and (golden) cups. The one table chosen to put “on the north side of the temple over against the lampstand” has only loaves (ἀρτούς) on it. This is in keeping with III Kingdoms 7: 48, which refers to τὴν τράπεζαν ἐφ’ ἥς οἱ ἄρτοι τῆς προσφορᾶς.

LXX Leviticus 24: 7 says: “And you shall put on [each] row pure frankincense and salt, Καὶ ἐπιθήσετε ἐπὶ τὸ θέμα καθαρῶν καὶ ὀλα. None of the items mentioned on the table in Exodus 25: 29 are required in Leviticus 24: 7. Conversely, the requirement of incense and salt in LXX Leviticus is missing in LXX Exodus. MT Leviticus 24: 7 calls for pure frankincense ναξ ἀβζ.85

Josephus concludes his description of the table (3.143) with another of his reminders of a proposed explanation of the reason

---

85 The Greek word λιβάνων, found often in Herodotus, Pindar, Euripides, etc., bears a strong phonetic resemblance to the Hebrew נְדַב, which surely suggests the influence either of the Greek word on the Hebrew word, or vice versa.
(αἰρίαν) for these things, yet to be written, that he first adumbrated in Ant. 1. 25. 

Josephus appears to write from memory in describing the Tabernacle table. In describing it he made the comparison with the table(s) at Delphi either as a means of entering into an exchange of familiar ideas with a circle of Greek intellectuals with whom he was "comparing notes," or as a means to further his apologetic. It is inviting to think that it was the former rather than the latter because, if his intention was apologetic, the tactic of mentioning the table at Delphi might have been seen as a bit blatant, particularly since the table at Delphi was so different, a tripod rather than a four-legged table. Yet, it may be observed, that in Ant. 15.371, he does not hesitate to state that the Essenes followed the teachings of Pythagoras, and in Life 12, he states that the Pharisees are like the Stoics. If he was "comparing notes," with Greek intellectuals interested in the antiquity of the Jewish people, it would have made good sense to compare a famous element of the temple at Delphi (and Olympia) about which they were aware, with the article of the ancient Jewish Tabernacle about which they knew nothing.

86 In Ant. 4. 198 Josephus calls this proposed work an explanation of customs and causes (εἰς τὴν περὶ ἑδών καὶ αἰτιῶν ἀπόδοσιν). In 20. 368, at the close of the Antiquities, he says that this work will be in four books. See Feldman's extended note, discussing the scholarship that has been offered on this issue, Josephus 10, p. 143. It bears notice, in the overall attempt to list resemblances between Plutarch and Josephus that suggest Plutarch's influence on Josephus, that three times in Plutarch's Isis and Osiris, he makes similar promises to discuss a particular issue in another place. In §4 he refers to περὶ ὅν ἐτερός λόγος, in §7 he writes: ἀπὸ ἀναληψαμένων, and in §29 he writes: ἄπερον ἐπισκεψθέθηκα. I did not notice these allusions to another projected explanation in Plutarch's other writings having to do with Delphi. Of course, many other authors also promise to discuss particular issues elsewhere.
The Candelabrum

Josephus' description of the candelabrum differs from his description of other elements of the Tabernacle furniture. Not only does he display some liberties in retelling the Biblical details, both adding to and taking away from the Biblical account, but he also interprets the candelabrum in a way specifically calculated to impress devout, mystically inclined Jews, as well as his anticipated non-Jewish readers, whom he expected would be interested in astrological symbolism. By contrast with his word-choice in describing the utensils on the table, where he avoids any of the words used in LXX, Josephus uses a slight revision of the same words found in LXX to describe the various parts of the branches on the candelabrum.

Carol Meyers has written of the inconsistency and variety characterizing the translation of technical terms relating to the candelabrum found in LXX. If Josephus had both MT and LXX before him, he could well take some liberties in offering the "Biblical" description of the candelabrum!

87 In War 5. 217 Josephus wrote that the twelve loaves on the table in the Temple represented "the circle of the Zodiac and the year; while the altar of incense, by the thirteen fragrant spices from sea and from land, both desert and inhabited, with which it was replenished, signified that all things are of God and for God." The twelve loaves in the Temple shared with the candelabrum astro-theological significance. But he does not impute this significance to the loaves in the Tabernacle, or to the altar of incense.

Josephus disregards the funnel (τὸν ἔπαρυστήρα) and snuff-dishes (τὰ ὑποθέματα) of LXX Exodus 25: 38, and MT Exodus 25: 38 its tongs (πυρᾶς) and its snuffdishes (πυρήνων). This may suggest that Josephus considered these utensils used in the refueling and extinguishing of the candelabrum unimportant, or that he forgot them, or that as he read the Greek text of Exodus, his eyes skipped over the part describing the funnel and snuffdishes. Josephus does not mention these utensils in explaining the Temple candelabrum in War.

Josephus' interpretation of the candelabrum was similar to, but not nearly so detailed as Philo's. Goodenough has written that "Josephus describes and evaluates the Temple or tabernacle cultus in terms of astral mysticism in a way essentially identical with Philo's explanation, but with such minor variations of detail

89 According to LSJ, ἔπαρυστήρα is not found outside LXX, hence Josephus may have omitted it since his audience of non-Jews would not have understood its meaning.

90 Υποθέματα is found elsewhere in the literature, according to LSJ (p. 1881).

91 As I will point out in explaining Josephus' description of the details of the branches on the candelabrum, he follows closely the Greek terms, adding pomegranates as a separate element. This last element can be reasonably explained from the vocabulary of the Greek Exodus.

92 Goodenough distinguishes two distinct stages in Philo's "Mystery." The higher stage is his Mystery of Moses, and the lower stage is his Mystery of Aaron. The Mystery of Aaron seems to be the kind upon which Josephus drew wherein he has elements of similarity to Philo's symbolism in the candelabrum. This was a kind of symbolism based on the Jerusalem cultus, the Temple and the Priesthood. The Mystery of Moses was more deliberately Platonic. It "abandoned the material world and led the worshipper above all material association. . ." E.R. Goodenough, By Light, Light; The Mystic Gospel of Hellenistic Judaism (Amsterdam: Philo Press, 1969), p. 96.
that Josephus could hardly have been drawing directly upon Philo’s writings."93

Josephus could have drawn on many sources for his inspiration. Martin Hengel has written of "the victorious progress of astrology in the Hellenistic era... which became more and more the spiritually dominant force among the educated."94 Goodenough shared this view as he wrote: "Throughout the literature of antiquity more or less elaborate allusions are made to the stars, their nature and relation to men, allusions which for our purposes have even more importance than the formal treatises."95 In another place this same author wrote: "Philo and Josephus alike give these allegories of the menorah... in order to integrate into Judaism the current idealistic astralism as contrasted with the materialistic."96 Josephus said enough in describing the candelabrum, for the reader interested in astrology, to allow him to infer much more than he says explicitly. He may have wished

---

93Goodenough, Jewish Symbols. VIII, 212-13. Cf. his By Light, Light, p. 99. In an unenthusiastic evaluation of Josephus, Goodenough describes his dependence on Philo overall in the Tabernacle/Temple material: "Josephus presents the basic elements of Philo's cosmic-mystic interpretation of Aaronic worship, robes, and instruments, as a dull listing, completely different from the passionate fancy of Philo." Jewish Symbols XII, 47. As Goodenough has noted (Jewish Symbols, IV, 85), Philo's most extensive discussion of the candelabrum is found in Who is the Heir, 216-229. There is no resemblance between anything found here and Josephus' brief discussion of the symbolism of the candelabrum. Philo also mentions the candelabrum briefly in The Preliminary Studies, 8.


95Goodenough, Jewish Symbols, VIII, 178.

96Ibid, IV, 86. Plutarch writes that "The Chaldeans declare that of the planets, which they call tutelary gods (θεοί τετυλέων καλοί) two are beneficent, two maleficent, and the other three are median and partake of both qualities (Isis and Osiris 48)."
those of his readers who knew of Philo's work to plug into the Alexandrian philosopher's broader explanation of the symbolism of the candelabrum.

Josephus explained earlier in Ant., that in effect, all of this importance of the stars began with Abraham who had the ability to infer wisdom from "the course of the sun and moon, and from all the celestial phenomena." He taught astrology to the Egyptians, who, in turn, taught the Greeks.

Goodenough has noted, that the sixth-century prophet Zechariah may be referring to the seven lights of the candlestick in the Temple as planets, when he says they are "the seven eyes of Yahweh, wandering through the whole earth." 

Josephus wrote: "Each branch bore one lamp, recalling the number of the planets (3.146)." This closely reflects Philo's words: "... on all these are set seven lamps and candlebearers, symbols of what the men of science call planets" (Life of Moses 2. 103).

97 Ant. 1. 156. He cites Berossus' high estimate of Abraham as a man "versed in celestial lore." (Ant. 1. 158).


99 Goodenough, Jewish Symbols, IV, 72-73.

100 Zechariah 4: 10.

101 It is beyond the scope of this study to explore this theme in its broader representation in the Judaism of this period. Martin Hengel discusses how "the Essenes shared with apocalyptic and the whole Hellenistic environment the widespread conception of a 'sympatheia' between earthly and heavenly events." Judaism and Hellenism (2 vols. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974), I, 232. He writes that "The only disruption in the ordering of the cosmos came from the fall of the heavenly 'watchers', who were also said to be stars; among other things they led men astray into star worship and thus to idolatry in general." Philo specifically avoided astral determinism by calling the stars lieutenants, intermediaries, under the control of the Father of all. Special Laws 1. 13-14. Philo says that the sun, moon, and other stars are
The prophet Zechariah (4: 2-14) provides, perhaps, a piece of evidence before the Hellenistic period, of perceived astral-symbolism in the menorah. No doubt the widespread Jewish interest in this symbolism during the period in which Philo and Josephus wrote, was due, most immediately, to Hellenistic influence.

D.S. Russell attributes the rise of interest in the "heavenly luminaries and especially the seven planets whose movements were believed to control the lives of men and nations" to Babylonian worship.¹⁰² The Jews made intimate contact with this during their Persian exile. Russell notes the irony that the principal evidence of astral symbolism is found among the Hasidim, the very Jews who tried most to resist alien influence.¹⁰³ The Qumran sectarians, Hengel observes, found "in the law... the perfect harmony of the whole of creation, as it is expressed above all in the ordering of the seasons and movement of the stars."¹⁰⁴

Though the Hasidim were unlike the Qumran sectarians in many ways, these two Jewish sects shared an interest in the significance of the stars.

¹⁰³ Ibid., pp. 19-20.
¹⁰⁴ Hengel, Judaism and Hellenism I, 223. In II, 147, note 732, he cites 1QS 10. 1-17, 23 "for the constant praise of God and for accord with the orbits of the sun."
Let us look closely at Josephus' description of the Tabernacle candelabrum. He begins by telling the location of the candelabrum (λυχνία 3.144) in the sanctuary facing the table, near the south wall (κατὰ πρόσωπον δὲ τῆς τραπέζης τῷ πρὸς μεσημβρίαν τετραμμένῳ τοίχῳ). This is the position of the table described in MT and LXX Exodus 26: 25. MT Exodus 40: 24 also gives this information, while LXX of this verse omits the detail of the candelabrum's relationship to the table. In Exod. 25: 37 we read that "the lamps shall be set up so as to give light upon the space in front of it."

Whereas the Bible (Exodus 25: 31) states that the candelabrum is made of pure gold (ἐκ χρυσίου χαθαροῦ/ ῥαθ ἤπι), Josephus (3.144) says it is made of cast gold (ἐκ χρυσοῦ κεχωνευμένα). While Josephus does not contradict the Biblical

---

105 Philo, in *On Mating with the Preliminary Studies* 8, remarks that the candelabrum gives light from one part only, that is the part where it looks towards God. . . it sends its rays upwards towards the Existent, as though feeling that its light were too bright for human sight to look upon it." This seems to imply that its light must be thrown in the direction of the Holy of Holies, rather than towards the table. In BT Menahoth 98b, Rabbi R. Eleazar son of R. Simeon says that the candelabrum stood with its branches extending north and south because 'it is written, Aaron and his sons shall order it . . . [before the Lord]', that is toward the Holy of Holies. The table is described here with its ends pointing east and west, so that the candelabrum could not be casting its light over the table. Strangely, both Weill and Thackeray cite Exodus 25: 31 as the Biblical support for this detail in Josephus.

106 Josephus uses the verb χωνεύω in four other places (Ant. 8. 79 [twice], 179, and 10. 57). In 8. 79 he is describing the cast bronze laver in Solomon's Temple. In 8. 179 and 10. 57 the verb means "melt." Carol Meyers proposes that "a clue concerning the nature of the specific technical dimension reflected in χωνεῦω as a terminus technicus can be found in a passage in Malachi [3: 2] " which refers to the "smelter's fire." The root ἱσσα "in the sense of purity, is firmly associated with the actual washing and also with metals." *The Tabernacle Menorah*, p. 29. The melting of the gold in the smelter's purifying process may have been Josephus' cue to employ the verb χωνεύω. Though LSJ gives as the principal meaning of this verb "coat jars with pitch" (p. 2014), it is a denominative verb based on the noun χωνεύω, "melting and casting of metal." Each of the cognate forms of this noun found
rubric in this, he adds the seemingly gratuitous suggestion that the candelabrum was cast, that is, made in a mold, while omitting to say that the gold is pure. He may have inferred that it was cast from Exodus 25:31, which implies that the various ornate elements of the candelabrum were not added to the simple stem, but were a unified object. Philo provided an allegorical explanation for this unity of the parts of the candelabrum. The candelabrum reflected the unity of heaven.

In a detail that is unique to Josephus, he states that the candelabrum was hollow (διάκενος), a detail that contradicts the

107 LSJ have to do with smelting. Meyers proposes that actually the gold was overlayed on a wooden (probably acacia wood) form. She notes that only one other object in the Tabernacle furnishings is described "as being made of πασσον gold work, the cherubim." "Technologically," Meyers writes, "they too would need to be constructed over a wooden form" (pp. 32-33). She observes that other utensils used in the Tabernacle possibly "were fabricated ... of casting the metal in molds," but these were only "accessories rather than major appurtenances" (p. 33). Josephus, however, seems to describe this major appurtenance, the candelabrum, as made by being cast in a mold. He did not have Professor Meyers' technological considerations, as an archaeologist, in mind as he retold how the candelabrum was made.

108 Philo, in Questions and Answers on Exodus 2.74 answers the question: "Why is it that the shaft and the branches and the bowls (and) the knops and the lilies were all 'of that' [εξ αυτης έσται="all of a piece," according to the note of Ralph Marcus]." "Since the theologian (ὁ θεολογος, i.e. Moses) was all wise, he clearly knew in his wisdom that the heaven itself is a harmony and union and bond of all those things which are in heaven, just as the limbs which are arranged in the body are all adapted (to one another) and grow together." In §73 of this work Philo says that the lampstand was "turned" and made of pure gold because "the lampstand is a symbol of the purest substance, namely the heaven (σόμβολον της καθαροτατης τοο ουρανοφ). "Other parts of the world were wholly made through the four elements, earth, water, air, and fire, but the heaven of (only) one."

109 The candelabrum in the Temple invaded by Pompey, like the other items in the Temple, as Josephus described them, was ὀλόχρυσα πάντα (War 1.152), which does not rule out the possibility that this candelabrum was hollow, though Thackeray translates ὀλόχρυσα "solid gold." ὀλόχρυσα simply denotes
Biblical description, which explains that the candelabrum was made of solid gold. LXX Exodus 38: 14 explicitly states that the stem of the candelabrum was solid (στεφέαν τὸν καυλὸν), while the parallel verse in MT (Exodus 37: 17) states that the base and stem were hard, or, perhaps better put, solid (יהיה). The Talmud (BT Menahoth 28b) states "The candlestick had to be made from one mass and of gold (משורד והיה באזא מ הששה ומ זהב).

Josephus may have made this small, though explicit change in describing the candelabrum for halakic reasons. Professor Feldman has noted that “Josephus is at times more strict than the rabbis in his interpretation of law.” BT Menahoth 28b, Avodah Zarah 43a, and Rosh Hashanah 24a, b forbid making a menorah like those in the Temple. The Tabernacle was the precursor of the Temple, but it was not the Temple. Josephus’ slight change in that it was made entirely of gold. It is the same in War 6.388. In War 7. 148 Josephus simply says the λυχνία is made of gold (χρυσῆ).

Carol Meyers writes that the word מילקון indicates the use of sheet gold. The Tabernacle Menorah, p. 32. She rejects the possibility that the menorah was made of solid gold. See her note 109, p. 53.

He writes this in Jan Mulder and Harry Sysling, eds., Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity (Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum, sect. 2, vol. 1) (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1988), 517. Professor Feldman notes, for example (Life 65), where Josephus “Indicates to the Jews of Galilee that he will lead them to destroy Herod the Tetrarch’s palace because it had been decorated with images of animals, and when he condemns (Ant 8. 195) King Solomon for breaking the Second Commandment in putting the images of bulls and lions in the Temple, whereas the Bible (I Kgs 7: 25, 10: 20) has no such rebuke.”

Cf. Goodenough, Jewish Symbols, IV, 71. In Menahoth 28b, as I have noted above, R. Papa ben R. Hanin says that “The candlestick had to be made from one mass and of gold.” A Baraita forbids making a candelabrum after the design of the candelabrum in the Temple. In Avodah Zarah 43a, Abaye explains: “A man may not make . . . a candelabrum after the design of its candelabrum. He may, however, make one with five, six or eight [branches], but with seven he may not make it even though it be of other metals.” Rosh Hashanah 24a repeats Abaye’s explanation.
describing the construction of the candelabrum would not have been visible outwardly.

One finds it hard to know why he would have said the candelabrum was hollow unless he wished to be scrupulous in not describing the Tabernacle candelabrum as the Temple candelabrum was made. This small difference, not noticeable to the eye, would have satisfied the rabbinic prohibition of making a candelabrum like the Temple’s candelabrum, if, indeed, this was Josephus purpose in stating that it was hollow.

Another possible explanation is that Josephus confused the hollow altar (Exodus 27: 8, LXX Κωῖλον συνιδωτόν ποιήσεις αὐτῷ./ MT קֹבֶלָה שָׁכַבְתָּו וְלָבָחָה) with the candelabrum. In his brief comment on the altar, he does not say it was hollow (3. 149).

Josephus (3.144) says that the candelabrum weighed one hundred minas (µνᾶς ἑκατόν), which the Hebrews call κηραίους. He explains that this is equivalent to the Greek talent. Philo, it may be noted, wrote that "the talent consists of sixty minas." Philo’s reason for giving this detail is allegorical. He states this in explaining the allegorical significance of the one-talent weight of the candelabrum. "He appointed the talent (to be) its form, for the talent consists of sixty minas," which, he said because "the parts of the earth, according to those who study astrology, are said to measure sixty." Marcus notes that Philo writes in Questions and Answers on Genesis IV, 164, of the sixty parts of the cosmos rather than of the earth."  

---

113 Philo, Questions and Answers on Exodus, II, 81.
114 Ibid., note g.
Again Josephus gives a Greek phonetic rendering of a Hebrew word קְרַבָּה. This time, however, he apparently does not try to reflect the way the Hebrew word would have been pronounced; he simply Hellenized the Hebrew word קְרַבָּה.

Josephus seems to be aware, at this point, of both the Hebrew and the Greek Bibles. MT Exodus 25: 39 reads כּרַבָּה and LXX reads τάλαντον χρυσίου χαθαροῦ so that the Greek τάλαντον is equivalent to the Hebrew קְרַבָּה. The Hebrew קְרַבָּה is transliterated in the Greek μνᾶ. One hundred μνᾶ were equivalent to one Greek τάλαντον or a Hebrew קְרַבָּה.

Thackeray, Weill, and Nodet have observed that Josephus is in error in saying that the candelabrum weighed one hundred μνᾶ. They note that the Greek talent was equivalent to sixty minas, rather than to one hundred. But this is not so.

First, it may be noted that the ordinary talent may have been equivalent to fifty minas, rather than sixty. Second, it may be noted that in BT Bekoroth 5a, Abaye says: “the sacred maneḥ was double the common.” Josephus was referring to the

---

115 Cf Nodet' reasoning in II, 155, note 7.
116 E.M. Cook has written that “Assuming a sixty-shekel mina and a three-thousand-sekel talent, the mina must have been one-fiftieth of a talent. This contradicts the surrounding metrologies, which had sixty-mina talents. International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia (4 vols., Grand Rapids, Mi.: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1988), IV, 1053.
117 The Abaye referred to was either one of the Amoraim, or from an earlier generation. Moses Mielziner, Introduction to the Talmud (New York: BLock Publishing Company, Inc., 1968), p. 293. Rashi said “Now the ordinary talent (weighed) sixty manehs, but the sacred (talent) was double (that), one hundred and twenty manehs.” The Pentateuch and Rashi's Commentary: A Linear Translation into English, by Rabbi Abraham Ben Isiah and Rabbi Benjamin Sharfman (Brooklyn, New York: S.S. & R. Publishing Company, Inc., 1949), p. 307. See Jastrow, ad. loc., where he surely gives the opposite of what is
sacred rather than to the common *maneh* in giving the weight of the candelabrum. Of course, this was quite appropriate in telling of a sacred object in the Tabernacle. Josephus provides datable evidence of this special computation of the weight of the sacred *maneh*.

The ornamental elements Josephus describes on the candelabrum are, with the exception of his addition of pomegranates (ροῖσκοις), the same as those described in LXX. He lists σφαρία, κρίνα, κρατηρίδιοις, and ροῖσκοις (knobs, lilies, little bowls, and pomegranates), which rearranges the order and spelling of LXX (Exodus 25: 31) κρατήρες, σφαιρωτήρες, and κρίνα. Thus, Josephus lists four elements to the candelabrum branches, while the Bible lists three elements.

In LXX, the κρατηρίδες are in the shape of καρυίσκους (almonds); the καρυίκοι are not a separate element on the branch. LSJ defines ροῖσκος as "small pomegranate: hence, knob or tassel shaped like a pomegranate." One may infer that a ροῖσκος closely resembles a καρυίσκος. Each is small and round. Apart from the prefix καρ, the phonetic resemblance of καρυίσκος to ροῖκος prompts me to suggest that Josephus adds ροῖκος to the list of parts on the candelabrum either by design or by mistake, perhaps because of a hurried consultation with LXX. The names of intended: “Maneh, a weight in gold or silver, equal to one hundred common or fifty sacred shekels.”

In LXX, golden pomegranates (ροῖσκοις . . . ροῖσκον χρυσόν) are mentioned on the vestments of the high priest (Exodus 28: 29-30). See the discussion on the high priest's vestments below.
the parts of the candelabrum in LXX too closely align with Josephus' words to be adventitious.

Josephus was surely aware of the Hebrew text as well. 'Poískouc reflects MT Exodus 25: 31, which reads נקבה, which means "its capital" or "its pomegranate." Targum Neofiti renders this דונה, for which the nearest equivalent in Jastrow is דונה, "little apple, or crab-apple." \[119\]

Josephus may have added the pomegranates in order to heighten the "tree of life" symbolism of the menorah. \[120\] The addition of pomegranates on the menorah, as specific parts of it, rather than as describing the shape of the little bowls into which olive oil was poured, certainly increases the likeness of the menorah to a tree. The golden pomegranates are as fruit on the branches. \[121\]

Goodenough has noted that the tree motif of the menorah in the vision of Zechariah (4: 2-10) resembles "the Egyptian tree with Nut in it, pouring the fluid of life from a spout." \[122\] Zechariah envisioned

---

\[119\] SP reads as MT. Targum Onkelos is similar to Neophiti, דונה. BT Menahoth 28b likens the knops to Cretan apples (שׁוֹדְדֹת נַרְחָת). 

\[120\] Cf. Carol Meyers, The Tabernacle Menorah, p. 84, where she writes: "It has long been recognized that because of the language employed to describe the menorah and because of its assumed appearance as a thickened stem or shaft from which branches project that the whole shape strongly resembles that of a stylized tree." See Chap. IV, "The Sacred Tree in Ancient Near Eastern Iconography," and Chap. V, "A Typology of Tree Motifs in Ancient Israel."

\[121\] Ibid., p. 54, note 124, where Professor Meyers notes that the pomegranates were also "symbols of fertility in antiquity." It would seem that Josephus' addition of pomegranates to the candelabrum was an amplification of something already suggested in both the Hebrew and Greek forms of the text.

\[122\] Cf Goodenough, Jewish Symbols. IV, 73.
a lampstand all of gold, with a bowl on the top of it, and seven lamps on it, with seven lips on each of the lamps which are on the top of it. And there are two olive trees by it, one on the right of the bowl and the other on its left. . . Then I said to him, 'What are these two olive trees on the right and the left of the lampstand?' And a second time I said to him, 'What are these two branches of the olive trees, which are beside the two golden pipes from which the oil is poured out?'. . . Then he said, 'These are the two anointed who stand by the Lord of the whole earth.'

The trees beside the menorah in Zechariah's vision, Goodenough suggests, may "simply preserve the original meaning of the menorah as a tree." He continues to say: "The form of the menorah suggested to Cook and many others that it originally represented the sacred tree, the Tree of Life, with lights or fruit hanging on it, since light and life were from early times almost interchangeable." 123

Josephus does not explain how the various elements are found on the candelabrum branches, as LXX does. He was apparently more concerned to describe the significance of the candelabrum than to describe exactly how it looked.

This view of his purpose is supported by his peculiar statement that the elements of the candelabrum "numbered seventy in all (€βδομήκοντα δ ' ἡν τὰ πάντα 3. 145). Later on (3.182), Josephus tells how he came to this number. "By making the candelabrum to consist of seventy portions, he hinted at the ten degree provinces of the planets, and by the seven lamps thereon the course of the planets themselves, for such is their

123 Ibid., p. 73.
number." Philo had written that "the lampstand [indicates] the sense-perceptible heaven." Was seventy the heavenly number of perfection for Josephus?

EXCURSUS: The number seventy in Josephus' Writings

Rengstorf lists sixty-four appearances of the word ἑβδομηκοντα in the works of Josephus. In several of these instances ἑβδομηκοντα is part of a larger number, as in War 1. 53 and Apion 1. 299 (ἑκατόν καὶ ἑβδομηκοντα).

Eight times Josephus recalls that seventy years elapsed between the fall of Jerusalem and the edict of Cyrus that the wall and Temple should be rebuilt. This is more frequent than in Scripture, where this detail of Israel's history is mentioned only when it is predicted in Jeremiah 25: 11-12, 29: 10, and alluded to in Daniel 9: 2, which refers to Jeremiah's prophecy.

---

124 Thackeray's translation. NB Thackeray's comments in note "a" found in Ant. 3.182. He observes, in note "c" that the component portions enumerated in Exodus 25: 33 ff seem to amount to 69 only (see Encycl. Bibl. i. 645, n 3). Meyers remarks that "The biblical combination of tree form with actual lamps, i.e. the tabernacle menorah, must be seen against [the] background of continued association of plant life and celestial light." The Tabernacle Menorah, p. 121. Cf. Nodet II, 155, note 9.

125 Questions and Answers on Exodus II, 95. αἰώνια... τὴν αἰωνιὰν οὐσίαν καὶ... τὸν αἰωνιὸν οὐρανὸν. In II, 81, he says the lampstand is "a symbol of the whole heaven."

126 War 1. 53, 511, 647, [673]; 2. 482, 570, 571; 4. 336, 341, 467; 5. 160, 208, 242, 389; 6. 425, 439, [440], 441; Ant. 1. 63, [87], 154, [256]; 2. 176, 214; 6. 16, 52, 78, 89; 7. 389; 8. 57; 9. 125, 270; 10. 112, 147, 184; 11. 2, 69, 137; 12. [40]. 57, 86, 107, 140, 369; 13. 213, 430; 14. 206; [18. 32]; 20. 233; Life 56 (twice), 58, 79; Apion 1. 132, [154], 299.

127 E.g. also War 6. 425, 439; Ant. 1. 63, 154; 5. 123; 6. 78; 8. 57; 10. 147; 11. 69, 137; 12. 107, 140; 13. 213, 430; 14. 206; and 18. 32.

128 War 5. 389; Ant. 10. 112, 184; 11. 1-2; 20. 233; Apion 1. 132, 154.
Clearly, Josephus' frequent mention of this Biblical detail indicates his view of its significance. We might say that, whether the period of time had been seventy or one-hundred years may be beside the point; it was a very significant period of Jewish history. To report it often, in different contexts, was a matter of reporting Israel's history. This was part of Josephus' overall purpose in everything that he wrote.

Josephus sometimes reports without change the occurrence of the number seventy in the Biblical passage he is retelling. For example, in Ant. 2.176 he notes that Jacob and seventy sons left for Egypt. In Ant. 7. 389 he states that David died at seventy years of age; and in 9. 125, he reports that Ahab had seventy sons. Surely, if Josephus' primary purpose in using the number seventy was to stress perfection, or superior virtue, or special significance, then he would have omitted mention of Ahab's seventy sons.129

Once, Josephus uses the number seventy to express a negative value judgment. In Ant. 3. 9-12, when Josephus tells of the seventy palm trees at Elim, which was Israel's first stopping place after leaving Egypt, he stresses that there were only seventy palm trees. This was a fact that, in his estimate, amplified the lack of water at this oasis. Josephus states that from a distance

129 See also Ant. 2. 214; in Ant. 6. 16 Josephus is using a text different from both MT and LXX. Josephus says that seventy people from Bethshemesh were killed for touching the Ark, while MT and LXX (I Sam. 6: 19) say it was seventy plus fifty thousand, which is highly unlikely. See Thackeray's note. Ant. 6. 52 is a place where Josephus draws on LXX, rather than MT. MT says that Samuel had about thirty guests (I Sam 9: 22), while LXX, as Josephus, says that Samuel had about seventy guests at the feast at which he recognized Saul as the first king of Israel.
the oasis seemed to have a good water supply, but that on closer inspection the Israelites found only a trickle of foul water.

Whereas a desert oasis with seventy palm trees, watered by twelve springs, would seem to be abundantly supplied, which was surely the reason why Moses, in the Biblical narrative, chose this place for Israel to rest, Josephus changes the significance of the seventy palm trees. Merely seventy palm trees testifies to the meager water supply of the oasis. One brief verse in Exodus 15 tells of the Israelite pause at Elim. It says, in conclusion, "they encamped there by the water" (v. 27). This can hardly be read as a statement about the shortage of water there. Josephus changes the significance of the seventy palm trees from something positive to something negative.

Most commonly, however, Josephus expresses a positive value judgement in mentioning the number seventy. At the end of Antiquities 3, Josephus provided a current illustration for the long-standing attitude of reverence the Jews had for their lawgiver, Moses. During the famine that occurred in the mid-first century C.E., no priest would eat any of the unleavened bread made for the Feast of Unleavened Bread. Josephus heightens the significance of this bread by reporting that it was made of seventy cors of flour (3. 321).

Here Josephus empahsizes not only the regard the Jews had for Moses, but the sacredness of the bread as well, made from seventy cors of flour. Thackeray notes that in Ant. 15. 314,
Josephus said that a *cor* was equivalent to ten Attic *medimni*.\textsuperscript{130} The Attic *medimnus* was equal to about one and one half bushels. One wonders if Josephus realized how much bread would have been prepared from seventy *cors*, that is, \(70 \times 15 = 1050\) bushels of flour! It would seem that he thought it desirable to use the number seventy to show the dignity of this bread, rather than to suggest the extraordinary abundance of it.

A similar nuance is found in *Ant* 5. 233, where we read that Gideon had seventy sons born in wedlock, and the one not included in this number, born a bastard, was Abimelech, who became a tyrant. That he was not of the seventy legitimate sons emphasizes his lack of virtue. Here, Josephus gives the essence of the account found in Judges 8: 29-9: 57.

Similarly, in *Ant*. 5. 274, Josephus remembers the otherwise insignificant judge, Agdon, mentioned in Judges 12: 13-14. His one claim to notice seems to be that the number of his sons and grandsons totalled seventy. "They rode on seventy asses," says the anonymous chronicler. Josephus concedes that only his happy paternity (\(\varepsilon\delta\pi\alpha\iota\delta\iota\alpha\zeta\)) is noteworthy.

Sometimes Josephus implies the infamy of certain deeds done to persons who were in groups of seventy. In *War* 2. 482 particular infamy is implied when Noarus slaughtered the deputation of seventy preeminent citizens that came to him, seeking protection. That there were seventy of these citizens emphasized the dignity of the delegation.

\textsuperscript{130}Cf note to *Ant*. 3. 121.
In a similar case, we learn that the Zealots (War 4. 336 ff) tried to persuade their fellow citizens to join against Zacharias, son of Baris, by summoning seventy of the leading citizens to their aid as a kangaroo court; but the seventy do not play into the Zealots' scheme. That there were seventy in this group is a clue to its virtue. Their unanimous verdict is for Zacharias. The seventy are too wise and virtuous to succumb to the influence of the Zealots.

War 2. 570 tells of Josephus' choice of seventy mature persons of greatest discretion to serve as magistrates in Galilee. Here Josephus seems to make himself appear parallel to Moses, who, at his father-in-law's urging (Exodus 18: 13), chooses elders to help him care for Israel. In Exodus 24: 1, we discover that the number of elders Moses chose was seventy.

Josephus, in War 4. 467, heightens the value of a miraculous spring near Jericho, that had been changed from toxic to sweet by Elisha, by saying that it was able to irrigate a plain seventy furlongs long and twenty wide. The plain was changed from barrenness to fruitfulness. The seventy furlong length of the plain made fertile amplifies the spectacular change Elisha effected in the spring's water.

This expands on a story found in II Kings 2: 19-22, in which no mention is made of this spring as the source of water for irrigating a plain seventy-furlongs long. Ginzberg does not mention any legends reporting this consequence of Elisha's second miracle. He does report the legend that as a consequence of this miracle, Elisha drew the anger of merchants who had sold wholesome water to the people living near this spring of bitter
Josephus' haggadic amplification of the Biblical story may draw on a source Ginzberg does not report. It is noteworthy that the seventy-furlong length of the plain irrigated by the spring emphasizes the wonderful effects of Elisha's miracle.

