



Josephus and Luke-Acts: A critical review of a thesis by Steve Mason

NPL Allen

orcid.org  0000-0002-6843-1865

Dissertation accepted in fulfilment of the
requirements for the degree *Master of Theology in
New Testament* at the North-West University

Supervisor: Prof. P.J Jordaan

Graduation ceremony: July 2019
Student number: 23445653

Abstract

This research project primarily concerns itself with a theory perfected by Steve Mason, concerning the more probable sources and inspirations for both the content and literary style of Luke-Acts, specifically:

This theory, I have termed the “Mason thesis” and which advocates that apart from its obvious dependence on Q. and Ev.Matt. Luke-Acts, was largely indebted to Josephus for much of his historical information as well as his favoured rhetorical strategy.

Acknowledgements

I would like to draw attention to but a select few of the many individuals who, each in their own way, contributed to the completion of this research project and have earned my most grateful appreciation:

My sincerest thanks go to my promoter, Prof. Dr Pierre Johan Jordaan, for his expert advice and guidance. In addition, I need to acknowledge Dr Johan Steenkamp for his erudition.

Last but not least, I am most indebted to my wife, Iris Marié Allen for her moral support, encouragement and marvellous editorial skills.

Declaration

I declare that the entirety of the work contained herein is my own, original work, that I am the authorship owner thereof (unless to the extent explicitly otherwise stated) and that I have not previously in its entirety or in part submitted it for obtaining any qualification.

Date: 29 September 2018

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Topic	Page
Abbreviations:	iv
List of Figures:	viii
Chapter One (Introduction):	1
1.1 Background to the Problem:	1
1.2 Statement of the Problem:	4
1.3 Statement of the Sub-Problems:	5
1.4 Definition of Terms	5
1.5 Delimitations of Research	8
1.6 Assumptions of the Research	9
1.7 Research Design / Methodology	10
1.8 Central Theoretical Argument	12
1.9 The Importance of the Research	13
1.10 Overview of the Research Project	14
Chapter Two (A Critical Review of Mason’s Methodology):	16
2.1 Introduction	16
2.2 The Influence of Collingwood	17
2.3 The Importance of the Linguistic Paradigm	19
2.4 The Hermeneutic of Suspicion versus the Hermeneutic of Trust	19
2.5 Mason’s Preferred Methodology	21
Chapter Three (A Critical Overview of the Mason Thesis):	31
3.1 Introduction	31
3.2 The Historical Context of Mason’s Thesis	31
3.3 Josephus and Luke in the Context of Hellenistic History Writing	32
3.4 Portraying Christianity in a Jewish Context	45
3.5 Evidence of Historiographical Influence and Josephan Rhetoric	51
3.6 Circumstantial Evidence of Plagiarism	63
3.7 Comparable Evidence of Plagiarism	74
3.8 Correspondences Between Literary Themes and Choice of Vocabulary	97
3.9 Chapter Three Summary	117
Chapter Four (Arguments in Favour of the Mason Thesis):	120
4.1 Introduction	120
4.2 General Points of Agreement	120
4.3 Comparable Parallels	124
4.4 Chapter Four Summary	147
Chapter Five (Alternate Views to the Mason Thesis):	150
5.1 Introduction	150
5.2 Conservative Christian Arguments	150
5.3 The Dating of Luke-Acts	151
5.4 The Authorship of Luke-Acts	169
5.5 The Unity of Luke-Acts	178

5.6 Luke-Acts as Hellenistic History Writing	186
5.7 Luke-Acts as Apologetic Historiography	204
5.8 Josephus as a Possible Influence on Luke-Acts	206
5.9 Chapter Five Summary	210
Chapter Six (Josephus's Reliability as an Historian):	213
6.1 Introduction	213
6.2 Josephus's Status as a Reliable Historian	213
6.3 Josephus's Honesty	213
6.4 Josephus's Agenda and Attitude to Sources	216
Chapter Seven (Conclusions):	221
7.1 Introduction	221
7.2 The Problem of Research	221
7.3 The Sub-Problems of Research	221
7.4 Conclusions	230
Source List	232

ABBREVIATIONS

The following abbreviations will be employed for all cited Biblical/Scriptural and Classical Works. For the purposes of consistency and standardisation, all abbreviations of works and authors will follow, as closely as possible, a system originally proposed by Liddell and Scott¹.

Θουκυδίδης a.k.a. Thucydides (c. 460 – c. 395 B.C.E.)	
Abbreviation	Title of Work
<i>Thucy.Hist.</i>	<i>Historia</i> (Ἱστορία) <i>History of the Peloponnesian War</i>

Πλάτων a.k.a. Plato (c. 425 – c. 347 B.C.E.)	
Abbreviation	Title of Work
<i>Plat.Phd.</i>	<i>Phædo</i> (Φαίδων)
<i>Plat.Ap.</i>	<i>Apologia Socratis</i> (Ἀπολογία Σωκράτους)

Ἀριστοτέλης a.k.a. Aristotle (c. 384 – c. 322 B.C.E.)	
Abbreviation	Title of Work
<i>Arist.Po.</i>	<i>Aristoteles Poetica</i> (Περὶ ποιητικῆς)

¹ Cf. Liddell and Scott. 1996. *Greek-English Lexicon*.

Ἄρατος ὁ Σολεός a.k.a. Aratus Epicus a.k.a Aratus (c. 315/310 - 240 B.C.E.)	
Abbreviation	Title of Work
<i>Arat.Phæn.</i>	<i>Phænomena</i> (Φαινόμενα)

Marcus Tullius Cicero a.k.a. Cicero (106 – 43 B.C.E.)	
Abbreviation	Title of Work
<i>Pro. Flacco</i>	<i>Pro L. Flacco Oratio</i>

Lucius Annaeus Seneca a.k.a. Seneca (c. 4 B.C.E. - 65 C.E.)	
Abbreviation	Title of Work
Sen.Ep.	<i>Epistulae Morales ad Lucilium a.k.a. Letters Dealing with Moral Issues Written to Lucilius Junior</i>

Ἰγνάτιος Ἀντιοχείας a.k.a. Ignatius of Antioch a.k.a. Ἰγνάτιος ὁ Θεοφόρος a.k.a. Ignatius Theophorus (c. 35/50 – 98/117 C.E.)	
Abbreviation	Title of Work
Ep.Smyrn.	Epistle to the Smyrnaeans

Ἰωσήφ ὁ Βηθλεημῆταις a.k.a. Ἰώσηπος a.k.a. Flavius Josephus a.k.a. Josephus (37 – c. 100 C.E.)	
Abbreviation	Title of Work
<i>AJ</i>	<i>Antiquitates Judaicae</i> (Ἰουδαϊκὴ Ἀρχαιολογία)
<i>BJ</i>	<i>Bellum Judaicum</i> (Φλαυίου Ἰωσήπου ἱστορία Ἰουδαϊκοῦ πολέμου πρὸς Ῥωμαίους βιβλία)
<i>Ap.</i>	<i>Contra Apionem</i> (Φλαυίου Ἰωσήπου περὶ ἀρχαιότητος Ἰουδαίων λόγος α and Φλαυίου Ἰωσήπου περὶ ἀρχαιότητος ἀντιρρητικὸς λόγος β)
<i>Vit.</i>	<i>Vita</i> (Ἰωσήπου βίος)

Πλούταρχος a.k.a. Plutarch a.k.a. Lucius Mestrius Plutarchus (46 – 120 C.E.)	
Abbreviation	Title of Work
<i>Superst.</i>	<i>De superstitione</i> (Περὶ δεισιδαιμονίας)

Πολύκαρπος a.k.a. Polycarp of Smyrna (c. 80 – 167 C.E.)	
Abbreviation	Title of Work
Phil.	Epistle to the Philippians

Κλήμης Ῥώμης a.k.a. Clemens Romanus a.k.a. Pope Clement I (d. 99 C.E.)	
Abbreviation	Title of Work
1 Clem.	1 st Epistle to the Corinthians (Assumed authorship of Clement I)
2 Clem.	2 nd Epistle to the Corinthians (Pseudo-Clement)

Isho'dad of Merv (c. 35/50 – 98/117 C.E.)	
Abbreviation	Title of Work
Com.Act.Ap.	Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles

Publius Cornelius Tacitus a.k.a. Tacitus (c. 55 - 117 C.E.)	
Abbreviation	Title of Work
An.	Annales

Ἰουστίνου a.k.a. Iustinus Philosophus a.k.a. Justin Martyr (c. 100 – 163/167 C.E.)	
Abbreviation	Title of Work
TID	<i>Tryphone Iudeo Dialogus</i> (Τοῦ ἁγίου Ἰουστίνου πρὸς Τρύφωνα Ἰουδαῖον Διάλογος)

Λουκιανὸς ὁ Σαμοσατεύς a.k.a. Lucianus Samosatensis a.k.a. Lucian of Samosata (c. 125 – after 180 C.E.)	
Abbreviation	Title of Work
Men.	<i>Menippus</i> , or The Descent Into Hades
Hist.Conscr.	<i>Quomodo historia conscribenda sit</i> (Πῶς δεῖ ἱστορίαν συγγράφειν) a.k.a. <i>The Way to Write History, An Essay in Literary Criticism.</i>

Ἄρριανός a.k.a. Lucius Flavius Arrianus "Xenophon" a.k.a. Arrian (c. 86 – c. 160 C.E.)	
Abbreviation	Title of Work
Diatr.	<i>Diatribai</i> (Ἐπικτήτου διατριβαί) a.k.a. <i>The Discourses of Epictetus.</i>

Ἅγιος Ἡγήσιππος a.k.a. Saint Hegessipus (c.110 - 180 C.E.)	
Abbreviation	Title of Work
Hypo.	<i>Hypomnemata</i> (Ὑπομνήματα)

Quintus Septimius Florens Tertullianus a.k.a. Tertullian (c.160 – c. 225 C.E.)	
Abbreviation	Title of Work
Adv. Marc.	<i>Adversus Marcionem</i>

Εἰρηναῖος a.k.a. Irenaeus a.k.a. Irenaeus (fl. 180 – c. 202 C.E.)	
Abbreviation	Title of Work
CH	<i>Contra Haereses</i> (Κατὰ αἱρέσεων)

Διογένης Λαέρτιος a.k.a. Diogenes Laërtius (c. 200 – 250 C.E.)	
Abbreviation	Title of Work
Diog. Vit.	(Βίοι καὶ γνῶμαι τῶν ἐν φιλοσοφίᾳ εὐδοκιμησάντων) a.k.a. <i>Lives and Opinions of Eminent Philosophers</i>

Eusebius Pamphili a.k.a. Eusebius of Caesarea a.k.a. Eusebius (c. 263 – c. 339 C.E.)

Abbreviation	Title of Work
<i>HE</i>	<i>Historia Ecclesiastica</i> (Ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἱστορίας)

General Reference Works

Abbreviation	Title of Work
<i>EJ</i>	<i>Encyclopaedia Judaica</i> . 1982. Ed. Fern Seckbach. 17 Volumes. Jerusalem: Keterpress.
JVL	The Jewish Virtual Library [Online]. Available: http://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/jsource/judaica/ejud_0002_002_1_0_21428.html [26 January 2015].

Biblical/Scriptural Works

Abbreviation	Title of Work
LXX	<i>Vetus Testamentum Graece Redditum</i>
MT	Masoretic Text (Hebrew Bible)
Am.	Amos
De.	Deuteronomy
Ex.	Exodus
Ge.	Genesis
Is.	Isaiah
Jl.	Joel
Lev.	Leviticus
Ps.	Psalms
<i>NT</i>	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
Act.Ap.	Acts of the Apostles
Ep.Col.	Epistle to the Colossians
1 Ep.Cor.	1st Epistle to the Corinthians
2 Ep.Cor.	2nd Epistle to the Corinthians
Ep.Gal.	Epistle to the Galatians
Ep.Phil.	Epistle to the Philippians
Ep.Hebr.	Epistle to the Hebrews
Ep.Philem.	Epistle to Philemon
Ep.Rom.	Epistle to the Romans
1 Ep.Thess.	1st Epistle to the Thessalonians
2 Ep.Ti.	2nd Epistle to Timothy
Ev.Jo.	Gospel according to John
Ev.Luc.	Gospel according to Luke
Ev.Marc.	Gospel according to Mark

Ev.Matt.	Gospel according to Matthew
Ev.Thom.	Gospel according to Thomas
Q.	Hypothetical Quelle Proto-Gospel

Bible Editions	
Abbreviation	Title of Work
JSB	The Jewish Study Bible. 2004. Eds Adele Berlin and Marc Zvi Brettler, New York: Oxford University Press.
NA ^{6r}	Novum Testamentum Graece. Nestle-Aland Text. 1992. Eds Kurt and Barbara Aland, Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 6th edn.

LIST OF FIGURES

Title		Page
Figure 1:	A Typical Conjectural Timeline for the Apostle Paul's Ministry:	152
Figure 2:	A Comparison of Commonly Employed Vocabulary apropos Luke's πρόλογος (Ev.Luc. 1: 1 – 3) and Josephus' explanation of his historiographical procedures (Ap. I, 10 / 53 – 55).	206
Figure 3:	A Comparison between the Secondary πρόλογοι (Ap. 2, 2 / 1 – 2 and Act.Ap. 1: 1 – 3).	207

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

1.1 Background to the Problem

Steve Mason held the Kirby Laing Chair of New Testament Exegesis (University of Aberdeen: School of Divinity, History and Philosophy) from 2011 until 2015. Since August 1, 2015, he has held the position of Distinguished Professor of Ancient Mediterranean Religions and Cultures at the Faculty of Theology and Religious Studies of the University of Groningen. Mason is a leading scholar in the history and literature of the eastern Mediterranean under Roman rule, especially Roman Judaea, the Jewish historian Flavius Josephus, and Christian-Jewish-Roman relations. He is also well-known in academic circles for his thesis that claims that the author(s) of Ev.Luc. and Act.Ap. relied heavily on, inter alia, specific historical data originally found in the various writings of Josephus Flavius².

In his seminal work (*Josephus and the New Testament* [2nd Edition]), Mason (2003: 297 – 298) stresses that an extensive knowledge of Josephus' works is imperative for a student who wishes to gain a more comprehensive understanding of the social, cultural and political world described in the *NT*.

Few would argue with him here. However, Mason goes somewhat further by highlighting key events described by Josephus in both his *Judean War* (75 C.E.) and *Antiquities of the Jews* (c. 94 C.E.) that seem to be the models for similar accounts recorded in, inter alia, Ev.Luc. and Act.Ap. The implication being that the author(s) of these two *NT* books was/were slavishly dependent on Josephus for both content and style. In addition, if validated, it would point to a late (possibly mid-second century C.E.) date for the composition of the final form of Luke-Acts. The upshot of this theory, which first appeared in print in 1992, is that due to the extent of the Lucan debt to Josephus, both Ev.Luc. and Act.Ap. were largely composed artificially, are both totally apocryphal in nature and guilty of excessive plagiarism of the only reliable historical source (i.e. Josephus) available at the time. A less likely alternative to this thesis is that Josephus and the *NT* author(s) in question were reliant on a common (albeit non-extant), source. Mason (1993: 233) explains that apropos the relationship between Josephus and Luke-Acts:

² יוסף הכהן בן מתתיהו a.k.a. Ἰώσηπος Ματθίου a.k.a. *Titus Flavius Josephus* (c. 37 – 100 C.E.).

Regardless of how one settles this famous problem, the parallels of genre between the two works illuminate the interpretation of Luke-Acts. We see here a two-volume history written according to current conventions, which shares with Josephus' works the goal of explaining and defending what seems troublesome to many in the Roman world³. But it seems that we can go further. Close inspection of the many affinities between Josephus and Luke-Acts indicates that Luke knew the writings of his famous Jewish contemporary.

In this context, Mason believes that the author(s) of Ev.Luc. and Act.Ap. ultimately created a rationale for Christianity which is essentially founded on Josephus' original defence of Judaism. Mason also strongly intimates that if his thesis is disproven, it will be difficult to explain away what are for him, the extraordinary correspondences that currently exist in the analogous texts. Some of the key areas that are stressed by Mason (2003), with reference to either content or style, include the similar accounts of such topics as the census under Quirinius in Syria and Judea (c. 6 C.E.), the actions of historical personages such as Judas the Galilean, Theudas, and the Egyptian Prophet (c. 52 – c. 62 C.E.); the role and specific mention of the *Sicarii* (c. 52 – c. 62 C.E.), the portrayal of Herod Agrippa II and *Marcus Antonius Felix*, the hegemony of the Pharisaic movement, the limited influence of the Sadducees and episodes of divine justice etc.

Few biblical scholars support Mason's thesis. Here, the most notable has to be Carrier (2000) who fully endorses Mason's findings. Carrier (2000) has even managed to augment the seeming coincidences between the Lucan material and key passages from Josephus's works. Gnuse also seems to buy into some of Mason's concepts (cf. 2002:158). It is also perplexing that one author (Einhorn, 2012:1-40) refers to Mason only once and seemingly in passing (2012:20 n.54) but still proceeds to give her own very detailed version of this thesis without any acknowledgment of its source!

Bermejo-Rubio, (2016: 93) refers to Mason's thesis as a "much-debated and thorny issue" and scholars such as Brighton (2011:552ff) reject it altogether. In this context Brighton concludes that the works of Josephus have possibly been misused in order to accuse the author(s) of Act.Ap. of historical error. Ultimately, Brighton (2011:558) feels that, at best, Act.Ap. "provides independent confirmation of Josephus's

³ In his 2003 second edition, Mason amplifies "many in the Roman world" as meaning "the culture and values of a minority community to a small circle of more influential friends".

portrayal of the Sicarii". It is also significant that regularly, we witness certain authors (including Christian apologists), who by their references make it perfectly clear that they are fully aware of Mason's contributions to New Testament research. Some go so far as to make extensive use of Mason's research for a wide range of contexts but all pointedly neglect to mention his Josephus/ Luke-Act thesis when directly discussing possible sources for Luke-Acts (cf. Peterson, 2009: 16-25; Howell, 2016: 30; and Smith and Kostopoulos, 2017: 390-410).

Another scholar, Goldberg (1995) has also explored the similarities between aspects of Ev.Luc and the writings of Josephus. Although he has considered other possibilities, he like Wesley Allen (1997: 6-21, 35-74), ultimately favours both of these authors drawing from a common source.

Mason's thesis also has implications for the more accurate dating of Luke-Acts. If he is in any way correct, Luke-Acts will need to be given a much later date than normally favoured by many scholars. In general terms there seem to be two distinct camps. The first consists of scholars who assume that Luke-Acts is mostly accurate and factual (e.g. Johnson, 1991:2; Green, 1997:3; and Knight, 1998:10-11). For these it is seemingly obvious that Paul's ministry occurred between c. 35/6 – 60 / 62 C.E. and that Luke was a travelling companion of Paul. Of course these dates and the estimated period that each event as recorded in Act.Ap. and the various epistles will still diverge according to which scholar is opining. Regardless these authors will never date the Gospel of Luke to later than say c.90 C.E. – all claiming a first-century C.E. date. The second group is composed of more sceptical scholars (e.g. Carrier 2000; and Tyson, 2006 and 2009: passim), who point out obvious similarities in rhetorical approach and/or historical content (albeit at times misreported) between Luke-Acts and other Hellenistic authors. These authors all favour an early to mid-second-century C.E. date (e.g. c.120 – c.140 C.E.). In addition, these scholars, like Verheyden (2012:27) accept that we do not know who the author of Luke-Acts was. Indeed, any number of individuals (including a school) might have been responsible for the final form of these two books.

With the aforementioned background information in mind, the present situation seems to reflect the concern that scholars tend to be more concerned with preserving their constructed realities than they are with dealing dispassionately with the known historical facts. This accusation can be levelled at all camps, regardless of whether

they claim to be conservative Christian scholars or even, free-thinking liberal academics.

Most importantly, given the divergence between a typically conservative and liberal understanding of the most likely historical context within which Josephus and the author(s) of *Ev.Luc.* and *Act.Ap.* existed, it would seem unlikely that agreement will ever be reached.

Certainly, the liberal camp tends to treat Josephus' reporting of historical events as somewhat superior to the *NT* versions. Not surprisingly, the conservative camp will do the exact opposite and will tend to hegemonise the *NT* accounts over those of Josephus – certainly when any discrepancy arises.

Mason's theory clearly shows the gospel writers to have displayed overt didactic objectives (let alone plagiaristic tendencies). Thus, any attempt to recapture historical truth will be forever disguised by the layers of borrowed literary motifs, rhetorical strategies, fantastical tales, allegory and symbolism. In short, according to Mason (1992) it is not really possible to separate fact from fiction in, inter alia, *Luke-Acts*.

Therefore, it is surmised that before any meaningful debate can take place, a substantiated historical context needs to be determined - one which is not unduly influenced by the respective worldviews of the scholars concerned. Within this more plausible context the claims made by, inter alia, Mason could be better analysed and a more convincing outcome conferred.

One of the challenges here will be the fact that to obtain a plausible history of the period, the researcher would have to, inter alia, employ the works of Josephus. Given the negative light that his records are sometimes cast in by more conservative scholars will require the researcher to be extremely judicious. Alternative histories will need to be sought (where possible) and critically compared. Thus, with these various contexts in mind it is possible to formulate the principle research question:

1.2 Statement of the Problem

To what degree does the Mason thesis withstand rigorous analytical scrutiny within the context of a substantiated and verified historical context?

1.3 Statement of the Sub-Problems

1.3.1 Statement of the First Sub-Problem

What is the most credible historical context for the pertinent writings of Josephus, Ev.Luc. and Act.Ap.?

1.3.2 Statement of the Second Sub-Problem

To what degree may either Ev.Luc. and Act.Ap. be considered reliable historical sources?

1.3.3 Statement of the Third Sub-Problem

In the context of the Mason thesis, to what degree may the pertinent writings of Josephus be considered historically reliable?

1.3.4 Statement of the Fourth Sub-Problem:

Will it be possible to determine if Josephus is indeed the primary source for any of the Lucan texts or vice versa?

1.4 Definition of Terms

For the sake of greater clarity, certain terms employed in this study need to be elucidated as regards their import and interpretation within a stated context. In most cases these are employed in a more regular way and do not necessarily deviate substantially from more common use. However in certain situations a specific term may well include more nuanced significance.

1.4.1 Conservative Scholars

It is certainly not the intention here to lump together all Christian-based scholars into one clique identified by a singular and monolithic point of view. Rather, because, one of the central issues under critical review, is the influence of a scholar's worldview on the outcome of supposed objective reasoning it is sometimes necessary to use a

collective noun when referring to those scholars who tend to walk a tightrope between faithful adherence to their personal religious convictions and intimate experiences and their academic training as dispassionate investigators.