*War* 5. 160 tells of the most wonderful feature of Herod's Jerusalem. The tower of Psephinus was seventy cubits high, allowing from sunrise a view of Arabia as well as of the limits of the Hebrew territory. The first gate of the Temple was of similar grandeur, seventy cubits high (*War* 5. 207), as was the highest of four turrets of the Antonia Castle (5. 242).

One place where Josephus chose the number seventy shows that he was aware that there were seventy rather than seventy-two translators of the "Septuagint." In *Ant.* 12. 56, he gives, in his customary paraphrase, the information found in the Letter of Aristeas. In Aristeas 30, Demetrius proposed to Ptolemy Philadelphus that he write to the High Priest in Jerusalem, requesting six exemplary elders, legal experts, from each tribe (πρεσβυτέρους ἄνδρας ἐμπείρους τῶν κατὰ τὸν νόμον τὸν ἑαυτῶν, ἀφ' ἐκάστης φυλῆς ἡξ). The king requests this in §39. Then in §46, Eleazar, the High Priest, replies to Philadelphus, reporting that he has chosen "good and true elders, six from each tribe" (καλοὺς καὶ ἀγαθοὺς πρεσβυτέρους, ἀφ' ἐκάστης φυλῆς ἡξ).

Josephus repeats this information (πρεσβυτέρους ἄνδρας ἡξ ἀπὸ φυλῆς ἐκάστης) in 12.56, but in 12. 57 he says the number of

---

131 Ginzberg, *Legends of the Jews* IV, 239-140.
132 Ginzberg says that "Neither the eight miracles of Elijah nor the sixteen of Elisha are enumerated in the Midrashim extant today." *Ibid.*, VI, 333-44, note 3.
elders who came from Jerusalem is seventy.\(^{133}\) Perhaps this is the source of the Septuagint's name, as Thackeray suggests.\(^{134}\) The number, it would seem, was originally seventy, with the number seventy-two resulting from the myth of six elders being selected from each tribe.

In *Ant.* 12. 368 we learn that the brave brother of Judas Maccabeas, named Eleazar, ran seventy stadia to the tallest elephant in the army of Antiochus V Eupator, sacrificing his own life as he stabbed and killed the elephant from beneath. Clearly the seventy stadia traversed by this brave man accentuated the glory of his deed.

Though Josephus does not always use the number seventy as an editorial device to emphasize grandeur, perfection, or sacredness, sometimes this is apparently his intent. This seems to be the reason why he gives the otherwise inexplicable statement that there were seventy parts to the candelabrum.

Josephus, of course, was not unique among Jewish writers in glorifying this number. Ginzberg lists numerous citations where

---

\(^{133}\)Professor Feldman writes, in a personal note, that "in the tractate Soferim 1.9 the readings vary: 70 and 72. Soferim 1.8 says there were 5 translators. Megillah 9a has 72." Philo, in *Life of Moses* 2.31 ff, does not mention the number of translators. Had he known of the number 70, he would have no doubt mentioned it. In *The Migration of Abraham* 169 he writes of 70 as "the holy and perfect measure of 7 multiplied tenfold." It may be noted that even in Aristeas, at the banquet, the king asks 11 questions on the sixth and seventh days of the feast, instead of 10 as on the first five days. Moses Hadas writes of this: "The eleventh questions in the last two sessions of table talk (273 and 291) seem extra additions beyond the expected number." *Aristeas to Philocrates*, Edited and Translated by Moses Hadas (New York: Ktav, 1973), p. 111 (see also the "Introduction," p. 42).

\(^{134}\)See note *ad. loc.*
the number seventy emphasizes particular worth. Schürer writes that "It was part of the perfection of his [i.e. God's] revelation that it was recorded in seventy different languages on stones erected on Mount Ebal (Deut. 28: 2ff)."

We noted above that Josephus explained how he arrived at the number seventy (3.182). "By making the candelabrum to consist of seventy portions, he hinted at the ten degree provinces of the planets, and by the seven lamps thereon the course of the planets themselves, for such is their number." Even though an impartial reckoning of the total number of parts of the candelabrum does not come to seventy, as Josephus surely must have known, he imposed on the candelabrum a meaning, with the number seventy, intended to introduce astral symbolism into his interaction with anticipated Greek readers. (End of excursus).

The stars were very important to Josephus, as they were to most people in his day. He praised Abraham as the one who taught the ancient Egyptians arithmetic and astronomy. Astronomy was, it would seem, as much a theological as a natural science. In *War* 5. 217 Josephus wrote that the twelve loaves

135 Ginzberg, *Legends of the Jews*, VIII, 429. None of these explains Josephus' use of seventy.
136 Schürer, *History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ*, revised edition, II, 351. Cf note 46 on this page which documents the rabbinic literature in which this legend is recorded.
137 Thackeray writes that "the component portions enumerated in Ex. xxv. 33ff. seem to amount to 69 only (see *Encycl. Bibl.* i, 645 n. 3).
138 *Ant.* 1. 167. NB the alternative reading of ἀστρολογίας (astrology) in L Lat. Eus, cited in Rengstorf's Concordance.
139 Schürer calls attention to 4QCryptic, or 4Q186, which was "a piece of astrological physiognomy based on the common astrological doctrine that a
on the table in the Temple represented "the circle of the Zodiac and the year; while the altar of incense, by the thirteen fragrant spices from sea and from land, both desert and inhabited, with which it was replenished, signified that all things are of God and for God." The twelve loaves shared with the candelabrum astro-theological significance.

Hengel has written of "the victorious progress of astrology in the Hellenistic era. After the end of the third century it became more and more the spiritually dominant force among the educated." Hengel, Judaism and Hellenism, I, 236.

Josephus remarked in Apion 2, on the confused idea of Mnaseas of Patrai, who seemed to be referring to the candelabrum when he tells of "Zabidus [who] constructed an apparatus of wood, inserted in it three rows of lamps, and put it over his person. Thus arrayed he walked about, presenting the appearance to distant onlookers of stars perambulating the earth." Apion 2, 113. Schürer suggests that Mnaseas, or Mnafeam, is to be possibly identified with a certain "student of Eratosthenes, who lived at the end of the third century B.C.E., or the very beginning of the second. He wrote amongst other things a geography, in which he dealt with the curiosities and objects of interest of individual regions and places." The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ, III, 598.

person's temper, physical features and luck are determined by the configuration of the heavens at the time of his birth. The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ, revised edition, III, 364. He describes as well early Genizah Fragment A (T.-S. K 21.88) that mentions the effect of the stars at a person's birth upon his life; and the Treatise of Shem, composed, Professor Charlesworth believes, in the late 20's B.C.E., that "contains prognostications regarding crops, political events, personal health, and climate, deduced from the constellation in which the year begins" (p. 369).
symbolized heavenly bodies. Philo, before Josephus, stated this quite explicitly.

The candlestick he placed at the south, figuring thereby the movements of the luminaries above; for the sun and the moon and the others run their courses in the south far away from the north. And therefore six branches, three on each side, issue from the central candlestick, bringing up the number to seven, and on all these are set seven lamps and candlebearers, symbols of what the men of science call planets. For the sun, like the candlestick, has the fourth place in the middle of the six and gives light to the three above and the three below it, so tuning to harmony an instrument of music truly divine.142

Philo avoided suggesting outright astral determinism by teaching, elsewhere, "that the sun, moon, and other stars are magistrates governing 'such beings as exist below the moon, in the air or on the earth." In this role they are "lieutenants" (ὑπάρχοντες) of the one Father of all, "copying the example of his government exercised according to law and justice over all created beings." Philo compared the Divine influence to a Charioteer who controls the team of horses pulling a chariot. He notes that while some would say that the horses that pull the chariot control it, actually the Charioteer controls it because he commands the horses with the reins.143

Josephus implies his personal interest in the stars elsewhere. In Titus' speech to his troops at the siege of Jerusalem, Josephus reports that he said

142 Life of Moses 2. 102-03.
143 Philo, Special Laws 1. 13-14. Cf. 1.92 where Philo writes: "For of all the things that happen upon earth, the signs are graven in the face of heaven."
For what brave man [among which number Josephus surely identified himself] knows not that souls released from the flesh by the sword on the battlefield are hospitably welcomed by that purest of elements, the ether, and placed among the stars, and that as good genii and benignant heroes they manifest their presence to their posterity.\textsuperscript{144}

Did he here give his own point of view, or Titus'? Later on, Josephus chided the heedless people in Jerusalem, who failed to observe the heavenly portents of Jerusalem's doom.

\ldots they neither heeded nor believed in the manifest portents that foretold the coming desolation, but, as if thunderstruck and bereft of eyes and mind, disregarded the plain warnings of God. So it was when a star, resembling a sword, stood over the city, and a comet which continued for a year. So again when, before the revolt and the commotion that led to war, at the time when the people were assembling for the feast of unleavened bread, on the eighth of the month Xanthicus, at the ninth hour of the night, so brilliant a light shone round the altar and the sanctuary that it seemed to be broad daylight; and this continued for half an hour. By the inexperienced this was regarded as a good omen, but

\textsuperscript{144}\textit{War} 6. 47. Cf. Goodenough, \textit{Jewish Symbols} IV, 81, where he describes an inscription from the Catacomb Monteverde in Rome, which depicts a large menorah with the word 'Aorηp above it. He cites the view of two scholars, Beyer and Lietzmann, that this is a Hellenized form of the Hebrew 'Esther.' The position of this name above the candlestick says clearly that this Esther is herself now a 'star,' gone to her heavenly abode." He writes: "The idea of salvation as a return to the stars is documented by Cumont from paganism, but it seems to me to be probably an old 'Orphic' notion, since it so clearly appears in Plato's \textit{Phaedrus}, where it is said that the soul before its fall shared in the great diurnal revolution of the 'gods.'" In a personal note, Professor Feldman questions this identification of 'Aorηp with Esther. LXX spells her name Eøθηp. He asks what would be the point of Hellenizing her name to 'Aorηp? And what would be the connection of Esther, in the Book of Esther itself, to a star?" Indeed?!
by the learned scribes it was at once interpreted in accordance with after events.145

Josephus' concluding remark on the candelabrum is that "the seven lamps (λύχνοι) [by which he surely meant the seven branches, topped with bowls of olive oil that burned to provide light] faced south-east (τὴν ἀνατολὴν καὶ τὴν μεσημβρίαν), the candelabrum being placed cross-wise (λοξῶς)" (3. 146). With regard to the candelabrum's placement, LXX merely reads: "and they will shine from one front" καὶ φανοῦσιν ἐκ τοῦ ἐνὸς προσώπου (Exodus 25: 37). Exodus 40: 24 adds that the candelabrum was placed "on the side of the tabernacle toward the south" (εἰς τὸ κλίτος τῆς σκηνῆς τὸ πρὸς Νότον). Josephus employed a word for "south" (μεσημβρία), that usually was used to mean "noon."146 Though he followed closely LXX vocabulary in naming the parts of the candelabrum, he may have followed Herodotus in choosing a meaning of μεσημβρία to replace νότον that was in the LXX text before him.

In Solomon's Temple, Josephus says, in a distortion of the Biblical text (III Kingdoms 7: 49), that one of the ten-thousand candelabra was placed κατὰ νότον (Ant. 8. 90) in the Temple before the ἄδυτον, in which the Ark was.

145 War. 6. 288-292. Here, of course, the star has nothing at all to do with the candelabrum.
146 As the first meaning in LSJ reads. Herodotus (1.6, 142; 7.113) uses μεσημβρία to mean south. In LXX, with the exception of Daniel 8: 4, every occurrence of μεσημβρία means "noon." Of the citations in Hatch and Redpath, Symmachus uses μεσημβρία to mean "south" in I Kingdoms 27: 10; 30: 1; and Ezekiel 20: 47 where LXX reads Νότον.
Why did Josephus add that the candelabrum was placed so as to face "south-east," and that it was situated cross-wise in the sanctuary? First of all, it may be noted that if the candelabrum were to shine in a south-easterly direction, it would need to be placed cross-wise, rather than placed in either an east-west, or north-south direction. Second, as we have already seen, Josephus took some care to stress the eastern orientation of the Tabernacle itself. The east was the direction of the march of the Israelites as they headed for the Promised Land. The east was also the direction of the rising sun, which, as Philo taught, gave light that was an appearance of God's wisdom.

Even though the light from the candelabrum would have been cast equally to its front and rear, unless a reflecting screen for each branch were provided to throw the light specially in one direction, it was described, in Exodus, as φανοσιν ἐκ τοῦ ἐνὸς προσώπου (Exodus 25: 37). No doubt, this was because the light cast to the south illuminated only the south wall of the sanctuary, near which it was placed. The one face would point towards the table directly, which was near the south wall, focusing this light, a symbol of the Divine presence, on the place where the Bread of the Presence was (ἔρτος ἐνωπίως Exodus 25: 30). If the candelabrum were turned east-west, it would have shone both on

147 See the "Tabernacle Entrance" section of chapter two, above.
148 On Creation 8. 18. Furthermore, it was the custom to face east, i.e., toward the Temple during prayer (I Kings 8: 34, 44, 48; II Chronicles 6: 34). Daniel (6: 11) prayed toward Jerusalem. M. Berakoth 4: 5 states that one is to face Erez Israel in prayer; to face Jerusalem when one is in Erez Israel; to face the Temple when one is in Jerusalem; and to face the Holy of Holies when one is in the Temple.
the table and the veil behind which the Ark rested. While Josephus does not make any such statement of why the candelabrum faces south-east, in his unique retelling, perhaps his purpose was to accentuate the importance of the table and the place in which the Ark rested. Such a change was not accidental, and I know of no Rabbinic source where this change is made. Perhaps the simplest explanation why Josephus makes the candelabrum face south-east is that he, a priest, saw it this way in the Temple.

The Incense Altar

The third piece of furniture in the Tabernacle was the incense altar. Josephus' term, like Theodotion, Symmmachus,149 and Philo,150 was θυμιατήριον (3.147), while LXX (Exodus 30: 1) as reflected in Codex Vaticanus reads θυσιαστήριον θυμιάματος.151 LSJ defines θυμιατήριον as "censer" or "vessel for fumigation."152 MT reads הַבָּקֵר. The Hebrew is pleonastic. The Greek, as found in Codex Vaticanus, and the other principal witnesses

149 According to Hatch and Redpath, Concordance to the Septuagint I, 660.
150 Life of Moses 2. 94, 101
151 In the critical apparatus of the Cambridge Septuagint, the following mss. read θυμιατηριον: mM(mg)vz. John W. Wevers writes that "Aquila has θυμιάσεως for θυμιάματος according to Syrohexaplar." Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus (Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1990), p. 489. Samaritan Pentateuch omits Exodus 30: 1-10, and 40: 27 having to do with the incense altar. The Targums clarify the apparent intended meaning of MT. Onkelos: נָכְלָו יְשָׁרָה וְהַמִּכְהֶרֶת וְלֹא מְרָבַת לְאֵלֶּהוּ עַל עַל אֵלֶּהוּ "You shall make an altar for the burning of incense." Neophiti I: וַעֲבֹר מְרָבַת "You shall make an altar [for] arranging the incense."
152 It is used in this sense in Ant. 4. 32, 54, 57 where the subject is the portable censers to be brought by claimants for the priesthood at the time of Korah's rebellion. Again it is used in Ant. 8. 92, for the censers brought to be used in Solomon's Temple.
followed by the Cambridge and Göttingen editions of the Septuagint, translates the Hebrew literally, though without reflecting the double use of ἁυρ. Wevers notes that the Hexapla (that is, Origen's reconstructed text) added θυμιατήριον after "altar" "so as to equal MT."\(^{153}\)

The altar of incense, Josephus declared, was made of the same undecayable (μὴ σηπόμενα) material as the other furnishings (σκεῦη) in the Tabernacle.\(^{154}\) Here LXX Exodus 30: 1 repeats the description ξύλων ἀσήπτων, "imperishable wood," used with the previously mentioned furnishings. Whereas LXX describes the gilding of this altar, part by part (καταχρυσώσεις χρυσίω καθαρφ τὴν ἐσχάραν. . . τοίχους. . . κέρατα), Josephus writes στερεὰ δὲ περιελήλατ’ αὐτῷ λεπίς. Josephus appears to suggest it was plated with solid metal. Gold is a metal, but so is bronze, the metal specifically mentioned as the material plating the altar of sacrifice that immediately follows in Josephus' narrative (3.149). Josephus states that the grating (ἐσχάραν) and the crowns at the corner of the altar (that formed the circle around the altar in the Biblical account) were made of gold, rather than plated with gold. It seems that Josephus intends to describe the body of the altar to be made of wood, plated with "metal," while the grating and "crowns" were completely made of gold.

His imprecision here no doubt implies that the reader is to picture an altar of incense essentially like the one described in LXX, though this would have been known only by readers

---

\(^{153}\) Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus, p. 489.

\(^{154}\) Cf Ant. 3. 102 ἡλικ καὶ μηδὲν ὑπὸ τῆς σήμεως παθεῖν δυνάμενα.
acquainted with LXX. The similarity in vocabulary in Josephus and LXX suggests that Josephus drew on LXX here directly, as he did in describing the elements of the branches of the candelabrum.

The dimensions of the altar of incense in Josephus' account are the same as Exodus 30:2. It is one cubit square and two cubits high. Josephus omits any mention of the horns of the altar of incense as he did of the altar of sacrifice. Instead of horns (κέρατα) at the corners of this altar he describes a crown (στέφανον) at each corner (κατὰ γωνίαν ἐκάστην). Why did Josephus omit the horns here? Perhaps because pagan altars of incense he may have seen did not have horns.

LXX Exodus 30:3 describes both the horns and a "wreathen crown of gold" (στρεφσην στέφανην χρυσῆν) round this altar. Josephus (3.148) is less than clear as he states: "at each corner a crown" (κατὰ γωνίαν ἐκάστην στέφανον), while at the same time, "and this was encircled with gold" (καὶ τοῦτον δ’ ἐκπεριοδεύοντα χρύσεον). He seems to substitute στέφανον for κέρατον, but he implies an encircling border of gold (ἐκπεριοδεύοντα χρύσεον) as well. In 3. 140, the border on the table is referred to as ἔλιξ. The border in LXX is the encircling crown. He uses the same word as LXX (ἔσχάρα) for the grate on the upper part of the altar of incense.155

155 Wevers notes that "A popular variant here substitutes ἑσχαρίδα (sic) "brazier" for ἑσχάραν, but altars do not usually have braziers." Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus, p. 489.
Josephus, like Philo, states that the altar of incense is situated between the table and the candelabrum.\textsuperscript{156} The Biblical rubric is that the incense altar (\textit{οὐσιαστήριον θυμιάματος}) is to be placed "before the veil that is by the Ark of the testimony" (Exodus 30: 6; 40: 26-27). Josephus and Philo merely explain the same place for the incense altar in different terms from the Biblical account. With the table situated to the north, and the candelabrum to the south, the incense altar would have been between them.

Josephus does not explain the purpose of the incense altar as the Bible does. The Bible makes clear that "a constant incense-offering [was] always before the Lord for their generations (Exodus 30: 8)." To this Philo adds that it was "a symbol of thankfulness for earth and water which should be rendered for the benefits derived from both these, since the mid-position in the universe has been assigned to them (sic)."\textsuperscript{157}

Josephus seems clearly to follow Philo (\textit{Life of Moses} 2.101) in describing the incense altar as \textit{θυμιάματος}, and in situating it between the table and the candelabrum. He differs from Philo in giving no explanation of the purpose of the altar of incense. In

\textsuperscript{156}\textit{Ant.} 3. 147. \textit{Life of Moses} 2. 101.
\textsuperscript{157}\textit{Life of Moses} 2. 101. In \textit{Who is the Heir} 196-200, Philo writes of the four ingredients of the incense (sweet spices, oil drop of cinnamon, cloves and galbanum of sweetening, and clear gum of frankincense) which was a "pure composition, a holy work" which was a symbol of "the elements out of which the whole world was brought to its completion." He concludes his discussion here of the incense by saying: "Surely it is a fitting life-work for the world, that it should give thanks to its Maker continuously and without ceasing, wellnigh evaporating itself into a single elemental form, to shew that it hoards nothing as treasure, but dedicates its whole being at the shrine of God its Begetter."
War 5. 216 Josephus offers a different explanation of the significance of the θυμιάτηριον in the Temple. He writes that the altar of incense there represented "by the thirteen fragrant spices from sea and from land, both desert and inhabited, with which it was replenished, signified that all things are of God and for God."\(^{158}\)

Josephus summarized tersely the Biblical rubric concerning the rings and rods that were passed through them when the incense altar was carried. LXX describes expansively both sides of the altar of incense; Josephus merely mentions that there were rings and rods, leaving it to the imagination of the reader the reasonable inference as to how these rings and rods were situated on the altar.

He changes the LXX word for rings (δακτυλίους) to κρίκοι; and the LXX word for rods (ψαλίδες) to σκυταλίδες. Josephus had already used κρίκοι and σκυταλίδες in describing the rings and rods on the Ark (3. 136), rather than δακτυλίους and ἀνοφορεῖς as is found in LXX Exodus 25: 12-13. Josephus is more consistent in his vocabulary in describing the parts of the tabernacle furnishings than LXX.

Whereas LXX merely states that the purpose of the rings and rods was to carry [the altar of incense] with them (ὡστε αἴρειν αὐτὸ ἐν αὐτοῖς Exodus 30: 4), Josephus specifies their usefulness

---

\(^{158}\) In Ant. 3. 198 Josephus describes five ingredients for the perfume (θυμιάματος) which was used to anoint the priests and for burning on the altar of incense: five hundred shekels of choice myrrh, an equal quantity of iris, two-hundred fifty shekels of cinnamon and calamus, a hin of olive oil.
while the incense altar was carried by the priests on the march (αίς κατὰ τὰς ὁδοὺς ύπὸ τῶν ἱερέων ἐφέρετο 3. 148). 159

In summary, we may remark that Josephus is clearly aware of both the Hebrew and Greek forms of the Biblical description of the Tabernacle furnishings. He seems to deliberately avoid the use of ἱλαστήριον, found in LXX, using ἐπίθεμα instead to describe the top of the Ark, which reflects a close translation of the Hebrew הַגָּאַז. This is a significant difference from LXX that suggests that he avoided using a term used repeatedly in LXX. Perhaps he did this because of the developing visibility of the Christians in Rome. They used the term ἱλαστήριον christologically (Romans 3: 25). In Paul's Epistle to the Romans this term refers to Jesus. 160 Whereas later Christians were able to make considerable use of Josephus' remarks on Jesus, James, and John the Baptist, he provided no ammunition for them in his description of the Ark.

When Josephus describes the table in the sanctuary he freely accommodates other sources to his picture of the table. To liken the table to the table(s) at Delphi, and to compare the lower part of its legs to the legs on Dorian couches shows that he was sensitive to his Gentile readership.

In his depiction of the candelabrum Josephus' terms are so much like those found in LXX that he must have had LXX

159 Josephus stresses this as well in describing the Ark in Ant. 3. 136, 148; and 7. 85. In 3. 141 Josephus uses the term κατὰ τὰς ὁδοὺς as well, with regard to the table.

vocabulary in mind. Why he did not deliberately alter the terms significantly is not clear. Perhaps, as Professor Feldman has remarked in a personal note, this is because in dealing with technical terms one really has little choice but to stick to the technical terms as found in one's source. Neither is it altogether clear why he describes the pomegranates as separate elements on the candelabrum. Perhaps he intended to stress its Tree of Life symbolism. The symbolism Josephus found in the candelabrum is not so developed as the symbolism Philo described in his candelabrum accounts. Josephus' symbolism draws attention to the Tree of Life motif in the candelabrum, along with a pale reflection of the astrological understanding of Philo.

Josephus, like Philo, called the incense altar \( \thetaυμιατηριον \). Both stated that it was situated between the candelabrum and the table. This similarity on two important details in describing the incense altar points towards Josephus following of Philo here.

Josephus seems to have used both the Greek and the Hebrew Bible. Nelson has observed that "Josephus follows one order and then another," referring to MT I and MT II, but from the vocabulary Josephus used, it would have seemed LXX was before him as well. Clues to this may be found both in his avoidance of \( \ιλαστηριον \) in describing the Ark of the Covenant, and in his use of virtually the same words found in LXX's description of the candelabrum. The testimony from silence in the

---

\( ^{161} \text{Cf. note 3 above.} \)
first example is nearly as eloquent as the evidence of essentially the same words found in the second.

Josephus description of the furniture in the Tabernacle, while clearly based on the Biblical model, is offered with an eye to both his Jewish and his non-Jewish readership. He is faithful enough to the Biblical model to satisfy his Jewish readers with his adherance to the sacred text. The strict use he makes of words such as ἐπίθεμα and σκέπη to refer to the cover of the Ark seem to suggest that he avoided ἱλαστήριον, a word choice that would have endeared him to Jewish readers who rejected the use made by Christians of this word. But where there was no danger, but rather some advantage, in associating with non-Jewish sacred imagery, as in the case of the "tables at Delphi," Josephus was "selling" his picture of the Tabernacle furniture to his non-Jewish readers.
Chapter IV
THE PRIESTLY VESTMENTS

The Ordinary Priests' Vestments

Whereas the Biblical account of the priestly vestments in the Tabernacle service specifically refers to Aaron's and his sons' attire, Josephus' account (3.151-192) generalizes the rubrics as referring first to the "other" (τοῖς ἄλλοις) priests' and then to the high priest's attire, before mentioning Aaron as the first recipient of the priestly attire. Josephus adds at the end, parenthetically, "He [Aaron] had at that time four sons: Nadab, Abihu, Eleazar, and Ithamar" (3. 192), without mentioning their role as priests. Perhaps Josephus assumed his readers would infer that Aaron's sons were priests. Since his intended readership was not well acquainted with Jewish history and worship, it would seem that he might have made this detail clearer by explicitly stating that Aaron's sons were the other priests (τοῖς ἄλλοις 3.151). Josephus had no apparent reason for disguising that Aaron's sons were the other priests.

Whereas the Biblical account begins with Aaron's, that is, the high priest's, vestments,1 and then describes briefly his sons', that is, the other priests' vestments,2 Josephus begins expansively with the ordinary priests' vestments,3 and then describes the high priest's even more expansively.4

---

3 Ant. 3. 151-58.
4 Ant. 3. 159-178.
Why did Josephus mention Aaron only after describing the high priest's vestments, when Aaron was so essential to the Exodus account? Why does Josephus give so much more emphasis to the lesser priests' attire than the Biblical account gives to Aaron's sons' attire? Why does he reverse the order of description from the Biblical account? In *War* 5.228-231, Josephus first writes of the officiating priests and then of the High Priest. But there he did not have the Biblical order before him, so that there he may be seen as describing the priests in ascending order of their importance.

Does Josephus have before him the Greek, the Hebrew, or some other form of the Biblical text? How does he change the Biblical picture of the priestly garb, and why? These are the questions that will be addressed in this chapter.

Why did Josephus mention Aaron only after describing the high priestly vestments, and why did he virtually neglect his sons? Though, as Goodenough has written, Josephus "differs from Philo on too many details to have taken his material from Philo,"⁵ and though it is evident that Josephus selects his vocabulary carefully, often transliterating the Hebrew terms as he writes of the priestly vestments, which points to his close observation of the text before him, perhaps his apologetic emphasis here was informed by Philo.

Josephus may have remembered that Philo introduced his account of the high priest's vestments by stating that "the craftsman (ο τεχνίτης)⁶ prepared sacred clothing (ιερὰν ἑσθητα) for the "future

---


⁶*Life of Moses* 2.109. In *Who is the Heir* 225, Philo seems to refer to Moses, rather than the architects, as ο τεχνίτης, who commands (προσέταξε) the
high priest" (τῷ μέλλοντι ἀρχιερεῖ), rather than "for Aaron."7 At the end of this section, before explaining the meaning of the priestly clothing, Philo again makes clear he is referring to the high priestly office, rather than to any one who held this office. He writes: "Such was the vesture (ἐσθής) of the high priest."8 Philo did not mention Aaron at all in this account of the high priest's attire. In this regard, Philo's writing here is like his other general description of the priestly clothing for the Temple priests in The Special Laws I. 80-97; he is interested in the office of the priesthood rather than with any particular priests.

Later on, when Philo writes of the selection of high priests, he tells of Moses' appointment of his brother, from all the possible candidates for high priest, "on his merits" (ἐξ ἀπάντων ἐπικρίνας ἀριστίνδην ἀρχιερεῖα), and his sons as priests.9 When it would have been surely more direct and economical to write "Aaron," instead of fabrication of the candelabrum; but in On the Giants 5.23, Philo is clearly referring to Bezalel, as δημιουργός καὶ τεχνίτης. Τεχνίτης is found often in LXX (Deut. 27: 15; IV Kingdoms 12: 12; I Chron. 22: 15; 29: 5; Cant. 7: 1; Jer. 10: 9; 24: 1; 36: 2.) Josephus uses τεχνίτης in Ant. 8. 103 with reference to the craftsmen that made the cherubim over the ark that is brought into Solomon's Temple. In LXX Exod. 35: 32 we find the verb ἀρχιτεκτονέων and the noun ἀρχιτεκτονίας, and in 35: 35 ἀρχιτεκτονίας. In LXX 36: 8 one reads of the makers of the priestly robes: Καὶ ἐποίησε πᾶς σοφὸς ἐν τοῖς ἄργαζομένοις τὰς στολὰς τῶν ἁγίων. Colson here translates ὁ τεχνίτης "the master," as though he had in mind Moses, which would seem to be born out by Philo's usage of this term in Who is the Heir 225. Philo may not always use this term in the same sense. At one place he mean Moses, and in another, Basael. Josephus uses this term frequently, though not in the Tabernacle account. There he uses the LXX term ἀρχιτέκτονας (Ant. 3.104). In Ant. 3.200 Josephus refers to Βεσσαλήλος and Ελιάρος as ἄριστοι τῶν δημιουργῶν. He employs this term most consistently in retelling the Aristeas legend in Ant. 12. 35-84

7Life of Moses 2. 109.
8Ibid. 2. 117.
9Life of Moses 2. 142. Philo remarks that Moses by-passed his own sons in favor of his brother's sons because the selection was on the basis of merit alone.
"his brother," why did Philo persist in referring to Aaron as Moses' brother, rather than by name? If, as Philo states, Moses' brother was chosen "on his merits," why did he not merit the use of his own name? It may be because Aaron's essential function was as Moses' spokesman.10

Philo here describes briefly the attire of both the high priest and the other priests.11 Philo then explains the purpose of the priestly vestments.12 Despite the evident honor that Philo attributes to Moses' brother and his sons, he avoids mentioning Aaron by name in the Life of Moses.13 Goodenough has observed that Philo

10 Cf. The Migration of Abraham 84, where Philo refers to Exod. 7: 12, 22, as he writes: "In this place Aaron or speech is spoken of as a 'mouth';" and 169, "For 'Aaron' is called in the Laws Moses; prophet (Exod. 7: 1), speech acting as prophet to understanding." Goodenough writes, "Aaron is to be simple an interpreter, 'telling to the multitude what he gets from you [Moses] while you tell him τὰ θέας." By Light, p. 184. Cf. Life of Moses 1.84, where, according to Philo, God tells Moses "If thou shouldst have need of an interpreter, thou wilt have in thy brother a mouth to assist thy service."

11 Ibid., 143-144. "First he washed them with the purest and freshest spring water, then he put on them the sacred garments; on his brother the vesture (τὸν ποδήρη) woven with its manifold workmanship to represent the universe, that is the long robe and the ephod in the shape of a breastplate (τὴν ἐπωμίδα οἰονεὶ θώρακα); on his nephews linen tunics (χιτώνας λινούς), and on all three girdles and breeches (ζώνας τε καὶ περισκέλῃ)"

12 "The object of the girdles was to keep them unhampered and readier for the holy ministry, by tightening the loose folds of the tunics; of the breeches to prevent anything being visible which decency requires to be concealed, particularly when they were going up to the altar or coming down from above and moving quickly and rapidly in all their operations. For, if their dress had not been arranged so carefully, as a precaution against unforeseen events, they would in their eagerness to carry out their duties with expedition reveal their nakedness and be unable to preserve the decency befitting consecrated places and persons." 1. 145.

13 Philo does mention Aaron by name elsewhere. In On Drunkenness 128 he states that "Aaron. . . means mountainous." "He is the reason whose thoughts are lofty and sublime, not with the empty inflated bigness of mere vaunting, but with the greatness of virtue, which lifts his thinking above the heaven and will not let him cherish any reasoning that is mean and low." Elsewhere he often mentions Aaron with other symbolic significance. Cf. "Index of Names," The Loeb Philo 10, 269-270.
distinguished between the greater and the lesser mysteries.\textsuperscript{14} The greater mystery is that of Moses;\textsuperscript{15} the lesser that of Aaron.\textsuperscript{16} In the \textit{Life of Moses}, Aaron is kept unnamed so that the greater mystery is not in any way obscured. Josephus may have chosen to write of his greatness in describing the details of the priestly attire before mentioning the less important detail that Aaron was the first to wear this attire. Although Josephus' discussion of the symbolism of the priestly vestments is, as a rule, less extensive than Philo's, he does attempt to explain their theological significance.\textsuperscript{17} This kind of explanation is not found in any of the Biblical accounts of the priestly vestments. The idea of offering such an explanation may derive from Philo.