Thus, the objective of the term “conservative scholar” is to highlight that the individual’s constructed worldview not only overtly colours his/her perceptions but in fact has a deciding vote when determining the very outcome of a particular argument. Wells (1988b: 20 - 21) has perhaps a more negative understanding of this term:

Conservative apologists still do the same . . . There is more parade of erudition and open-mindedness. But the conclusions always turn out to be in accordance with desire, in harmony with what is regarded as essential doctrine.

Thus for the purposes of this study, scholars, who as Wells intimates, tend to wear their religious convictions on their sleeve, are grouped together as “conservative”. In this context, most conservative researchers would also subscribe to a confession of faith whereas a liberal scholar would most definitely not. Although aspects of fundamentalism are certainly factors here, many, if not all, of the leading Christian-based scholars who are featured in this study still claim to be open-minded and purportedly champion rational thought.

1.4.2 The Interpretivist/Constructivist Episteme

According to Cohen and Manion (1994: 36), an interpretivist/constructivist approach to research has the intention of understanding the world of human experience better because it accepts that reality is as Mertens (2005: 12) confirms: “socially constructed”. Here it is assumed that the constructed worldviews of all role-players reviewed in this research project (including that of the researcher), will impact on the research findings.

This approach also allows the researcher to make use of, where relevant and applicable, a wider range of methods which, when triangulated, may better assist in establishing greater validity of interpretation. According to Mackenzie and Knipe (2006):

The constructivist researcher is most likely to rely on qualitative data collection methods and analysis or a combination of both qualitative and quantitative methods

(mixed methods). Quantitative data may be utilised in a way, which supports or expands upon qualitative data and effectively deepens the description.

It is also the contention of the researcher that the greatest stumbling block to contemporary scholars reaching consensus apropos the Josephus/Luke-Acts debate is almost totally a result of the dominant worldviews of the researchers involved.

Lüdemann (2013: 262) quotes Van Harvey (1996: xx–xxi) who stated:

what we call historical inquiry is really the formalization by professional historians of our modern, Promethean desire to know, a desire that is actually rooted in everyday life. Historical reasoning is merely the formalization of one method that has, over time, proved to be our best guarantor of achieving this desire and of holding in check the special pleading, obscurantism, and tendentiousness that are omnipresent in human existence.

An interpretivist/constructivist approach, fully-focussed on this issue of social constructs, will better assist in highlighting this problem and hopefully make it possible to establish a more plausible context and, as far as is possible, shared worldview, within which rational deduction may take place.

1.4.3 Luke as Author

As confirmed by, inter alia, Sterling (1992: 313) the first writer to identify Luke as the author of Ev.Luc. was Justin Martyr (c. 100 – c. 165 C.E.) and the suggestion that both Ev.Luc. and Act.Ap. were written by the same author or group of authors is largely a later Christian tradition.

As Dicken (2012: 7) states “These ascriptions may have been based on reliable tradition, but without earlier corroborating evidence, we may continue to be skeptical.” Therefore, due to the fact that there is no absolute clarity as to who actually wrote Ev.Luc. and Act.Ap., reference will often be made, inter alia, to the “Lucan author(s)” or the “Lucan material” or even “Luke”. Indeed, certain scholars - such as Mason (2003: 251 n. 2) - will employ the latter term (i.e. “Luke”) as a literary convenience when referring to the unknown author or authors of either of these two books.

However, many, typically conservative scholars, tend to employ this term more literally and somewhat perfunctorily; believing (either furtively or unreservedly) that a singular individual called Luke truly wrote all of the Lucan material. Regardless, when quoting authorities who make use of the term “Luke”, irrespective of their personal world-views, confessions of faith or religious stance, this author will take it as read that the employment of this term in no way indicates blind acceptance of this commonly held assertion. In addition, this author will, on occasion, employ the term “Luke” as an expedient generic term to identify Lucan material.

1.4.4 Worldview

For the purpose of this investigation, the insights of, inter alia, Koltko-Rivera (2000: 2) are favoured. Thus a “worldview” should be seen as a way of “describing the universe and life within it, both in terms of what is and what **ought to be.**” [My emphasis].

It would also be fair to state that a worldview is intimately linked to an individual’s ideology. The following statement, adapted by Koltko-Rivera (2000: 2) is pertinent in this regard:

A given worldview is a set of beliefs that includes limiting statements and assumptions regarding what exists and what does not (either in actuality, or in principle), what objects or experiences are good or bad, and what objectives, behaviors, and relationships are desirable or undesirable. A worldview defines what can be known or done in the world, and how it can be known or done. In addition to defining what goals can be sought in life, a worldview defines what goals should be pursued. Worldviews include assumptions that may be unproven, and even unprovable, but these assumptions are superordinate, in that they provide the epistemic and ontological foundations for other beliefs within a belief system.

1.5. Delimitations of the Research

1.5.1 Reconstruction of Historical Contexts

It is accepted that the worldview of any scholar impinges directly on the quality of their research. This factor is greatly enhanced in the case of those scholars who also operate within a particular confession of faith. Indeed, it makes little sense for anyone

to claim to be scientific or academic if they simultaneously want to uphold any doctrine that cannot be verified by rigorous scientific critique.

In this context, the most accurate reconstruction that one can produce of a believable historical perspective – one that can also serve as a benchmark against which to compare a particular scholar's case - will also depend on the worldview of the researcher concerned. Thus, to claim that one has the best reconstruction of a particular moment in history would be arrogant and self-delusional.

1.6 Assumptions of the Research

1.6.1 Intellectual Integrity

This research accepts that in the final analysis truth, or what we believe to be truth, is dependent on sincere, albeit constructed, intellectual integrity. In this regard, this study assumes, as does Rand (1962: 65), that integrity "does not consist of loyalty to one's subjective whims, but of loyalty to rational principles".

Furthermore, even if we want to be as cynical as Rorty (1992: 141), who once stated that he did "not have much use for notions like 'objective truth'" and who (Rorty, 1982: xvii) scoffed that claiming a statement to be "true" was akin to giving it a "rhetorical pat on the back" we could do worse than follow the advice of Haack (1996: 57 - 58) who informs her reader that:

The first step is to point out that the concept of truth is internally related to the concepts of belief, evidence, and inquiry. To believe that *p* is to accept *p* as true. Evidence that *p* is evidence that *p* is true, an indication of the truth of *p*. And to inquire into whether *p* is to inquire into whether *p* is true; if you aren't trying to get the truth, you aren't really inquiring.

This investigation takes it as read, that we construct our realities and that these worldviews impinge on our attempts to establish truth. In this regard this investigation fully subscribes to the perceptions of, inter alia, Koltko-Rivera (2004: 3) who states that:

the nature of this in-sight is that human cognition and behavior are powerfully influenced by sets of beliefs and assumptions about life and reality. Applied to the individual level, this insight has implications for theories of personality, cognition, education, and intervention. Applied to the collective level, this insight can provide a basis for psychological theories of culture and conflict, faith and coping, war and peace.

Particularly as psychologists search for ways to reintegrate the discipline after a century of tumultuous and fractious growth, it would be worthwhile for psychology and its sub disciplines to focus on a construct that is central to this aforementioned insight, a construct with a long history and broad applicability but a dearth of serious theoretical formulation. This is the construct of worldview (or “world view”).

Therefore, this study also assumes that, especially in those disciplines that impinge on personal faith (with willing deference to the insights of Haack [1996: 58]):

[B]oth pseudobelief and pseudo inquiry are commonplace. Pseudobelief includes those familiar psychological states of obstinate loyalty to a proposition that one half suspects is false, and of sentimental attachment to a proposition to which one has given no thought at all (*Sic*).

1.6.2 Fundamentalism

It is assumed that any form of religious fundamentalism, will make any rational scientific debate impossible. Consider for example the views of the arch-fundamentalist, Bloesch (1994: 121 and 293) who will openly deny that there is any relationship between what he would term “God’s logic” and “human logic”. Indeed, Bloesch (1994: 55) is happy to believe that his constructed truth, based on what he believes is the *NT*’s divine revelation, is both true and beyond the “analytical methods of formal logic”. It should go without saying that such attitudes will not likely result in scientifically verifiable knowledge, let alone a universal truth. Thus, for a fundamentalist, logical deductions which clash with so-called revelation are unacceptable.

1.7 Research Design / Methodology

With the aforementioned contexts in mind, this dissertation will, inter alia, attempt to verify/clarify an acceptable and believable historical context for the classical/biblical authors currently under review.

Moreover, great attention will be placed on the following factors that indisputably impacted on the worldviews of the respective authors under review. These include:

1. Contemporary Religious Beliefs;
2. Contemporary Political Realities;
3. Contemporary Dominant Social Constructs;

4. Undisputed Historical Facts; and
5. Consistency of Reporting.

In addition, the proposed dissertation will also look at the degree of historical validity in both Ev.Luc. and Act.Ap. as well as the applicable writings of Josephus.

In the latter cases, the arguments of a selected range of leading scholars will be appraised diagnostically. This group consists of those authorities, living or dead, who are still considered to be the most relevant in the contemporary Josephus/Luke debate. In this regard, inter alia, the insights of scholars such as: François Bovon, Mark Andrew Brighton, Frederick Fyvie Bruce, Richard Carrier, Henry J. Cadbury, Frank Dicken, Bart D. Ehrman, Craig A. Evans, Joseph A. Fitzmyer, Gary J. Goldberg, Ernst Haenchen, Adolf Harnack, Peter Kirby, Gerd Lüdemann, Daniel Marguerat, Ian Howard Marshall, Steve Mason, Gregory E. Sterling and Patricia Walters will be considered.

With an established historical context in place, key similarities that seem to exist between the respective texts will be subjected to a similar, but not always identical, critical review process.

The current scholarly debates concerning the issue of historical reliability as well as originality of each of the disputed passages under review, will be made, paying close attention to a scholar's constructed reality and the degree to which it impinges negatively on his/her attempt to undertake a neutral discourse. To this end, great attention will be placed on, inter alia, such factors as:

1. internal and external arguments;
2. comparative arguments;
3. textual arguments;
4. stylistic arguments;
5. historical arguments; and
6. theological variations.

1.8 Central Theoretical Argument

It is proposed to take a more interpretivist/constructivist approach rather than a naïve positivistic one. It is acknowledged that all deliberation will be taking place within a linguistic paradigm that posits knowledge is mediated through language (thinking) and consequently it is not possible to ever objectively know what we assume to be reality. Therefore, an interpretivist/constructivist epistemology is clearly favoured.

It is accepted that it will never be possible to accurately reconstruct the historical context(s) that underpin(s) the premises of the various arguments tendered by the key-role players in the Josephus/Luke-Acts debate. It is also accepted that a particular scholar's constructed reality will impinge on his/her interpretation of the best-argued evidence. It can be safely argued that knowledge is that which is constructed by the researcher or theorist by virtue of any number of applicable methods

Although it is certainly not refuted that information can be obtained by direct sense experience of the world (linguistic mediation), the important point is that we can never really know the source of that perception (the assumed external reality). Rather we constantly formulate (construct) an understanding of the world within which we live by thinking – a process which is always mediated linguistically. In this latter regard, certain of the views of the post-structuralist philosopher Jacques Derrida⁴ are invaluable in grasping the point that language (in all its manifestations), cannot embody inviolable universal truth and is itself a flawed medium.

Unfortunately, language as “text”, regardless of its form (i.e. oral, scribal, aural, olfactorial etc.), is the only medium we have - which points to meaning always being imperfectly mediated.

Again, because all interpretation can only take place within a particular “text”, it is never possible to return to the “source” or the “origin” deferred/referred to by the “text”. In the same way the intentions of an author or an artist are, in the final analysis, quite irrelevant when interpreting say, a particular written text or work of art, since the reader or spectator, armed with their own constructed realities, only has the

⁴ Cf. Derrida. 1997. *Of Grammatology*.

written or visual text by which to arrive at a particular (albeit shifting/provisional) point of view.

This approach neither accepts the maladroit conclusion that in the final analysis “anything goes” nor does it advocate nihilism. Undeniably, the complete opposite is implied. Any judicious deconstruction of a text implies a rigorous and critical analysis with an amplified awareness of the pitfalls of naïve relativism.

It is the contention of the researcher that contemporary scholars cannot reach a consensus of learned opinion apropos the Mason thesis by dint of their respective dominant worldviews.

As knowledge is obtained by means of an interpretivist/constructivist mechanism a plausible historical context must first be established within which to test Mason’s arguments and indeed, his antagonists’ counter-claims.

Thereafter, an interpretivist/constructivist approach, fully focussed on this issue of social constructs, will better assist in highlighting this problem and hopefully make it possible to establish a more plausible context and, as far as is possible, shared worldview, within which rational deduction may take place.

1.9 The Importance of the Research

Much literary support exists which exhorts the reader to disregard the authenticity of the Mason thesis. However, these refutations come predominantly from a conservative Christian ethos. In addition, none of the scholarly responses in question seems to deal directly and/or objectively with certain key issues. It is believed, that elements of personal bias (whether justified or not), and the specific constructed worldviews of the scholars concerned are a major contributor to the incentive behind most of the established arguments in circulation today.

A more convincing refutation of Mason’s thesis would lend support to the current conventional wisdom that advocates both Ev.Luc. and Act.Ap., as historically reliable documents. However, if the Mason thesis is largely vindicated it would also shed light on a more plausible evolution and compositional history of these two *NT* books.

1.10 Overview of the Research Project

This dissertation is set out in a specific order to present its arguments as clearly as possible:

Chapter One (Introduction) is the preamble wherein the parameters and intentions of research are explicated.

Chapter Two (A Critical Review of Mason's Methodology) explicates the validity of Mason's theoretical approach and where the author's approach is in agreement.

Chapter Three (A Critical Overview of the Mason Thesis) sets out to critically evaluate the following pertinent issues, viz.:

1. the historical context for Mason's thesis;
2. Josephus and Luke in the context of Hellenistic history writing;
3. the portrayal of Christianity in a Jewish context;
4. evidence of historiographical influence and Josephan rhetoric;
5. circumstantial evidence of plagiarism;
6. comparable evidence of plagiarism; and
7. correspondences between literary themes and choice of vocabulary.

Chapter Four (Arguments in Favour of the Mason Thesis) assesses any general points of agreement with the work of scholars such as Richard Carrier. In this regard any evidence that supports Mason's thesis will be considered. However weaknesses in a scholar's argument will also be exposed.

Chapter Five (Alternate Views to the Mason Thesis) sets out to evaluate alternate scholarly views by a wide range of researchers from both conservative and more liberal backgrounds. In this regard the following issues will be critically evaluated, viz.:

1. The dating of Luke-Acts
2. The authorship of Luke-Acts
3. The unity of Luke-Acts

4. Luke-Acts as Hellenistic history writing
5. Luke-Acts as apologetic historiography
6. Josephus as a possible influence on Luke-Acts

Chapter Six (Josephus' Reliability as an Historian) examines Josephus' degree of credibility as a reliable historical source for information.

Chapter Seven (Conclusions) is a detailed synopsis wherein the various sub-problems of research are addressed in the light of the evidence obtained and, where applicable, further research recommended.

CHAPTER TWO

A Critical Review of Mason's Methodology

2.1 Introduction

When Mason's thesis first appeared in 1992 in his book titled: *Josephus and the New Testament*⁵ he had already taken a very specific stance apropos Josephus-based research. However, although, at the time, he fully explained his dissatisfaction with past methodologies in his chosen field, he never really spelled out the precise details of his preferred methodology, especially in the context of this specific thesis.

At the time he seemed to emphasise three main issues, viz.: the failings of source criticism, "scissors and paste history" and the previous maltreatment of Josephus as an individual.

Mason (1993: 29) emphasises that previous generations tended to ignore Josephus' "own intelligence as an author". Further, these past approaches to Josephus-based research still impact on scholars in more contemporary times. Again, according to Mason (1993: 33) Josephus' own interpretation of what was for him contemporary history was often overlooked in favour of the agenda of the historian or theologian concerned. Mason (1993: 33) complains:

Even when the religious maltreatment of Josephus subsided, the poor fellow was largely abused by the academic world, which also tended to fragment his writings into little bits of data. As a result it has taken us the better part of two thousand years to begin reading what Josephus actually wrote.

However, subsequent to this publication, Mason has explained his approach in far more detail. Of special importance are his comments made in 2012⁶.

Here, one suspects that Mason's (2012: 155 – 240) more current explanation of his preferred methodology for studying history, is in some ways more refined and even more critical than the one that he employed in the 1990s.. Regardless, for the sake of accuracy, his possibly more mature approach to studying history will first need to be

⁵ Cf. Steve Mason. 1992. *Josephus and the New Testament*, 1st ed. 1st printing. Peabody, Ma.: Hendrickson Publishers, Inc.

⁶ Steve Mason. 2012. "What is History? Using Josephus for the Judaeen-Roman War", in *The Jewish Revolt Against Rome: Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, edited by Mladen Popović, 155 – 240. Leiden: Koninklijke Brill NV.

unpacked and examined in order to gain a better understanding of the precise methodology that resulted in a thesis that substantiates Luke-Acts plagiarising aspects of Josephus' work.

2.2 The Influence of Collingwood

Here, Mason (2012: 155-240) readily admits to his adherence to certain of the fundamental tenets of Collingwood's⁷ approach to historical enquiry.

In general terms, Collingwood (1994) advocated that history is concerned neither with the past (in itself) nor with the historian's conception of the past. Rather, the historian deals with both reciprocally.

Within this paradigm, the past is always unknown to us. Actions and events that occurred before the present no longer exist. The historian's task is to try to understand what lay behind past events⁸ but not recover the past events in themselves. Within this scenario the historian does not study history but the history of thought. Collingwood (1994: 88) explains: "history is nothing but the re-enactment of past thought in the historian's mind".

Here it is important to grasp that this "re-enactment" still requires empirical evidence yet the process itself is not empirical. History is not the regurgitation of facts, something that Collingwood (1994: 98 ff.) denigrates as "scissors and paste" history. On this issue, Collingwood (1994:99) explains:

History constructed by excerpting and combining the testimonies of different authorities I call scissors-and-paste history ... it is not really history at all, because it does not satisfy the necessary conditions of science; but until lately it was the only kind of history in existence, and a great deal of the history people are still reading to-day, and even a good deal of what people are still writing, belongs to this type.

In the specific context of employing Josephus as a (primary) historical source, the more traditional *modus operandi* was to take Josephus largely at his word and then regurgitate aspects of his own stated sentiments in the process of re-writing. In line with Collingwood's approach to history, Mason also emphasises that the historian

⁷ Robin George Collingwood (1889 – 1943).

⁸ This is highly reminiscent of Kant's concept of "*Das ding an sich*" (noumenon) as opposed to "phenomenon".

should guard against the illusion that history is “value-free” and totally “factual”. In particular, Mason warns against an approach to presenting history merely as a set of recorded facts (often drawn from disparate sources) that when cobbled together are taken as a valid account of what occurred say two thousand years ago. This approach is compounded when the primary source is someone of the calibre of Josephus. Thus if Josephus’ rhetorical statements are taken at face value we run the risk of ending up with the fantasy that we have fully understood the specific motives and feelings behind a particular person’s actions in the past.

Mason (2012: 166 -167) gives some typical (albeit insightful) examples where historians of the calibre of Schürer⁹ and Williamson¹⁰ have transplanted uncritically, Josephus’ own interpretation concerning the thoughts of an actor from past times in their own accounts. Mason (2012: 167) rightfully responds:

[H]ow can we know that these men from two thousand years ago thought and felt these things, when we cannot hope to describe even the thoughts and feelings of our own contemporary leaders?

The historian needs to apply his/her mind in the process of selecting and interpreting facts. Indeed, only then can empirical evidence become an historical fact.

Mason (2012: 138 – 207) also spends quite some time explicating the various problems that face historians today as well as exactly what might constitute history. For example, what is the domain of the pure historian? Here, he draws his readers’ attention to the oft naïve assumption, enforced by popular culture, that history (especially ancient history) is automatically aligned to archaeology. Popular culture, for one, tends to assume that all ancient historians are automatically expected to be archaeologists. Of course, it is true that historians make use of hard evidence, like archaeologists, of such historical records or remains, as artefacts, in their research. It is also true that there exists an overlap between the two disciplines. However, some archaeologists would appear to be quick to disavow anyone of the illusion that Ancient History and Archeology are the same discipline. Mason (2012: 161) points to Magness¹¹ (2002: 4-5) who dogmatically states that archaeologists learn about the past solely through the study of the material remains left by humans of all levels of

⁹ Emil Schürer (1844 – 1910).

¹⁰ Geoffrey Arthur Williamson (1895 – 1982).

¹¹ Jodi Magness (Born 1956).

society, whereas historians only study written texts mostly produced by members of a ruling elite.

2.3 The Importance of the Linguistic Paradigm

Apart from the observation (duly justified) that historians tend to study the past through the eyes of the elite, I for one take issue with the clear implication that historians only read texts and in sharp contradistinction, archaeologists restrict themselves solely to artefacts. The very notion is clearly preposterous.

Here, I believe that Mason would agree with me, since he clearly states that he, as well as his respected aficionados (i.e. Collingwood and Bloch¹²), all believe that an historian, makes use of any physical and/or literary testimony that, depending on the context, is capable of supplying evidence concerning the past. This is an admission of the textuality of the world within which we live. Arguing from the perspective of a linguistic paradigm, everything is mediated through language and everything can be interpreted linguistically, be it a written text, spoken word, gesture, image, smell, atomic structure or even DNA code. There can be no valid reason why, outside of a valid context, the physical remains of an ancient culture cannot be “read” and interpreted according to the same structures as apply to say a written text formed from characters inscribed on parchment or an image painted on a piece of canvas. Although different interpretations might occur, which involve different linguistic processes, the very structure of understanding, certainly, in a Gadamerian¹³ sense, is identical.

2.4 The Hermeneutic of Suspicion versus the Hermeneutic of Trust

Mason refers his reader to some important reflections made by Sandgren¹⁴ (2010: 3-4) apropos two more contemporary (albeit competing) approaches to undertaking historical research:

¹² Marc Léopold Benjamin Bloch (1886 – 1944).

¹³ Hans-Georg Gadamer (1900 – 2002). In terms of Gadamer’s dialectical hermeneutical approach, understanding occurs within a shared linguistic paradigm after a dialectical process (conversation). Here, all understanding (as a description of this process) is evaluated by virtue of a person’s subsequent application of what he/she has “understood”. Cf. Hans-Georg. Gadamer, 2006. *Truth and Method*, xxix, 25, 306-310, 313 ff. Cf. Nicholas Allen. 1990 *The Relevance of Chance and Technique in the Creative Process in the Work of Art*.