The neglect by Philo and Josephus of the lesser priests, by name, may simply reflect the small notice given to Aaron's sons in the Exodus Tabernacle account.\textsuperscript{18} In his account of the consecration of the priests, Josephus mentions the sprinkling with blood of Aaron

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{14}Goodenough, \textit{By Light, Light}, p. 96. Cf. \textit{The Sacrifices of Abel and Cain}, 62 (τῶν μεγάλων τούτων τὰ μικρὰ μυστήρια).
\item \textsuperscript{15} On the Cherubim, 49: καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ παρὰ Μωυσεῖ τῷ θεοφαλεῖ μυθεῖς τὰ μεγάλα μυστήρια.
\item \textsuperscript{16}Philo does not speak of the mystery of Aaron explicitly as he does of the mystery of Moses. But, in \textit{Questions and Answers on Exodus} 2. 27, Philo writes: "For Moses is the most pure and God-loving mind, while Aaron is his word, which is the underlying interpreter of the truth."
\item \textsuperscript{17}Clemens Thoma remarks that "Josephus is very much in favor of the religious symbolism. To his mind this is the very means to represent the transcendent dimension of the Jews. Unfortunately, Josephus does not explain whether this dimension has a sacramental character as well, in other words, whether it influences the whole world from its inner core." "The High Priesthood in the Judgment of Josephus," \textit{Josephus, the Bible, and History}, Edited by Louis H. Feldman and Gohei Hata (Detroit, Michigan: Wayne State University Press, 1989), p. 204. Thoma does not comment on the comparison between Philo's and Josephus' symbolism.
\item \textsuperscript{18}Cf. note 2 above.
\end{itemize}
and his vestments, and merely adds parenthetically again, σον τοις παισιν, "with his children."19

If Josephus followed the outlook of Philo's *Life of Moses*, that Goodenough called a "primer for proselytes,"20 he may have focused on Moses' directions that were applicable to all the priesthood, rather than on Aaron and his sons, who had an ephemeral role as the objects by whom the sacred rubrics were given to posterity.21 Indeed, since Josephus' expected that he would have non-Jewish

19 The LXX Exod. tabernacle account refers to Aaron's sons as οι υιοι 'Ααρων (27:21; 28: 1, 4, etc.). Παις is a less intimate term for son than υιος, meaning "child," and sometimes, "servant." Cf. Louis H. Feldman, "Josephus' Vocabulary for Slavery," JQR LXXVI, 4 (April, 1986), 295, where he observes that "παις is used in Greek literature in the sense of 'child.' Its first occurrence in extant literature, according to Liddell-Scott's Greek lexicon, with the meaning of 'slave' or 'servant' is in the fifth century B.C.E. in Aeschylus (*Choephoroe* 653) and in Aristophanes (*Acharnians* 395); and it appears with this meaning frequently thereafter." The author notes that "In the War *Josephus uses the word παις 101 times (107 times, counting alternate readings) but only three times in the sense of 'slave.' Josephus' use in *Ant.*, and *Life*, in the sense of "slave" with similar infrequency, and in *Apion*, not at all. In short, he concludes, Josephus use of παις is imprecise. (p. 396).

20 Goodenough, *By Light, Light*, p. 96. Though, as Professor Feldman has noted, "It is not possible for a proselyte to become a priest," (personal note), Philo's *Life of Moses* presented significant information about Moses' role as legislator, priest, and prophet, which would have been useful both for the Jew, whom Philo may have led into a deeper understanding of his faith, and for the intelligent proselyte to Judaism, who could be introduced to the significance of Moses. Cf. Chapter VII, "Moses for Gentiles." Martin Hengel has written: "Anyone who belonged to the people of God--even the proselyte [emphasis mine]--was now invited to study wisdom, i.e. the law; and provided that he had the application and the aptitude, he had the possibility of being a great teacher of the law." *Judaism and Hellenism*, I, 80. Samuel Sandmel observes that some of Philo's writings dealing with themes derived from the Bible scarcely mention the Biblical text from which they derive because Philo apparently assumes his readers are Jews, acquainted with the Bible. Others of Philo's writings begin with an explanation of the Bible passage before proceeding to a discussion. These works may have been for a readership not acquainted with the Bible, that is, non-Jews. *Philo of Alexandria* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1979), pp. 47-55.

21 Philo never mentions Aaron at all in either the descriptive or the interpretive part of his section on the high priest's vestments (*Life of Moses* 2. 109-116, 117-135). Goodenough still comments that in Philo's account, "The robe Aaron wears. . ." *By Light, Light*, p. 99.
readers, and since Moses already had a high reputation in the pagan world,\textsuperscript{22} it suited his apologetic purpose to accentuate Moses rather than Aaron.

Josephus may also have been prompted by a desire to elevate the image of the ordinary priests of his own day. As I have observed already, Josephus mentions the ordinary priests first, and describes their vestments more fully than Exodus. This motive was partly self-serving. Though he claimed to be descended, through his mother, from the Hasmonaean kings, which lineage included the high priesthood, he probably considered himself as one of the ordinary priests who served in the first of the twenty-four courses of priests.\textsuperscript{23}

Seth Schwartz has noted that the priests Josephus favors throughout the \textit{Antiquities} are from his own class, "the geographically scattered, numerous, diverse class of well-to-do lower priests. . . a class which had long been influential and of which many

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{23}Life, 1-6. Emil Schürer writes that the high priests in Josephus' day "belonged predominantly, if not exclusively, to the party of the Sadducees." \textit{History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ}, II, 213. He calls attention, however, to Josephus' remark that the Sadducees listened to the Pharisees who had the ear of the people (cf. \textit{Ant}, 18. 17). Josephus, it may be remembered, claimed to be a Pharisee (\textit{Life}, 12.). Gideon Fuks, in "Josephus and the Hasmonaeans," JJS 2 (1990), 166-176, replying to the objections of Cohen \textit{(Josephus in Galilee and Rome}, pp. 107-08) and Hölscher ("Josephus (2)" in Pauly Wissowa IV, 2 (1916), col. 1935) that Josephus claim to be of Hasmonaean lineage was a fabrication rather than a fact, argues, in line with Rajak (\textit{Josephus, the Historian and his Society}, pp. 1517), that Josephus depicts the Hasmonaeans more favorably in \textit{Ant}, than in \textit{War} because of the more favorable political circumstances when he wrote \textit{Ant}. The stubborn resistance of the Hasmonaeans to the Romans would have made it imprudent for him to speak favorably of them when writing of the Jewish War. In \textit{Ant}, he expresses his true feelings about his Hasmonaean ancestors, Fuks states.
\end{flushright}
had not been discredited by participation in the war." 24 Perhaps it is with this favoritism in mind that Josephus begins by describing the ordinary priests, giving a much fuller description of their vestments than is found in the Biblical text.

If this is so, it is odd that he did not have a parallel description of the ordinary priests' vestments in the War 5.131-136, where he describes in detail the High Priest's vestments. Of course, Josephus wrote the War earlier, when his purpose was different. 25 In the Antiquities he wrote for the benefit of the entire Greek-speaking world, telling his people's story. 26 It was a story that would lead up to his own times in which he played a prominent role. Aaron was not nearly as important to this flow of history as Moses.

Why did Josephus play down the priesthood of Aaron's four sons, if his intention was to magnify the ordinary priesthood, his

25 Even though, as Professor Feldman has noted, Josephus "devotes a relatively minor part of War to his own generalship" (personal note), this role was not insignificant in his own estimate. Shaye Cohen writes: It is no surprise that Josephus presents himself [in War] as one of the greatest generals of this war, hence of all time." Josephus in Galilee and Rome: His Vita and Development as a Historian (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1979), pp. 91 f. The opening lines of the Jewish War declare that "the war of the Jews against the Romans--the greatest not only of the wars of our own time, but, so far as accounts have reached us, well nigh of all that ever broke out between cities or nations--" Jewish War 1.1. This high estimate of the struggle with Rome may well have been intended to disuade Parthian Jews from considering war with Rome. Cf. 1. 3 where Josephus alludes to the work he wrote in his own tongue for the benefit of τοις βαρβαροῖς of the interior, that is, of the East. As Tessa Rajak observes, Josephus here uses barbarians "in an entirely Greek way, to refer to all who are not Greeks. Even his own nation is numbered among them... the recipients are to be Parthians, Babylonians, and the furthest Arabians; but also the Jews who lived across the Euphrates, together with the people of Adiabene." Josephus: The Historian and His Society (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983), p. 175
26 Ant. 1. 5.
kind of priesthood? Perhaps Josephus assumed Aaron's sons' role would have been obvious, since in 3.209, they are mentioned as ministering at the altar. It may be, as I have noted above, that this merely reflects the small amount of material on the lesser priests found in the Bible. On the other hand, Josephus was not one to follow at all slavishly the Biblical emphases. He expands and contracts haggadic elements freely. As I have noted, Josephus adds to the Biblical account an explanation of the symbolism of the Tabernacle and the priestly vestments.

Perhaps Josephus' neglect of Aaron's sons, while generally accentuating the importance of the lesser priesthood, is because of the tragic death of Nadab and Abihu for offering "strange fire before the Lord" (Leviticus 10: 1). Of them it was said: "They had no children" (Numbers 3: 4). Josephus tells of this episode without mentioning that they were priests (Ant. 3. 209). While exceeding Scripture in reporting that Nadab and Abihu received a dignified burial, Josephus adds to the terror of their death, as though to accentuate the impropriety of their even offering incense. He adds here a small detail that they were accustomed to bringing improper incense (ἀλλ' οίς ἐχρωντο πρώτερον) which implies that they were customarily offensive. It was their right, as priests, to serve at the altar; but they failed to serve the incense prescribed by Moses. This tragic element in the saga of his priestly ancestors would not have helped him glorify his own kind of priests.

The Exodus Tabernacle account features Aaron prominently. Since Josephus seems to have intentionally slighted Aaron here, it is
useful to note that Josephus was not reluctant to write of Aaron elsewhere.

Josephus writes of Aaron forty-one times in the *Antiquities*. He does not hesitate to speak highly of Aaron. In 3.188 Josephus embellishes the terse Biblical account of God's telling Moses to choose Aaron and his sons as priests. The Bible reads: "Take for yourself Aaron your brother, and his sons, even from the sons of Israel, to serve me, Aaron, and Nadab, and Abihu, and Eleazar, and Ithamar" (LXX Exodus 28: 1). Josephus retells this: "God appeared to Moses and commanded him to give the priesthood to Aaron his brother, as the one whose virtue was more worthy than all others to receive this honor."

Josephus' Moses proceeds to justify God's selection of Aaron, while candidly stating that he would have chosen himself rather than Aaron as high priest: "For my part, had the weighing of this matter been entrusted to me, I should have considered myself worthy of the dignity, both from self-love that is innate in all, as also because I am conscious of having labored abundantly for your salvation. But now God himself has judged Aaron worthy of this honor and has chosen him to be priest, knowing him to be the most deserving among us."

Parallels to this view of Moses' desiring the priesthood for himself are found in the Rabbinic literature. Josephus was apparently

27 *Ant*. 2. 279, 319; 3. 54, 64, 188, 190, 192, 205, 208, 211, 307 (2x), 310; 4. 15, 18, 21, 23, 26, 33, 46, 54, 56-58, 64-65, 66 (2x), 83; 5. 361; 6. 86, 89; 8. 228 (2x); 9. 224; 10. 65; 20. 225-27, 229, 235.

28 *Ant*. 3. 190.

29 Exodus Rabbah 37: 1 reads: "When God was about to appoint a High Priest, Moses believed that he would be made High Priest, but God said to him: 'Go and appoint Me a High Priest.' Moses replied: 'Lord of the Universe! From which tribe shall I appoint him?' The divine reply was: 'From the tribe of
reflecting stock ideas about Moses and Aaron from his day, that appear as well in the midrashim.

Josephus goes to an odd extreme in emphasizing the preeminence of Moses over Aaron. He wrote: "For Aaron, by reason of his birth, his prophetic gift, and his brother's virtues (καὶ τὴν ἀρετὴν τάδελφοδ) was more highly qualified than all for the dignity" (3. 192). Here it is Josephus' own estimate of Moses rather than a point of view he ascribes to Moses.

The time would come, however, when Josephus granted Aaron a final moment to enjoy his own dignity. Josephus describes Aaron's death with Moses absent from the scene, even though in the Biblical account, Moses is prominent. Moses' absence from Aaron's death account might be seen either as a denigration of Aaron, or as an attempt to build Aaron up, as he is allowed center stage alone, if only at the end of his life. Numbers 20: 28 tells of Moses taking Aaron up on Mt. Hor, stripping him of his garments, and putting them on Aaron's son, Eleazar. Josephus tells of Aaron climbing a high mountain alone, in the sight of the Israeli army, taking off his own high priestly robes, and placing them on Eleazar his son (ἀποδύεται τὴν ἀρχιερατικὴν στολὴν καὶ παραδοὺς αὐτὴν Ἐλεαζάρῳ τῷ παιδί 4.

---

Levi.' Moses was thereupon exceedingly glad, saying, 'So beloved is my tribe!' God further said to him: "It shall be Aaron thy brother." In 37: 2, we read that Moses held Aaron responsible for the golden calf episode, and was angry at him for being a "partner in this crime." In 37 4 we read: "When the Holy One, blessed be He, said to Moses, And bring thou near unto thee, etc., he was displeased, but God comforted him by saying: 'The Torah I possessed I gave to thee; I could have appointed thy brother as High Priest without informing thee thereof, but I wanted thee to be his superior." Ginzberg cites as well Tan. Terumah 10; Midrash Shemuel 23, 112; Midrash Koheleth Rabbah 7: 1; Midrash Tehillim 101, 427-428. Legends of the Jews VI, 68, n. 351.
83). Aaron is not subservient to Moses here. He ends his days arrayed in his own dignity.

I shall now set forth Josephus description of the priestly attire, comparing it with his description of the high priest's vestments in the Jewish War, with the Biblical versions, with the Targumim, with the description of the priestly clothing in Philo's Life of Moses, and with the description found in M. Yoma 7.

First I shall present the terse summary of the priestly attire given in M. Yoma 7: 5. "The High Priest serves in eight garments (חכיתב), and a ordinary priest in four -- in tunic (נַּי, underpants (מֶנֶס), head covering (נַעְשָׁה), and girdle (מַעַבְרָה). The High Priest in addition wears the breastplate (מְצִיָּה), apron (רוּפָה), upper garment (קֶרֶב), and the frontlet (דְּבֹר). By these did they receive inquiries for the Urim and Thummim (שְׁמוּאֵל)."  

Here the Mishnah reverses the Biblical order as Josephus does, and in this description of the Temple priests, rather than the Tabernacle priests, the Mishnah makes no mention of Aaron and his sons, because the Mishnah is not concerned with the history but with the ritual, which is timeless. 

The Ordinary Priests' Vestments

Josephus (3.151) starts with the ordinary priests' clothing (στολαῖ) which consisted of the same articles worn by the high priest

---

31 In M. Yoma 4: 2 the priest prays, mentioning "the children of Aaron," but otherwise Aaron is not referred to here.
before putting on his special garments. Here Josephus uses the same general term for clothing found in LXX Exodus 28: 3, καὶ ποιήσωσι τὴν στολὴν τὴν ἄγιαν Ἁρων εἰς τὸ ἄγιον, while Philo uses ἔσθης. Josephus uses ἔσθης often throughout the Jewish War, as well as in the Antiquities, and in the Life, but not in the Tabernacle account. Rengstorf notes that Josephus uses στολή in the Antiquities "especially of the high priest's or the king's vestment." Josephus does not use στολή even once in the Jewish War.

32Josephus writes in Ant. 3.159 "The high-priest is dressed in the same way, omitting none of the things already mentioned. . . ."

33Life of Moses 2.109, 143, 146. LSJ shows that Aeschylus in the "Agamemnon" 1270 used ἔσθης for the dress of prophetesses. In Herodotus, History 3.66, etc., it is used with reference to ordinary Persians' garments. Elias Bickerman observed that "the Seventy took pains to avoid using the technical [religious] vocabulary of heathenism." The Jews in the Greek Age (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1988), p. 113. Bickerman notes that "the Seventy relaxed their vigilance when dealing with poetry," but when they used pagan terms for Jewish religious institutions, they tried to be careful to describe differently the true religion as opposed to pagan error (p. 114). Philo did not have this aversion to heathen religious vocabulary.

34Josephus uses ἔσθης in War in the same context as Philo. In War 1.26 he explains the project of his work, which includes explaining τὰς ἔσθητας τῶν ἱερέων καὶ τοῦ ἀρχιερέως. Cf. also 1.437 τὴν ἱερὰν ἔσθητα, and 2. 131 of the holy vestments of the Essenes, etc. Cf Rengstorf, Concordance to Josephus 2, 215. In the Gospel of Luke 23: 11 the author uses ἔσθης for the apparel put on Jesus when he was being mocked by Herod's soldiers, as well as in 24: 4 for the apparel of the angels at the tomb on Easter morning. The same author, in Acts 4: 30 uses it for angelic apparel, and in 12: 21 for King Herod's royal attire.

35Forty-four times. In Ant Josephus does not seem to reserve ἔσθης particularly for royal or priestly clothing, though, as in 5.330 he refers to King Saul's clothing as τὴν βασιλείαν ἔσθητα, and he thus refers frequently to David's clothing. ἔσθης and στολή are used interchangeably in Ant.

36Four times.


38Rengstorf, Concordance 4, 47.
The first article of clothing, that would be found closest to the body, is the underclothing. Josephus refers to this first as τὸν μακανάςδην a slightly modified transliteration, with different vowels (σελη), of the Hebrew term מְנָקָדֶפֶּה, treating it as a first declension Greek noun to which he gives an appropriate accusative singular definite article and ending. When Josephus gives the symbolic meaning of the priestly clothing in Ant. 3.179-187, he omits the μακανάςδης. Though the underclothing worn by the priests had a significant ceremonial purpose, to hide their private parts as they did the sacred tasks, Josephus apparently found no symbolic significance here. He, like Philo, restricted himself to practical comments on the

39 This orderly approach to describing the priests' attire is like Josephus' orderly description of the Tabernacle, working from the outermost, the part that would be seen first, to the innermost part.

40 Niese lists manuscripts reading μενακάςδην (SP), μανακάςδην (L), manachasin (manachamsin cod. Wiz.) Lat., and μακανάςδην Bernard, which Thackeray chooses for his text.

41 The vowel pointing that Josephus has in mind may reflect a different vocalization of the word in his day from the days of the Masoretes.

42 If מְנָקָדֶפֶּה is transliterated into a nominative singular form, it would have a concluding sigma. Josephus declines this transliterated word appropriately in the sentence. One can only speculate if this was the transliteration Origen provided in the second column of his Hexapla. If this were known, it would give some minute evidence that Origen was aware of Josephus' transliterations of particular Hebrew words.

43 MT Exodus 28: 42 has רַנְנָקָדֶפֶּה, the masculine plural construct ending of which, apart from רַנ, is more like Josephus' transliteration, μακανάςδη, though Josephus' vowel pointing is different from MT as well. Max L. Margolis' "Transliterations in the Greek Old Testament," JQR 16, 2 (1925), 117-125 tells of Wutz's conclusion "that the oldest Greek translators, beginning with the Pentateuch, made their version not directly from a Hebrew copy of the Scriptures but from a secondary exemplar in which the entire text was written out in Greek letters" (p. 118). Franz Wutz, Die transkriptionem von der Septuaginta bis zu Hieronymus (Lieferung 1, Leipzig, 1925). Part II of Texte und Untersuchungen zur vormasorethischen Grammatik des Hebräischen, edited by Paul Kahle. Josephus' transliterations may have followed such a secondary exemplar. Professor Feldman comments (in a personal note) that Wutz "eventually gave up his own theory."

44 Life of Moses 2. 143-45.
function of the underclothing. Ginzberg mentions no legends imputing special significance to the "breeches."\(^{45}\)

Emanuel Tov has written that all Hebrew words transliterated in LXX were corrupted in the transmission of LXX.\(^{46}\) Josephus' transliterations of Hebrew words may have suffered comparable corruption in being transmitted, or there may have been attempts to bring Josephus' transliterations into line with LXX spellings. Josephus' \(\mu \alpha \chi \alpha \nu \alpha \delta \sigma \varsigma\) ἀβεβηκά is virtually the same term ἄβεβηκά, found in M. Yoma 7. 5.

Why does Josephus create terms here and in the following articles of the priestly clothing by transliterating the Hebrew words rather than using the LXX terms or some other readily understood synonyms, such as \(\pi \varepsilon \rho \iota \sigma \kappa \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon \varsigma\)? Josephus' transliterations were intentional in a way that went beyond the phenomenon of loan-words passing from one language into another language spoken by contiguous people. Josephus' transliterations are of technical terms.

It would seem that his purpose was to accentuate the mysterious quality of ancient Israelite worship by introducing arcane terminology for the priests' clothing. His Jewish readers who knew Hebrew or Aramaic would perceive that he knew the ancient terms, and his non-Jewish, non-Hebrew speaking readers would be impressed with the mysterious sounding words.

Josephus (3.152) provides three synonyms to make clear what is being described in the word \(\mu \alpha \chi \alpha \nu \alpha \delta \sigma \varsigma\), "under-drawers":


συνακτήρα, διάζωμα, and ἀναξυρίδας. 47 The last of these is the most common word that would have been most instructive to his readers.

LXX Exodus 28: 38 refers to the underclothing last in telling of the garments of Aaron's sons. The term in LXX is περισκελῆ λινᾶ, "linen drawers." Philo, in Life of Moses, follows LXX, calling this item of clothing περισκελῆς. 48 In The Special Laws 1. 83, he calls the underclothing περίζωμα. 49 Περισκελῆς is an uncommon word in the non-biblical literature, but it occurs six times in LXX. 50

Although Josephus does not repeat the word found in LXX, his description of the purpose of this article of clothing paraphrases the Bible's expression of purpose. LXX reads: "You shall make for them περισκελῆ λινᾶ to cover the nakedness of their flesh, from the loins to the thighs (ἄπο ὁσφύος έως μηρῶν). Josephus declared the purpose of the μαχαιράσης was to be περὶ τὰ αἰδοία, "around the shameful parts." 51 In War 5. 231, Josephus expresses generally the purpose of

47 Συνακτήρ is found only here in Josephus' writings. LSJ lists this occurrence as its one example. Διάζωμα is found also in War 5. 231 with reference to the high priest's attire, and in Ant. 12. 78 where it refers to the middle of the bowls (κρατήρων) brought as a gift to the Temple in Jerusalem in Josephus' retelling of the Aristeas legend. LSJ cites an instance of the meaning "drawers" in Thucydides' History 1.6. ' Αναξυρίδας is found only here in Josephus' writings. It is the most common of the three words used here by Josephus, but it is not exactly a synonym, since it means "trousers." LSJ lists several occurrences in Herodotus and Xenophon, p. 114.

48 Life of Moses 2.143.

49 Josephus uses this term only in War 2. 137, 161 to describe the underclothing of the Essenes. In 2. 129 he calls these σκέπασμα. In LXX περίζωμα does not appear in the Exodus Tabernacle account, but is used ten times elsewhere.

50 Exodus 28: 38; 36: 36; Leviticus 6: 10; 16: 4; Sirach 45: 8; Ezekiel 44: 18. Josephus never uses περισκελῆς.

51 Ant. 3.152. Cf. Exodus 20: 26 which is a general prohibition against mounting the altar steps at the risk of being exposed for all Israelites. But the LXX term is ὅπως ἂν μὴ ἀποκαλύφῃς τὴν ἀσχημοσύνην σου ἐκ' αὐτοῦ. Here ἀσχημοσύνην translates πληγή. Αἰδοίον is found in LXX only in Ezekiel 23: 20 as a translation of θηλα. It means, specifically, "pudenda." While ἀσχημοσύνη is a
this undergarment as LXX has it, "to hide, by the under-drawers, from the thigh to the private parts": τοὺς μὴροὺς μὲν ἄχρις αἰδοίου διαζώματι κολύπτων.52

In Josephus' remark on the fit of the underclothing in Ant. 3.152, he states that the purpose is to hide from the middle downwards, which, it may be noted, is like the description in War 5.231: ἀποτέμνεται δὲ ὑπὲρ ἡμίσιν καὶ τελευτῆσαι ἄχρι τῆς λαγόνος περὶ αὐτῆσι ἀποσφάγησαι, "it is cut above the waist and ends at the λαγόνος, around which it is bound tight." Josephus' λαγόνος,53 which Thackeray translates "thighs", actually means "flank," according to LSJ. Josephus draws a distinction between "waist" (ἡμίσιν) and λαγόνος, where the drawers terminate. Why Josephus used λαγόνος in the Ant. Tabernacle account, rather than μηρός, is unclear. There (3.152) again he uses the term αἰδοίος that he used previously in War 5.231, and would use again in the Ant. with reference to the part of the priestly anatomy being covered. Josephus, it would appear, referred to the area below the ribs, which is not the thigh.

52War 5.231.
53LSJ gives the first meaning: "the hollow on each side below the ribs, flank." The word "thigh" is not given as a meaning for λαγόνος.
Josephus describes the second article of the ordinary priests' clothing, first using the common Greek term ἑνδωμᾶ, usually meaning simply "garment." Josephus then gives a transliteration of the Hebrew term נְתִינָה, χεθομένη, as the particular name of the linen of which the robe is made, which he says is taken from the word χέθον (נְתִינָה), meaning linen. There is no such word נְתִינָה found in the Hebrew Bible, but in Rabbinic literature Jastrow lists נָחִי (נְתִינָה, נָחִי), נָחִי meaning "flax." The Hebrew word for "tunic," found in MT Exod. 28: 4, is נַחָה, very close to the Greek word for "tunic," χιτών, which most likely derives from Phoenician. Thackeray (3.153) seems to imply that the tunic itself is named χεθομένη, whereas in 3.156, at the end of his description of the tunic, Josephus says it is called

54 Not found in the LXX Exodus, though Aquila has ἑνδωμᾶ in Exodus 28: 31 where MT has סֵלֶד. Aquila thus uses ἑνδωμᾶ with reference to the garment of the high priest. Josephus uses it generically again in 3.153 with reference to the ephod. In II Kingdoms 1: 24; 20: 8 ἑνδωμᾶ means simply "apparel," while in IV Kingdoms 10: 22 it means "robe." Philo uses the general word ἐσθής with reference to the high priest's garments (Life of Moses 2. 109, 143.)

55 Only here in Josephus' writings. Since χεθομένη clearly does not give an exact transliteration of נְתִינָה, Josephus' transliteration has either been altered in transmission, or he used a source whose transliterations were of Hebrew words different from those found in Josephus' Hebrew Bible. Thackeray comments at this point: "Josephus takes his terms from the Aramaic, Hellenizes them, and perhaps traces a connexion with the Greek χιτών used below." Rengstorf refers to this as the "linen under-garment of the priests." He is apparently incorrect in this, since Josephus writes ἐσθής δὲ τοῦ ἑνδωμα ποδήρας χιτών, a vestment reaching down to the ankles, and is not an undergarment.

56 Only here in Josephus' writings. BDB lists נַחָה or נְתִינָה with many citations in the Hebrew Bible meaning "tunic, linen," but meaning specifically here "the holy linen tunic of the high priest." Parallel citations are found in Leviticus 8: 7, 13; 10: 5, and 16: 4. Thackeray seems to imply that the tunic itself is called, whereas in 3.156, at the end of his description of the tunic, he says it is called μωσαβαζάνης, a rough transliteration of the Hebrew word for "checker-work", found in Exod. 28: 4, ποιησα.

μασσαβαζάνης, which points to his awareness of the Hebrew text. 
Mασσαβαζάνης is a rough transliteration of a cognate form of the
Hebrew word for "checker-work," found in Exod. 28: 4 γαζίν. In the
Hebrew Bible, the tunic of the High Priest is made of checker-work,
and is probably not ankle-length. LXX here renders γαζίν γαζίν, ποδήρη χιτώνα κοσμεμπωτόν, apparently taking "checker-work to
mean "ankle-length, fringed." Josephus would not have heard any
such change mentioned in his synagogue worship unless the Greek
Exodus was being read. This robe is more specifically designated in
MT Exod. 28: 39. Targum Neofiti translates γαζίν as πάταξι, "knitted." 
Targum Onkelos renders it πάταξι, which is a synonym for γαζίν.

Josephus refers to χέθον (flax), a word used in his time,
probably derived from the Biblical word, as the basis of the Biblical
word χεθομένη! Aramaic was, after all, the language with which he
was best acquainted. In the attempt to proceed from the more
familiar to the less familiar, it is understandable that he would have
cited the contemporary word in explaining the ancient word,
however anachronistic this might have been.

Yet, leaving little to conjecture, Josephus prefaces his pleonastic
remarks on the linen of which this robe is made, by saying that it is

58Nodet II, 159, note 1, remarks that "In Exod. 28: 4, 39, γαζίν describes
the fabric of the tunic while Josephus appears to make of πάταξι the name of the
tunic. He observes that before concluding that this was a bad reading of the
text, it is necessary to note that the text is defective. (Here Nodet seems to mean
that the text of Josephus is defective.)

59In Gen. 37: 3 Aquila translates Joseph's coat of many colors χιτών
ἀστραγάλων, i.e., reaching down to the ankles.

60Thackeray observes that "The 'language of his forefathers' (BJ 1.3 τή
πατρίῳ (γλώσσῃ) in which Josephus composed the first draft of his Jewish War
was doubtless Aramaic, of which he must have had a thorough mastery." 
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made διπλής... σινδόνος βυσσίνης "of double fine linen" (3. 154). Σινδόνος βυσσίνης is virtually a tautology.61 Σινδόνος was "fine cloth, usually linen,"62 and βυσσίνης was "fine linen" too.63 Βύσσος is a Greek word in its own right, but also may be for Josephus a transliteration of the Aramaic נסי.64 That is to say, he may be drawing upon the Greek Exodus, or transliterating from an Aramaic paraphrase of the Hebrew Bible. He would have been well acquainted with the Aramaic from hearing it in the synagogue. In the LXX rubrics for making the priestly vestments, the term for "linen" is repeatedly either βυσσίνης65 or, more commonly, βύσσος.66

Why does Josephus add διπλής? Weill here cites BT Yoma 71b, upon which he makes the comment: "D'après la tradition également, dans le tissu des vêtements sacerdotaux chaque fil était double plusieurs fois." But, in the Gemara at this point we read: "Our Rabbis taught: [All] things, in connection with which the word shesh ['fine linen'] is said, had their threads sixfold: twined [denotes] eightfold [threads]; the robe [had its threads] twelvefold." Here the word-play is on the Hebrew word שס, which means both "linen" and "six."

---

61 According to LSJ it was a term used by Herodotus as the material used to wrap mummies. History 2. 86.
62 LSJ, p. 1600.
63 LSJ, p. 333.
64 As is found in Targums Neophiti and Onkelos Exod. 28: 5. LSJ cites βύσσος already in the fifth-century B.C.E. Greek author Empedocles. This suggests that נסי is a Greek or Phoenician loan-word brought into the Semitic vocabulary. Cf. Saul Lieberman, Greek in Jewish Palestine (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1942), p. 29-67, "The Greek of the Synagogue."
65 Exod. 28: 35; 36: 25.
66 Exod. 25: 4; 26: 1, 31, 36; 27: 9, 16, 18; 28: 5, 6, 8, 29, 35; 31: 4; 35: 6, 23, 25, 35; 36: 9, 10, 12, 32, 36, 37; 39: 13.
LXX Exodus 25: 4 listed κόκκινον διπλοῦν καὶ βύσσον κεκλωσμένην among the materials brought by the people to be used in the Tabernacle project.\(^{67}\) Κόκκινον διπλοῦν is the Greek hyper-literal translation of the Hebrew רֵשֵׁת, meaning "scarlet." It is conceivable that Josephus arrived at his phrase διπλής ... σινδόνος βυσσίνης, by mistakenly associating the διπλοῦν with βύσσον rather than with κόκκινον, making the necessary inflectional change.

Having described the material from which this garment was made, and the etymology of its transliterated name, Josephus describes the garment itself as ποδήρης χιτών, "an ankle-length tunic."\(^{68}\) Whereas the Greek word χιτών transliterates the very Hebrew word רֵשֵׁת, that Josephus devoted some care to transliterating χεθομένη, and for which he provided an etymology, he does not mention any verbal relationship between χιτών and רֵשֵׁת.\(^{69}\)

LXX Exod. 28:36 (MT 28: 40-נר) does not describe the ordinary priests' tunic as ποδήρης χιτών, but simply as χιτών. This tunic, it would seem, did not reach to the ankles. In MT there is nothing to indicate that either the High Priest or the ordinary priests had ankle-length robes. Aaron's robe was checkered (Exod 28: 4 רֵשֵׁת נַחַל), but not necessarily full-length. Presumably the priests,

---

\(^{67}\) The LXX κόκκινον διπλοῦν seems to be a literal translation of the Hebrew רֵשֵׁת, meaning "scarlet." Cf. John w. Wevers, Notes on the Greek Exodus, pp. 392-93. Here he notes that the Hebrew phrase רֵשֵׁת כּוֹכֵן is usually rendered by κόκκινον διανοηθεὶς ... or the noun alone τό κόκκινον."

\(^{68}\) Nodet II, 158, note 2, remarks, "Likewise Malmonides, hilk. Kelâ haMiqdas 8: 17 בֶּפֶצְךָ רֵשֵׁת מִן לְשֶׁת הַלַּחֲמָה 'as far as the top of the heel', repeating the prior tradition."

\(^{69}\) In Ἀντ. 3.36-37 Josephus uses χίτων to reflect the sound of the Hebrew נַחַל. Nodet remarks that "The Hebrew נַחַל 'tunic' is parent of the Greek χιτών, but FJ, for the sake of the meaning, reconciles it to the Aramaic מְזִרב, 'linen'." II, 158, note 1.
according to Exod. 28: 38, particularly needed the underclothing that was tight about the thighs because their outer "(for the ordinary priests', only) tunics did not reach to the ankles. LXX Exod. 28: 42-43 declares that this undergarment is to be for both Aaron and his sons, but since the περισκέλη are commanded for the ordinary priests first, in the brief postscript that outlines the garments of the ordinary priests, before the statement that Aaron was to wear this article of clothing too, presumably the shorter tunic of the ordinary priests, in the thinking of the Greek translators, made the underclothing particularly necessary.

MT does not distinguish between the length of the High Priest's and ordinary priests' robes, thus making the breeches needful for all of them for reasons of decency. The High Priest's robe is distinguished in MT for being made of checker-work. MT Exod. 28: 40 describes the robes or Aaron's sons merely as ρωγ. LXX adds the ankle-length to the High Priest's robe, and Josephus goes one step farther in adapting the High Priest's ankle-length robe to the attire of the ordinary priests.