¹⁴ Leo Dupree Sandgren

- Minimalism: Applying the “hermeneutic of suspicion” to sources; and
- Maximalism: Applying the “hermeneutic of trust” to sources.

Here a minimalist (à la Sandgren) will typically view everything with distrust, suspecting the intentions and possible ulterior motives of the writer. As a consequence a minimalist favours multiple sources. Sandgren (2010: 3-4) states: “The minimalist has a high standard of proof and is reticent to affirm a statement about history unless it is certifiably factual”.

On the other hand a maximalist (whilst also claiming the need for substantiation), tends to accept what an author states based on their reputation. As an aside, these types of scholars tend to trust the viewpoint of religious people. Authors are allowed their idiosyncrasies and foibles as long as they are considered benign. Only truly unbelievable accounts are dismissed.

Sandgren (2010: 3-4) explicates: “After we have stripped away the miraculous ... and hyperbole, our witnesses, even one, should be accepted, unless they can be proven in error. Burden of proof lies with the historian, not the hapless source”.

Sangren (164 – 165) goes on to explain that, theoretically, both types of historian employ the tools of the discipline even-handedly, in order to acquire knowledge that we can trust. He also emphasises that this desire to prove something that we are happy to accept is the very essence of the problem. It is the very reason why we as historians fail to reach consensus:

[S]ome people see things that others do not. Intuition and reading between the lines is a common practice in all forms of knowledge. The truth cannot be known from pottery shards and provable declarative statements only. Maximalists err on the side of credulity; minimalists err on the side of caricature.

The facts are, that this distillation of historical approaches only seems apt when one considers scholars who are primarily concerned with theological-based research. Here it is possible to see aspects of Sangren’s maximalist in action. However, although Sangren’s model is useful as a general analogy, in reality, the historian who desires to be brutally honest is hardly likely to strictly conform to the constraints of either of Sangren’s caricatures. Here, Mason (2012: 165), in total accord with Collingwood (1994: 371 and 378), correctly points out that “[s]ystematic doubt lies at

the heart of the enterprise”. Historians are normally vigilant about naively accepting the claims made by a particular source. He emphasises that more adept historians will critically examine sources as regards their claims to any form of legitimacy. In this context, Mason (2012: 165) mentions the importance of taking into account a source’s “transmission, rhetorical effects, motives, character, style, possible duplicity, and so on.”

Again, Mason with reference to Woolf (2006: 93 – 108), comments on the tendency of historians to treat an ancient source (such as Josephus) as a “research assistant”. Here the assumption is often made that as Josephus is our primary source, he is somehow totally responsible for supplying us with what was important in his own time. Mason (2012: 168) explains:

... as our chief historian of the period, it fell to him to record everything important (to us), and in a conveniently proportional chronology. What he did not mention either did not happen or, if we have some reason to suspect that it did, he suppressed it for some reason.

The warning here, is that in accord with tenets of embracing a linguistic paradigm, our information is always mediated, processed, filtered and contextualised. However “reliable” a source may be it will always be flawed in some way.

If a source such as Josephus fails to mention something that in itself, cannot be taken as evidence that it never happened. We also cannot expect Josephus to supply us with information that he had no knowledge of. Accordingly, Mason asks “[w]here is our justification for burdening him posthumously with a responsibility to provide for our interests?”

2.5 Mason’s Preferred Methodology

With the above-mentioned challenges in mind, Mason (2012:171) proffers his preferred approach to studying the period incorporating the Judean calamity (c. 64 – 73 C.E.). He formulates three distinct phases:

1. Selecting a general direction among various historiographical options;
2. Isolating what is most fundamental to the idea of history; and
3. Outlining a programme based on these considerations.

In this context, Mason's (2012: 172) favoured approach encapsulates the following principles:

1. Pursuit of knowledge of what is human, including individual thought.
2. Emphasis on the need for active inquiry
3. Recognition of specific events and individual actions as part of history's concern.

He is opposed to an approach, previously espoused by Carr (1961). Accordingly, Mason confirms that the historian cannot focus solely on social forces to the exclusion of, individual actions or thoughts. Likewise, he cannot limit his/her concern to those specific historical events that are considered of importance to a subsequent age.

Mason (2012: 174) quotes Burckhardt (1999: 171) who stated that history is always, the "record of what one age finds worthy of note in another." Here, of course Burckhardt was also stressing that historians tend to bring their own baggage to the debate and was not necessarily saying that chance events were unimportant per se.

Regardless, Carr (1961: 55 ff.) would have the historian eschew all chance events as irrelevant and unworthy of study. This is because he wants to stress the overriding hegemony of the role played by primary social forces.

One very obvious and good example of the problem of dogmatically following Carr's proscriptions would be where an individual was indeed, solely responsible for a particular historical event and/or reacted to a chance occurrence. Mason (2012: 174; 207 – 239) gives two good examples:

1. Cestius Gallus' invasion of Judaea including his personal political and military objectives; and
2. Titus' eventual reasons for destroying the Temple.

In addition, as has already been verified, most ancient historical documents deal with the actions of emperors, kings and presidents. Very little if anything is ever presented from the perspective of the slave, the serf or the disenfranchised. In this context

alone, Carr's preferred history would de facto be nothing more than a re-presentation of the important social forces as dictated by the elite and the powerful.

From a commonsensical and pragmatic viewpoint, nobody should have a problem with Mason's generalised observations regarding, say, the Judean War. Certainly, due to the existence of reliable, substantiated historical documents and artefacts, most would surely agree that in c. 64 - 74 C.E. as a result of Roman expansionism, Judaea experienced enormous internal upheaval and persecution. This resulted in, inter alia, the general devastation of the city of Jerusalem, the eradication of the second Temple and the subsequent loss of the Jewish homeland.

However, Mason (2012, 155) goes further and states: "But the hundreds of thousands of persons involved in the growing conflict, on all sides, each had an incalculable number of experiences, thoughts, feelings, and interactions". Obviously we cannot recover these specific human experiences but we willingly assume that they occurred, because as Mason (2012, 155) expresses it, "we know by analogy: they were human beings, and so must have had thoughts, feelings, and interactions".

We also assume, that each of these human beings involved in this undisputed calamity, were affected in very unique ways. After all, some were the oppressors and were motivated by say, personal glory, fame, greed and/or the desire to please their superiors. Whereas others, especially the Jews, were directly affected by the eradication of everything they believed in, the annihilation of their cultural identity, the loss of loved ones, personal physical suffering, etc.

The permutations here, are possibly endless and all assumed to have occurred because common sense dictates that we are able to empathise with their human condition – something we share with these individuals, even after two thousand years.

Again, Mason (2012, 156) fully concurs with what should be viewed as quite obvious:

...we know that untold myriads of things happened in this region from, say, 65 to 74 c.e. Whatever was said, done, and thought by all of these players - and by the ordinary inhabitants of the area - was real life then and there.

Nonetheless, for truly critical historians, the task is more demanding than merely re-presenting assumptions and generalisations. We all, albeit naively, desire to reveal or uncover that which is now lost or unclear to us. We want to recover something specific about the past other than assumed generalities. For example, what was/were the actual cause(s) of the Judean War? Who were the key role-players in the entire event? Given that we are often most reliant on an historian such as Josephus for much of our information, can we trust what he has to say? Or, do we understand Josephus well enough to still be able to extract a reliable history once we have adjusted for his personality traits, agenda(s), rhetoric, hyperbole, world view etc.? We could go further and ask “why do we even want to know what happened?” – more precisely - “what is it that we need to know and what purpose does this information ultimately serve?”

These are the kinds of dynamics that also seem to be of major concern to Mason. He (Mason 2012, 156) postulates that, given the acceptance that something momentous did indeed occur two thousand years ago (e.g. the Judean War), the typical historian needs to address, inter alia, the following kinds of questions:

- What are the aims of the historian when undertaking a history of a particular event?
- Of all the past events that are unknown or unclear to the historian, which are the most suitable targets for historical study, and based upon what criteria?
- What methodology should the historian employ when investigating these events?
- What kinds of ancient evidence are available to the historian, what are their respective characteristics and why did they survive to the present day?
- How sure can historians be of their findings apropos both specific issues as well as the broader picture?
- What language and categories should historians employ in their efforts at description: what combination of theirs and those of the past? And for which kinds of things?
- What is the relationship between the past, as recreated through a research methodology as opposed to the actual lived reality of long deceased individuals?

On all of these points, I for one, fully concur with Mason. If historians do not consider these kinds of question then they fall into the trap described by Collingwood (1994: 389):

Methodology in this general or pure part is in point of fact almost wholly neglected by historians ... and on the rare occasions when they start thinking about the subject they are apt to conclude that all historical thought is logically indefensible, though they sometimes add a saving clause to the effect that they personally can interpret evidence pretty well because they have a mysterious intuitive flair for the truth ... which informs them when their authorities are telling lies.

Little consensus exists today as regards a common, generally accepted view apropos the history of the Judean War. Although largely true of other historical events as well, this specific period is particularly problematic for a number of reasons that will become evident as this discourse progresses.

In terms of the specific problem of ascertaining the truth of the claim that Luke-Acts was based on the works of Josephus, let alone the specific scope and degree of this possible occurrence, the researcher first needs to establish a credible historical context. Against this desired and reliable backdrop it should then be possible to test the validity of the various arguments that are presented both in support and refutation of Mason's thesis.

Given the multiple world-views that are currently brought to the fore due to the great number of individuals who are interested in this particular period alone, at best, it would seem that we have a number of camps, each resplendent with their own range of opinions. Here, I believe that Mason (2012: 163) would largely agree since he has also noted that scholars engaged in biblical and theological research, tend to conflate history with personal belief. Here the manner in which a conclusion is actually arrived at is not always seen to be of major importance. Mason (2012: 163) gives some very good illustrative examples:

Do you believe that the Pharisees were the most influential pre-70 sect, that there was a standing Sanhedrin, that the James ossuary is genuine or a forgery, or that Essenes lived at Qumran? These kinds of questions one encounters all the time, though it is difficult to imagine similar camps forming in other areas of ancient history: over the reasons for Tacfarinas' revolt in Africa or debating whether Boudica was motivated more by financial or sexual outrage.

Based on my own experience of studying other aspects of this period, it is clearly discernible that many self-proclaimed, objective researchers, due to their equal and coincident commitment to a particular confession of faith, will on occasion, refuse to accept a particular research outcome. As a consequence it should be seen as obvious that unless researchers are prepared to leave their “baggage” at the door they should not enter the room of scientific enquiry. Mason (2012: 163) also takes issue here, and correctly sees personal belief as inappropriate when it comes to bona fide historical research.

Mason (2012: 159) correctly points out another important related issue here. Not all of these scholars who delve into, inter alia, the Second Temple period, are historians per se. That is not a problem in itself – in fact that is refreshing and encourages multiple perspectives. The problem relates to the impact of the researcher’s personal world-view and the employment of inappropriate methodologies. Here, Mason reminds his reader that the topic of the Judean War will typically be tackled by, inter alia, biblical scholars (from both Christian and Jewish perspectives), classicists and archaeologists alike. We must also consider here the various disciplines that are involved in examining say, the Judean War, which will predictably include such disparate fields as New Testament, rabbinical literature, Semitic and/or Classical philology, Jewish history, theology and numismatics. Even mathematicians have studied aspects of this topic¹⁵.

The same “biased” fervour is found amongst scholars who claim to be sceptical researchers – who overtly eschew any religious affiliation and wish to apply unforgiving, hard logic to the various issues under discussion. Even here, although they will be more likely to pursue a more objective and scientific approach without fear or favour, they can equally be accused of being predisposed in their specific approach and/or having some axe to grind.

An issue that seems problematic to Mason (2012: 157) concerns the fact that historians are obviously very reliant on the works of Josephus for information about this specific period of history. Seemingly, instead of being in any way grateful for the

¹⁵ Cf. the infamous example of Josephus’ bizarre account of how he managed to cheat death by virtue of the “chance” outcome of lots cast by 40 fellow Jews in a suicide pact (cf. War 3, 8, 3/ 350 - 7/ 391). As a consequence, this narrative has attracted the attention of mathematicians, fascinated by what is now known as the “Josephus Problem” or “Josephus Permutation”. Cf. Steve Weitzman, 2004. 230-245. He cites I. Herstein and I. Kaplansky, 1974. *Matters Mathematical*, New York, Harper & Row: 121–28.

enormous amount of literature that Josephus has left historians, he bemoans the fact that for too long now, Josephus continues to “provide the interpretative spine” for the time span in question (c. 64 - 73 C.E.).

Mason (2012: 157), goes further and states that historians’ long dependency on any ancient text cannot be justified by a defensible historical method. He also believes that adhering to Josephus’ histories, even when we accommodate for his inconsistencies and personal agendas, “severely handicaps our conception of history, our procedures, and therefore our results”. I agree that the historian should treat Josephus’ writings in the same dispassionate manner that we deal with other ancient sources. However, we can hardly blame Josephus for being virtually our only source for information. Given the enormous amount of literature that he produced – some eight times the volume of the entire *NT* – without his input we would be entirely lost.

I also have to consider here another issue in that if the author(s) of Luke-Acts did indeed plagiarise Josephus (ostensibly for the very same reason that modern historians also rely so heavily on this individual), then on one level it does not matter how accurate Josephus was. What is more important in this specific context, and apart from any attempt at having a good understanding of the period under investigation, is comparing the histories presented in Luke-Acts with those formulated by Josephus.

Like Collingwood we have already seen that Mason pragmatically argues that history is not the study of the past, since the past no longer exists. Ironically, on this point, he is in total accord with a post-structuralist thinker of the calibre of Derrida¹⁶. Yet, despite the fact that he supposedly lives in the post-modern epoch, Mason appears to have misapprehensions concerning the import of embracing the linguistic paradigm as a model of understanding reality.

Mason (2012: 177) refers specifically to the work of White¹⁷ whose approach eschews the possibility of there ever being “neutral or factual language”. Here, Mason explains:

¹⁶ Jacques Derrida (1930 – 2004).

¹⁷ Hayden White (born 1928).

We can readily agree that there is no such thing as neutral language, and that we all write with a rhetoric of some kind, and yet still imagine that we regularly communicate ideas with sufficient overlap of language to be understood—not objectively, but understood nonetheless. Further, if history is not essentially narrative or discourse, as postmodernists tend to assume, and its open inquiry and argumentation are not merely rhetorical tropes, but an expressed mode of reasoning.

Mason (2012: 182-183) proffers his reader with the observation that perhaps history is really the study of the human past – albeit in the present. Here he again confirms his reliance on Collingwood (1994: 409), who correctly argued that to speak about the past is really to speak about the present, because:

we cannot ever say what the past in itself truly was, but only what the evidence now at our disposal enables us to say that it was; and ... it is quite certain that this evidence is always fragmentary and inadequate.

Mason (2012: 186) also posits that our lack of knowledge must always remain our default position because “we do not know the past except by means of the impending investigation (i.e., through *historia*)”.

He also echoes an important contribution made by Zindler¹⁸ (2003: 2), viz.: the burden of proof resides solely with those persons who cling uncritically to any irrational concept. In short, if you can't prove it then you can't claim it. This remains a major obstacle for most scholars who simultaneously want to uphold a confession of faith or dogma. They end up assuming that it is the responsibility of the sceptic to disprove them rather than accept that the responsibility of substantiation is theirs and theirs alone. Here, Mason (2012: 186) sums up the ideal approach well when he states:

If history is the methodical inquiry into the human past, without which we cannot know it, then the burden rests always, entirely and exclusively, on the investigator who has the courage to conduct the inquiry and try to establish a case...If other scholars find their case weak or the evidence insufficient ...the case fails and we return to not knowing.

Given the huge amount of pseudo-historical investigation which has been produced up until now (predominantly to bolster a host of individuals' personal confessions of

¹⁸ Frank Zindler (born 1939).

faith), Mason's (2012: 187) preferred approach is exemplary when it comes to the issues of burden of proof and academic integrity:

History does not require us to believe something, anything. Such a quasi-religious expectation would be anti-historical. Our task is to pursue problems only as far as we can with available evidence, then to report honestly on the state of affairs.

Mason confirms the importance of asking the correct questions before embarking on historical enquiry. Here he is very traditional and strongly conforms to best practice when formulating a research question. All questions need to be carefully considered before attempting to find an appropriate methodology that will assist the researcher in best answering.

Mason (2012: 187) also believes that the very choice of question also establishes the independence of the researcher: "We may think up any questions we wish, and these are unlikely to correspond closely to the prepossessions of ancient authors such as Tacitus and Josephus".

With reference to Momigliano¹⁹ (1977: 365 -373), Mason insists that quite apart from the issues of reliability, the historian also needs to be able to evaluate the significance of his/her evidence relevant to the context of the research question.

Gathering relevant evidence. A publicly accountable method requires that we begin with evidence undoubtedly bearing on the problem under investigation, moving to other possible evidence only when we have some working hypotheses in place based on this control material.

Next we must try to understand our evidence for what it is, by itself and in its own contexts, without yet trying to exploit it in answer to our historical questions. Never assume that evidence may be understood intuitively. We also need to be aware of the agenda of the sources that our primary sources drew from:

Mason emphasises the role of imagination as an important weapon in the historian's arsenal. Her, of course this does not mean "anything goes" but rather, the informed, intellectual freedom to consider every option given the known substantiated facts. In this context, Mason advocates that each piece of piece of evidence needs to be fully

¹⁹ Arnaldo Dante Momigliano (1908 – 1987).

understood and then tested against the hypotheses of research. Mason (2012:200) explains:

This means imagining as many possibilities as we can about that lost X and weighing each reconstruction according to its explanatory power. In ancient history, again, we shall rarely be able to reach certainty or great confidence about the vanished past. Even with several lines of evidence the problem lies in the large number of possible explanations for any single piece, and the consequent difficulty of explaining all of it together in a compelling way.

Mason (2012:201) stresses the problem that especially in the case of Josephus, the historian often only has this one voice from the past and no real means by which to test its validity. Obviously, the historian has to be continually aware of the danger of underestimating or overestimating Josephus' knowledge on a particular topic let alone ignoring his agenda(s), personal idiosyncrasies and unconscious preconceptions and predispositions etc.

Finally, Mason (2012: 203- 204) eschews a narrative formulation when writing up the results of an investigation. He prefers to set down a thesis wherein he lays out his chosen problem, the investigation and the conclusions. The goal of the historian should be to communicate his/her research process to other historians such that they will also be able to reproduce and confirm the findings. At all times the historian needs to remember that he/she is favouring a scientific approach. Of course unlike so-called "pure science", the historian duplicate the experiment because he/she cannot reproduce the past. Mason elucidates:

It is oft said that history differs from science in being unrepeatable, but that difference is easy to overstate, for we can indeed communicate the results of our inquiry, inviting our readers to walk through it with us. We cannot repeat the past, of course, but we were not studying the past itself. We invite others to work through the problems we have posed, the evidence for them, and our reasoning processes

CHAPTER THREE

A Critical Overview of the Mason Thesis

3.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to present Mason's thesis as accurately as possible and with direct reference to his 1992 seminal work titled *Josephus and the New Testament* and which saw a second edition in 2003²⁰. In this regard, an attempt will be made to identify and record all the key aspects of his thesis and where readily discernible, point out potential problems as well as show support for successful argument and substantiation.

This action is important as it lays the foundation for a subsequent evaluation, in later chapters, of both espousal and adversity for this thesis from other leading scholars in the field.

For this reason much effort will be made, wherever possible, to amplify, both the positive and the negative aspects of Masons' arguments. In this regard, where deemed relevant, those references and cited evidence (as supplied by Mason) will be double-checked and critically examined apropos their potential veracity, probity and merit.

3.2 The Historical Context of Mason's Thesis

Carrier (2000) reminds his reader that the Josephus-Luke debate has given rise to three alternate hypotheses, viz.:

1. Luke plagiarised Josephus; or
2. Josephus plagiarised Luke; or
3. Josephus and Luke plagiarised a common (albeit extinct) written and/or oral source.

Mason (2003: 251) is more specific and points out that it was in 1894²¹ that Krenkel first postulated that Luke employed the works of Josephus as a primary source for

²⁰ Mason. 2003. *Josephus and the New Testament*, 2nd Ed. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, Inc.

²¹ Krenkel. 1894. *Josephus und Lukas*. Leipzig: Haessel.

Ev.Luc. and Act.Ap. This thesis was almost immediately countered in 1895²² by Belser who argued the complete opposite, viz.: Josephus plagiarised Ev.Luc. and Act.Ap.

Mason (2003: 251) indicates that these two theses are no longer popular – especially in our more contemporary times - since they exhibit “significant differences” when recording identical historical events. For this reason, the third alternative currently holds sway. On this point Mason (2003: 251) confirms:

A third position, that the two writers shared common oral and written sources, has more adherents, because it allows some flexibility. Josephus and the author of Luke could merely have heard similar stories.

Although very aware of this accepted context, Mason eschews conventional wisdom and sets out to substantiate the validity of the first hypothesis, viz.: Apart from his obvious dependence on Q. and Ev.Matt. Luke was largely indebted to Josephus for much of his historical information as well as his favoured rhetorical strategy.

Mason (2003: 298) believes that his thesis is potentially important and informs his reader that:

[V]irtually every line of Josephus’ copious work is relevant in some way or other to NT interpretation. We have merely sighted and described the proverbial tip of the iceberg.

3.3 Josephus and Luke in the Context of Hellenistic History Writing

3.3.1 The Tripartite Structure of Hellenistic History Writing

Mason (2003: 252 - 273) also goes to great pains to emphasise the extreme importance of taking careful cognisance of the literary, religious and socio-political contexts that Hellenistic writers such as Luke and Josephus once operated within. According to Burnstein (1997):

Hellenistic historiography was in every sense a continuation of the Classical tradition of historical writing inasmuch as the historians shared the same polis-centered viewpoint of their fifth-and fourth-century B.C.

²² Belser. 1895. Lukas und Josephus in *Theologische Quartalschrift* 77: 634 – 662.

predecessors, treated similar subjects, used their predecessors' works as models, and even sometimes wrote continuations of them. By contrast, the case of Hellenistic philosophy is similar to that of drama, but more extreme in that the Hellenistic philosophers built upon only a small portion of the Classical philosophical tradition while discarding the rest.

Due no doubt to the important contributions made to the then more modern approach of recording historical events by such luminaries as Herodotus²³, Thucydides²⁴ and Polybius²⁵ historians like Josephus were fortunate beneficiaries of tried and proven literary models which they willingly tried to emulate and perfect.

As an aside, it is worth briefly reviewing aspects of Thucydides' rhetorical approach as this informs the one ultimately employed by both Josephus and Luke.