Josephus' ordinary priests wore ποδήρης χιτῶν, a deliberate change from the Biblical rubric, that decidedly gives more dignity to their attire than is found in the Bible. These ankle-length tunics the ordinary priests wore did not, however, have the lower fringe found on the High Priest's tunic. LXX Exod. 28: 4 describes the High Priest's tunic as a ποδήρη χιτῶνα κοσμημένων, "fringed ankle-length tunic."

Philo's description of the priests' tunics, whether of the High Priest or of the ordinary priests, bears some resemblance to Josephus' account. In the Life of Moses 2. 109-110 Philo refers to
the two articles of the high priest's ἐσθήτα (vestments) as the ὑποδύτης and the ἐπωμίς, the robe and the ephod. The ὑποδύτης, then, is described by the LXX term ποδήρης, "ankle-length," without χιτῶν (2. 118). In Questions and Answers on Exodus 2. 107, Philo emphasizes the ankle-length of the "sacred stole" (στολή) as characteristics of the "glory and honor" mentioned in Exod. 28: 2.70 He writes: "The ankle-length (garment) is a symbol of that which is woven of many and various things." This would seem to suggest the checker-work nature of the tunic as found in the Hebrew term γάβριη, rather than being a comment on the ankle-length. In The Special Laws 1. 82 f, however, Philo refers to the priestly tunics as short tunics (χιτωνίσκοι). They are short so that the priests are not restricted in doing their perambulations about the altar.71 Philo's symbolism here comes full circle, however, when he again calls the tunic ποδήρης χιτῶν (1.85), and when he expands on the theme of the tunic symbolizing the air which reaches "from the sublunar region above to the lowest recesses of the earth."

This tunic, according to Josephus' description (3.153), encircled the torso and the sleeves fit the arms tightly (περιγεγραμμένος τῷ σώματι καὶ τὰς χειρίδας περὶ τοῖς βραχίοσιν κατεσφυγμένος). In this

70Καὶ ποιήσεις στολήν ἁγίαν Ἀαρὼν τῷ ἄδελφῳ σου εἰς τιμήν καὶ δόξαν. Wevers, Notes on the Greek Exodus, p. 445, observes that "the term εἰς τιμήν καὶ δόξαν appears elsewhere in LXX in transposed order four times (Ps. 8: 5, 95: 7; Job 40: 5; 2 Chr. 32: 33). When applied to the priestly garments it refers to their splendor and beauty."

71Here Philo first refers to the tunic as χιτῶν (1.83), and then as χιτωνίσκος. The rationale here is this: "For in this undress, with nothing more than the short tunics, they are attired so as to move with unhhampered rapidity when they bring the victims and the votive offerings and the libations and all other things needed for sacrifices. The high priest is bidden to put on a similar dress. ..." (1.84). Here Philo also first describes the ordinary priest's dress, then adds that the high priest is dressed similarly.
non-biblical embellishment, Josephus here may have in mind the Hebrew Bible’s account of the long robe with sleeves made by Jacob for his son, Joseph, which LXX calls a many-colored robe.\textsuperscript{72} BT Yoma 72b may describe something very similar as it reads: "The sleeves of the priestly garments were woven apparently and then attached to the garment. They reached up to the wrist."

Josephus’ description of the neck opening of the priests’ garment (3.156) appears to be a paraphrase of the LXX description of the neck opening of the High Priestly robe of Aaron. Since LXX translates MT (28: 31 f) very freely here, the basis of Josephus’ rendering of this aspect of the priestly attire is difficult to assign. LXX Exod. 28: 28 reads: Καὶ ἐστὶ τὸ περιστόμιον ἐξ αὐτοῦ μέσον ὁμοραμενὸν κύκλῳ τοῦ περιστομίου ἔργον υψάντου τὴν συμβολήν συνυφασμένην ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἑνα μι ῥαγὴ, "And the mouth of its top shall be in its middle, a hem shall be around its mouth, the work of the weaver; like a breastplate it shall be to it that it may not be torn" (Marcus’ translation\textsuperscript{73}).

\textsuperscript{72}Genesis 37: 3. Here the Hebrew שָׂפָה נְדִיבָה is translated in LXX χιτῶνα ποικίλον. Vulgate: polylimtam=wrought with many threads; Aquila ὀστραγάλη=reaching down to the ankles. Hebrew שָׂפָה (in connection with Joseph’s coat=stripe or ankle. Feldman remarks in a personal note: "From the painted tombs of the Bene Hassein in Egypt from the Patriarchal Age, Semitic chiefs wore coats of many cols as insignia of rulership. The Samaritan priests, who claim to be descended from Joseph, wear long striped garments. The phrase τῇ ὕπαιθρίᾳ-the hand from the wrist to the tip of the finger." Nodet calls attention to John 19: 23 which comments on Jesus’ tunic: Ἰν δὲ ὁ χιτῶν ἄραφος ἐκ τῶν ἀνεβεν υψάντος δι’ ὅλου, "But the tunic was without seam, woven from top to bottom.’ He remarks that Josephus’ description is after (d’après) B Yoma 72a, the sleeves were woven to the tunic (les manches étaient tissées à part puis rattachées à la tunique).” II, 158, note 3.

\textsuperscript{73}Marcus’ translation of LXX here is found in the Loeb edition of Questions and Answers on Exodus 2.118, note c (p. 169).
Josephus paraphrases this: "This tunic is nowhere folded, but has a loose opening at the neck, and by means of strings fastened to the border at the breast and at the back is supported on each shoulder." There may be a significant clue that Josephus is consciously paraphrasing LXX here in that both LXX and Josephus use the word ὃς only with reference to the hem of the neckline on the priestly robe. It is found only here in Josephus, who, as has been shown already, adapts aspects of the Biblical description of Aaron's robe to the ordinary priests' robe. In LXX ὃς appears only in Exod. 28: 28; 36: 31, with respect to the Aaron's robe, and in Ps. 132: 2 again referring to the hem of Aaron's robe. Philo does not mention this detail of the priest's robe in the Life of Moses.

74 Thackeray's translation. ὁ χιτών κολποῦται μὲν οὐδαμῶθεν λαγαρὸν δὲ παρέξων τὸν βροχωτήρα τοῦ αὐχένος ἀρπεδόσαι ἐκ τῆς ὃς καὶ τὸν κατὰ στέρνον καὶ μεταφέρον ἡμτημένας ἀναδέσαι ὑπὲρ ἐκσφέραν κατακλείδῳ; In Ant. 12. 70, κατακλείδες means "clamp," while here it means shoulder. Josephus is freely elaborating the Biblical text (Exod. 28: 32), which merely reads: "[The robe] shall have in it an opening for the head, with a woven binding around the opening Ant. 3.156 and 12. 70 are the only two places where Josephus uses κατακλείς. Neofiti 28: 32 reads: "And it will have the opening for the head in the middle; its opening shall have a border all around, the work of a weaver; it shall be like the opening of a coat of mail. It shall not be torn." Targum Onkelos: "And there shall be a hole in the top of it, in the midst thereof; it shall have a binding of work of a weaver round about the hole of it as it were the hole of a coat of mail (נְפָשָׁה), that it be not rent." LXX Exod. 28: 28 translates the uncertain Hebrew (Exod. 28: 32) very freely. The unclear Hebrew word, נְפָשָׁה, translated by RSV, "garment," and by Brown Ddriver and Briggs' Hebrew lexicon, "prob. (linen corselet)," is found only here and in 39: 23, its counterpart in the second part of the Tabernacle narrative. LXX, it appears, renders the phrase נְפָשָׁה יִבְּרָק רֻגֶּשׁ, τὴν συμβολὴν συνυφασμένην ἐξ αὐτοῦ (literally: the woven coming together of it). By κολποῦται μὲν οὐδαμῶθεν Josephus may be suggesting that it lies close to the chest, rather than being loose. In LSJ the verb κολπῶ is used to describe the bulging out of a sail with the wind, and the cognate noun κολψίς is used to describe the bulging out of the center in a line of battle. p. 974.
Josephus (3.154) introduces the third item of the ordinary priests' attire, ζώνη (girdle), as a parenthesis in his description of the priestly tunic. Philo mentions this article of the priests' clothing briefly, saying that the purpose was functional, "to keep them unhampered and readier for the holy ministry, by tightening the loose folds of the tunics." 75 Josephus refers to it first with the word used in LXX Exod. 28: 4, ζώνη, "belt," or "girdle" (3. 154), before ending the description with a transliteration of the Hebrew word (אָבֶנֶּה = אָבֶנֶּה), 76 and its "Babylonian" equivalent (אֵּמִיָּן = Aramaic אֵּמִיָּן). 77 This is a term used in the Mishnah. 78

75 Philo, in Life of Moses 2. 143-145, writes of Moses' nephews wearing linen tunics, girdles, and breeches (χιτώνας λινοῦς, ζώνας τε καὶ περισκελή). In The Special Laws 1.82-84, Philo mentions only the χιτών λινοῦς and περίζωμα (a synonym for περισκελή), without any reference to the girdle.

76 According to Jastrow (ad. loc.) אֶבֶן meaning "belt," is found in BT Baba Kama 94b, and BT Yoma 6a and 12a. Nodet remarks that "the Aramaic חָמִינָה (hamina) translates אֶבֶן (abnet) in Targum Jonathan on Exod. 28: 39, 39: 29, etc. The word was originally Persian." II, 158, note 9.

77 Ant. 3. 156. Josephus uses the term בָּבּוֹלָן (Babylon) frequently, most often in Ant. 10, which presents the exile of the Jews in Babylon. There it appears fifty-nine times. The Babylonians, as conquerors of the Jews, and destroyers of their first Temple, were an earlier type of the Romans, as seems apparent in early Christian literature in 1 Peter 5: 19, and Revelation 16: 19, where Rome is referred to as "Babylon." See note i2 to Sibyline Oracles, The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, edited by James Charlesworth (2 vols. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1985), I, 396, where J.J. Collins writes that "The analogy between Babylon and Rome, both of which destroyed Jerusalem and the Temple, underlies the fictional setting of 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch." See also note a2, to Psalms of Solomon 2: 25, The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, II, 653. See also Louis H. Feldman, "Abba Kolon and the Founding of Rome," forthcoming in JQR, where the author comments on Song of Songs Rabbah 1.6.4, which reads, "On the day on which Jeroboam made the calf of gold two huts were built in Rome. They kept on falling in, until an old man there named Abba Kolon said to them, 'Unless you bring water from the river Euphrates and mix it with the clay, the building will not stand.' . . . From that time they used to say: Any country that has not an Abba Kolon is no country. They called the place Rome Babylon." Of the Babylonians Josephus writes that they were destined to conquer Egypt and King Joakimos (10.89). Jeremiah, and then Ezekiel, in their day, were like Josephus in his day, in trying to persuade his people not to rebel against the occupying king (10: 103-106). Nodet II, 158, note 9 and Jastrow remark that the Aramaic term חָמִינָה translates
Josephus (3.154), adding to the Biblical rubric, states that this girdle, which Thackeray appropriately translates "sash," is four fingers wide (πλατείαν μὲν ως εἰς τέσσαρας δακτύλους). It is embroidered with flowers of scarlet, purple, blue, and βύσσος, which is the very word for the linen of which the other garments were made, and presumably the sash too. Its open weave suggests to Josephus snake's skin.

LXX Exod. 28: 35 says of the sash that it is ζώνην...ἐρυγον ποικιλτοῦ, "the work of an embroiderer." But the Bible does not state that this sash is embroidered with flowers. Exod 28: 5 speaks of the βύσσος along with the colors as though it is one of these colors as well as the material out of which the garment is made. The βύσσος was cream or white-colored thread.

78 The Aramaic term, נברא, is found in M. Erub. 10: 15 (BT Erub. 104b) and M. Succ. 5: 3 (BT Succ. 51a), though it is not described as a Babylonian term. Nodet II, 158, note 4, observes that Maimonides, hilk. Kelé haMiqdas gives the width of the sash as three fingers, rather than four, and was thirty-two cubits long (as in Jerusalem Talmud Yoma 7: 3)!

79 Nodet remarks that Exod 28: 39 (fnba) does not give the dimensions. Josephus is like Maimonides, hilk. Kel'haMiqdas 8: 19, the width of the sash, for both the common priests and the high priest, was the same, three fingers, (close to Josephus), and it was thirty-two cubits long (like J Yoma 7: 3). II, 158, note 4.

80 See note 60 above.

81 Nodet II, 158, note 5 observes that MT Exod. 28: 39 here reads יתנ וPropertyName, LXX ἑρυγον ποικιλτοῦ, which detail is developed by Josephus from the word יתנ in Exod. 28: 4, "checker work" which Rashi explains are "like indentations made in the ornaments of gold for the settings (in which) were placed precious stones and pearls." Rashi, Exodus Commentary, p. 340. This open-woven fabric, Nodet comments, is like the veil hiding the Holy of Holies (26: 31).

82 Philo, in Life of Moses 2. 133 writes that the high priest "brings upon his person... the flower trimming of earth, "when he sets forth to his holy duties." He may refer to the sash here.

83 Concerning this Weill writes "le byssus n'est pas une teinture, mais sert de fond aux trois autres couleurs." He calls attention to άπλ. 3.183, where Josephus writes of four υφανθέντων. Βύσσος appears to be the first of the four materials Josephus has in mind. It is not inconceivable that there was linen-
This sash appears in Josephus to be essentially ornamental, since the tunic seems to fit closely to the torso. He alludes to its beauty (ἐνπρέπεια) and to its being longer than was functionally necessary if its purpose were to hold in place the tunic. When performing the priestly duties, the priests had to throw it over the left shoulder (ἀναβαλὸμενος ἐπὶ τὸν λαιὸν ὄμον).\(^{85}\) It is wound twice around the chest, knotted, and then hangs on one side to the ankles (3.155).\(^ {86}\) Weill calls attention to Targum Jonathan on Ezekiel 44: 18 where is found the term "on their heart," which corresponds to Josephus' κατὰ στέρνον (3.155).\(^ {87}\) In BT Zebahim 18b one opinion colored thread used as well as thread of the other three colors. This is not uncommon in the art of embroidery.

\(^{84}\) Pausanius writes of the βόσσος of Ἰλεία, that it is as fine as that of the Hebrews, but it is not so yellow (ἔστι δὲ οὐκ ὄμοιως ξανθή). Description of Greece V, v, 2.

\(^{85}\) Weill states that BT Yoma 44a says the sash was "32 coudeés de long ou 32 plis," a figure that Thackeray cites "according to the Talmud," but I did not find this in Yoma 44a.

\(^{86}\) Nodet II, 158, note 7, remarks Targum Jonathan on Ezek 44: 18 says that the the vestments of the priests, while they serve, are fixed on the heart. He notes that "a baraita indicates that this sash about the heart demands the expiation of the contradictions of the heart (B Arakhim 16a). This baraita comes in a passage preceded by the question of R. 'Anani b. Sason: "Why is the portion about the priestly garments placed next to the portion about the sacrifices?" To which question comes the answer: "It is to tell you that just as sacrifices procure atonement, so do the priestly garments. The tunic procures atonement for bloodshed. . . The breeches procure atonement for incest. . . The mitre procures atonement for those of arrogant mind. . . The girdle procures atonement for sinful thoughts of the heart. . . The breastplate procures atonement for error in legal decisions. . . The ephod procures atonement for idolatry. . . The robe procures atonement for slander. . . The golden plate procures atonement for impudent deeds." The Tosafot (15b, fnba) point out that according to a midrash the priest wound the sash symbolically twice around his heart, in accordance with his two sins. According to others (Sita Mekubbeset, ad loc.) this sash, which was thirty-two cubits long, was wound thirty two times around the body, thirty-two being the numerical value of the word ἁρ, 'heart.' Josephus does not appear to enter into this kind of explanation. His detail intends only to describe the attire of the priests, rather than to give an explanation of the meaning of these vestments.

\(^{87}\) Weill, I, 178.
expressed on the length of priestly garments, is that of Rab Judah, who speaks in Samuel's name, that "trailing garments are fit; garments which do not reach the pavement are unfit."88

The fourth article of the ordinary priests' vestments was the turban (πίλον 3.157-58).89 It was unpointed (ἀκωνος),90 and covered just somewhat more than half of the head of the priests. He says it was called μασναζφθης, which is a transliteration of MT Exod. 28: 4 ἀμαζαζης.91

Thackeray remarks that in MT Exodus 28: 40, the name given to the turbans of the ordinary priests is חֹשֶׁךְ,92 so that Josephus is in error. He calls this a "direct contradiction" of Scripture by Josephus. It reflects his own times rather than ancient times.93

88Josephus, in saying that the sash is wound around the chest, apparently as high as the armpits, appears to contradict the ruling of Abaye that "When they gird themselves, they must do so neither below their loins nor above their elbows, but in the place corresponding to their elbows. R. Ashi said: Hianna b. Nathana told me, I was once standing before King Izgedar; my girdle lay high up, whereupon he pulled it down, observing to me, It is written of you, And ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests and a holy nation" Zebahim 19a. Nodet comments on Josephus' contradiction of rabbinic tradition here, in that rabbinic tradition said that the abnet was made of wool and linen, that is, of a forbidden combination, (le sa'atnez cf. Maimonides hil. Kelé haMiqdas 8: 1,2). II, 158, note 8.

89Πίλος is used by Homer (Iliad 10.65), Hesiod (Works and Days 546), Dionysius of Halicarnassus (Roman Antiquities 2.64), Herodotus (History 3.12), and by other writers whom Josephus would have had occasion to read.

90Weill translates this "une calotte sans pointe."

91Nodet observes that in Exod 28: 4, 39, חֹשֶׁךְ is the turban of the High Priest, while in v. 40, the turbans of the priests are called חֹסֶךְ. Josephus seems to equate the two, at the risk of freely giving the High Priest an additional article of clothing. According to B Yoma 71b, the two turbans were very similar, made of similar bands, but they were wound differently around the head. According to Maimonides hil. Kelé haMiqdas 8: 19, the turban was made of bands sixteen cubits long, which is half of the thirty-two around the כר. II, 159, note 2.

92So also SP and 4QpaleoExodm (only the concluding letter remains of this word here. The editors have conjectured that the word is the same as MT).

93Cf. note to Ant. 3. 157. Here Thackeray apparently derives his view from Weill, who writes: "Cependant ce passage, par sa précision, fait croire a
Rather than being a contradiction of Scripture, Josephus here reflects the terminology he would have heard in the synagogue worship. M. Yoma 7: 5 refers to the turban of the ordinary priest with the same term mentioned by Josephus, πεπερασμένον, as do Targums Neofiti and Onkelos.

LXX Exod. 28: 4 refers to the High Priest's turban as κίδαρις, which is the same word found in LXX Exod. 28: 36 with reference to the ordinary priests. Josephus referred to both as πιλος.

MT Exod. 28: 40 refers to the ordinary priests' turbans as ποταμός. It is unclear why Josephus would give the opposite of the sense of ποταμός in referring to this turban as πίλον ἀκωννον, "unpointed turban," when the sense of ποταμός is a peaked turban. ποταμός may be for Josephus essentially descriptive of a kind of headwear, rather than the technical name for the High Priest's turban. But it is

l'exactitude des souvenirs de Josephe qui rapporte, sans doute, ce qu'il a vu lui-même." Weill cites BT Yoma 12b with regard to the same term for the High Priest's and the ordinary priests' headdress. There R. Dosa is quoted that "the four garments of the high priest on the Day of Atonement may be used by the common priest during the rest of the year." Objections are then raised to this. 94 Hatch and Redpath's Concordance cites πιλος in Sam (?). II, 1133. Perhaps by Sam. is meant Sm, which refers to Symmachus' recension. Πίλον does not otherwise appear in LXX. Κίδαρις is the word used in Exodus and Leviticus for the priestly headwear, both of the ordinary priests and of the High Priest (Exod. 28: 4, 35, 36; 29: 9; 36: 6; Lev. 8: 13; 16: 4. It is also found in Ezekiel 21: 26 with reference to the head gear of the wicked prince of Israel, replacing the crown; and in Ezekiel 44: 18 for the priests in Ezekiel's vision of the Temple. Josephus uses κίδαρις in Ant. 11. 35 and 331. In the first instance κίδαρις βυσσίνην describes part of the prize offered by King Darius to the one who could interpret his troubling dream. In the second instance it describes the Jewish High Priest's headress, on which is the golden plate inscribed with God's name. Here Josephus is telling of the encounter between the Greek King Alexander and the High Priest during the former's visit to Jerusalem. This was also the word for the ordinary Persian headress.

95 This word is cognate to the word πυγμαίον, meaning hill. LSJ cites Josephus here as its example for the word ἀκώννος, p. 59.

96 It is cognate to the verb πεσω, "to wrap." As Nodet remarks (II, 159, note 3), Josephus appears to be describing headwear that he had seen. The
unclear why he would apparently contradict the sense of the Hebrew word. The Targums refer to the ordinary priest's turban as וְרֵשׁ, which according to Jastrow, is the Aramaic term for the high turban worn by the Persians. Philo does not write about the ordinary priests' turbans.

In referring to the ordinary priests' headdress as נְזַע, Josephus may intend to emphasize that it is a "turban," that is, a headress composed of cloth wound around the head (ἐπιπτυσοῦμενον). This is all held together with many stitches (δὰπτεται πολλάκις). This turban is then covered with linen so that the layers of wrapping beneath are not able to be seen (3.158). It fits securely so that it does not slip off the priest as he does his tasks.

This care for detail in describing the fit and suitability of the priestly garments suggests that Josephus had some intimacy of acquaintance with them. He may have worn such garments himself, referring to them, as M. Yoma and the Targums record, in terms that were somewhat changed from Biblical times. Whereas elsewhere, as I have shown, Josephus seems to follow LXX in his terminology, he is quite independent here of both LXX and MT.

The High Priest's Vestments

Josephus begins the description of the High Priest's vestments by stating that after putting on the attire worn by the ordinary priests, the High Priest puts on a second robe, or pallium, which is a rubric for the sleeves, that they be woven, was like the rubric for the headwear. He cites B Yoma 72b and B Zebahim 88a, which stress that the priestly garments were to be of woven material, rather than sewn, that is, of one piece, rather than pieced together.
blue, ankle-length tunic called μεεῖρ, "in our tongue" (ἐξ ὀσκίνθου πεποιημένον χιτώνα ποδήρης δ' ἐστὶ καὶ οὖτος μεεῖρ καλείται κατὰ τὴν ήμειτέραν γλώσσαν 3.159). Once again he transliterates the Hebrew term for this garment, found in Exod. 28: 4, υἱήμη. In MT this is the proper name for the pallium.97 In Exod. 28: 31 it is specified further as ταύτην υἱήμη, "the robe of the ephod." The description of the ephod precedes the description of the robe accompanying it. Though LXX Exod. 28: 31 refers to this as ὑποδύτην ποδήρη, "ankle-length robe," MT does not state that this pallium is ankle-length.

Josephus interrupts his description of the High Priestly pallium briefly to mention a belt (ζώνη), which is similar in color to the belt of the under-tunic, except that it has gold threads woven in (χρυσοῦ συνυφασμένου). Philo seems to allude to this in Life of Moses 2.113, when he describes the secure fastening of the προσαγορευομένῳ λογείῳ, "place of reason" to the ephod.98 But this he writes, is achieved ἀλυσείδιος χρυσάς, "with little golden chains," rather than by a belt such as Josephus or the Bible describes.99

It is not clear from the Biblical account that there is more than one belt, or sash among the High Priest's vestments. MT Exod 28: 4 lists five articles of the High Priest's clothing, the last of which is the χρῶμα. Then, Exod. 28: 39 describes: μέτρι πάρθενα ἀπὸ "a belt of a variegator's work," which is tied around the tunic of checker work.

---

97 Josephus uses this word only here. In MT it is found in Exod. 28: 4, 31, 34; 29: 5 39: 22-26; Lev. 8: 7; I Sam. 2: 19; 15: 27; 18: 4; 24: 5, 12; 28: 14; II Sam. 13: 18; Isa. 59: 17; 61: 10; Ezek. 26: 16; Ps. 109: 29; Job 1: 20; 2: 1229: 14; Ezr. 9: 3; 5; and I Chron. 15: 27.

98 Colson's translation of προσαγορευομένῳ λογείῳ.

99 LSJ lists ἀλυσίς, "chain," but not ἀλυσείδιον.
This is the tunic and the belt described in Exod. 28: 4.

The only other belt, mentioned in Exod. 28: 27 (39: 5) is the band of the ephod (ירוס תחנה). Exod. 39: 5 ascribes to this band the colors Josephus ascribes to the girdle on the High Priest's pallium: "gold, blue and purple and scarlet, and fine twined linen."

LXX omits verses 22-28 of what is found in MT. The Targums follow MT. Where MT has יִירָס תחנה in 28: 27, Neofiti has וְחַלְתִּים אֲユーザָרָו, and Onkelos מְעַרְרוֹמָו. The blue robe of the ephod (ירוס פַּשְׁת) described in 28: 31 is not the same thing as the tunic described in 28: 4, 39 ( שש חתנים חצץ). Neither of these is the tunic of the ordinary priests, described in 28: 40 merely as "tunics," (تحضير).

Josephus describes the bottom hem of the pallium: Tassles colored like pomegranates, and golden bells, alternately, are sewn there, hanging, with great attention to beauty (κατὰ πέξαν δ ἀυτῷ προσερραμένοι θύσανοι ροών τρόπων ἐκ βαφῆς μεμιμημένοι ἀπήρτητο καὶ κόσμωνες χρύσεοι κατὰ πολλὴν ἐπιτήδευσιν τῆς ἐυπρεπείας). In phrasing his description of the tassles ροών τρόπων ἐκ βαφῆς μεμιμημένοι, Josephus clearly paraphrases LXX Exod. 28: 29: Καὶ ποιήσεις ύπὸ τὸ λῶμα τοῦ υποδύτου κάτωθεν ὥσεὶ ἑξανθούσης ρόας

100 The verb יִרָס means "Weave in checker work."
101 BDB gives as the meaning of פַּשְׁת, "ingenious work." This is missing at this point in LXX. Josephus writes of this band in the appropriate place (3.171).
103 The Targums' וְחַלְתִּים and וְחַלְתִּים are equivalent to the MT יִרָס.
104 In War 5. 232 Josephus writes that the bells signified thunder and the pomegranates lightning.
ροίσκοις... "and you shall make under the hem of the robe beneath, as it were pomegranates of a flowering pomegranate tree."

Josephus renders the idea of LXX ὄσι with τρόπον ἐκ βαφῆς μεμημένοι. MT here (Exod. 28: 33) simply reads: "you will make on its skirts pomegranates of blue..."

Josephus (3.160) differs from LXX in that LXX calls for both golden pomegranates (28: 29 ροίσκοις χρυσοῦς) and pomegranates made of various colors (ροίσκοις ἐξ ὑακίνθου καὶ πορφύρας...). Josephus describes only tassels of various colors looking like pomegranates. Presumably, the θύσανοι ροῶν τρόπον (tassels resembling pomegranates) and the ροίκον (pomegranates) Josephus mentions a few lines later refer to the same ornamentation. Here Josephus' description is like MT, which has no golden pomegranates, but only pomegranates made of various colors (28: 33-34; 39: 24-26). BT Zebahim 88b, which clearly develops MT here, is like Josephus in describing these pomegranates: "Blue [wool], purple wool and crimson thread, twisted together, were brought, and manufactured into the shape of pomegranates whose mouths were not yet opened and in the shape of the cones of the helmets on children's heads."

But Josephus (3.160) is also like LXX in explaining that the tassels were like pomegranates (ροῶν τρόπον), rather than being pomegranates. Though LXX and Josephus undoubtedly give the
sense intended by MT, they are different from MT in this regard. Josephus (3.160) adds a curious remark that there were not only pomegranates between the bells, but ἰοῦν κάδωντον, "little bells between the pomegranates." The Targums, unlike LXX and Josephus, follow MT closely in referring to the tassels as pomegranates (28: 33; 39: 24-25 יִנְסָרָה).107 Since the Targums follow MT closely here, it can only be said that Josephus would have derived the same information from either, and may be guided by either at this point. There is no difference between Josephus and the other versions under consideration with regard to the gold bells that alternate with the pomegranates, except that LXX has added golden pomegranates which alternate with the colored pomegranates and gold bells (LXX Exod. 28: 29-30).108 Josephus was governed in content by the information in MT, but governed in style by LXX.

Though Josephus did not specify how the ordinary priests' tunic was constructed, he specifies that this pallium is made of one piece of material, not two, stitched together (3.161). This may be based on the statement in MT Exod. 39: 22-23 which describes the "robe of the ephod" (אֶפֶּלָּדַת עֵנוֹפָת) which was "woven all of blue" (כחול

107 Nodet calls attention to BT Zebahim 88b where the skirt of the High Priest's robe was made of "blue [wool], purple wool and crimson thread, twisted together, [which] were brought, and manufactured into the shape of pomegranates whose mouths were not yet opened and in the shape of the cones of the helmets on children's heads. Seventy two bells containing seventy two clappers were brought and hung thereon, thirty six on each side." Leviticus Rabbah 21: 7 presents the conflicting rubrics of R. Judah b. R. Eleazar and "Our Rabbis." The former said the High priest should wear thirty-six bells and thirty-six pomegranates. The later said the number was seventy-two bells and seventy-two pomegranates. Josephus does not state how many bells and pomegranates were to be on the High Priest's tunic.

108 Weill observes the detail found in BT Zebahim 88b, that there were seventy-two bells on the hem of the pallium. Another view recorded here, of R. Dosa, is that there were thirty six, eighteen on each side.
Josephus' view is parallel to the view expressed in BT Zebahim 88a: "Our Rabbis taught: The priestly garments were not sewn but woven, as it is said, of woven work.' Similarly, BT Yoma 72b records one opinion of the rabbis: "All priestly garments must not be made by needle-work, but by weaving', as is said: woven work!" 109

The pallium, as Josephus described it, differs from the Talmudic view in that openings were cut for the head and the arms, and the openings were hemmed. There were no sleeves to the pallium. 110 The opening for the head was cut from front to back, rather than from side to side. Josephus did not find these details in the Biblical record. They may derive from his personal observation of the priestly vestments. When the Talmud states that the priestly garments must be made by weaving, this does not necessarily rule out hemming slits cut in the woven material for head and arms. What it does rule out is sewing together various cut pieces of cloth for the garment.

Again Josephus transliterates the Hebrew term תֶּבֶן, in beginning his description of the mysterious ephod, ἐφόδιον. He describes it as like the Greek ἐπωμίς. Were it not for the fact that this is the term found in LXX Exod. 28: 4f as the suitable Greek translation for the Hebrew תֶּבֶן, it would appear strange that Josephus uses this word.

109 This means that they were directly woven into the form in which they were worn by the priests.
110 Weill notes the correspondence between the later views of Maimonides and Nahmanides and Josephus concerning the lack of sleeves on the pallium.
The Greek ἐπωμίς denoted the shoulder of a woman's tunic. Apart from the Greek Exodus, I know of no instance of ἐπωμίς being used in this cultic sense. Josephus, like Philo, is adopting the LXX translation, perhaps because there was no suitable Greek word, describing a counterpart to the ephod in a Greek cultic setting. As the first Greek biblical translators thought that the ephod looked like the ἐπωμίς they saw women wearing, their translation reflected this, and the word was used by Philo and Josephus. Since Josephus was not bound by the vocabulary he found in the Greek text, he must have concurred with LXX translators. Furthermore, evidently he found nothing adverse in using this term.

Burkert writes of the appearance of the Greek priest: "His hair is usually long and he wears a head-band (strophion), a garland, costly robes of white or purple, and a special waistband; he carries a staff in his hand. The priestess is often represented carrying the large key to the temple kleidouchos." There is nothing here which is like the ephod.

111 Cf. LSJ, p. 679.
112 Life of Moses 2. 122 f. In The Special Laws 1. 88-89 Philo refers to the ephod as τὸν λογείον.
113 Rashi writes of the ephod: "I have not heard nor found in (any) Baraita an explanation of its pattern. My heart however, tells me that it was girded to him on his backside; its width (being) like the width of the back of a man, like the kind of apron which is called pourceint in O.F., which the noble women gird upon horses...And my heart tells me further that there is a proof that it is a kind of garment, for Jonathan translates 'and David was girded with a linen ephod" (II Sam. 6: 14) "a tunic" of linen, and he translates in like manner "robes" in the account of Tamar the daughter of Absolom, "for thus were appareled the kings's daughters that were virgins with robes". Here Rashi appears to be making a case from Scripture for the parallel to feminine attire for a model of the appearance of the ephod. Abraham ben Isaiah and Benjamin Sharfman, translators, The Pentateuch and Rashi's Commentary, Exodus (Brooklyn, New York, 1949), pp. 338-329.
114 Walter Burkert, Greek Religion, p. 97.
Josephus states that the ephod is the third piece of the High Priestly vestments, but actually it is the fourth. Since he does not explain any symbolic significance to the μαχανάς, perhaps he intends the reader not to number this with the rest of the priestly vestments.

According to Josephus, the ephod is a short, sleeved, jacket, open in the front. In the open place in the front is suspended a breastplate, six-inches square, that has embroidered onto it twelve stones, representing each of the tribes of Israel. The lower part of the ephod is fitted with a belt (again ζώνη 3. 171), with tassels hanging from it.

Josephus describes the construction of the ephod essentially as the LXX text does, summarizing the specific colors with the term ἐκ τῇ χρωμάτων παντοίων καὶ χρυσοῦ (3. 162).

There are differences between Josephus’ description and the Bible’s. The Bible seems, to Josephus, to imply that there is an open space in front into which the breastplate is sewn. Indeed, LXX Exod. 29: 5 reads: καὶ συνάψεις αὐτῷ τὸ ὁ λόγιον πρὸς τὴν ἐπωμίδα, "and you will attach for him the breastplate to the ephod." This may have been the source of Josephus’ impression. The oracle of judgment (τὸ λογεῖον τῆς κρίσεως LXX Exod. 28: 24; MT Exod. 28: 15 ψη) may just as suitably be thought of as being sewn to the material on the front of the ephod as fitting into an open space.