For example, in his *Thucy.Hist.* I, xx, / 1²⁶, Thucydides explains that previous histories on his topic were inadequate:

τὰ μὲν οὖν παλαιὰ τοιαῦτα ἡῦρον, χαλεπὰ ὄντα παντὶ ἐξῆς τεκμηρίῳ πιστεῦσαι. οἱ γὰρ ἄνθρωποι τὰς ἀκοὰς τῶν προγεγενημένων, καὶ ἦν ἐπιχώρια σφίσιν ἤ, ὁμοίως ἀβασανίστως παρ' ἀλλήλων δέχονται.

Having now given the result of my inquiries into early times, I grant that there will be a difficulty in believing every particular detail. The way that most men deal with traditions, even traditions of their own country, is to receive them all alike as they are delivered, without applying any critical test whatever.

He then goes on to confirm that he will be as honest as he can be, ensuring that he does not pass on anything that he does not himself trust, sharing only those accounts that he witnessed personally, removing any hearsay or embellishment, and ultimately compiling an account that can be trusted as not having been unduly influenced in his *Thucy.Hist.* I, xxii, / 1 – 4:²⁷

²³ Herodotus (Ἡρόδοτος) (c. 484 - 424 B.C.E.).

²⁴ Thucydides (Θουκυδίδης) (c. 460 - c. 395 B.C.E.).

²⁵ Polybius (Πολύβιος) (c. 200 - 118 B.C.E.).

²⁶ Greek text according to Jones and Powell (Eds.).1942. Thucydides Historiae in *Perseus Digital Library* [Online] Available:

<http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0247%3Abook%3D1%3Achapter%3D20> [19 October 2015]. English translation according to

Crawley, 1910. *The History of the Peloponnesian War: Thucydides*. [Online] Available:

<http://classics.mit.edu/Thucydides/pelopwar.1.first.html> [19 October 2015].

²⁷ Greek text according to Jones and Powell (Eds.).1942. Thucydides Historiae in *Perseus Digital Library* [Online] Available:

καὶ ὅσα μὲν λόγῳ εἶπον ἕκαστοι ἢ μέλλοντες πολεμήσειν ἢ ἐν αὐτῷ ἤδη ὄντες, χαλεπὸν τὴν ἀκρίβειαν αὐτὴν τῶν λεχθέντων διαμνημονεῦσαι ἦν ἐμοὶ τε ὧν αὐτὸς ἤκουσα καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοθεν ποθεν ἐμοὶ ἀπαγγέλλουσιν: ὡς δ' ἂν ἐδόκουν ἐμοὶ ἕκαστοι περὶ τῶν αἰεὶ παρόντων τὰ δέοντα μάλιστα εἰπεῖν, ἐχομένῳ ὅτι ἐγγύτατα τῆς ξυμπάσης γνώμης τῶν ἀληθῶς λεχθέντων, οὕτως εἴρηται. τὰ δ' ἔργα τῶν πραχθέντων ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ παρατυχόντος πυνθανόμενος ἠξίωσα γράφειν, οὐδ' ὡς ἐμοὶ ἐδόκει, ἀλλ' οἷς τε αὐτὸς παρῆν καὶ παρὰ τῶν ἄλλων ὅσον δυνατόν ἀκριβείᾳ περὶ ἐκάστου ἐπεξελεθῶν. ἐπιπόνως δὲ ἠύρισκετο, διότι οἱ παρόντες τοῖς ἔργοις ἐκάστοις οὐ ταῦτα περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν ἔλεγον, ἀλλ' ὡς ἐκατέρων τις εὐνοίας ἢ μνήμης ἔχοι. καὶ ἐς μὲν ἀκρόασιν ἴσως τὸ μὴ μυθῶδες αὐτῶν ἀτερπέστερον φανεῖται: ὅσοι δὲ βουλήσονται τῶν τε γενομένων τὸ σαφὲς σκοπεῖν καὶ τῶν μελλόντων ποτὲ αὔθις κατὰ τὸ ἀνθρώπινον τοιούτων καὶ παραπλησιῶν ἔσεσθαι, ὠφέλιμα κρίνειν αὐτὰ ἀρκούντως ἔξει. κτῆμά τε ἐς αἰεὶ μᾶλλον ἢ ἀγώνισμα ἐς τὸ παραχρῆμα ἀκούειν ξύγκειται.

With reference to the speeches in this history, some were delivered before the war began, others while it was going on; some I heard myself, others I got from various quarters; it was in all cases difficult to carry them word for word in one's memory, so my habit has been to make the speakers say what was in my opinion demanded of them by the various occasions, of course adhering as closely as possible to the general sense of what they really said. And with reference to the narrative of events, far from permitting myself to derive it from the first source that came to hand, I did not even trust my own impressions, but it rests partly on what I saw myself, partly on what others saw for me, the accuracy of the report being always tried by the most severe and detailed tests possible. My conclusions have cost me some labour from the want of coincidence between accounts of the same occurrences by different eye-witnesses, arising sometimes from imperfect memory, sometimes from undue partiality for one side or the other. The absence of romance in my history will, I fear, detract somewhat from its interest; but if it be judged useful by those inquirers who desire an exact knowledge of the past as an aid to the interpretation of the future, which in the course of human things must resemble if it does not reflect it, I shall be content. In fine, I have written my work, not as an essay which is to win the applause of the moment, but as a possession for all time.

Another contributive factor that Mason (2003: 253) mentions concerns the characteristic rhetorical tactics Hellenistic authors employed when writing their histories. In addition to this then relatively enlightened approach to history writing, was the fact that a more typical Hellenistic historical text (as opposed to say Hebrew Scripture), was identifiable by its extremely logical and formal structure. In many ways this approach was indebted to the established practices of the Greek

<http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0199%3Abook%3D1%3Achapter%3D22> [19 October 2015]. English translation according to Crawley, 1910. *The History of the Peloponnesian War: Thucydides*. [Online] Available: <http://classics.mit.edu/Thucydides/pelopwar.1.first.html> [19 October 2015].

playwright. Indeed, in his *Arist.Po.* (c. 335 B.C.E.)²⁸ Aristotle²⁹ had previously explicated Greek drama's component parts, viz.: the πρόλογος and πάροδος; the ἐπεισόδια and στάσιμον; and the ἔξοδος:

1. Πρόλογος and πάροδος: where the drama's topic was first introduced;
2. Ἐπεισόδια and στάσιμον: a dramatic scene (i.e. episode) followed by a choral song (i.e. stasimon). This binary pattern was often repeated, depending on the needs and/or length of the drama; and
3. ἔξοδος: the resolution of the drama.

Thus, the typical dramatic production had a distinct beginning, middle and end, where perhaps the most important aspect of the play/text was the πρόλογος (prologue).

Ullman (1942: 25) reminds his reader that in his *Arist.Po.* (1447a 14 - 18) Aristotle posits that imitation is an essential feature of poetry as well as other art forms. On this issue Aristotle³⁰ states:

ἐποποιία δὴ καὶ ἡ τῆς τραγωδίας ποίησις ἔτι δὲ κωμῳδία καὶ ἡ διθυραμβοποιητικὴ καὶ τῆς αὐλητικῆς ἢ πλείστη καὶ κιθαριστικῆς πᾶσαι τυγχάνουσιν οὕσαι μιμήσεις τὸ σύνολον: διαφέρουσι δὲ ἀλλήλων τρισίν, ἢ γὰρ τῷ ἐν ἑτέροις μιμεῖσθαι ἢ τῷ ἕτερα ἢ τῷ ἑτέρως καὶ μὴ τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον.

Epic poetry, then, and the poetry of tragic drama, and, moreover, comedy and dithyrambic poetry, and most flute-playing and harp-playing, these, speaking generally, may all be said to be "representations of life". But they differ one from another in three ways: either in using means generically different or in representing different objects or in representing objects not in the same way but in a different manner.

From this it follows that such things as discourses on medicine or physics (i.e. examinations of the particular) cannot be considered to be poetry (i.e. accounts of the general or the universal) because they do not imitate. Furthermore, just because

²⁸ Fergusson (Ed.) 1961. *Aristotle's Poetics*: 60.

²⁹ Aristotle (384 – 322 B.C.E.).

³⁰ Original Greek and English translation according to Fyfe (Tr.) 1932. Aristotle in 23 Volumes, Vol. 23, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press in Perseus Digital Library [Online]. Available: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0056%3Asection%3D1447a> [2 December 2014].

something is produced in a poetic format (e.g. metre and rhyme) does not necessarily make it poetry. In his *Arist.Po.* (1447b 16 - 19)³¹ Aristotle confirms:

καὶ γὰρ ἂν ἰατρικὸν ἢ φυσικὸν τι διὰ τῶν μέτρων ἐκφέρωσιν, οὕτω καλεῖν εἰώθασιν: οὐδὲν δὲ κοινόν ἐστιν Ὅμηρῳ καὶ Ἐμπεδοκλεῖ πλὴν τὸ μέτρον, διὸ τὸν μὲν ποιητὴν δίκαιον καλεῖν, τὸν δὲ φυσιολόγον μᾶλλον ἢ

For if people publish medical or scientific treatises in metre the custom is to call them poets. But Homer and Empedocles have nothing in common except the metre, so that it would be proper to call the one a poet and the other not a poet but a scientist.

Ullman (1942: 25) points out that although Aristotle does not explicitly state it, he does insinuate that scientific discourses are founded on observable fact and theory (i.e. the particular) whereas poetry (and certain art forms) are so defined because they represent or imitate the actions (both honourable as well as vile) of society at large or what individuals most typically do (i.e. the universal). In his *Arist.Po.* (1448a 1)³² Aristotle explains that:

ἐπεὶ δὲ μιμοῦνται οἱ μιμούμενοι πράττοντας, ἀνάγκη δὲ τούτους ἢ σπουδαίους ἢ φαύλους εἶναι

Since living persons are the objects of representation, these must necessarily be either good men or inferior –

Aristotle explicates further in his *Arist.Po.* (1451b 1 – 7)³³ when he comments that:

...εἴη γὰρ ἂν τὰ Ἡροδότου εἰς μέτρα τεθῆναι καὶ οὐδὲν ἦττον ἂν εἴη ἱστορία τις μετὰ μέτρου ἢ ἄνευ μέτρων) : ἀλλὰ τούτῳ διαφέρει, τῷ τὸν μὲν τὰ γενόμενα λέγειν, τὸν δὲ οἷα ἂν γένοιτο. διὸ καὶ φιλοσοφώτερον καὶ σπουδαιότερον ποιήσις ἱστορίας ἐστίν: ἢ μὲν γὰρ ποιήσις μᾶλλον τὰ καθόλου, ἢ δ' ἱστορία τὰ καθ' ἕκαστον λέγει.

³¹ Original Greek and English translation according to Fyfe (Tr.) 1932. Aristotle in 23 Volumes, Vol. 23, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press in Perseus Digital Library [Online]. Available: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0056%3Asection%3D1447b> [2 December 2014].

³² Original Greek and English translation according to Fyfe (Tr.) 1932. Aristotle in 23 Volumes, Vol. 23, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press in Perseus Digital Library [Online]. Available: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0056%3Asection%3D1448a> [2 December 2014].

³³ Original Greek and English translation according to Fyfe (Tr.) 1932. Aristotle in 23 Volumes, Vol. 23, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press in Perseus Digital Library [Online]. Available: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0056%3Asection%3D1451b> [2 December 2014].