115 The μαχανάς (under-drawers), μασσαβαζάνης (checkered-tunic), μεσίρ (robe of the ephod) come before.

116 Wevers calls attention to how LXX "has considerably simplified the text of v. 6 by limiting the materials for the ephod to ἐκ βύσσου κεκλωμενής, omitting all reference to gold and the colored fabrics of MT." Notes on the Greek Exodus, p. 447.
Josephus explains that the Hebrew יָעָן means λόγιον. This is its function rather than its "meaning." MT Exod. 28: 15 refers to it as יָעָן, because of the decisions given by the Urim and Thummim, which explains the LXX rendering τὸ λογεῖον τῆς κρίσεως, but the meaning of יָעָן, or the description of its appearance, seems to be "pouch." Josephus omits mentioning this pouch, it seems, because there is no need for it without the Urim and Thummim to go into it.

Josephus does not mention the Urim and Thummim, that LXX calls δήλωσις καὶ ἀληθεία (28: 26), which was one of the essential aspects of the Biblical ephod, found in the pouch at the front of the ephod. This had long been gone from the High Priest's equipment. Why did Josephus fail to mention the Urim and Thummim at all, both here, and in the several places where other haggadic legend elaborated on them? When he might have found fruitful parallels between the Oracle at Delphi and the Urim and Thummim, which

117 Thus BDB because of the description of it in MT, that it is "square, it will be doubled over" (28: 16 יָעָן יָעָן לְבוּר). LXX 28: 16 έσται διπλοῦν.
118 Philo usually uses the terms found here in LXX Exodus, but at other times he calls the Urim and Thummim σοφίνεια καὶ ἀληθεία. Cf. note k, Questions and Answers on Exodus II, 116 (Loeb edition), which lists Allegorical Interpretation 3.132, Life of Moses 2.113, 128-129, and The Special Laws 4.69 where Philo discusses the Urim and Thummim.
119 As Weill has noted, See Thackeray's note b, IV, 420-21 of the Loeb edition. "The work was completed in A.D. 93-94 (xx.267) and was probably 15 or more years in the making. The 200 years take us back to the close of the theocracy at the death of John Hyrcanus (135-105 B.C.), the prophet who 'was so closely in touch with the Deity that he was never ignorant of the future' (B.J.i. 69). But the statement is unsupported. According to Palestinian tradition the oracle of Urim and Thummim ceased earlier, 'at the death of the first prophets' after the return from captivity (Sota ix.14, quoted by Weill)." Actually it is M. Sotah 9: 12, which reads: "When the First Prophets died, Urim and Thummim ceased." This is part of a list of catastrophes described in M. Sotah 9: 9-15. Cf. BT Sotah 48a f.
would surely have made more clear to his Greek audience this mysterious element in the ancient story of his people, why did he not do so? He could have transliterated the Hebrew שֵׁרוֹן, שֵׁרוֹ א, as he did each of the other of the Hebrew terms for the priestly vestments.

He specifically mentions in 3. 214 that he had omitted this detail when he described the High Priestly vestments earlier.\(^{121}\) He explains that the purpose of these unmentioned articles was to bring direct Divine revelation, so as not to have to trust to possibly corrupt prophets, and to impress foreigners (ξένοι) who might be there.\(^{122}\)

Josephus does not ignore the function of the Urim and Thummim. He attributes to the two sardonyxes and to the twelve stones sewn into the breastpiece the function the Bible gives to the Urim and Thummim (3.215-218).\(^{123}\) In fact, the twelve stones sewn into the breastpiece, Josephus wrote, would shine brightly before a battle, to indicate God's help in achieving victory. Thus, "those Greeks, who honor our customs. . . call the ἐσσήν (Hebrew יִשְׁמָעֵל, breastpiece), 'oracle' (λόγιον)."\(^{124}\) This was a function very much like

---

\(^{121}\) Ο μέντοι περὶ τῆς τοῦ ἄρχερέως στολῆς παρέλιπον διελθεῖν βούλομαι.

\(^{122}\) Thackeray observes (note c, to Ant. 3. 215) that this second benefit of the unmentioned Urim may derive from Numbers 27: 21 where it is referred to as δῆλοι, "conspicuous stones."

\(^{123}\) Ginzberg writes that "The twelve stones in the breastplate with their bright colors, were of great importance in the oracular sentences of the high priest, who by means of these stones made the Urim and Tummim exercise their functions. For whenever the king or the head of the Sanhedrin wished to get directions from the Urim and Tummim he betook himself to the high priest. The latter, robed in his breastplate and ephod, bade him look into his face and submit his inquiry. The high priest, looking down on his breastplate, then looked to see which of the letters engraved on the stones shone out most brightly, and then constructed the answer out of these letters." III, 172. Cf. VI, 69, note 358, which makes reference to BT Yoma 73a,b, and Yerushalmi 7, 44c.

\(^{124}\) Cf. Herodotus, History IV, 178.
that of the Delphic oracle which was consulted, among other questions, with questions having to do with the outcome of battles. The Greeks who would most honor this custom would be the ones who honored the oracular powers of the Pythian priestess at Delphi.

Second, since the Urim and Thummim no longer functioned in Josephus' day, and since he described a function for the sardonyx shoulder pieces and the twelve stones of the λόγιον similar to that of the Delphian oracle, he may have thought it superfluous to tell of the miraculous Urim and Thummim. The ephod was still worn by the High Priest, and its parts could be seen. But among these parts was no longer the Urim and Thummim.

Had his purpose been like that of Philo, whose allegorical expositions were read, I presume, mostly by Alexandrian Jews, then it might have served Josephus well to write about the Urim and Thummim. But since he wrote for a non-Jewish readership, it may have seemed to him beside the point to introduce this. There seems to be little other reason why he would have completely neglected this detail, so important to the High Priest's special place in ancient Israel.

The breastplate is attached to the front of the ephod at each corner by a gold ring. The rings are sewn to the tunic with blue

---

125 E.g. Herodotus, History VI, 77, where the Argives consult the Pythian priestess concerning the outcome of war with Sparta; and IX, 33, where the Spartans try to get Tisamenus to be their leader in war after he is told by the Pythian oracle that he would win five great victories (the five victories are announced in §35).

126 Though Goodenough explains that Philo wrote for the benefit of Gentiles. Cf By Light, Light, Chapter VII, "Moses as Presented to the Gentile Inquirer."
thread, and the ἐσσὴν is sewn all around to secure it in place. The ephod itself has epaulettes with sardonyx stones127 (σαρδόνυχες, Hebrew אַֽרְּבָּן), mounted in gold fittings, attached by pins (περόνισιν) to the shoulders. Josephus appears to change the kind of stone found here in the Bible from emerald (LXX 28: 9 σμαράγδος) or onyx (MT 28: 9 נֶפֶשׁ יְבוֹם) to sardonyx (σαρδόνυξ). But LSJ (p. 1584) explains that "The stone was called ὀνυξ when the dark ground was simply spotted or streaked with white, but σαρδόνυξ if the different colours were disposed in layers." Josephus evidently has in mind the same stone mentioned in LXX, under a different aspect.

Philo follows LXX.128 Here the Targums read differently. Onkelos reads אַֽרְּבָּן יְבוֹם onyx (or beryl) stones. Neofiti reads אַֽרְּבָּן יְבוֹם, precious stones.129 These differences found in the Targums suggest that Josephus may have been accustomed to hearing more than one stone described on the shoulders of the ephod.

The sardonyxes each have six names of the sons of Jacob engraved on them, in Hebrew, with the older sons' names found on the right side (3. 166). The order of the names in the Biblical record

127 Thackeray seems to be incorrect in his translation that treats ἔπομίδα as the subject: "The epomis is buckled on to the shoulders by two sardonyxes," which leaves the impression that the sardonyxes are part of the security of the epomis. More exactly, accepting the accusative case of ἔπομίδα, it seems that Josephus is saying that the sardonyxes are fitted on the epomis at the shoulders. They are fastened to the ephod, which has been woven in one piece. Cf. note 92. Wevers notes that the Hebrew name for the two stones ἀπε, "has been variously identified in the Greek tradition. In Exod A [i.e. the first part of the Tabernacle narrative], the gem is mentioned three times and is rendered differently each time. In 25: 6 σαρδίου; in 28: 9 by σμαράγδου; and in 28: 20 by βηρύλλιου. Josephus, it may be noted, chooses here his own equivalent.


129 SP is the same as MT.
is kατὰ τὰς γενέσεις αὐτῶν, "according to their birth" (LXX and MT Exod. 28: 10). Since the right hand side was the position of honor, Josephus infers that the six older sons' names were engraved there.

Josephus tells of the twelve stones fixed on the breastpiece of the ephod in much the same way as Exodus 28: 17-19 (3. 166). But, whereas the Bible merely names the twelve kinds of stones, Josephus suggests that these are more than ordinary precious stones. "Twelve stones were pressed (ἐπίσας) on the ἐσοχν of extraordinary size and beauty, of a sort not acquired by men, being of excessive value" (3. 166). Josephus adds the explanation that "They were applied to the fabric with gold wire (χρυσός... τὰς ἔλικας), being put together in such a way that they would not fall out" (3. 167). On each stone was engraved the name of one of the sons of Jacob (3.169). The four rows of stones in the ἐσοχν, as Josephus lists them, are, with slight changes in the form of the words, the same as in LXX, though each row does not have all three stones in the same order.130

130 Cf. the chart in Professor Feldman's "Prolegomena," to M.R. James' translation of The Biblical Antiquities of Philo (New York: Ktav, 1971), p. cxiii, which compares the Hebrew, LXX and Philo's Allegorical Interpretation 1.81, Josephus in War 5.234 and Ant. 3.168, Revelation 21: 19, Midrash Shemoth Rabbah 38: 8, and Pseudo-Philo's Biblical Antiquities. Cf. also Saul Lieberman's discussion in Greek in Jewish Palestine, pp. 56-58. On p. 59 he notes that in the Midrash Shemoth Rabbah, "The rabbis drew from an old Greek translation of the Bible which widely diverged from the Septuagint." In War 5. 234-35, Josephus uses the form of five of the LXX words that he changes in Ant. 3. 168. In War, in row two, rather than ἀνθράκα, he has ἀμέθυστος, and ἱασσής rather than ἱαστί; in row three he has ἀλάμουρον instead of λίγυρος, and ἀμέθυστος rather than ἀμέθυστος; and in row four he has χρυσάλιδος rather than χρυσάλιδες, for a discussion of the Hebrew and Greek names of these stones, cf. Wevers, Notes on the Greek Exodus, pp. 452-53. Josephus' order in Ant. 3. 168 compared with LXX order is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LXX</th>
<th>Josephus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>σαφράνυξ</td>
<td>τόπαξος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀνθράκα</td>
<td>ἱαστίν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λίγυρος</td>
<td>ἀμέθυστος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χρυσάλιδες</td>
<td>ἄνεξ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>σαφράνυξ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>σάρμαχος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>σάρμαχος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>σάρμαχος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>σάρμαχος</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In order to impress the reader with the size of the stones on the breast piece of the ephod, Josephus describes a supplement to the support system of the ἐσσην (3. 170) which goes beyond the Bible, but seems to derive from MT 28: 27/39:20. This support consisted of two gold rings, larger than the rings at the four corners of the ἐσσην, sewn at the hem (τῇ πεζη) of the neck, to which were connected gold chains. These were entwined with gold cords which passed over the shoulders, connecting to another gold ring sewn to the hem at the back of the ephod (3. 170). This last ring is added by Josephus, where the Bible has "belt" (ψην).

Finally, Josephus, reflecting MT Exod. 28: 8,131 describes a belt (ζωνη) at the lower part of the ephod, made of the colors already described (scarlet, blue, purple and fine linen) together with gold. Here MT uses a different word (ψην) from the word for the belt (μβασι) of the tunic (38: 4), while Josephus uses the same word for both. Since LXX does not mention this element of the ephod, it is reasonable to assume that Josephus has in mind the Hebrew text here. Targums Neofiti and Onkelos also use the same word (הנמה) in both places.

This belt, Josephus adds, passes around the priest and is tied again at the place where the ἐσσην is sewn to the ephod, and the remainder of the belt hangs to the side. He does not state on which side of the body the belt hangs. Though the Biblical text describes no

L X X

|- σάρδιον | τοπάζιον | σμαραγδός |
|- ἄνθραξ | σάπφειρος | ήλιος |
|- λιγύριον | ἀχάτης | ἀμέθυστος |
|- χρυσόλιθος | βηρύλλον | ὄνυχιον |

131 The parallel citation is in MT 39:20.
tassels on this belt, Josephus declares that golden reeds (χρύσεαι σύριγγες) at the end of the belt gathered in all the tassels (θυσάνους).

Josephus' description of the High Priest's turban adds to the simple account of MT Exod. 28: 36-37; 39: 30-31/ LXX 28: 32-33. It assumes the description of the ordinary priests' πίλος mentioned earlier (3. 157-58), to which was added the features unique to the High Priest's turban. The added element was apparently another πίλος of blue embroidery (ἔτερος ἐξ ὑακίνθου πεποικιλμένος), surrounded by a forged three-tiered gold crown (περιέρχεται δὲ στέφανος χρύσεος ἐπὶ τριστίχιαν κεκαλκεμένος). Though Exodus makes no mention of such a crown, Philo describes the gold plate "as though it was fashioned into a crown," ὡσανεὶ στέφανος ἐδημιουργεῖτο (Life of Moses 2. 114).

At the end of his botanical excursus on the σακχάρον, Josephus states briefly that the gold band (τελαμών δ᾽ ἐστὶ χρύσεος, cf. LXX 28: 32 πέταλον χρυσοῦ καθαρὸν) was inscribed with the sacred letters by which God is referred to, i.e., the tetragrammaton (3. 178).

The gold plate on the High Priest's turban as the Bible explains it, bears the inscription (MT Exod. 28: 36/LXX 36: 32), νησιν ψηρ, Ἀγίασμα Κυρίου, "Holy to the Lord." MT and LXX are the same. Josephus (3.178) states that the plate was engraved with the letters of the name of God (γράμματα τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν προσηγορίαν). Philo calls this inscription "four incisions having a name which only those whose ears and tongues are purified may hear or speak in the

---

132 Rashi describes the plate "as a sort of cap on the mitre."
133 Rashi explained that the plate was two-fingers wide, extending on the forehead from ear to ear. Rashi, Exodus, p. 357.
134 Cf. also War 5.235.
holy place, and no other person, nor in any other place at all." In describing the tetragrammaton, Philo shows that he is acquainted with the four Hebrew characters, ויהי.

Philo may well be Josephus' model here. Josephus added feature, the crown of gold, is from Philo. Josephus adds his own detail in stating that the crown was three-tiered.

It may be that Josephus added the "three-tiered" as a red herring to disguise the fact that Philo was his source. On the other hand, Josephus may here be quite deliberately drawing upon Philo's mystical insight.

What is the source of Josephus' three-tiered crown? It may be that Josephus is writing of this special part of the High Priest's turban, influenced by Philo, who found mystical Divine symbolism in the number three. Philo wrote that "in order that mind may perceive God the ministering Powers appear to be existing along with him, and as it were they make an apparition of three instead of one." Philo goes on here to write: "The spiritual eyes of the virtuous man are awake and see... and having become an eye, he begins to see the sovereign, holy and divine vision in such a way that the single appearance appears as a triad, and the triad as a unity." Josephus, in effect, gave witness to his "spiritual understanding as a

---


136 Josephus uses the term ῥιστικ(parser error) elsewhere only in Ant. 8. 136, where he tells of the stones in King Solomon's palace. There he cites the three-tiered arrangement of the stones as an indication of its beauty.

137 Philo, Questions and Answers on Genesis IV, 2. Cf. Goodenough, By Light, Light, pp. 33-47.

138 Philo, Questions and Answers on Genesis IV, 2.
virtuous man," to use Philo's terminology, by perceiving a three-tiered crown where Philo saw only a single crown, at the place where the sacred Name was inscribed. There is nothing specific in what Josephus writes to allow one to affirm apodictically that he intends any such mystical symbolism to the High Priest's three-tiered crown. But the correspondence between the Biblical description of the golden plate, Philo's addition of the crown, together with what Philo wrote about the mystical pertinence of the number three elsewhere, and Josephus' changes to the Biblical description of the golden plate on the High Priest's turban, is very suggestive that Josephus' was influenced by Philo. Since the subject of this inquiry is the High Priest's vestments, rather than Josephus' understanding of botany, I shall omit comment on the curious botanical excursus Josephus makes on the σακχάρον, whose calyx, he writes, resembles the top of the High Priest's turban (3. 172-178).  

In his description of the vestments of the priests, Josephus displays an awareness of the Hebrew and Greek texts of Scripture. He reflects an acquaintance with Philo. And he permits himself a latitude found also in the Rabbinic literature. It is safe to say that Josephus paraphrases the Biblical material within the range of paraphrasis found already in other contemporary Jewish literature.

139 Cf. Thackeray's notes f, g, and h to §172. Cf. also Weil's note 1, p.183.
Chapter V

CONCLUDING DETAILS CONCERNING THE TABERNACLE

In Ant. 3.179-207, Josephus gives thumbnail sketches of various concluding details, Biblical and extrabiblical, pertinent to his picture of the ancient Tabernacle.

The Symbolism of the Tabernacle

Sections 179-187 summarize elements of the symbolism in the Tabernacle and the priestly vestments. Here Josephus finishes his explanations of the symbolism to be found in the Tabernacle and priestly vestments that he began in the body of his Tabernacle account. The symbolism Josephus finds in the Tabernacle fits, in whole and in its parts, into the cosmological order, which he saw to be in conformity with the order set forth in the laws of Moses. But, as Harold Attridge has noted, Josephus was not consistent in this view throughout his writings.

Attridge remarked, following Adolf Schlatter, that "'nature' was presupposed in the thinking of Josephus as an objective force, which governed the conduct of men, and with which the Mosaic law is in conformity." But, Attridge writes, "in the first half of the Antiquities as in all of the corpus, there is a wide variety of usages, which indicates a lack of any systematic reflection on the subject." In Ant. 1.24, Attridge noted, "Josephus had claimed that the law of Moses is

---


2 Attridge, The Interpretation of Biblical History in the Antiquitates Judaicae of Flavius Josephus, p. 141.
in conformity with nature," a thesis Josephus developed further in outlining the symbolism of the Tabernacle.  

But sometimes Josephus argues as though nature is "a force which can act in an undesirable way." "The Mosaic law is in direct opposition to φύσις understood in this sense." One clear example of this contrary influence of nature is found in the Tabernacle section, where Josephus notes that Moses wanted to be the High Priest, "from that self love (φιλαυτος) that is innate (φύσει) in all" (3.190). But Moses was not to be the High Priest. His natural inclination in this instance was contrary to God's will. God directed him to choose his brother, Aaron (3.191-92).

What was the source(s) of Josephus' thinking about the Tabernacle's symbolism? Sandmel writes that "Philo alludes to having heard the interpretations he gives from 'natural philosophers,'" and that "it seems reasonable that in part Philo was a legatee of a method already in existence among some Jews." But Daniélou has expressed the view that Philo began this particular cosmic interpretation of the Tabernacle Josephus was

---

3Ibid., p. 141.
4Ibid., p. 142. Attridge notes that in 4.193, Josephus remarked on the need for laws "lest through ignorance of the better way your nature should incline you to the worse."
heir to this tradition. He may have encountered it in his formative years in Palestine, and in so far as he had a place in the Jewish community at Rome. This latter fellowship, however, among the Jews living in Rome may not have been great, because he was hardly beloved by his fellow Jews after the Jotapata incident. Josephus nowhere indicates that he had any contact with the Jewish community in Rome.

Some of the significances that Josephus perceives are clearly parallel to symbolisms Philo explained, which may lead to the inference that Philo was his source. Indeed, in the *Life of Moses* 2. 71-158, *Questions and Answers on Exodus* 2. 51 ff, in *The Special Laws* 1.66-78, and, as I have noted in note 6 above, *Who is the Heir*, Philo wrote of the Tabernacle with a special interest in the symbolism he found there, narratives that would have later been available to Josephus as he wrote of the Tabernacle in the *Antiquities*. I shall develop this correlation between Philo and Josephus more, shortly.7


7
But Philo is not the only source Josephus may have had, nudging him in the direction of looking for broader significance in the Tabernacle and priestly attire. Craig Koester observes that the author of the apocryphal Wisdom of Solomon, who was a contemporary of Philo, also reflected on the meaning of the Tabernacle. There is an echo, in the Wisdom of Solomon, of the idea, found in Josephus, that the laws of the Jews reflect "God's laws," in the broader sense that seems to include the laws of nature. It would seem that Josephus does not have the fascination with wisdom found in the Wisdom of Solomon. The author of the Wisdom of Solomon is not interested in the allegorical significance or symbolism of the Tabernacle or Temple.

The Biblical Antiquities of Pseudo-Philo was another work having to do with the ancient heritage of his people which Josephus may have read, since, as Professor Feldman has written, it "was composed in the latter half of the first century, making it somewhat older than Josephus' Antiquities, which was issued in 93/94." 8

---

8 Ibid., pp. 63-64.

9 Wisdom's laws are not necessarily the same as nature's laws. Cf. Wisdom 6: 18, where following "wisdom's laws" "is assurance of immortality, and immortality brings one near to God." But in 9: 14 the anonymous author says, "The reasoning of mortals is worthless, and our designs are likely to fail," which suggests the futility of "natural wisdom." In 13: 1, "All men who [are] ignorant of God [are] foolish by nature; and they [are] unable from the good things that are seen to know him who exists." But (13: 5) "from the greatness and beauty of created things comes a corresponding perception of their Creator." 10

With regard to the Tabernacle narrative, it is of interest to note that the author of the Biblical Antiquities also differs from MT and LXX in the number of the census. But here, as we shall see, Josephus' number differs from the number of the census found in Biblical Antiquities. The varying numbers found in the Biblical account, Josephus, and Biblical Antiquities may indicate that the Biblical texts read by the two non-Biblical writers were not the same as the texts that are extant today.

As I have observed, Josephus' thinking about the Tabernacle was often along the same line as Philo's. But, Josephus does not follow Philo's example slavishly in proposing the meaning of elements of the Tabernacle and vestments. Josephus does not write of all the same elements of the Tabernacle as Philo, and when he does write about the same elements, his explanation of the significance is scarcely developed at all. Philo's symbolism arises out of his broader allegorical interpretation of Scripture.

Swansong of Eden," JJS 31 (1980), 190), to after the second century, or even as late as the fourth century ("Erwägungen zu Pseudo-Philos Quellen und Zeit," JSS 11 (1980), 38-52).

While noting the basic difference between Josephus' Ant. and Pseudo-Philo's Biblical Antiquities, in that the former wrote a history, while the latter wrote more in the style of midrash, Feldman discovers thirty parallels between the two that are not found in any other extant work and Josephus, and fifteen cases where the two may reflect a common tradition. "Josephus' Jewish Antiquities and Pseudo-Philo's Biblical Antiquities," p. 61.

There is a clear difference between Philo's allegory and the allegory of the Greeks who applied this method of interpretation to the ancient poets. Whereas, as E.R. Goodenough has written, for Philo "the real was the immaterial," and the material world "relatively unreal." (An Introduction to Philo Judaeus, second edition (New York: Barnes & Noble, Inc., 1962), p. 134.), his allegories were written of a body of Scripture that he accepted as a record of actual events, rather than as a complete fabrication of myth, as were the poems of Homer and Hesiod. J. Tate has written of Cornutus, a Stoic cotemporary of Josephus, that he considered Homer and Hesiod heirs 'to many and varied myths concerning the gods' (πολλὰς καὶ ποικίλας περὶ θεῶν μυθοποιίας), "undertaken by those who were older and wiser than they. These
Josephus never engaged in full-fledged allegorical interpretations; his perception of other significance in various aspects of the Tabernacle and priestly vestments may not, in fact, warrant being called "allegories." Josephus used the verb ἀλληγορέω only once (Ant. 1.24), and the noun ἀλληγορία only once (Apion 2.255). His suggestions of the significance of elements of the Tabernacle account are terse; his hints are left unexplained. It is almost as if Josephus is giving token acknowledgement to a kind of interpretation that he needs to show acquaintance with if he is to be considered a sophisticated writer.13

As Philo's allegory unfolded, he explained wide-ranging symbolism in the Tabernacle that Josephus did not find; for example, Philo "identified the tabernacle and its furnishings with the soul several times."14

pre-Homeric philosophers gave a mythical expression to sound doctrine; they were, indeed, 'no ordinary men, but able to understand the nature of the universe, and given to philosophizing concerning it in symbols and enigmas. But in this praise the poets [Homer and Hesiod] have no part. Blind to the deeper meaning of the myths, they regarded them as mere romances. . . Consequently they have transmitted to us only fragments of the original allegories devised by the ancient philosophers." "Cornutus and the Poets," CQ 23 (1929), 41. But Philo held no brief against the writings of Moses, as Cornutus, Josephus' contemporary, held against Homer and Hesiod. For Philo, "the true mystery had been revealed by Moses in both cryptic story and Jewish rite. . . his loyalty to Jewish law and people he takes for granted." Yet, "he is trying like the Greeks to show that traditional legend and rite have their true meaning only when they are made a typological revelation of the mystic path from man to God (p. 140). Daniélou perceives that Philo inaugurated a new interpretation of the Tabernacle, subsequently reflected in the New Testament Epistle to the Hebrews,

13 Seth Schwartz calls attention to Carl Holladay's wry remark (Theios Aner in Hellenistic Judaism [Missoula: Scholar's Press, 1977], p. 86, note 262) that in AJ 3, "If Josephus is engaging in allegory at all, it is at the most elementary level." Josephus and Judean Politics, p. 42, note 70.

14 Koester, The Dwelling of God, pp. 65-66. E.g. Life of Moses 2.83, where the sanctuary is likened to δ νοος, and the court to το ρο οιδητου. Cf. also Questions and Answers on Exodus 2.51, 53, 54, 55.
Philo's perception of wide-ranging symbolism was a function of his persistent use of the allegorical method of interpreting Scripture.\textsuperscript{15} The Jews inherited the allegorical method of interpreting Scripture from the Stoics' allegorical interpretation of Homer and Hesiod.\textsuperscript{16} This inheritance was possible because the allegorical method was compatible with the Jewish approach to their Scriptures. Wolfson has observed that "The readiness with which Philo, and by the same token also his predecessors among Hellenistic Jews, adopted the allegorical interpretation was facilitated by the fact that in Jewish tradition the Jew was not bound to take his Scripture literally."\textsuperscript{17}

There was a key difference between Philo's allegory, and the significance that Josephus perceived in various parts of the Tabernacle. Philo's attempt to explain the "immaterial" reality was like J. Tate's description of Anaxagoras in the fifth century B.C.E., who explained that in the poetry of Homer, the real "subject [was] virtue

\textsuperscript{15}Cf. Sandmel, \textit{Philo of Alexandria}, pp. 17-28. Sandmel notes, for example, with respect to Philo's interpretation of Cain and Abel, that "What Philo has done in his allegorical interpretation has been to make Cain and Abel types of human beings who are to be found in every age and every place. So, throughout his writings, he transforms biblical characters, or biblical place-names, into universal types of people, or universal characteristics of mankind" (p. 18).

\textsuperscript{16}Ibid., p. 19-21. Cf. J. Tate, "The Beginnings of Greek Allegory," CR XLI, 6 (Dec., 1927), 214-15, where the author traces the origins of allegory to Pherecydes of Syros (b.ca. 600 B.C.E.), mentioned by Celsus in Origen's \textit{Contra Celsum} VI. 42, as saying that Zeus' words to Hera (\textit{Iliad} XV. 18), "are the words of God to matter." Cf. also the brief article, "Greek Allegory," by J. Tate in the \textit{Oxford Classical Dictionary} (Oxford: University Press, 1949), 45-46.

\textsuperscript{17}Harry Austryn Wolfson, \textit{Philo} (2 vols. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1948), I, 133. Wolfson continues to say: "What is known in Judaism as the Oral Law meant freedom of interpretation of the scriptural text, whether dealing with some legal precept or some historical event or some theological doctrine."
and justice." Of particular heroes in Homer's epics, he wrote, "Agamemnon was aither, Achilles the sun, Helen the earth, Paris air, Demeter the liver, Dionysus the spleen, and Apollo the gall." Similarly, though not in exactly the same way, for Philo, as Goodenough has written, "The furniture of the tabernacle became cosmic elements and astral bodies... the great personalities of the Torah were... men and women who had transcended human nature and who became the Logos and Sophia." Yet for Philo, who was more a philosopher than a historian, the historical Tabernacle was not without importance in itself.

Josephus, however, never gives the impression that when he proposes that "the partition of the tabernacle was an imitation of universal nature" (3.123), that the physical, historical Tabernacle is essentially to be understood in mystical terms. The brief asides he makes on the significance of the Tabernacle's parts never eclipse the historical reality of the ancient Tabernacle. The candelabrum, for Josephus (3. 146), had seven lamps that "were reminiscent of the number of planets" (τῶν πλανητῶν τῶν ἀριθμῶν μεμιμημένων). But the candelabrum did not need this reminder of the planets to have a significance. Its significance was essentially in that Moses had commanded it to be made. The only association between the planets and the branches of the candelabrum that seems significant to Josephus, both here and in 3. 183, is found in the number seven. Josephus nods, as it were, to the Hellenistic interest in the planets in

---

18 Tate, "Plato and Allegorical Interpretation," CQ XXIII (1929), 142.
19 Ibid., pp. 142-43.
20 An Introduction to Philo Judaeus, p. 140.
order to create a bridge of interest for his non-Jewish reader. As I shall show, this sparse correspondence between elements in the tabernacle and their correspondent in nature holds true for other aspects of the Tabernacle account. One wonders why Josephus did not specifically refer to the arboreal significance of the candelabrum as well as the celestial.

Philo and Josephus were alike in that when they wrote of other significances than the literal, they did not deny the literal, historical, significance of the Tabernacle and priestly paraphernalia. The twelve loaves were not eclipsed in any way as simply twelve loaves on the table in the sanctuary when Josephus proposed that "by placing upon the table the twelve loaves, he [Moses] signifies (ἀποσημώνει) that the year is divided into as many months."21 Likewise, for Philo the meaning of the parts of the high priest's vestments did not do away with the fact that they were part of the priest's attire.22

Wolfson writes that "The Palestinian rabbis of that time, unlike Philo, happened to have no acquaintance with the literature of Greek philosophy, and consequently they did not interpret Scripture in terms of Greek philosophy; but they interpreted it in terms of something else which they did happen to know, the accumulated wisdom of ages, their own practical experience and speculative meditations, the urging necessities of changed conditions of life, the

21 Anit. 3.181.
22 Life of Moses 2.117 ff, Philo describes the violet gown as "an image of the air," and the flower trimming at the end of the skirt of the robe represented the earth, etc, but they were no less real for signifying other things.
call of an ever-growing moral conscience, and undoubtedly also repercussions of all kinds of foreign lore. The main thing is that by the time of Philo [and Josephus], the principle was already established in native Judaism that one is not bound to take every scriptural text literally."²³ The notion that the rabbis had no acquaintance with the literature of Greek philosophy has been refuted by Judah Bergmann and others.²⁴

Sandmel notes that "the Rabbinic literature speaks of two types of interpreters, 'expounders of sealed-up matters' and 'expounders of difficult matters.'"²⁵ Josephus inherited this tradition. He had more intimate contact with the Palestinian rabbis than with Philo, whom he knew, it would appear, only through his writings.

Josephus was not preoccupied with the allegorical method as Philo was, even though he had a tangential interest in symbolism, reflecting his heritage in the Hellenistic-Jewish tradition.²⁶

²³Philo I, 134-35. Supporting this view is Saul Lieberman, in "How much Greek in Jewish Palestine?" in Alexander Altmann, editor, Philip W. Lown Institute of Advanced Judaic Studies, Brandeis University: Studies and Texts, vol. 1: Biblical and Other Studies (Cambridge: University Press, 1963), 123-141. In a personal note, Professor Feldman has written: "Inasmuch as there we have no rabbinic literature in written form until the end of the second century C.E. (the Mishnah), it is hard to be sure that this principle was well established, unless, as I tend to believe, the traditions are much older than the time when they were reduced to writing."

²⁴"Die stoische Philosophie und die jüdischen Frömmigkeit," Judaica: Festschrift Hermann Cohen (Berlin, 1912), 143-166. See also Henry A. Fischel, Rabbinic Literature and Greco-Roman Philosophy (Leiden: Brill, 1973), and his Essays in Greco-Roman and Related Talmudic Literature (New York, 1977). Cf. also David Daube's article, "Rabbinic Methods of Interpretation and Hellenistic Rhetoric," HUCA 22 (1949), 239-264, where the author cites prior classical parallels to the interpretive rules (middoth) of Rabbi Hillel.

²⁵Sandmel, Philo of Alexandria, p. 21.

²⁶It is immediately evident from reading Ginzberg's listing of the numerous other Jewish statements of symbolism to be found in the Tabernacle and priestly vestments (Legends of the Jews, III, 165-167; VI, 62-63, e.g. Shu'aib. Terumah 36b-36c which explains that the Tabernacle is symbolic of the human
did not simply reproduce Philo's explanations of the symbolism found in the Tabernacle; furthermore, he wrote of the significance of elements in the Tabernacle narrative that Philo did not mention.

There may be more than one reason why Josephus does not reflect Philo more. First, to be sure, Josephus was a proud man, not inclined to show that he was beholden to anyone in retelling the Scriptural story of his ancestors. Josephus never mentioned the names of Aristobulus or Eupolemus, or of any other Hellenistic-Jewish historian either, though it seems clear that they antedated him by at least a century. Professor Rajak has observed that Josephus viewed himself "as the only man alive with sufficient grasp both of Judaism and of Greek to have produced the [Antiquities]." 27 Thus Josephus no doubt disguised his dependence on Philo by deliberately omitting to write of symbolism that Philo discussed in Life of Moses, and by discovering significances that Philo somehow failed to adduce.

Second, Josephus may not have understood Philo. Philo was not from one of the αἱρέσεις he claimed, in his Life (10), to have studied. 28 Furthermore, Philo's allegorical interpretation of Scripture body), that Josephus' interest in symbolism was not unique to him and Philo. As Hengel has noted (Judaism and Hellenism I, 165), before Philo, the second-century B.C.E. Jewish philosopher, Aristobulus, took the allegorical interpretation of myth used by the Stoics, and applied allegory as an interpretive device to the Jewish Scriptures. Allegory observes the other meanings in the obvious. Observable things become symbols for what cannot be seen.

27 Tessa Rajak, "Flavius Josephus: Jewish History and the Greek World," I, 188. She cites Josephus' remark in Ant. 20.263, "no one else, either Jew or gentile, would have been equal to the task, however willing to undertake it, of issuing so accurate a treatise as this for the Greek world."

28 There is no evidence as to whether Philo was attached to one of the sects. Sandmel has written of Philo's consistency with "Platonic and Stoic dualism." Philo of Alexandria, p. 54. The ideas of both Philo and Josephus, as I
was abstruse and developed into a system, that was, in Sandmel's words, "quite beyond the random, disparate individual allegorical items found in Josephus or the ancient Rabbis."29 It may be conjectured that Josephus' Antiquities was a historical rather than philosophical work, and that he intended to write more philosophically when describing the "customs and causes" in his proposed work on this subject. There is not much evidence to suggest that Josephus was biding his time to show himself as a philosopher. Ludwig Wächter would seem to be on target in referring to Josephus as an "educated story teller," rather than a "philosophical thinker."30

Since Josephus did not restrain himself from proposing the moral significance of his people's history, he might as easily have found occasion to explain allegorical significance, if he understood

have already noted, bear certain resemblances to Stoicism; Josephus observed that his chosen sect of the Pharisees was similar to the Stoics (Life 12). But Philo's resemblance to the Stoics did not thereby define him as a Pharisee. He more resembled the Saducess than the Pharisees. Goodenough has written that Philo was in harmony with the Saducess in repudiating the Pharisaic doctrine of predestination. He kept the doctrine of providence while rejecting determinism. Like the Sadducees, he also denied the resurrection of the body. Furthermore, "Philo knows nothing of such [i.e. the Pharisaic] angelology; his angels are only δυνάμεις of God, and not of a sort remotely to provoke or admit individual mythological elaboration. He could not possibly have made room for a literal Gabriel or Michael in his thinking, and allegorized away all resemblance of the Cherubim to that Palestinian tradition which seems to have been accepted and developed by the Pharisees." Goodenough goes on to admit, however, that "Our evidence for them [i.e. the Sadducees] is so slight that it is impossible to prove that Philo was in any sense influenced by them. But it is at least striking that Philo agrees with every one of the positions they are known to have taken, while if he was possibly not of priestly family he was at least of the same general social class to which they made their appeal." By Light, Light, pp. 79-80.

this significance. He did not hesitate to propose that various parts of
the Tabernacle and priestly attire had other significance than the
sacred.

Third, the very limitations of doing research in Josephus' day,
may have limited his greater use of Philo. The awkwardness of
pursuing Philo's discussion of the significance of the Tabernacle
through his various works, when they were in scroll form, without
page numbers, and unindexed, would have inhibited him
considerably. Perhaps Josephus used the sections of Philo's Life of
Moses, or Who is the Heir, or Questions and Answers on Exodus that
he could keep unrolled at the time he was writing the Tabernacle
section of the Antiquities. The mental weariness accompanying the
comparison of various of Philo's works under these conditions may
have contributed to Josephus' lack of productivity, who, as Professor
Feldman has noted, "wrote an average of about ten lines of Greek a
day" as he wrote the Antiquities.31

It appears that Josephus used Philo's Life of Moses more than
he did the rest of Philo's writings.32 It most deals with the subjects

31Professor Feldman has written that "inasmuch as he spent at least a
dozen years writing the Antiquities, living on an imperial pension and, so far
as we know, without having any additional duties or responsibilities, he wrote
an average of about ten lines of Greek a day." "Introduction," Josephus, the
Bible, and History, p. 17.

32The special pertinence of Philo's Life of Moses to Josephus, if this
was in fact the case, may be traced to Philo's expressed reason for writing
about Moses early in Book 1. There he writes of his purpose in words that
could very plausibly be dubbed into the mouth of Josephus: "While the fame of
the laws which he left behind him has travelled throughout the civilized
world and reached the ends of the earth, the man himself as he really was is
known to few Greek men of letters have refused to treat him as worthy of
memory, possibly through envy, and also because in many cases the
ordinances of the legislators of the different states are opposed to his... I will
disregard their malice (βασκαίνοντες Life of Moses 1, 2). cf. Apion 1.72 where
Josephus refers to the Jews' enemies he is addressing as oî βασκαίνοντες.
Josephus was interested in as he composed the Tabernacle narrative: the grandeur of Moses, and the wonder of the ancient Israelite Tabernacle. Indeed, Philo's description of how he composed this work resembles closely what Josephus did as well, not only in describing Moses, but in his narrative throughout the *Antiquities*.  

Fourth, Josephus may have disguised Philo's influence on him in order to seem to rely entirely on the Bible as his source. As Per Bilde has noted, Josephus' "main purpose with Ant. was to present the ancient history of the Jews to the Greco-Roman public," as he found it in the Jewish Scriptures. Josephus repeated the affirmation numerous times, that he based his writing on the Jewish Scriptures. To copy Philo conspicuously would have taken away from his design of making the Scriptures appear to be his source. As Professor

---

33I will "tell the story of Moses as I have learned it, both from the sacred books, the wonderful monuments of his wisdom which he has left behind him, and from some of the elders of the nation; for I always interwove what I was told with what I read, and thus believed myself to have a closer knowledge than others of his life's history" (Ibid., 1.4).

34Per Bilde, *Flavius Josephus Between Jerusalem and Rome: His Life, His Works, and their Importance* (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, Ltd., 1988), p. 93. NB Josephus' affirmation in Ant. 1.17 that he is "neither adding nor omitting anything from the details of the scriptures; echoed in 2.347, "I have recounted each detail here told just as I found it in the sacred books;", and 4.196, "All is here written as he left it: nothing have we added for the sake of embellishment, nothing which has not been bequeathed by Moses. Our one innovation has been to classify the several subjects; for he left what he wrote in a scattered condition, just as he received each several instruction from God." and 9.208, "I have promised to give an exact account of our history, I have though it necessary to recount what I have found written in the Hebrew books. . ."; and 9.214, "I have recounted his story as I found it written down." and 10. 218, "I safeguarded myself against those who might find something wanting in my narrative or find fault with it, and said that I was only translating the books of the Hebrews into the Greek tongue, promising to report their contents without adding anything of my own to the narrative or omitting anything therefrom;" and 20.261, "I have further noted without error. . . all as recorded by the Holy Scriptures. For this was what I promised to do at the beginning of my history;" and *Apion* 1.1 "That history [Ant.] was written by me in Greek on the basis of our sacred books."
Feldman has noted, Josephus may have expected that his readers were acquainted with Philo's writings, while not being acquainted with the developing midrashic traditions that he drew upon.\footnote{This remark comes from a personal communication from Dr. Feldman.}

What was the principle of selection Josephus used in choosing the symbolism in elements of the Tabernacle narrative? He may not have had a principle of selection. Josephus omits mention of some elements of the Tabernacle furniture, in his concluding section on symbolism, that were very significant. Some elements that Josephus overlooks were important for Philo in writing the \textit{Life of Moses}. For example, Philo wrote that the ark was a symbol of "the gracious power of God."\footnote{\textit{Life of Moses} 2.96.} Certainly it would seem that the ark was important enough for Josephus to remark on its significance, but he did not do so. Philo explained that the cherubim signified God's creative and royal power;\footnote{Ibid. 2. 99.} the altar of incense was "a symbol of the thankfulness for earth and water;"\footnote{Ibid., 2.101.} the great altar in the court signified the intentions of those who sacrificed;\footnote{Ibid., 2. 106.} the laver, made of the mirrors and jewelry of the women, was a symbol of the blameless life,\footnote{Ibid., 2. 138.} and it signified the desire of the women who did the weaving of the hangings to see into themselves to find inward purity;\footnote{The Migration of Abraham. 97-99.} and the "flower patterns (\\text{\v{y}thv\v{a}}) [rather than pomegranates] and bells on the
end of the robe of the High Priest were "symbols of qualities recognized by the senses and tested by sight and hearing."{42}

Why did Josephus omit the symbolism of these items of the Tabernacle furniture? One can only surmise that he chose to mention certain elements of the Tabernacle furniture that served his apologetic purpose of catching the imagination of his pagan readers. Altars were common enough, and Philo’s subtle symbolism was presumably not useful to his purpose. The cherubim were somewhat of an embarrassment to Josephus, as we have noted from his failure to mention the embroidering of cherubim in the tapestry covering the Tabernacle, because they were the forms of living creatures.{43} He either had a reason for omitting each item he neglected, or he simply forgot about them as he wrote. Josephus was not always systematic.

But there were elements in the Tabernacle whose significance was useful in his apologetic enterprise.

Symbolism in the Earlier Tabernacle Narrative

I have already had occasion to comment on the symbolism Josephus saw in the Tabernacle in discussing elements of the Tabernacle’s layout, its furniture, and the priestly vestments. In these cases, Josephus often implies symbolism, rather than specifically calling the attention of the reader to particularly

{42}Ibid., 103.

{43}Professor Feldman has noted several other examples of Josephus simply omitting embarrassing (or problematic) elements in the Biblical narrative. For example, when in Joshua we read the words "as it is to this day" (8: 28), or "unto this day" (9: 27), Josephus omits introducing the troublesome inference that what is written is not an eye-witness account by not reproducing these words (cf. Ant. 5.47, 57, 61). "Josephus's Portrait of Joshua." HTR 82, 4 (1989), 371-72.
symbolic elements of the Tabernacle. In the Tabernacle narrative, Josephus never uses the noun σύμβολον. Neither does he use the verb ἀποσημαίνω in his discussion of the symbolism of the Tabernacle until 3.181, when he sets out explicitly to demonstrate symbolism per se.\(^\text{44}\) Then, from 3.181 to 185 he uses this verb five times. This use of ἀποσημαίνω, following the introduction to the last section found in 3.179-180, marks this special attention to explaining the meaning of significant elements of the Tabernacle.

It is useful to review some of the previous incidences of implicit symbolism in the body of the narrative. In 3.115, Josephus remarks that the Tabernacle faced eastward so that the sun might shine its dawn rays into it. Here, as I observed above, Josephus' intent was to do something more than to describe the entry-way. The entry of the sun's rays symbolized the presence of God in the Tabernacle. The prophet Ezekiel, as I have observed above, \(^\text{45}\) seemed to see a like significance in this correlation between the rising sun and the orientation of his idealized Temple, as did the rabbis, \(^\text{46}\) and the Therapeutai of whom Philo wrote. \(^\text{47}\) Those early

\(^{44}\) Josephus uses ἀποσημαίνω often, though only in Ant. Rengstorf, Concordance I, 206-207.

\(^{45}\) Cf. the excursus entitled "Josephus and Ezekiel" in chapter two above (p.84).

\(^{46}\) Cf. the section entitled "The Tabernacle entrance" in chapter two above, in which I allude to M. Berakoth 9: 4.

\(^{47}\) Cf. Philo, The Contemplative Life IX (89). Martin Hengel observes that "The daily evening and morning prayer of the Essenes and Therapeutae were not a cultic veneration of the sun but were made in praise of God as the Lord of creation and of the course of history; the interest in the sun which can without doubt be detected was a result of ligt symbolism, which was promoted for dualistic reasons." Judaism and Hellenism, I, 246. Cf. II, 166, note 878, which calls attention to 1QS 10.10 for the Essenes', and On the Contemplative Life, 37, for the Therapeutae's interest in the sun in their morning and evening prayers.
rays of the sun had sacred significance not only to Ezekiel and the Therapeutai, but also to those among Josephus' readers who venerated the God Apollo.\footnote{Cf. the discussion relating to the Temple of Apollon in Delphi in the section entitled "The Table" in chapter three above.} Josephus undoubtedly knew of this interest in the early rays of the sun among pagan worshipers at Delphi, so that to describe the Tabernacle's eastern direction was apologetically useful in communicating with non-Jewish readers. That this was a symbolism important to Ezekiel, to the rabbis and to fellow Jews in Egypt described by Philo, allowed Josephus' observation to serve him well with Jewish readers too.

When Josephus wrote that the "height [of the Tabernacle] had to be equal to its breadth" (3.115), this symmetry to which he draws the reader's attention in a halakic addition to Scripture, is symbolic of the Tabernacle's perfection, as befits the Place inhabited by God. His remark (3.118) on the proportion of the frames in the Tabernacle accentuated this symbolic perfection (\(\alphaν\nu\delta\lambda\gammaε\iota\ \gamma\alpha\rho \ \omega\ \tau\omega\ \kappa\iota\o\nu\\nu\ \\alpha\rho\iota\theta\mu\o\varsigma\)).\footnote{Carol Meyers remarks that "every sanctuary is constituted as an imago mundi, with the cosmos as paradigmatic model." See note 19, page196, where she alludes to Mircea Eliade's \textit{The Sacred and the Profane} (New York: Harper and Row, 1961), pp. 45, 234-43, for a discussion of sacred space.} This symbolic symmetry is emphasized again in 3.123 (anticipating his more specific remark in 3.181) where Josephus describes three sections within the Tabernacle, whereas Exodus has only two.\footnote{Professor Feldman observes (in a personal note) that Josephus may here be appealing to a Greek audience, informed by its mythology that Zeus shared his powers with his brothers, so that he assumed the sky as his special sphere, while Poseidon ruled the sea and Hades (Pluto) the underworld.} He tells (3.123) the reason for this three-fold division:
"Now this partitionment of the tabernacle was an imitation of universal nature (μίμησιν τῆς τῶν ὄλων φύσεως); for the third part of it, that within the four pillars, which was inaccessible to the priests, was like heaven devoted to God, while the twenty cubits' space, even as earth and sea are accessible to men, was in like manner assigned to the priests alone"

It may be a moot point to distinguish between the function of the three parts of the Tabernacle mentioned here, and the symbolism to which Josephus calls attention in 3.181. Indeed, Josephus, in using the noun μίμησις, is pointing to the symbolism of the Tabernacle, but the foundation of this explanation is the function of the Tabernacle's rooms. Whereas in 3.123 Josephus says that the divisions of the Tabernacle were like nature in that the earth and sea (the first "two" parts) are accessible to (any) man, and the heaven (the third part) is accessible only to the priests, that is, to the men specially devoted to serving God, in 3.181 the first two sections of the Tabernacle simply signify (ἀποσιμαίνω) earth and sea, and the third, the Holy of Holies, signifies heaven. In 3.181, the issue of to whom the parts of the Tabernacle are accessible has nothing to do with their significance.

In describing the symbolism of the Holy of Holies in 3.181, he alters the explanation he used in 3.123. In 3.181 he declares that the Holy of Holies is reserved for God, whereas in 3.123 it is accessible to the priests.\footnote{51 Of course, the Holy of Holies was not accessible to the priests, but only to the High Priest, once a year, at Yom Kippur.} He made this change, I infer, in order to stress the symbolism itself, apart from the Tabernacle's function. This most holy Place stood for the presence of God. I draw this distinction only to point out that Josephus attempted something more
in his concluding section on the symbolism of the Tabernacle than he attempted in explaining the significance of elements of the Tabernacle and priestly vestments in the body of his narrative.

The reason (3.121) for the fittings that kept the frames of the Tabernacle secure against the desert winds was, it would seem, more than practical. The Tabernacle, as God's Place with His people, ought not to be seen as a tent that bends and flaps as it is buffeted by the desert winds. The term "Tabernacle," in fact, was interchangeable with "portable temple" (3.103), or simply with "temple" (3.125, 139, 142).

The colors of the coverings for the Tabernacle (3.126) were the very colors found in "every manner of flower that the earth produces." The Tabernacle, in other words, was an epitome of all God's creation.52 The reason why no animal form could be found in the ornamentation of this covering was obedience to the prohibition of the second commandment, "Thou shalt not make for yourself a graven image" (Exod. 20:4).53 Since the Tabernacle was a place of worship, the presence of even embroidered cherubim in the covering, an aspect of the Tabernacle that could be seen by all, unlike the Holy of Holies which only the High Priest saw once a year, might be mistaken by his pagan readers for objects of worship. The Holy of

---

52 Philo, in Questions and Answers on Exodus 51 writes that the deeper meaning of the sanctuary, in which God appears, is the world, in which "His beneficent powers are seen and move around in all its parts, in heaven, earth, water, air and in what is in these." In §52, Philo continues to express the idea that the pattern of the tabernacle and its vessels are "the forms of intelligible things and the measures of all things in accordance with which the world was made." In Life of Moses 2.37 Philo refers to the elements of nature as "earth, water, air, and heaven."

53 LXX Ὀ νοίωσες σεαυτῷ εἴδωλον.
Holies of the Temple in Josephus' day was empty. In a day when certain of the Jew's enemies charged that an ass's head was worshiped in the Temple, no image at all could be found there, not even cherubim.\(^5^4\)

In 3. 132 Josephus tells of the amazement expressed by those who looked at the Tabernacle from a distance. It suggested heaven to them. Here Josephus is elliptically stating that the Tabernacle was symbolic of heaven, the place of God's throne. As we observed in describing the Ark, Josephus wrote (3.137) that Moses "saw the Cherubin sculptured in bas relief on the throne of God" (τὸ θρόνον τοῦ Θεοῦ προστυπέεις). From a distance the Tabernacle appeared so beautiful that it was a symbol of heaven, but once inside, the Tabernacle was not merely a symbol of heaven, but was "transubstantiated" into heaven itself, the place of God's throne (though only symbolically still, of course).\(^5^5\) It may be noted that this

\(^5^4\)Thus Posidonious and Apollonius Molon in Apion 2.80 f. This is the same as Tacitus, who gives the canard that wild asses led the Israelites to water when they were wandering in the desert, "so that in their holy place they have consecrated an image of the animal by whose guidance they found deliverance from their long and thirsty wanderings." The History V, 4. 2, trans. by John Church and William Jackson Brodribb, ed. by Moses Hadas (New York: The Modern Library, 1942), pp. 658-59. Plutarch was acquainted with this libel. He writes in Isis and Osiris 31: "Those who relate that Typon's flight from the battle was made on the back of an ass and lasted for seven days, and that after he had made his escape, he became the father of sons, Hierosolymus and Judaeus, are manifestly, as the very names show, attempting to drag Jewish traditions into the legend." Here Plutarch seems to think this is a Jewish legend, rather than an anti-Jewish myth. NB the difference between this reservation on Josephus part and the unrestricted depiction of man- and lion-faced cherubim carved on the temple walls and doors in Ezekiel's vision (Ezek. 41: 17-25). Cf. the Excursus, "Josephus and Ezekiel" in chapter two above.

\(^5^5\)Ginzberg cites various rabbinic authorities that the Tabernacle was a symbol of heaven. Tadshe 2; Pesikta de R. Kahana 1, 5a; Tanhuma B. II, 90-92. Legends of the Jews VI, 63. See also VI, 67, note 346, where Ginzberg writes: "The most elaborate symbolic explanation of the tabernacle, found in rabbinic sources, is the one given by R. Shemaiah of Soisson in his treatise on the tabernacle published by Berliner in Monatsschrift XIII, 225-231 and 258-264. . .
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imagery is different from the imagery Josephus sets forth in describing the three-fold division of the Tabernacle, where the first two sections represent earth and sea, and the third alone represents heaven.

When Josephus tells of the candelabrum (3.146), he says that the seven lamps are reminiscent of the number of planets (τῶν πλανητῶν τὸν ἄριθμὸν μεμιμημένοι). Here he uses a verb form of the noun μίμησις that he used in 3.123, avoiding both the verb ἀποσημαίνω and the noun σύμβολον. He is saying, in effect that "the seven lamps remind me of the seven planets," rather than that they actually signify the seven planets.

The hat worn by each priest when doing the work of the Tabernacle, he writes (3.157), "seems like a crown" (ὡς στέφανη δοκεῖν); that is, it is a symbol of royalty as well as priesthood. Perhaps Josephus here sees a reflection of his own dual ancestry, described in Life 1-2, from both priestly and royal lines. The high priest's cap (3.172) was "encircled by a crown of gold" (περιέρχεται δὲ στέφανος χρύσεος). Josephus may have drawn this combination of royal and priestly symbolism, that increases the grandeur of the priest's hat, and therefore of the priestly office, not only from his own background, but, by a slight inversion, from the words spoken by God to Moses in Exod. 19: 6 "you shall be to me a kingdom of priests." The priestly office represented royalty too. Moses never

Noteworthy is the following quotation from a Midrash given by R. Shemaiah (p. 226) which reads, 'God said unto Moses; "Behold the celestial sanctuary, and erect the terrestrial sanctuary in like fashion."

56NB, M.Aboth 4.13 quotes R. Simeon as saying, "There are three crowns: the crown of Torah, the crown of priesthood, and the crown of sovereignty." Here the priesthood is associated with royalty too.
wore the priestly crown; only Aaron and his successors did. Goodenough observes that the crown was a symbol of victory. Though there was nothing openly suggesting the triumph of Judaism in Josephus' presentation of the Tabernacle, perhaps he expected that evocative words such as "crown" would suggest the perseverance of his beleaguered religion.

Philo too emphasized the crown on the High Priest's cap in Life of Moses 2.114. He describes the gold plate that was shaped into the form of a crown (ώσανει στέφανος ἐδημιουργεῖτο). Philo (2.116) refers to the cap itself as η μίτρα, the term found in LXX Exod. 29: 6, which Josephus never uses at all.59 Josephus (Ant. 3.172) calls the High Priest's cap ὀ πίλος, made in part like the head-wear of the other priests (παραπλησίως εἰργασμένος τοῖς πᾶσιν ἱερεύσιν), surrounded by

57 Professor Feldman has observed (in a personal note) that even though the Bible (Deut. 33: 5) and Philo (Life of Moses 1.62, 148-49, 158, 334; 2.292) refer to Moses as king; and even though one of Josephus' favorite authors, Herodotus (3.82), agrees with the Persian opinion that if only the king is virtuous the ideal form of government is a monarchy, Josephus never refers to Moses as a king. Even though Moses, in Josephus' description, has all the qualities of a Hellenistic king--lawgiver, judge, general, and shepherd of his people, Josephus omits characterizing Moses in this way. This may be so, perhaps, because Josephus had to defend Moses against the charge that he tried to seize the kingship of Egypt (Ant. 2.234). Cf. "Josephus' Portrait of Moses," forthcoming in JQR. Since this legend of Moses' snatching the Pharaoh's diadem and trampling it on the ground is also found, as Thackeray has observed (Josephus IV, 267, note a), in the Midrash on Exodus 2.10, but does not appear in the pagan reminiscences of Moses, according to Gager's Moses in Greco-Roman Paganism, it would seem that Josephus did not have to contend with adverse opinions about Moses from this angle. To describe the crown encircling the High Priest's turban, while not suggesting that Moses was a king, emphasizes that the one who presided over the religious life of his ancestors, was more their king than the one who led and governed them. This accentuated the piety of the ancient Israelites.

58 Goodenough, Jewish Symbols XII, 139-40.

59 See also The Migration of Abraham 103, where the engraving on the gold plate on the head-wear of the High Priest "is the original principle behind all principles, after which God shaped or formed the universe."
a three-tiered crown of gold (στέφανος χρύσεος ἐπὶ τριστιχίαν κεχαλκευμένος). 60

The twelve stones on the high priest's ἐσοήν (3.166, 169) are not symbols per se, since they represent the twelve sons of Jacob, who gave their names to the tribes of Israel, by having the names of these twelve sons engraved on them. By contrast, in 3.186 Josephus wrote of the subtler symbolism of the zodiac signs. The engraving of the names on the twelve stones, in the earlier notice, makes explicit their significance. Their significance is not at all subtle there, needing thought or explanation. This significance was already set forth in the Exodus Tabernacle account. In 3.186, however, he suggests the symbolism of the twelve stones which has nothing to do with what is written on them. Without his explanation of their significance, it is not immediately obvious what the stones symbolize.

Josephus' Final Explanation of Explicit Symbolism

Josephus wished to insure that the symbolism found in elements of the Tabernacle and priestly vestments was not overlooked by his readers, because symbols have considerable suggestive power. For this reason, as the Tabernacle account draws to a close, he focused more carefully on some details with symbolism

---

60 Cf the discussion of the crown on the High Priest's turban in Chapter IV, in which I reflect on the Divine symbolism of the number three. A πίλος, according to LSJ, was made of felt, the material used in making tents. A μίτρα, by contrast, according to LSJ, was the word used for the badge of rank at the Ptolemaic court. It was the term for a metal waistband in Homer's Iliad (4.137, 187, etc.). Even though LXX used this term, Josephus may have avoided using it for the sake of introducing a greater realism. If the High Priest's turban is called πίλος, which was a word describing headwear made of the same material tents were made, this small detail of acquaintance with the materials the ancient Israelites actually worked with, would have suited Josephus' project well, of describing the Tabernacle of his people in a nomadic time of their history.
in them. Yet, as I have observed earlier in this chapter, Josephus does not comment on all the objects in the Tabernacle which Philo taught were symbolic of important realities.

Morton Smith has written that "Religious symbols are among the objects that produce emotional reactions in their observers (make them feel secure, hopeful, etc.). The emotional reaction produced by a symbol is its 'value,' as distinct from its 'interpretation,' which is what the people who use it say it means. The value of a symbol is always essentially the same, the interpretations often change."61

One may, with warrant, wonder what "emotional reactions" Josephus intended to arouse in non-Jewish readers. It would seem that he principally wished to persuade them that the elements of the Tabernacle and priestly vestments had symbolic significance. He wanted to make this significance clear because, as Smith has written, "In the Greco-Roman world there was a 'lingua franca' of live symbols."62 To show that the Tabernacle had these symbols was to participate in this lingua franca. The similarity of outlook between Josephus, Philo, and the Stoics enabled Josephus to place the Jewish symbols in the Tabernacle into a "vernacular" of nature-symbolism.63

61 Morton Smith, "Goodenough's Jewish Symbols in Retrospect, JBL 86, 1 (1967), 53.
62 Ibid., p. 54. Smith is writing here primarily about the symbols drawn from the cult of Dionysus "which both expressed and gratified the worshipers' hope for salvation by participation in the life of a deity which gave itself to sacrificial death in order to be eaten by its followers and to live in them" (p. 54). But his idea of a lingua franca of live symbols seems an appropriate way to describe the cultural setting Josephus expected for the readers of his account of the Tabernacle.
63 Professor Feldman has written of Josephus' use of "several favorite Stoic words (προνοήσαι, εὔφαγησαι, and τοῦ κελεύοντος). . .[that] would make a particular appeal to his audience, inasmuch as Stoicism was the favorite
Josephus wrote that "every one of these objects [i.e. the details of the Tabernacle and the priestly vestments] is intended to recall and represent (ἀπομίμησιν καὶ διατέπωσιν) the universe."  

Goodenough numbered Josephus and Philo with "a group of Jews . . . that used the pagan symbols together with the Jewish ones. . . . for example, the stones on the high priest's breastplate represented the zodiac. This was indeed a mingling of Judaism and pagan astralism." It may be noted that the prophet Jeremiah wrote: "Learn not the way of the nations, nor be dismayed at the signs of the heavens because the nations are dismayed at them, for the customs of the peoples are false" (2: 2-3). There was clearly a change in the Jewish outlook between the seventh century B.C.E. and the first century C.E. This changing would continue to take place until the signs of the heavens would come to have a visible part in the ornamentation of late-third and fourth-century synagogues.

Goodenough states that "in the Philonic stage. . . the ideas, the aspirations, of pagan mysticism were appropriated--appropriated by

---

philosophy of the Hellenistic world." He writes of Josephus' interest in "answering the Stoics," in his rebuttal of their "argument for the existence of God based on the regularity of celestial phenomena," by arguing "upon [the basis of] certain irregularities observed in these phenomena (Ant. 1.156)."


64 Ant. 3.179.
65 Goodenough, Jewish Symbols IV, 69.
finding these ideas and objectives in a symbolic interpretation of the Torah itself.  

From the exclamation Josephus makes in 3.179, he was surprised that the pagan critics of the Jews missed the universal symbolism they should have seen, had they been duly observant. Josephus was writing in their idiom.

But one may well be astonished at the hatred which men have for us and which they have so persistently maintained, from an idea that we slight the divinity whom they themselves profess to venerate. For if one reflects (κατανοήσεις) on the construction of the tabernacle and looks at the vestments of the priest and the vessels which we use for the sacred ministry, he will discover that our lawgiver was a man of God and that these blasphemous charges brought against us by the rest of men are idle. In fact, every one of these objects is intended to recall and represent (ἀπομίμησιν καὶ διατύπωσιν) the universe, as he will find if he will but consent to examine them without prejudice and with understanding (ἀφθόνως καὶ μετὰ συνέσεως) (3.179, emphasis mine).

When Josephus writes that "every one of these objects is intended to recall and represent the universe" (ἐκαστα γὰρ τούτων εἰς ἀπομίμησιν καὶ διατύπωσιν τῶν θεῶν), he is anticipating and leading up to the following narrative. He reserves the verb ἀποσημαίνω for this cadenza on symbolism at the end of the Tabernacle account. Though even here he does not restrict himself to one way of designating the symbolism.

As I have observed above, Josephus never uses the noun σύμβολον in the Tabernacle account, though he uses it ten times...

66Ibid., p. 69. NB Among the reviews of Goodenough's Jewish Symbols listed in XIII, 229-30, are found objections to his interpretations of these religious symbols by various scholars.
elsewhere in *Ant.*67 Was this an intentional aversion to the most obvious word to use? Philo used σύμβολον repeatedly in explaining the meaning of the Tabernacle and the priestly vestments.68 Did Josephus avoid using a word that would have made his reliance on Philo obvious? As Nodet has observed, there is a resemblance between *Ant.* 3.179 f and Philo’s *Life of Moses* 2.11769 that tempts one to think the later writer was instructed by the former. Josephus writes (3.180) about the Tabernacle objects recalling and representing the universe. Philo writes of the high priest’s vestments: "We have in it as a whole and in its parts a typical representation of the world and all its particular parts."70

For Josephus, the three-fold division of the Tabernacle (3.181), rather than the priestly vestments, signifies (ἀποσημαίνει) the parts of creation: the earth, sea, and heaven.71 This particular emphasis on

67 *Ant.* 2.47; 5.100, 112; 6.28, 313; 7.4; 12.91; 14.147; 15.374; 16.56. He also uses it in *War* 7.127. Professor Feldman has noted that there are other instances as well, where Josephus is uneven in his use of specific terms. "Josephus’ Vocabulary of Slavery," JQR 76 (1986), 300-01.

68 *Life of Moses* 2.82, the five pillars inside the Tabernacle were συμβολικός of the mind; 2.96, the ark ἐξοικεὶν ἐν ἐν τοῖς σύμβολοι of God’s gracious power; 2.98 the two cherubim are σύμβολα of the two hemispheres; 2.101, the altar of incense is a σύμβολον of thankfulness for the earth and water; 2.103, the candlesticks are σύμβολα of the planets, then in 2.105 the candlestick and altar of incense are σύμβολα of the universe; 2.115, the four letters of the tetragrammaton are σύμβολα of the numbers 1,2,3, and 4; 2.119, flowers are σύμβολον of earth; 2.121, the priest’s long robe is a σύμβολον of the elements; 2.122, the ephod is a σύμβολον of heaven; 2.138, the laver is a σύμβολον of a blameless life. Philo also uses synonyms for σύμβολον: 2.82 gold ἔκατεσθε the mind; 2.102, 131 he uses the verb αἰνιγοῦσι

69 Nodet II, 163, note 3.

70 *Life of Moses* 2.117 ὅλος μὲν ἐνή γέγονεν ἀπεικόνισμα καὶ μίμημα τοῦ κόσμου, τὰ δὲ μέρη τῶν καθ’ ἐκατοσ τοις μεροῖς. Emphasis mine. *Ant.* 3.180 is the only place in Josephus’ corpus where he refers to Moses as θείον ἄνδρα, "man of God." This phenomenon no doubt reflects the fact that here Josephus is writing about the symbolism of the Tabernacle, that is, its higher significance.

71 Philo perceived in the furnishings of the sanctuary, the candelabrum, table, and incense altar, symbolism of thanksgiving from all
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the interior of the Tabernacle, and this symbolism are Josephus' own. In fact, there were only two divisions in the Tabernacle. In War 5. 215-219 he described a two-fold division of the sanctuary in the Temple. There the forty cubits of the first partition correspond to the first "two" parts of the sanctuary in the Tabernacle, while the Holy of Holy (ἀγίου δὲ ἁγίων) measured twenty cubits. However, Josephus told of no symbolism in the Temple.

Philo described elaborately the (necessary) symmetry of the "portable sanctuary" (φορητὸν... ἱερὸν), which reproduced the model stamped in Moses' mind at Sinai. Philo did not here liken any of the parts of the Tabernacle to specific parts of the cosmos. He did, however, liken the inner part of the sanctuary to ὁ νοῦς, "the mind," while he likened the court to τὸ αἰοθητὸν, "the sense-perception."

Josephus' statement that the three-fold division of the Tabernacle signifies (ἀποσημαίνει) earth, sea, and heaven, is the first of five uses of the word ἀποσημαίνω in quick succession. It is clear that Josephus intends, by using this word, to make explicit a symbolism that was only implicit in the examples I have cited above.

He writes (3.182) that when Moses placed the twelve loaves on the table in the Tabernacle he signifies (ἀποσημαίνει) the twelve

creation. "In the altar... we have the thought of thanksgiving for the elements, for the altar itself contains parts of the four elements... In the table we have thanksgiving for the mortal creatures framed from these elements, since loaves and libations, which creatures needing food must use, are placed on it. In the candlestick we have thanksgiving for all the celestial world, that so no part of the universe may be guilty of unthankfulness." Who is the Heir, 226.

72Life of Moses 2. 76 f.
73ibid., 2. 83.
months of the year. As I have noted in chapter three, Josephus knew that there were twelve loaves from Lev. 24: 5. Philo does not mention that there were twelve loaves, but makes some allusion to the cycle of the year when he writes that the bread on the table stands for the food that comes from heaven and earth, when heaven sends the rain, and earth yields the seeds that ripen under the influence of water. Here Philo writes primarily about the table, which stands for the "nourishing and fertilizing" north wind, and the bread is only a symbol of this nourishing.

In War 5.217 Josephus previously wrote that the loaves on the table represented the circle of the year and the zodiac. Presumably, what he wrote of the loaves in the Temple he inferred from the loaves in the Tabernacle, even though he says only that of the twelve loaves in the Tabernacle that "they signify that the year is divided into as many months." How did Josephus see the zodiac symbolized in the twelve loaves? It appears that the number twelve evoked this symbolism, just as in 3.186, Josephus saw (with Philo) the zodiac symbolized in the twelve stones on the High Priest's ephod. It may

---

74 Whereas Josephus uses the verb ἐμφαίνω five times in War, seventeen times in Ant., and once in Apion, he never uses it in the Tabernacle narrative. In War 5.217 ἐμφαίνω is clearly a synonym for ἀποσημαίνω. Hecataeus of Abdera, who wrote during the reign of Ptolemy I in Egypt, i.e. 323-282 B.C.E., remarked that Moses "divided the people into twelve tribes because it corresponded to the number of months in the year." Aegyptiaca, cited in Photius' Bibliotheca, which, in tum is citing Diodorus Siculus. John Gager, Moses in Greco Roman Paganism, p. 27. Similarly, Philo, Life of Moses 2.124,133-34 said that the twelve stones on the High Priest's ephod signified the zodiac circle (δείγματ' εἴδον τοῦ ζωδιακοῦ κύκλου).

75 Life of Moses 2.104.
76 Cf. Goodenough, By Light, Light, p. 98.
77 Ant. 3.182.
78 Life of Moses 2.124-26.
be noted that of the numerous instances where Josephus mentions the number twelve, only in *War* 5.217 and *Ant.* 3.186 does he mention ζῳδιακὸς in connection with the number twelve.79

A Talmudic parallel to Josephus' association of the twelve tribes of Israel and the twelve constellations is found in BT Berakoth 32b, which cites the words of the first generation Amora, Resh Laqish, who said that the Holy One, blessed be He. . . [said]: "Twelve constellations have I created in the firmament, and for each constellation I have created thirty hosts. . . I have attached three-hundred sixty-five thousand of myriads of stars, corresponding to the days of the solar year, and all of them I have created only for thy [i.e. Israel's] sake." In other words, the twelve constellations were created for the sake of the twelve tribes of Israel.80 Just what this signified was left unexplained, except that they were created for Israel's sake.

Goodenough observes that the Stoics "became drenched with astralism, as the pantheistic cyclical determinism of Zeno was seen to have its counterpart in the cyclical determinism of the stars themselves."81 Even though Josephus was interested in the zodiac as a symbol, there is no reason to believe that he thought in terms of astral determinism in any absolute sense. After mentioning that the twelve stones signify the zodiac, there is no statement of what this means. Presumably, since Josephus did not elaborate on his

meaning, each reader was welcome to interpret this suggestive correlation as he pleased.82

In light of Josephus' lack of explanation it seems fruitless to plumb the mysteries of Stoic astral determinism to try to impute to Josephus a Stoic understanding in the zodiac. Josephus' use of the word εἰμαρμένη, "fate," (War 2.162-63; Ant.13.5,9), which has no Hebrew equivalent,83 when he compares the views of Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes on fate, does not associate fate with the stars.84 As G. F. Moore observed, even the gods were subject to "Destiny,"85 so that to think a Jewish theist such as Josephus saw some ultimate control over fate by the stars is unthinkable.86 But,

82 Though I take this to be implicit here, elsewhere Josephus specifically mentions that the reader is free to make up his own mind (Ant. 1.108; 3.81; 4.158; 10.281).

83 G.F. Moore, "Fate and Free Will in Josephus," HTR 22 (1929), pp. 379, 382. Moore notes the difficulty of translating εἰμαρμένη into Hebrew seen in the translation of War into Hebrew by Simchoni. He rendered "εἰμαρμένη with תַּרְגּוֹה, 'decree' (of God), putting the Greek word in a note and explaining it by תַּרְגּוֹר, which is modern Hebrew for 'providence.'"

84 Cf. Luther Martin, "Josephus' Use of Heirmarmene in the Jewish Antiquities XIII, 171-3," Numen 28 (1981), 127-137. Here the author writes that Josephus "presents to his Hellenistic audience through the more comprehensible terminology of heirmarmene, but he locates also the Jewish people in an international setting with a universal problem. . . He presents the Jews as the people who are freed from heirmarmene by the providence of God, and who consequently exercise free will and human responsibility in and through their obedience to Torah" (p. 135).

85 Ibid., p. 376 He writes of the Stoics' use of εἰμαρμένη. "It was the eternal, unalterable, causal nexus of the universe; as what we call the 'uniformity of nature' it was Nature itself (φύσις) looked at in terms of cause and effect it was Necessity (ἀνάγκη); while considered theologically, as the ordering of the all-pervading dynamic Reason (λόγος) of the world, it could be called Providence (πρόνοια)."

86 Philo wrote critically of "Chaldean" astral determinism in The Migration of Abraham 178-183. He chided the Chaldeans because "they made Fate (εἰμαρμένη) and Necessity (ἀνάγκη) divine, thus filling human life with much impiety, by teaching that apart from phenomena there is no originating cause of anything whatever, but that the circuits of sun and moon and of the other heavenly bodies determine for every being in existence both good things and their opposites."
Josephus may have had some place for the stars in the nexus of factors by which fate is made known. Moore observes that the Stoics connected the word εἰμαρμένη with εἰρμός (connexion), an etymology which prevailed over the earlier connection of the word with εἰρημένη (perfect participle of εἰρεῖν, to speak). In that Josephus writes about the zodiac, and about the branches of the candelabrum representing the planets, is suggestive that he believed the heavenly bodies played some role in the revelation of Divine providence, or at least that he wished to draw on his pagan readers' belief in the influence of the stars, in order to make them think well of the candelabrum, shew bread, and stones on the High Priest's breastpiece.

In 3.183 the fine linen (βυσσος) "appears to signify (ἀποσημαίνειν ἐοικε) the earth." The first of the three sections of the Tabernacle also signifies the earth (3.181). And so does the High Priest's χιτών (3.184), because it is made of linen (λίνεος, a synonym actually of βυσσος). In terms of Morton Smith's definition, here the interpretation of the symbols varied, while their "value," that is, their latent ability to arouse emotional reaction, remained the same. These three significances are in different schemas.

In the first instance, the earth exemplified in the first division of the Tabernacle, the schema is, it would seem, a variation of the ancient Biblical tripartite division of the cosmos into heaven, firmament, and earth. Second, in speaking of the symbolism of the four materials of the Tabernacle tapestries, Josephus has in mind the

---

87Ibid., p. 377.
88Smith, "Goodenough's Jewish Symbols in Retrospect," pp. 53-54.
ancient Greek four-fold primary substances of water, fire, air, and earth as found in Empedocles, routed through the Stoics. In the third earth-symbolism, of the High Priest's χιτών, he has in mind the dynamic interaction of the heavens with earth. In this instance Josephus refers to the two tunics he previously described in the High Priest's regalia; the first being of linen, and the second of blue (3.159). The tunic underneath signifies the earth, while the blue tunic over it signifies the firmament, and the pomegranates and bells represent the lightning and thunder seen in the sky from the earth. All three examples are representations of nature.

Finally, in 3.185, the High Priest's girdle (ζώνη) signifies (ἀποσημώνει) the ocean. Philo does not mention this article of the High Priest's clothing. Ginzberg does not list any comparable symbolism for the ocean. Josephus undoubtedly is drawing on the image of the ocean surrounding the earth for this symbolism of the girdle. In War 2.378 he writes of the ocean surrounding the Britons, which protected them no better than Jerusalem's wall protected her against the Romans.

---

89 Cf. Werner Jaeger, *The Theology of the Early Greek Philosophers* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1936), p. 70, 137. Cf. Frederick Copleston, *A History of Philosophy* (Garden City, New York: Image Books, 1962), I, ii, 133. Philo, in *Life of Moses* 2.121 writes of the three elements, earth, water and air, represented in the High Priest's robe from which the pomegranates and bells were suspended. In 2.133, he writes that the same long robe is symbolic only of the air (ἀέρος), and the pomegranates signify water, the flower trimming the earth, the scarlet the fire, the ephod the heaven, the circular emeralds on the shoulder pieces that are engraved with six names of Israel's tribes on each, represent the two hemispheres, and the twelve stones on the ephod the zodiac. His symbolism is not consistent, which is in keeping with the loose method of allegory. Cf. G.F. Moore, "Fate and Free Will in Josephus," *Harvard Theological Review* 22 (1929), 376 f. where the author calls attention to the Stoics who gave currency to the term ἐμαρμένη, a term figuring prominently in Josephus' outlook.
Josephus then uses four verbs or phrases that may be considered synonyms of ἀποσημαίνω to indicate further symbolism. In 3.185 the ἔσοσκεν is ἐν τρόπῳ γῆς; ἐν τρόπῳ stands for σημαίνω; then again in §185, the synonym is δηλόω;90 in 3.186, first it is the circumlocution, τῆς κατ' ἐκείνον γνώμης οὐκ ἂν ἀμάρτω ("he will not mistake the lawmaker’s intention), and second, δοκεῖ τεκμηριωθὲν ("it seems to me a sign").

Josephus states (3.185) that the sun and moon are signified (δηλοῖ) by the two sardonyxes of the High Priest’s shoulder-pieces. The sun and moon are symbolized as well in two of the seven "planets" suggested by the candelabrum. Philo wrote that he was aware of that understanding, but preferred the view that the two circular emerald stones were suggestive of the two hemispheres of the sky, because the two hemispheres are equal, not made so as to wax and wane as the moon does.91 Since Philo mentions and rejects the interpretation that the stones on the shoulder-pieces indicated the sun and moon, a view that Josephus adopts, if Josephus did not take his view from Philo, they either both drew upon a common source, or they arrived at the idea independently. Goodenough has written, "It would seem that there was considerable variety in the way in which Jews made the objects in the temple represent the mystic rise from material confusion. . . but the very variety of detail is essentially important to us precisely because so strong a unity of

90Josephus used δηλόω in this sense already in 3.183.
91Life of Moses 2.122. πρότειν μὲν γὰρ οἱ ἐπὶ τῶν ἀκρωμίων σμαράγδου δύο λίθοι περιφερεῖς μηνόσωσιν, ὡς μὲν οἴονται τινες, ἀστέρων τοὺς ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτὸς ἡμεώνας, ἡλιον καὶ σελήνην.
purpose carries on through the variety, and hence suggests a single and considerable movement with wide divergences."

The verb ἀποσημαίνω is implied again in 3.184 where Josephus writes that the High priest's ἐφαυτίδα stands for τοῦ παντὸς τὴν φύσιν, "universal nature," particularly with the gold woven into it. The gold συνυφασμένην "weaving together," signifies τῆς προούσης Ἀπασιν αὐγῆς, "the attribute of the all-pervading sun-light."

The one-span-square breastplate (3.185) in the ἐφαυτίδα (οὔ ἐφώδης) that Josephus calls the ἐσοήν, represents the earth which is situated in the middle of the universe (μέσον ὄντα τῆς ἐφαυτίδος ἐν τρόπῳ γῆς ἐταξε). As I have observed above, ἐν τρόπῳ is synonymous with ἀποσημαίνω.

In 3.186 Josephus likens the twelve stones on the High Priest's ephod to the twelve months, or to the twelve signs of the zodiac, in a turn of phrase that leads one to think that he thought this symbolism would seem natural to the Greek reader. The odd phrase, τῆς κατ' ἐκεῖνον γνώμης οὐκ ἂν ἁμαρτοι, suggests that Josephus considered it unlikely that Moses' symbolic intent would be missed by perceptive readers.

The total number of parts on the candelabrum, Josephus writes (3.182) is seventy. This is a number he arrives at not by actually counting the parts on the candelabrum, but by computing the sum of

---

93Josephus referred to this as the ephod, like the Greek ἐπωμίς, in 3.162. The ἐφαυτίδα was the upper garment of a soldier, cf Polybius, History 30, 25, 10.
94Cf. Ant. 3.163, where he describes gold woven into the the insert of the ἐπωμίς.
95See the discussion of the stones on the breastplate in Chapter IV.
the five planets then known, Saturn, Jupiter, Mars, Venus, and Mercury, along with the sun and moon, multiplied by the ten degrees of the celestial (solar) ecliptic allotted to each planet.\textsuperscript{96} Thackeray observes that the reference to the seven lamps in \textit{War} 7.149 may indicate the honor paid "to the week," rather than just to the number seven.\textsuperscript{97}

There is a remark in BT Shabbath 156ab which, though it does not refer to the candelabrum, bears upon the pertinence of the planets which Josephus saw symbolized in the candelabrum. Although Josephus does not spell out the significance of the candelabrum's symbolizing the planets, it may be inferred that he expects his readers to have some preconceptions about the impact of the planets on life. This passage in BT Shabbath suggests that later rabbis' thinking developed considerably beyond Josephus' undeveloped (or under-expressed) understanding of the pertinence of the planets to Israel. G.F. Moore remarks that the flow of

\textsuperscript{96}Thackeray, \textit{Josephus} IV, 404-05, notes a and b. Thackeray states that if the number of the parts on the candelabrum are counted, they total only 69. See note c, \textit{Josephus} IV, 403. In \textit{War} 7.149 the seven lamps "indicate the honor paid to that number by the Jews." Cf. Philo, \textit{Who is the Heir}, 208, 221-225. Philo puts the sun as the symbol of the middle lamp, with Saturn, Jupiter and Mars above, i.e. on one side, and Mercury, Venus, and the moon below, i.e. on the other side. "So, the Master-craftsman (τεχνίτης), wishing that we should possess a copy of the archetypical celestial sphere with its seven lights, commanded this splendid work, the candlestick, to be wrought." In §226 Philo writes "In the candlestick we have thanksgiving for all the celestial world that so no part of the universe may be guilty of unthankfulness and that we may know that all its parts give thanks, the elements and the creatures framed from them, not only those on earth, but those in heaven." For an explanation of the astronomical understanding in the world of Josephus and Philo, see A. Aaboe, "Scientific Astronomy in Antiquity," \textit{Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London}, Pt. A, 276 (1974), 21-42.

\textsuperscript{97}Josephus IV, 405, note b.
comments on this subject from rabbinical sources increased after the fall of Jerusalem.98

R. Hanina writes in BT Shabbath 156a "Not the constellation of the day but that of the hour is the determining influence." The discussion suggests that the thinking of some rabbis developed well beyond Josephus', to include spelling out how planetary influence on Israel took place. Philo and Josephus represent a stage in the development of Jewish syncretism of alien elements into Jewish sacred thought.

Goodenough writes of a later period that "the Jews of Palestine had as their favorite design for a mosaic floor that of Helios driving his chariot in the center of the circle of the zodiac, set in a square with the Seasons in the corners."99 He remarks that "We have four assured cases of the zodiac in mosaic on synagogue floors."100 Yet he says that "the zodiac does not testify to the congregation's interest in, or use of astrology." In the note to this remark Goodenough accepts the proposal of Hanfmann (Seasons I, 194), that the zodiac served as a calendar.101

But in BT Shabbath 156a-b there is a long discussion of the effect of the constellations on Israel that suggests that some Jews believed in the influence of the stars, so that it was necessary for the

98G.F. Moore, "Fate and Free Will in Josephus," p. 380. Cf. his examples
99Jewish Symbols XII, 152. Eg. his discussions of the Beth Alpha synagogue which dates from the late third century C.E., in I, 241-253, and of the Dura synagogue, which he states began as a private house, but was remodeled in 245 C.E. for use as a synagogue in I, 227-232 (which does not mention the zodiac).
100Jewish Symbols XII, 168.
101Ibid. VIII, 168
Tannaim to address this concern. R. Johanan and Rab teach that Israel is immune from astral influence. Here the seven constellations, the five bright planets observable to the naked eye, Venus, Mercury, Saturn, Jupiter, and Mars are mentioned, in addition to the sun and the moon.

"Go out and tell the son of Levi, Not the constellation of the day but that of the hour is the determining influence. He who is born under the constellation of the sun will be a distinguished man: he will eat and drink of his own and his secrets will lie uncovered; if a thief, he will have no success. He who is born under Venus will be wealthy and unchaste. What is the reason? Because fire was created therein. He who is born under Mercury will be of a retentive memory and wise. What is the reason? Because it is the sun's scribe. He who is born under the Moon will be a man to suffer evil, building and demolishing, demolishing and building, eating and drinking that which is not his and his secrets will remain hidden: if a thief, he will be successful. He who is born under Saturn will be a man whose plans will be frustrated. Others say: All [nefarious] designs against him will be frustrated. He who is born under Zideki [Jupiter] will be a right-doing man. He who is born under Mars will be a shedder of blood. . .The planetary influence gives wisdom, the planetary influence gives wealth, and Israel stands under planetary influence. . . R. Johanan said: How do we know that Israel is immune from planetary influence? Because it is said, Thus saith the Lord, Learn not the way of the nations, and be not dismayed at the signs of heaven, for the nations are dismayed at them [Jeremiah 10: 2]: they are dismayed but not Israel. Rab too holds that Israel is immune from planetary influence. For Rab Judah said in Rab's name: How do we know that Israel is immune from planetary influence? Because it is said, and he brought him forth from abroad. Abraham pleaded before the Holy One, blessed be He, 'Sovereign of the Universe! one born in mine house is mine heir.' 'Not so,' He replied, 'but he that shall come forth out of thine own bowels.' 'Sovereign of the Universe!' he cried, 'I have looked at my constellation and
find that I am not fated to beget child.' 'Go forth from thy planet [gazing], for Israel is free from planetary influence. What is thy calculation?

If the interior of the Tabernacle symbolized the earth, sea, and heaven, the candelabrum, symbolizing the seven planets, represented the complete source of light (but not of determinism) at work in the universe, which, in Josephus' understanding, was geocentric. That this light source did not illumine the Holy of Holies, i.e. heaven, since it was separated from the rest of the Tabernacle by a veil, may be seen as a theological nicety, or as an inconsistency no doubt noticeable only to someone not in tune with the mystic's outlook. As a theological nicety, Josephus implied the light-sufficiency of the Place where God is.

The materials (3.183) from which the tapestries (φάροη) in the Tabernacle are woven signify nature (φύσιν δηλοὶ). The tapestries, representing all of nature, are the sum of their parts, that is, nature is made up of air, water, earth, and fire, signified in the blue (air), purple (water), linen (earth), and crimson (fire). The verb δηλόω here is used as a synonym for ἄποσημαίνω, just as when it appears three lines later: ἀέρα βούλεται δηλοῦν ὁ ύάκινθος, where Josephus says that the blue signifies the air.

Again calling attention to the High Priest's head-dress, he writes (3.187) that "it seems to be a τεκμηριῶν of heaven." Once again, we see that for Josephus, more than one object symbolizes the same thing. The Tabernacle, we have observed, looked like heaven from afar, and the Holy of Holies, the third part of the Tabernacle, represented heaven. Finally, the blue head-dress, with its golden
crown (like the calyx of the plant called *hyoschamus niger*) \(^{102}\) on which the Divine name was engraved, symbolized heaven because of its bright glow which especially delights the deity (ὅ μάλιστα χαίρει τὸ θείον).

Josephus concludes the brief section on symbolism with a remark that the credit for all this symbolism is due to Moses. The plans for the Tabernacle may have been delivered to Moses from Mt. Sinai, but his own input contributed the subtleties found in the symbolism.

**The Appointment of Aaron as First High Priest**

Sections 188-192 introduce Aaron as the first recipient of the high priestly honor. I have written about this above in discussing the priestly vestments, in chapter IV. Though Exod. 28: 1 and 29: 1 explicitly include Aaron's sons in this appointment, Josephus does not explicitly state here that Aaron's four sons were priests, though he concludes §192 by saying that "He had at this time four sons: Nadab, Abihu, Eleazar, and Ithamar. His Jewish readers would know that the four sons were also appointed priests, but readers not acquainted with the Jewish Scriptures may not have inferred this, unless they assumed that the vestments of the "other priests" that Josephus describes before describing the High Priest's attire, were to be worn by these four sons.

Apparently Leviticus 8: 1 was the scriptural passage in Josephus' mind as he tells of God commanding Moses to select his brother, Aaron, as High Priest. Though Josephus did not restrict

\(^{102}\)Cf. Thackeray, *Josephus* IV, 399, note f.
himself to the details he found in Exodus, there Aaron and his sons are chosen before their vestments are made, whereas in Leviticus 8:1, Aaron and his sons are brought forward to be anointed to the priesthood, with no mention of the vestments. The situation is similar in 3.188. The construction of the Tabernacle was completed; the priestly vestments were made; and Aaron was chosen to be the first High Priest.

Josephus puts into Moses' mouth (3.190) the confession that he would have preferred to be the High Priest because of all he had done for Israel. Midrash Rabbah Exodus XXXVII, 1 gives the same idea: "Moses believed that he would be made High Priest."103

**Coverings for the Tabernacle Furniture**

Section 193 relates a detail, apparently drawn from Numbers 4:5-12, in which Josephus includes, as part of the plan for the Tabernacle, the provision subsequently made to protect the furniture of the Tabernacle in the desert wanderings. This is not, then, strictly speaking, a haggadic addition on Josephus' part. Instead, it suggests that Josephus was drawing on more than the Exodus Tabernacle account in reconstructing his description of the Tabernacle.

103In Midrash Rabbah Exodus XXXVII. 2 we read concerning the episode of the golden calf that "The intention of Aaron was really to restrain the people until Moses came down, but Moses thought that Aaron was a partner in their crime and he was incensed against him. Whereupon God said to Moses: 'I know that Aaron's intention was quite good.'" Nodet discovers similar traditions in Midrash Tanhuma Sav 8 f, Pesikta de R. Kahana 4.38, and Leviticus Rabbah 11.6 (though I did not find this here). Nodet II, 164, note 8. Rashi saw in Exod. 4: 14 the reason for God's choice of Aaron rather than Moses as High Priest. Moses' reluctance to speak, which resulted in Aaron speaking for him, aroused the Divine ire against him, so that Aaron was chosen as High Priest. Henceforth... he will be the priest and you the Levite." Rashi, *The Pentateuch and Rashi's Commentary: A Linear Translation into English*, by Rabbi Abraham Ben Isaiah and Rabbi Benjamin Sharfman, *Exodus*, p. 33.
Weill and Nodet explain Josephus' addition here as a misinterpretation of MT Exod. 31: 10. Taking this derivation for granted, Weill contends that Josephus was confused by the Hebrew term ידש, which he took to be from the root of the word ידש found elsewhere in Numbers 31: 35, and Joshua 10: 20, meaning "survivor." Following the same assumption, Nodet comments that Josephus "without doubt bases this on the unclear term יזק לארשי (Exod. 31: 10), which he derives from ידש (to be left over).

Indeed LXX Exod. 31: 10 seems unlikely to be Josephus' source here. LXX abbreviates MT, and neither has anything to do with coverings for the Tabernacle furniture. Yet, Rashi, commenting on Exod. 31: 10, maintains that "these יזק לארשי are the same as the garments of blue and purple and scarlet that are mentioned in the section of the journeyings (Num. 4), 'and they shall put thereon. . . a cloth. . . of blue' (verse 6), 'and they shall spread a purple cloth thereon' (verse 13),' and they shall spread upon them a cloth of scarle'. . ." Rashi's association of the priestly garments, described in Exod. 31: 10, with the coverings of the Tabernacle furniture, appears to be an interpretation associating the instances of יזק לארשי appearing in Exod. 31: 10 and Num. 4: 6 and 13. This kind of

---

104 Weill, I, 187, note 5.
105 Exod. 31: 10--καὶ τὰς στολὰς τὰς λειτουργικὰς Ἀαρών καὶ τὰς στολὰς τῶν υἱῶν αὐτοῦ ἱερατεύειν μοι. Wevers explains LXX Exod. 31: 10 which "characterizes the priestly garments doubly as σὰρξ καὶ βραχίονα καὶ ναὸς κύριος, but Exod economizes by omitting the second as an unnecessary doublet, which omission Hex rectified by adding καὶ τα μαστία του αγιου." Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus. p. 511.
106 Nodet, II, 165, note 2. Rashi says: "But these יזק לארשי are the same as the garments of blue and purple and scarlet that are mentioned in the section of the journeyings (Num. 4)." Commentary on Exodus. p. 395.
interpretation is characteristic of Rabbinic exegesis. It seems less likely that this was Josephus' intention than that he simply drew on Num. 4: 5-12, telescoping a later event to the Tabernacle account.

The Half-Shekel Tax

Sections 194-196107 tell of the half-shekel tax levied on the people for the upkeep of the Tabernacle. Josephus writes (3.195-96) that "[Moses] imposed on them a contribution of half a shekel for each man, the shekel being a Hebrew coin equivalent to four Attic drachmas.108 They promptly obeyed this command of Moses and the number of contributors amounted to 605,550 the money being brought by all free men aged from twenty years up to fifty."109 This

107MT/LXX Exod. 30: 11-16 give the command to levy the tax. MT/LXX II do not mention the collection of the tax. In Exod. 30: 12, the tax is associated with the census, which strictly speaking, goes beyond the subject of the Tabernacle account. Roland de Vaux sees Exod. 30: 11-16 as a reflection of "the Priestly redaction of the Pentateuch," dating from the time of the exile. But Nehemiah 10: 33-35 tells of a one-third shekel per annum levy for the Temple. Ancient Israel (2 vols. New York: McGraw Hill Company, 1965), II, 403.

108Cf. John Wevers' Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus, p. 495. "The tax imposed on every male was a half didrachma, Exod's rendering of the Hebrew half shekel. The standard coin of Ptolemaic Egypt was the tetradrachma or four drachm coin, of which the didrachma was half; thus the poll tax was one drachm. (note 16--Aq and Sym translate χρυσόν by σταυρός, which was equal to a tetradrachma, according to Bauer. On this reckoning the half shekel would equal a full didrachma.) The standard to be used was the sacred didrachma.; this was to guard against a debased currency. Since to later copyists the coin was no longer current the spelling of the word became uncertain and the stem often became διδραχμ-, and even occasionally διδραχμ-, but only διδραχμον is correct.

109LXX Exod. 39: 3 reads Πάς ὁ παραπομπόμενος τὴν ἑπίσκεψιν ἀπὸ εἰκοσαετός καὶ ἑπάνω, "all males from twenty years and upwards." Cf. Num. 1: 32 πάντα ἁρσενικά, ἀπὸ εἰκοσαετός καὶ ἑπάνω. Commenting on Weill's statement that Josephus was in error in determining the value of the half-shekel, Nodet remarks that Josephus is at fault only in presenting an anachronism, as he often did, giving the didrachma in an equivalency of his own time rather than of the times found in the Biblical account. Nodet cites M. Sheqalim 2: 4, in which R. Judah says: "Sheqel taxes are not subject to a prescribed limit. For when the Israelites came up from the Exile, they would pay the sheqel in darics. Then they went and paid the sheqel in selas [double sheqels]. Then they went and paid the sheqel in [sheqel] coins. And they
is in keeping with Josephus comment in Ant. 18.312 that "The Jews. . . used to deposit there [in Nisibis] the two-drachma coins which it is the national custom for all to contribute to the cause of God." Likewise, Matthew 17: 24 records the custom of contributing τὰ δίδραχμα to the Temple.

In Exod. 30: 12 f, the half-shekel assessment is tied to the census of the people. IV Kingdoms 12: 4, with its parallel passage in II Chron 24: 1-11, tells of this practice, as King Joash tells the priests to use the ἄργυρον συντιμήσεως, the "money of valuation," (MT 12: 5 שָׁנֵא רֹבֶן פֶּרֶשׁ), or census tax, to repair the temple. Josephus appears to derive his information from Exod., even though the number of those from whom the tax was collected, as he tells it, differs from the census information found in LXX Exod. 39: 3110 (Josephus--605,550 [ἐξῆκοντα μυριάδες καὶ πεντακισχίλιοι καὶ πεντακόσιοι καὶ πεντήκοντα], rather than the Biblical 603,550 [ἐξῆκοντα μυριάδας καὶ [even] wanted to pay the sheqel in denars." Neusner, Mishna. p. 254. The shekel varied in weight over Israel's history. De Vaux records that on the basis of Exod. 38: 25-26, the talent was equivalent to 3,000 shekels. From the data given in Ezekiel 45, the talent was equivalent to 3,600 shekels. Ancient Israel (2 vols. New York: McGraw hill, 1965), II, 204-05. Nodet states that Josephus' reckoning of the shekel conforms to the standard set by Ptolemy II Philadelphia, where the monetary drachma weighed 3.58 grams, which was equivalent to the coins found in the Judean desert. Nodet II, 165, note 4. None of the values of the shekel and drachma given by de Vaux are the same as the values given by Weill and Nodet. Weill comments that the Attic drachma weighed 4gr.37, while the Hebrew shekel was fourteen grams. Josephus is alluding to a Phoenician tetradrachma, Reinach comments, ad loc. Weill's terminology is not clear to me here.

110=MT Exod. 28: 36; Num. 1: 32. Numbers 1: 46 gives the same total as Exod. 39: 3. Philo does not mention this census or the tax in Life of Moses. But in Who is the Heir 38-39 (§186-189). Philo remarks: "And was not the consecrated didrachmon portioned out on the same principle? We are meant to consecrate one half of it, the drachma, and pay it as ransom for our own soul. . . " He does not mention the historical setting of this tax, as his interest is only in its allegorical significance here.
τρισχίλιοι πεντακόσιοι καὶ πεντακονταὶ, and Josephus adds a specific upper age parameter of fifty. The same upper parameter is suggested in Pseudo-Philo's Biblical Antiquities 14: 1, 3, where after stating that forty years of age was the upper parameter, we read that Moses numbered those who were over fifty and those who were under twenty, but apparently not so as to be included in the census for taxation. The census recorded in Numbers 1: 3, 20, which is taken when the Tabernacle is finished, sets the boundaries for the census as "from twenty years old and upward, all in Israel who are able to go forth to war." Presumably Josephus sets his age-limit for the tax because Numbers 4: 3 sets fifty as the age-limit for the Kohahites from the tribe of Levi who could work in the Tabernacle. Numbers 8: 25 again sets the age limit for working Levites at fifty. If this number reflects the retirement age of men generally, then the tax, as Josephus explains it, was assessed only on men of working age.

111Since the numbers are the same, apart from the Biblical τρισχίλιοι and Josephus πεντακόσιοι, Josephus' change may have been deliberate. On the other hand, this may represent a simple scribal error. Since the prefix πεντακόσιοι appears two other times in the number, πεντακονταὶ may have been inadvertently written due to some scribe's looking at text at the wrong place. It seems unlikely that Josephus Biblical text gave the number he used rather than the number found in MT/LXX. Wevers does not cite any alternate reading of a different number in this place. In Pseudo-Philo's Biblical Antiquities 14: 3, the census figure is 604, 550.

112Sed enumeravit eos qui supra quinquaginta annos erant, quorum numerus erat XLVII milia trecenti. Et dinumeravit adhuc qui infra viginti annos, et factus est numerus eorum DCCC quinquaginta milia DCCCL.

113The Mishnah makes no citation from the Book of Exodus after 34: 26, and does not cite II Kings 12: 4 or II Chron. 24: 1-11. M. Shekalim 1: 3 states that "They do not exact a pledge from priests for the sake of peace." 1: 4 presents conflicting views on the necessity of the priests paying the shekel, and 1: 5 states that if they do pay the shekel tax, it is accepted. The tax is not accepted from Gentiles or Samaritans. The reason for rejecting the shekel tax from Gentiles and Samaritans is (1: 5), as it says in Ezra 4: 3, "You have nothing to do with us to build a house unto our God."
In Exod. the tax is collected as an apotropaic against the plague. Josephus does not write of this aspect of the tax, perhaps because he was sensitive to Manetho's libel (Apion 1.235, 257) that the Israelites were lepers banished from Egypt. In Lev. 5: 14 f, the shekels are brought as penitential offerings. Josephus doesn't mention this penitential reason either, since it did not reflect well on the piety of the ancient Israelites if the need for penance was built into their system of worship.

Since the idea of the tax derives from MT/LXX I (Exod. 30: 13), it can be said that Josephus derives his information from the first part of the Exodus Tabernacle account. However, in Exodus we only find the command that the tax be levied. It is not collected when the Tabernacle is finished.

In Nehemiah 10: 32, it is recorded that "We also lay upon ourselves the obligation to charge ourselves yearly with the third part of a shekel (MT 10: 33 נֵסֵפּוֹן נֵשָׁפָה, LXX τρίτον τοῦ διδράχμου) for the service of the house of our God." Historically, this seems to be the first mention of the collection of a tax for the Temple up-keep.\(^{114}\)

In MT Exod. 38: 24 f, the shekels of gold, silver, and bronze that are brought are part of the offerings of the people for the construction of the Tabernacle. This passage seems to be the source of Josephus' comment in 3.102 that the people brought their silver,

---

gold, and bronze, etc. for the building of the Tabernacle, rather than for its up-keep, which is the purpose of the census tax.

Josephus' reports in War 7.218, that after the Romans defeated the Jews, a two-drachma poll-tax was imposed on all Jewish residents of Jerusalem, which was like the sum they were accustomed to pay to the Temple in Jerusalem. No doubt it is this custom of the Jews which they practiced even if they were far away from Jerusalem, a sign of their loyalty to their religion (Ant. 18.312), that stands behind Josephus' comment. His mentioning age fifty as the outer parameter for those the Jews taxed may be seen as a subtle bit of evidence that the Jews were gentler on their own than the Romans were on their Jewish subjects.

The Sanctification of the Tabernacle and Priests

Sections 197-199 tell of the sweet-smelling oils and incense used to set apart the priests for their office, and to sanctify the Tabernacle from day to day. The list of spices that were brought to make the ointment used in the anointing is the same in name and number (five) as found in LXX Exod. 30: 23-24. As I shall point out, at one point, Josephus' change of term is virtually the same as Philo's,

---

115 Cf. Nodet II, 165, note 3. In Suetonius, "Domitian," 12, Suetonius writes that when he was a boy, he once saw an agent of Domitian inspecting a ninety-year-old man, to see if he was circumcised in order to collect the tax from him. Thackeray cites Dio Cassius, History LXVI, 7 to corroborate what Josephus writes. Schürer (revised edition) cites evidence from documents found in Egypt, "namely ostraka from Edfu, listed in CPJ II, nos. 160-229, . . . showing that the tax was paid by both males and females from age 3 to 60 or 62, as is shown by no. 421. Slaves and freedmen of a household were also included." Schürer, The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ, revised edition III, 122.

116 MT/LXX Exod. 30: 22-38; MT 37: 29, LXX 38: 25.
in *Life of Moses*, which leads one to infer that Josephus had the LXX and Philo as his guides here.

Josephus lists σμύρνης σίκλους πεντακοσίους (five hundred shekels of myrrh), ἵρεως σίκλους πεντακοσίους (five hundred shekels of iris), κινναμώμου and καλάμου ἡμίσειαν τῶν πρῶτον (half that amount of cinnamon and kalamus), and ἐλάιον τε ἐλαίνου εἶν (a hin of olive oil).

There is only slight difference between Josephus' list and that found in LXX. Josephus lists the ἵρεως (iris) second, whereas LXX mentions it last. The order of MT is the same as LXX. LXX refers to the measurement for the iris as σίκλους τοῦ ἁγίου (shekel of the sanctuary), LXX spells out the number of shekels weight for the cinnamon and kalamos (διακοσίους πεντήκοντα), and LXX adds adjectives that Josephus omits: ἄνθος σμύρνης (flower of myrrh) and κινναμώμου/καλαμου εὐώδους (sweet-smelling cinnamon and kalamus). Josephus describes the anointing oil as χρίσμα εὐωδεστάτον,\(^\text{117}\) while LXX describes it as χρίσμα ἁγιον. Josephus refers to the one mixing the oil as τέχνη μυρεψῶν, while LXX calls this person τέχνη μυρεψοῦ, and Philo ὁ μυρεψικὴ τέχνη \(^\text{118}\) LXX used the adjective εὐώδους in describing the cinnamon and kalamos, which Josephus omitted. Josephus may have chosen to include this Biblical information about the sweet odor of the ointment at the last in calling it superlatively, like Philo, χρίσμα εὐωδεστάτον. From this comparison, in which there is no difference in the essential

\(^{117}\) Cf. Philo, *Life of Moses* 2.146 χρίσματος εὐωδεστάτον

\(^{118}\) Ibid., 2.146, χρίσματος εὐωδεστάτου λαβών, ὁ μυρεψικὴ τέχνη κατεργάσθη. Philo, *Who is the Heir* 196, paraphrasing LXX, calls this person μύρον μυρεψόν ἔργον συνθέσεως καθαρᾶς.
vocabulary in the two lists, it would appear warranted to infer that Josephus bases his account on LXX, but he is aware of Philo.

Josephus (3.198) adds the explanation that the great variety of perfumes (θυμιάμενα πολλὰ δ’ ἐστὶ ταῦτα καὶ ποικίλα) were brought together on the golden altar of incense in the Tabernacle. Presumably he means that the mixing of the ingredients took place here.

Josephus abbreviates the material in LXX, though not nearly so much as Philo in Life of Moses, who does not mention any of the ingredients of the ointment.119 Josephus, as Philo, omits the warning of Exod. 30: 32-33, that threatens punishment for anyone copying the recipe for the anointing oil. There would have been no apologetic usefulness in mentioning such a harsh warning.

Josephus also omits the additional spices listed in Exod. 30: 34, used to make incense: στακτὴν (stacte),120 ὀνυξα (onycha),121 χαλβάνη (sweet galbanum),122 and λίβανον διάφανή (transparent frankincense).123 Philo mentions these spices, though

119 Life of Moses 2.146. But, in Who is the Heir 196-97, Philo quotes Exod. 30: 34-35, commenting on the equal proportion of the four spices brought as symbols of the elements of which the world is made: στακτὴν symbolizes water, ὀνυξα the earth, χαλβάνη the air, and, reversing the LXX order, διάφανη λίβανον fire.

120 Josephus mentions στακτὴ only in Ant. 2.118 as one of the gifts taken to Joseph in Egypt when his brothers brought Benjamin with them.

121 ὀνυξ is also the name of a precious stone, onyx, which Josephus mentions in War 5.234 and Ant. 3.168 as one of the twelve stones on the High Priest’s breastplate.

122 Josephus nowhere mentions the word χαλβάνη.

123 In Ant. 3.143 Josephus mentions λίβανος in two cups on the table in the sanctuary, and again in Ant. 12.140 as one of the gifts given by Antiochus III to the Temple at the time Palestine was taken from the Ptolemies by the Seleucids.
not in *Life of Moses*. The omission of some detail as this may be due to his failure to remember these details, or to his opinion that details such as this were unnecessary to his project.

Josephus merely mentions in 3.199 that incense had to be burned before dawn and after sunset, which corresponds with the rubric in Exod. 30: 7-8 that Aaron should burn incense in the morning, and in the evening when he lights the lamps—a constant incense offering before the Lord for their generations. As Thackeray notes, it was also the practice described in II Chron. 13: 11, where the ὀλοκαυτώμα, the holocaust or whole burnt offering, and θυμίαμα συνθήσεως is specifically mentioned for the morning and evening.

Josephus adds a detail not found in any of the Biblical rubrics concerning the candelabrum, that three of the lamps on the candelabrum were lit in the morning and the rest in the evening.

---

124 *Who is the Heir* 196. Here the slight differences between Philo and LXX as we have it may be due to the form of the Greek text before him which Philo was copying faithfully.

125 M Yoma 3: 4-5 makes comment on the incense of the morning (.isRequired), and the incense of twilight (isRequired) (Cf. BT Yoma 33a). Nodet cites BT Yoma 39a, which actually doesn’t contribute to the understanding of Josephus remarks on the strength of the incense’s fragrance which made it unnecessary for brides in Jerusalem to perfume themselves, and made goats in Jericho sneeze.

126 *Josephus* IV, 412, note a.

127 Nodet II, 166, note 1, calls attention to the ambiguity of the Biblical descriptions of the lighting of the candelabrum (cf. Exod 25: 37), which state that the lamps would shine from one front [καὶ φανερὰν ἐκ τοῦ ἐνὸς προσώπου]; 27: 20, which states that a lamp will shine [Ἰνα καὴται λύχνους διαπαντὸς ἐν τῇ σκήνῃ τοῦ μαρτυρίου], where the anarthrous λύχνος may refer to only one of the seven lamps, but more probably refers to the candelabrum as a whole; 30: 8, where it says that ἕξαπτη Ἀρωπον τοὺς λύχνους ὠψ; which is concord with Lev. 24: 1-4, where it seems from v. 4 that all the lamps [τοὺς λύχνους] are to burn continuously; I Sam. 3: 3, where it is the candelabrum in its entirety that seems to be implied that is simply lit, before it was trimmed, which implies that it was night at the time; and II Chron 13: 11, which tells of lighting the candelabrum.
Here again Josephus interjects what may be an anachronism, imputing to ancient times the practice of his own day, as he did in the case of the half-shekel assessment.

**Josephus' Postscript on the Architects**

Sections 200 and 201 comment briefly again on the architects for the Tabernacle, and, in an extra-biblical detail, on the time frame of the construction project. Section 200 seems to be equivalent to the first part of the Exodus Tabernacle account, which looks forward to the building of the Tabernacle. Here the two principal architects, Βεσελέηλος and Ἐλίαβος are chosen for the work to come, as the two most inventive among many architects, with Βεσελέηλος being the better of the two. From Josephus' description of the details of the Tabernacle, it is unclear to what he refers when he

in the evening only. Nodet comments that Josephus is the only witness to the practice during the Second Temple period, so that what he says of three lamps being lit in the morning, and the rest at evening refers to the practice in the Temple of his day. M. Tamid 3: 9 E. (reading from Neusner's translation) presumably describes the practice of the Temple prior to its destruction: "He who had won the right to clean the candlestick entered, and [if] he found the two eastern lights flickering, he cleaned the rest and left those flickering in their place. F. [If] he found that they had gone out, he cleaned them and lit them from those which were [yet] flickering." Here the mishnah in section "F." would seem to indicate that at least two lamps, besides the two flickering lamps, were lit at the time the priest came to care for the candlestick. This suggests that more than three lamps were lit at the time. M. Tamid 6: 1 E. seems to describe the practice in the morning. "And [if] he found the two easternmost lamps still flickering, he clears out the eastern one and leaves the western one flickering, (F.) for from it did he kindle the candlestick at twilight. G. [If] he found that it had gone out, he cleaned it out and kindled it from the altar of the whole offering." Here, at some point, only one lamp would be lit, the western one. If the western lamp was extinguished, he would relight it from the altar of the whole offering. Neusner, *Mishnah*, pp. 867, 870-71. M Yoma 3: 4-5 makes comment on the incense of the morning (ר"ל על כל הע crist), and the incense of twilight (ר"ל על כל הע crist) (Cf. BT Yoma 33a). Nodet cites BT Yoma 39a, which actually doesn't contribute to the understanding of Josephus here. Here the Talmud remarks on the strength of the incense's fragrance which made it unnecessary for brides in Jerusalem to perfume themselves, and made goats in Jericho sneeze!

128Cf. *Ant.* 3.105, where Josephus introduces them.
states that they devised things unknown before. This may imply that the guidelines given to Moses, which they followed scrupulously, resulted in their designing previously unknown objects. One might say that every part of the Tabernacle was unknown before; each element was newly designed according to the commands of God. Previously, as I have noted in chapter II, Josephus, in accordance with rabbinic tradition, presented the two architects as equals (3.105). In 3.204, Josephus announces that (presumably all) the workers (ἐργασμένους) were rewarded for the excellence of their labors.

Josephus writes (3.201) that the Tabernacle took seven months to build, and that it was finished by the time of the first anniversary of the Exodus. Exod. 40: 17 reads that "in the first month, in the second year after their going forth out of Egypt, at the new moon, the tabernacle was set up" (ἐν τῷ μηνὶ τῷ πρώτῳ τῷ δευτέρῳ έτει, ἐκκορασμένων αὐτῶν ἐξ Αἰγύπτου, νοομηνίας ἐστάθη ἢ σκηνή). According to Exod. 19: 1, the Israelites came into the wilderness of Sinai on the third month, to the day, after the exodus from Egypt. The first month of the second year, as Exod.40: 17 reads, is virtually the same date as the first anniversary of the exodus, as Josephus explains.

There is no specific biblical warrant for Josephus remark that the Tabernacle took seven months to build. But there was the precedent of special significance for the seventh month in Jewish history.
Josephus may be tying in the completion of the Tabernacle with Yom Kippur. According to Jubilees 34: 18, on Yom Kippur a kid (ἐφίφος) was sacrificed, because Joseph's coat was dipped in kid's blood before it was taken to Jacob, his father, with the news that Joseph had been killed. This non-biblical detail may have been known to Josephus, prompting him to include a kid (3.204) among the three animals killed in the consecration of Aaron and his sons. According to Lev. 23: 24 the first day of the seventh month was proclaimed by God as a day of solemn rest, a memorial proclaimed with blast of trumpets, a holy convocation." Thus began the preparation for Yom Kippur, which took place on the tenth day of the seventh month (Lev. 16: 29; 23: 27). That Lev. stresses that the first day of the seventh month would be a καινόθεν ἑγερτήμα, a holy convocation, may be taken up by Josephus as a day for celebration for the completion of the Tabernacle.

The Anointing of Priests and Tabernacle

Josephus tells of the process of consecrating the priests and Tabernacle in two stages: 1) 3.197-98, and 2) 3.205-06. In the first stage, he reflects both orders of anointing found in Exod. In 3.197-198, he briefly introduces the anointing of the Tabernacle and of the

129Ginzberg, *Legends of the Jews* III, 139; VI, 58, note 301, cites Pirke de R. Eliezer 46 where it is written that Yom Kippur was the day on which Israel received the Torah. In III, 151, Ginzberg gives the legend that God commanded Moses to build the Tabernacle on Yom Kippur (Cf. VI, 63, note 322, where Ginzberg lists as his sources for this legend Tan. Terumah 5-8; Tan. B. II, 90-92; Shir 4.13; Zohar II, 148a. In *Legends of the Jews*, II, 27, Ginzberg records the legend found in Jubilees 34: 12-19, of the origin of Yom Kippur as the day (on the tenth day of the month Tishri) when Josephus' brothers brought word to their father, Jacob, that Josephus died. They dipped Josephus' coat in the blood of a kid, and thus the blood of a kid was to be used to atone for sins on Yom Kippur.
priests, "Ἡγνίζε δὲ καὶ τὴν σκηνὴν καὶ τοὺς ἱερέας, which corresponds to Exod. 30: 26-30, καὶ ἁγιάσεις αὐτὰ [τὴν σκηνὴν τοῦ μαρτυρίου καὶ τὴν κιβωτόν]. . καὶ Ἀαρών καὶ τοὺς νίους αὐτοῦ χρίσεις. Then, in 3.198, after describing the ingredients of the anointing oil, Josephus reverses the order, saying, αὐτοὺς τε τοὺς ἱερέας καὶ πάσαν τὴν σκηνὴν χρίων κεκάθαρκε. Thus Josephus gives, within a paragraph, the orders of consecration as they are found in the conflicting orders found in Exod.

The text of Exod., as Nelson has written, was revised between parts I and II of the Tabernacle account. Josephus may have been writing in a time when this revision was underway, so that he reflects the conflicts inherent in the revision process. Revision seems to have occurred even within part I. In part I, Exod. 29: 4-37 describes the anointing of Aaron and his sons as priests, and then of the altar, beginning with the words, "You shall consecrate them" (ἀγιάσεις αὐτοὺς). Exod. 29: 44, then reads: "I [i.e. God] will consecrate the tent of meeting and the altar; Aaron also and his sons I will consecrate, to serve me as priests (ἀγιάσω τὴν σκηνὴν τοῦ μαρτυρίου, καὶ . . . Ἀαρών καὶ τοὺς νίους. . .)." This second explanation of a Divine consecration gives the order: tent, altar, and priests, with the suggestion that the event was an unmediated, Divine act. Exod. 30: 22-30, also in part I of the Tabernacle account, in a section that follows the description and function of the laver (that seems out of place), describes in some detail first the anointing of the Tabernacle, and then of the priests.

In part II of the Tabernacle account MT 40: 9-15/LXX 40: 7-14 as in Exod. 30: 26-30, the anointing of the Tabernacle comes first, and then the anointing of the priests. Josephus attempts to distil from the rather complicated, repetitive description now found in Exod. a description of what essentially took place in the consecration of the Tabernacle and priesthood. In doing so, he changes some steps, either intentionally, in order to compress the Biblical material, or inadvertently, in the attempt to summarize, or simply because he was writing from memory and forgot the details. In any case, he was working with sources of varying reliability.

That he was writing from memory seems to be the reason for describing the descent of the cloud on the Tabernacle (3.203), in God's visitation, before finishing his account of the anointing of the priests (3.205-06). Here he makes use of a word Christian writers used in a different, Christological sense, as he refers to this cloud as the παρουσία of God. At the beginning of the Tabernacle narrative (3.100) Josephus had stated that the purpose of the Tabernacle was to provide a place where God "might be present at our prayers," (παρατυχανή ταίς ἡμετέραις ἐν χαις). The cloud showed this presence. It seems that he must have intended to end the Tabernacle account at 3.203, but then decided to add something


more on the anointing, before telling of the sacrifices that were offered once the Tabernacle and priests were duly consecrated.

Whereas Exod. 29: 1 gives the rubric that "one young calf from the herd (μοσχάριον ἐκ βοῶν ἔν) and unleavened bread kneaded with oil, and unleavened cakes anointed with oil (ἀρτοὺς ἀζύμους πεφυραμένου ἔν ἑλαίῳ, καὶ λάγανα ἄζυμα κεχρισμένα ἐν ἑλαίῳ) should be brought to the Tabernacle before Aaron and his sons are washed, Josephus omits this ceremony, proposing to describe this ritual in his projected work περὶ θυσιῶν.133

Whereas Exod. 29: 4-9 and Philo (Life of Moses 2.143) explain that Aaron and his sons were washed prior to putting on their vestments, in Ant. 3.205 Josephus describes the washing and anointing of Aaron and his sons, who are already clad in their vestments. Josephus has undoubtedly simply omitted the order of anointing and vesting described in Exod. He omitted the order no doubt because his purpose in writing of these matters was to give the details that would be pertinent to his readership, rather than to simply reproduce what was in Exodus.

133 Thackeray notes that this projected work, refers to his previously mentioned, projected work on "Customs and Causes" (first alluded to in Ant. 1.25, specifically mentioned in Ant. 4.198, and promised to contain four books in Ant. 20.268). But, Thackeray observes, when Josephus arrives at a suitable point in his narrative to describe the ritual, 3.224, he does not do so. Thackeray writes of Josephus' text in 3.205 etc., "The text here (a parenthesis, perhaps a p.s.) and below (§§ 213 f, 218, 223 f) betrays signs of rewriting. The author seems to be in doubt how much to include in the present work on the sacrifices, how much to reserve for a separate treatise, and breaks off more than once from the subject. Probably, when the projected treatise was finally abandoned, he incorporated much more of its intended contents in later editions of the Antiquities." Josephus IV, 414-15, note a.
Exod. 29: 4 f outlines, step by step, the ritual to be followed in consecrating Aaron and his sons. First comes the washing with water of Aaron and his sons. Second comes the vesting of Aaron, followed by the third step, his anointing with oil. Fourth, Aaron's sons are clad with their special priestly garments, with the girdles (ζωνας) and turbans (κύδσρες) mentioned specifically. Fifth, Aaron and his sons place their hands on the head of the calf, after which it is killed at the door of the Tabernacle, and its blood put on the horns and base of the altar. Sixth (29: 15), Aaron and his sons place their hands on the head of one of two unblemished rams, after which it is killed, and its blood is poured around the altar. Seventh, (29: 19 f) Aaron and his sons place their hands on the head of the second ram, after which it is killed, and its blood placed on the tips of Aaron's and his sons' right ear, right thumb, and the great toe of their right feet. Eighth, blood from the altar and anointing oil were sprinkled on Aaron and his sons, and on their vestments; thus is Aaron set apart (ἀναστήσεται), together with his sons. Orders are then left for the method of passing on the priesthood to the succeeding generations of priests (29: 29-30).

Josephus' order of description has little correlation to Exod. Once again, Josephus' design was to provide an impressive picture of

---

134 More steps might be seen in this process if the preliminaries, and the disposition of the parts of the calf, mentioned in 29: 13-14 and of the rams in 29: 17-18, 22, and the wave offering, that represents the supply of the priests' needs in days to come, are counted. I have taken into account only the steps in the process that directly touched Aaron and his sons.

135 Philo, Life of Moses 2.150-51, explains this action: "In this figure, he indicated that the fully-consecrated must be pure in words and actions and in his whole life; for words are judged by the hearing, the hand is a symbol of action, and the foot of the pilgrimage of life."
this ceremony, rather than to reproduce the details of Scripture. His order in 3.205 has two steps: 1) the sprinkling of blood on Aaron's vestments and on Aaron himself; 2) the washing with spring water and sweet oil. Exod. 29: 1-4 describes the sacrifice of a young calf and two rams prior to Aaron's and his sons' washing at the door of the Tabernacle, but the blood from this sacrifice does not touch Aaron, his sons, or the Tabernacle until later. Josephus omits the unleavened bread anointed with oil, that was part of this preparatory ritual.

Josephus may have been generalizing about the sacrifices Exodus describes, though from Exod. it seems that the sacrifices were not the source of the blood used in anointing Aaron and his sons. These were details that he intended to clarify in his projected work on the priests being anointed with blood taken from animals specially slaughtered for this sprinkling of consecration to office and dedication of the altar (Exod. 29: 1-12). The calf and rams were then burned on the altar, but this does not diminish the fact that they were killed specially for the anointing. This seems to be the intention of Exod. 29: 28, where the animals killed for anointing are called a perpetual and special offering (νόμιμον αἰώνιον παρὰ τῶν νῦν Ἰσραήλ. ἔστι' ἀρ ἁφόρισμα τοῦτο).

Josephus (3.206) states that for seven days, the priests and their vestments are purified with spring water (πηγαίοις τε ὤδασι), myrrh (μύρῳ), and with "the blood of bulls and rams" (τῷ αἵματι τῶν ταῦρῶν καὶ κριῶν). Here he changes the order found already in this sentence, from sprinkling with blood, then water, to purging with spring water, myrrh, and blood. That this was to be done for seven
days derives from Exod. 29: 35, where it reads: "And you will do for Aaron and his sons according to whatever things I have commanded you; seven days you will fill their hands" (Καὶ ποιήσεις Ἀαρών καὶ τοῖς υἱοῖς αὐτοῦ οὕτω κατὰ πάντα ὅσα ἐνετειλάμην σοι. ἐπτὰ ἡμέρας τελειώσεις τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῶν).

Whereas the directions in Exod. calls for one calf and two rams, Josephus (3.104), in a gratuitous change, writes, instead of "two rams," κριὸν καὶ ἔριφον, "a ram and a kid." This puzzling change really adds nothing of significance to the solemnizing of the ordination process, since a ram and a kid are merely a full grown and a not full grown goat. In Ant. 11.102 Josephus again adds kids (ἔριφον) to the list of animals (which included rams) the Jews sacrificed, as described in Ezra 7: 17, when they rebuilt the Temple in Jerusalem. Nowhere in the Hebrew Bible are a kid and a ram mentioned together in a sacrifice.

Josephus may have added ἔριφον because the purpose of the sacrifice was to atone for sin. The rubric in Lev. 4: 23 (etc.) calls for a kid (γυναῖκα) in making a sin offering. Josephus would have remembered this from his own experience in the Temple, and he added this to the Tabernacle account to conform to the practice he remembered.

Josephus specification of "spring water," πηγαίοις τε ὕδασι is like Philo's description of this water as the purest and freshest spring water (ὕδατι πηγῆς). MT/LXX Exod. 29: 4/MT 40: 12 merely read
"with water" (LXX λούσεις αὐτοῦς ἐν ὕδατι). Here Josephus and Philo appear to be imputing to the purification of the priests the practice described in Numbers 19: 17, of using "running water" (LXX ὕδωρ ζῶν) in the purification after contact with someone who has died. Nodet calls attention to M. Miqvaot 1: 7 which refers to the water in the mikveh coming from a spring. In this emphasis on spring water, Josephus may have had the regulations for the mikveh in mind.

Josephus is unlike Philo, however, in other aspects of the anointing ceremony. Philo follows the order of events in Exod. describing the washing with water as a preparation for the anointing. The washing, in Exod., takes place at the door of the Tabernacle, just prior to putting on their vestments. Philo (Life of Moses 2.143), like Josephus, does not provide the detail that the washing and robing took place at the door of the Tabernacle.

Philo here states that "The installation was made with the consent of the whole nation, and followed the directions laid down by the oracles (καθίστη δὲ μετὰ τῆς ἀπαντος τοῦ ξηνούς γνώμης, ὡς τὰ λόγια ψηνειτο). Though Josephus (3.104) added to the Exod. account that the people approved the choice of the architects, he does not here mention the popular approval of the ordination process. He may have omitted mentioning this popular approval because he already was making clear the people's enthusiastic participation, and did not wish to overstate, so as to diminish the credibility of his

138Likewise Lev. 8: 6. It may be noted that LXX often uses the term πηγὴ ὕδωρ (Gen. 16: 7; 24: 13; Exod. 15: 27; Lev. 11: 36; Num. 33: 9, etc), so that Philo and Josephus would have had ample occasion to read it.
favorable account of his ancestors. Josephus (3.207) does, however, indicate the subsequent sign of the approval of the people when he states that "they, vying with and striving to surpass one another in their respective offerings, obeyed these behests," when Moses announced a feast on the day after the consecration rituals were finished, and urged the people to offer sacrifices according to their means. This adds a joyous element not found in either the Exod. or the Lev. (8-9) accounts. In fact, the event that immediately followed the inaugural activities in Scripture was the offering of "strange fire" by Aaron's two sons, Nadab and Abihu (Lev. 10: 1-2). Josephus separates the tragedy of Nadab and Abihu from the Tabernacle account with a comment on the enthusiasm of the people when the Tabernacle was completed. He no doubt separated this tragedy from the Tabernacle narrative because it diminished the glory of the Tabernacle story.

Josephus concluding remark of the Tabernacle narrative (3.207) tells of the dramatic consumption of the sacrifice that ended the dedication ceremonies. "And when the victims were laid upon the altar, of a sudden a fire blazed up therefrom spontaneously (αὐτόματον), and like a flash of lightning before their eyes, consumed everything upon the altar in flame." Exod. does not provide this detail. Josephus included this dramatic climax, without any disclaimer about the miraculous, because here his own personal enthusiasm for his people's ancient story got the upper hand over his concern for the sensibilities of his non-Jewish readers. As Professor Feldman has observed, a major objective of Josephus' changing of the Bible was "to present a profoundly religious and Jewish
interpretation of history." Here Josephus' Jewish sensitivity was altogether exposed, without apology. Exod. 40: 34-35 concludes with the descent of the cloud that filled the Tabernacle with the glory of the Lord.

The Biblical basis for this detail is Lev. 9: 24, Καὶ ἐξήλθε πῦρ παρὰ Κυρίου, καὶ κατέφαγε τὰ ἐπὶ τοῦ θυσιαστήριον, τὰ τε ὅλοκαυτώματα, καὶ τὰ στέατα. καὶ εἶδε πᾶς ὁ λαὸς, καὶ ἐξέστη, καὶ ἐπεσαν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον. Nodet observes that this was a traditional Biblical motif Josephus drew upon.

Josephus' addition of the word αὐτόματος seems to de-emphasize the Divine element in the burning of the sacrifice which is emphasized in Lev. by the term πῦρ παρὰ Κυρίου. But, from the use of this word elsewhere, I infer that he was merely selecting another word to convey the same ideas that found in Lev. 9: 24. He was not, in fact, diminishing the miraculous nature of this fire at this point.

In War 6.293-95, Josephus tells of a portent of Jerusalem's coming doom, in which a "gate was observed at the sixth hour of the night to have opened of its own accord (αὐτομάτως). He follows up on this with an explanation that God was the agent by which the gate was opened. In Ant. 1.46 Divine πρόνοια stands behind the good that seems to come spontaneously (αὐτομάτως). In Ant. 2.347, Josephus

141 Professor Feldman has remarked that Josephus sometimes used the "time-honored formula ὥς ἀν ἐκάστοις ἡ φίλων, οὕτω σκοπείτωσαν (Ἀντ. 1.108) and its equivalents elsewhere (see following note), as "an expression of courtesy to his pagan readers more than a confession of his own doubt about the veracity of these accounts." "Mikra in the Writings of Josephus, p. 506.
juxtaposes in one sentence εἴτε κατὰ βούλησιν θεοῦ εἴτε κατὰ ταυτόματον, "whether by the will of God, or spontaneously." Here he credits the deliverance of Israel through the sea, to the will of God rather than to accidental good fortune, just as God delivered Alexander's armies from the Pamphylian Sea when He had determined that the Persian Empire was to end. In Ant. 4.47, Josephus gives Moses' request to God to "Prove now once again that all is directed by thy providence, that nothing befalls fortuitously (αὐτομάτως), but that it is thy will that overrules and brings everything to its end." In Ant. 4.55, Josephus tells of the Divine response to Korah's rebellion (Num. 16), without hesitating to make clear that the fire was from God: "And suddenly there blazed forth a fire, the like of which had never in the record of history been made by the hand of man... nor yet spontaneously (αὐτομάτως), but such a flame as might be kindled at the bidding of God." In Ant. 5.24, Josephus gives Joshua's speech to Israel that "God would deliver Jericho to them and that, spontaneously (αὐτομάτως) and without effort on their part, the walls would collapse." Here clearly, God is the direct agent of Jericho's fall, and αὐτομάτως merely refers to the lack of effort needed from the Israeli forces. In Ant. 10.278 Josephus states clearly that God governs the affairs of human life by πρόνοια, against the Epicureans, who "say that the world runs by its own (αὐτομάτως) movement without knowing a guide or another's care."

It seems clear that Josephus did not hesitate to state that God was the source of the fire that consumed the sacrifice offered when the Tabernacle was finished, even as he did not hesitate in other
places to tell of direct Divine intervention. This is in keeping with his exhortation to the reader, found in Ant. 1.15, to "fix [his] thoughts on God, and to test whether our lawgiver has had a worthy conception of His nature and has always assigned to Him such actions as befit His power, keeping his words concerning Him pure of that unseemly mythology current among others." Furthermore, he does not append the disclaimer, περὶ μὲν τούτων, ὡς ἄν ἐκάστοις ἡ φίλον, οὕτω σκοπεῖτωσαι, which he offers with elements of the miraculous elsewhere.142

Thus, Josephus concludes the Tabernacle narrative with an emphasis on the Divine presence, as he began (3.100) by saying that the purpose of the Tabernacle was that God would no longer need to come down to Mt. Sinai, but "himself, frequenting the tabernacle, may be present at our prayers." Whereas at the beginning, Josephus emphasized God's presence at the prayers of Israel, at the end, God's power is dramatically shown at a sacrifice.

CONCLUSION

In this study I have attempted to make an analysis of the description of the ancient Israelite Tabernacle found in Josephus' *Jewish Antiquities* 3. 99-207. Here Josephus described not only the Tabernacle and its furnishings, but also the institution of the priesthood that served in the Tabernacle.

I have searched the Greek and Hebrew Bible, to learn what form of the developing text Josephus had before him. I found that Josephus drew upon Numbers as well as Exodus, and he was clearly influenced by Ezekiel's vision of an idealized Temple. Sometimes he evidently wrote from memory, influenced by his personal recollection of Temple worship as well as of the Scriptural record.

I conclude that Josephus clearly used both the Hebrew and Greek forms of the Bible. Nelson stated that Josephus principally followed "a Palestinian Greek text which was related to the Greek of Gk I and non-core Gk II. . .a text close to the present MT."1 I have found Nelson's view here to be correct.

However, Josephus clearly was aware of Philo's account of the Tabernacle as well. While not following Philo rigidly, where he does seem to follow him, and while sometimes being very different from Philo, there are significant ways in which he is like Philo.

Even though Josephus customarily changed the vocabulary found in the Biblical text he used, sometimes it is his vocabulary itself that provides fairly certain evidence when he was reading from

---

a Greek or Hebrew text (for example in describing the parts of the candelabrum, he scarcely changes the Greek names of parts of the candelabrum). At times he is obviously following the Hebrew text. One very obvious evidence of Josephus' attention to the Hebrew Bible is found when he transliterates the Hebrew terms for various elements of the Tabernacle and priestly vestments.

I have also searched other Jewish and non-Jewish sources that seem to have been of some influence on Josephus as he sought for the appropriate means of explaining the Tabernacle for readers whom he expected to include sympathetic, non-Jewish intellectuals, as well as fellow Jews who were either skeptical of him, or were in need of the encouragement he could provide by describing the grandeur of their ancient sacred Place, the Tabernacle.

Among Jewish writers I found that Josephus was well acquainted with various of Philo's works, though principally with his Life of Moses II, which was written for reasons similar to Josephus' in writing the parts of the Jewish Antiquities having to do with Moses. The clear parallel between some of Josephus' hagadic extras and remarks found in the Mishnah, Talmud and various midrashim suggest that he was a participant in the development of early hagadah.

The evidence I found from rabbinic sources mostly confirmed the view that Josephus, as the rabbis, respected and mostly adhered to the text as they found it. Some expansions in Josephus' account that are like expansions found in the Mishnah, Talmud, and the midrashim, suggest that Josephus drew on a common fund of halakha and hagadah. Josephus is a datable witness to some hagadic and
halakik developments that appear later in the midrashim and Talmud.

The shrine of Apollo at Delphi was evidently an important source for Josephus as he looked for pagan parallels to enhance the prestige of the Tabernacle. Josephus may have learned of Apollo's temple from Herodotus, or from Plutarch, or from hearsay he listened to in Rome. From the second-century Greek writer, Pausanias, I found evidence of the Delphic lore which Josephus would have heard in Rome, which he then borrowed for the purpose of describing the grand Tabernacle of his ancestors.

Josephus' Tabernacle account fulfills well the interests of Jewish and non-Jewish readers. Here one does not find, overall, the kind of concern with "anti-Semites" that is found in *Apion*, despite Josephus' expression of alarm at anti-Jewish sentiments in *Ant.* 3.179. He is essentially explaining the ancient Tabernacle for the benefit of curious non-Jews.

Josephus' attempt to explain the significance of the Tabernacle never reached the level of allegory, but he clearly tried to provide a bridge of understanding between his people and Hellenistic intellectuals, principally Stoics, by hinting at the cosmic pertinence of the Tabernacle. In this Philo probably served as his model. Josephus is a first-century C.E. witness to a strain of mystical interest in Palestinian Judaism that appeared as well in the ornamentation of diaspora synagogues in subsequent centuries.

"Ωσπερ ἕνια χαίρουσι πατρίδα βλέπειν,
osτως καὶ τοῖς κάμνουσι βιβλίου τέλος."
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