...indeed the writings of Herodotus could be put into verse and yet would still be a kind of history, whether written in metre or not. The real difference is this, that one tells what happened and the other what might happen. For this reason poetry is something more scientific and serious than history, because poetry tends to give general truths while history gives particular facts.

Tragedy, he continues, imitates a complete action having some magnitude. Through pity and fear it produces a catharsis of these emotions. Here it is understood that action (or plot) is the most essential element in tragedy. As will be seen in due course, Luke seems to rely quite heavily on similar strategies to create a sense of vibrancy and enthusiasm in his writing.

In the context of Hellenistic history writing Mason (2003: 253) states that

This opening statement [πρόλογος] had to accomplish several things at once. It had to state clearly the aim, scope, and thesis of the work. Even more crucial to the writer's success, it had to convince the reader that the subject was of the utmost significance, and that the writer was singularly qualified to deal with it. [My insertion for clarity NPLA].

With reference to Mason's insights, the following features characterise a typical πρόλογος for a Hellenistic historical work, viz.:

1. the topic and its importance;
2. the inadequacy of previous histories of this period;
3. the author's circumstances and his motivations for writing;
4. the author's complete impartiality and concern for the truth;
5. the author's strenuous research efforts and access to eyewitness testimony;
6. the author's thesis, including a view of the causes of the events in question; and occasionally
7. a brief outline of the work's contents.

3.3.2 Comparing the Respective πρόλογοι

In the context of late Hellenistic history writing Mason (2003: 254) explains that:

Because every author ended up making much the same kind of appeal, the trick for the successful historian was to use the conventions in an original way. The historian had to make a convincing case that his history really was superior to all of the others. Josephus' preface to the War is an admirable example.

Indeed, if one examines this specific πρόλογος (i.e. *War* 1, pr. / 1 – 4 and 9 - 12)³⁴ one finds the following, somewhat overconfident statements written by a then relatively young Josephus³⁵ (c. 75 C.E.):

Ἐπειδὴ τὸν Ἰουδαίων πρὸς Ῥωμαίους πόλεμον συστάντα μέγιστον οὐ μόνον τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς, σχεδὸν δὲ καὶ ὧν ἀκοῇ παρειλήφαμεν ἢ πόλεων πρὸς πόλεις ἢ ἐθνῶν ἔθνεσι συρραγέντων, οἱ μὲν οὐ παρατυχόντες τοῖς πράγμασιν, ἀλλ' ἀκοῇ συλλέγοντες εἰκαῖα καὶ ἀσύμφωνα διηγήματα σοφιστικῶς ἀναγράφουσιν, οἱ παραγενόμενοι δὲ ἢ κολακεία τῇ πρὸς Ῥωμαίους ἢ μίσει τῶ πρὸς Ἰουδαίους καταψεύδονται τῶν πραγμάτων, περιέχει δὲ αὐτοῖς ὅπου μὲν κατηγορίαν ὅπου δὲ ἐγκώμιον τὰ συγγράμματα, τὸ δ' ἀκριβὲς τῆς ἱστορίας οὐδαμοῦ, προυθέμην ἐγὼ τοῖς κατὰ τὴν Ῥωμαίων ἡγεμονίαν Ἑλλάδι γλώσση μεταβαλὼν ἃ τοῖς ἄνω βαρβάροις τῇ πατρίῳ συντάξας ἀνέπεμψα πρότερον ἀφηγήσασθαι Ἰώσηπος Μαθίου παῖς ἐξ Ἱεροσολύμων ἱερεύς, αὐτός τε Ῥωμαίους πολεμήσας τὰ πρῶτα καὶ τοῖς ὕστερον παρατυχὼν ἐξ ἀνάγκης:

Whereas **the war which the Jews made with the Romans hath been the greatest of all** those, not only that have been in our times, but, in a manner, of those that ever were heard of; both of those wherein cities have fought against cities, or nations against nations; while some **men who were not concerned in the affairs themselves have gotten together vain and contradictory stories by hearsay**, and have **written them down after a sophisticated manner**; and while **those that were there present have given false accounts of things**, and this either **out of a humor of flattery to the Romans, or of hatred towards the Jews**; and while **their writings contain sometimes accusations, and sometimes encomiums, but nowhere the accurate truth of the facts**; I have proposed to myself, for the sake of such as live under the government of the Romans, to translate those books into the Greek tongue, which I formerly composed in the language of our country, and sent to the Upper Barbarians; **Joseph, the son of Matthias, by birth a Hebrew, a priest also, and one who at first fought against the Romans myself, and was forced to be present at what was done afterwards, [am the author of this work].**

³⁴ Original Greek and English translation according to Whiston (Tr.) 1895. *Flavius Josephus. The Works of Flavius Josephus, in Perseus Digital Library* [Online]. Available: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0148> [3 December 2014].

³⁵ In c. 75 C.E. Josephus would have been about 38 years of age.

Οὐ μὴν ἐγὼ τοῖς ἐπαίρουσι τὰ Ῥωμαίων ἀντιφιλονεικῶν αὔξειν τὰ τῶν ὁμοφύλων διέγων, ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν ἔργα μετ' ἀκριβείας ἀμφοτέρων διέξιμι, τοὺς δ' ἐπὶ τοῖς πράγμασι λόγους ἀνατίθημι τῇ διαθέσει καὶ τοῖς ἔμναυτοῦ πάθει διδοῦς ἐπολοφύρεσθαι ταῖς τῆς πατρίδος συμφοραῖς. ὅτι γὰρ αὐτὴν στάσις οἰκεία καθεῖλεν, καὶ τὰς Ῥωμαίων χεῖρας ἀκούσας καὶ τὸ πῦρ ἐπὶ τὸν ναὸν εἴλκυσαν οἱ Ἰουδαίων τύραννοι, μάρτυς αὐτὸς ὁ πορθήσας Καῖσαρ Τίτος, ἐν παντὶ τῷ πολέμῳ τὸν μὲν δῆμον ἐλέησας ὑπὸ τῶν στασιαστῶν φρουρούμενον, πολλάκις δὲ ἐκὼν τὴν ἄλωσιν τῆς πόλεως ὑπερτιθέμενος καὶ διδοῦς τῇ πολιορκίᾳ χρόνον εἰς μετάνοιαν τῶν αἰτίων. εἰ δὴ τις ὅσα πρὸς τοὺς τυράννους ἢ τὸ ληστικὸν αὐτῶν κατηγορικῶς λέγοιμεν ἢ τοῖς δυστυχήμασι τῆς πατρίδος ἐπιστένοντες συκοφαντοίῃ, διδότην παρὰ τὸν τῆς ἱστορίας νόμον συγγνώμην τῷ πάθει: πόλιν μὲν γὰρ δὴ τῶν ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίοις πασῶν τὴν ἡμετέραν ἐπὶ πλεῖστον τε εὐδαιμονίας συνέβη προελθεῖν καὶ πρὸς ἔσχατον συμφορῶν αὐθις καταπεσεῖν: τὰ γοῦν πάντων ἀπ' αἰῶνος ἀτυχήματα πρὸς τὰ Ἰουδαίων ἠττῆσθαι δοκῶ κατὰ σύγκρισιν: καὶ τούτων αἴτιος οὐδεὶς ἀλλόφυλος, ὥστε ἀμήχανον ἦν ὀδυρμῶν ἐπικρατεῖν. εἰ δέ τις οἴκτου σκληρότερος εἴη δικαστής, τὰ μὲν πράγματα τῇ ἱστορίᾳ προσκρινέτω, τὰς δ' ὀλοφύρσεις τῷ γράφοντι.

However, **I will not go to the other extreme, out of opposition to those men who extol the Romans nor will I determine to raise the actions of my countrymen too high; but I will prosecute the actions of both parties with accuracy.** Yet shall I suit my language to the passions I am under, as to the affairs I describe, and **must be allowed to indulge some lamentations upon the miseries undergone by my own country.** For that **it was a seditious temper of our own that destroyed it, and that they were the tyrants among the Jews who brought the Roman power upon us,** who unwillingly attacked us, and occasioned the burning of our holy temple, Titus Caesar, who destroyed it, is himself a witness, who, daring the entire war, pitied the people who were kept under by the seditious, and did often voluntarily delay the taking of the city, and allowed time to the siege, in order **to let the authors have opportunity for repentance.** But if any one makes an unjust accusation against us, when we speak so passionately about the tyrants, or the robbers, or sorely bewail the misfortunes of our country, let him indulge my affections herein, though it be contrary to the rules for writing history; because it had so come to pass, that our city Jerusalem had arrived at a higher degree of felicity than any other city under the Roman government, and yet at last fell into the sorest of calamities again. **Accordingly, it appears to me that the misfortunes of all men, from the beginning of the world, if they be compared to these of the Jews are not so considerable as they were;** while the authors of them were not foreigners neither. This makes it impossible for me to contain my lamentations. **But if anyone be inflexible in his censures of me, let him attribute the facts themselves to the historical part,** and the lamentations to the writer himself only. . [My emphases for greater clarity NPLA].

In addition one also needs to review Josephus' later work (c. 97 C.E.) where with assuredly greater maturity³⁶ he produces the following πρόλογος to cover much the same topic (i.e. *Antiquities* 1, pr. / 1 – 9)³⁷ :

Τοῖς τὰς ἱστορίας συγγράφειν βουλομένοις οὐ μίαν οὐδὲ τὴν αὐτὴν ὁρῶ τῆς σπουδῆς γινομένην αἰτίαν, ἀλλὰ πολλὰς καὶ πλεῖστον ἀλλήλων διαφερούσας. τινὲς μὲν γὰρ ἐπιδεικνύμενοι λόγων δεινότητα καὶ τὴν ἀπ' αὐτῆς θηρευόμενοι δόξαν ἐπὶ τοῦτο τῆς παιδείας τὸ μέρος ὁρμῶσιν, ἄλλοι δὲ χάριν ἐκείνοις φέροντες, περὶ ὧν τὴν ἀναγραφὴν εἶναι συμβέβηκε, τὸν εἰς αὐτὴν πόνον καὶ παρὰ δύναμιν ὑπέστησαν: εἰσὶ δ' οἵτινες ἐβιάσθησαν ὑπ' αὐτῆς τῆς τῶν πραγμάτων ἀνάγκης οἷς πραττομένοις παρέτυχον ταῦτα γραφῆς δηλοῦσιν περιλαβεῖν: πολλοὺς δὲ χρησίμων μέγεθος πραγμάτων ἐν ἀγνοίᾳ κειμένων προὔτρεψε τὴν περὶ αὐτῶν ἱστορίαν εἰς κοινὴν ὠφέλειαν ἐξενεγκεῖν. τούτων δὲ τῶν προειρημένων αἰτιῶν αἱ τελευταῖαι δύο κάμοι συμβεβήκασι: τὸν μὲν γὰρ πρὸς τοὺς Ῥωμαίους πόλεμον ἡμῖν τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις γενόμενον καὶ τὰς ἐν αὐτῷ πράξεις καὶ τὸ τέλος οἷον ἀπέβη πείρα μαθῶν ἐβιάσθη ἐκδιηγῆσθαι διὰ τοὺς ἐν τῷ γράφειν λυμαινομένους τὴν ἀλήθειαν, ταύτην δὲ τὴν ἐνεστῶσαν ἐγκεχειρίσμαι πραγματείαν νομίζων ἅπασιν φανεῖσθαι τοῖς Ἕλλησιν ἀξίαν σπουδῆς: μέλλει γὰρ περιέξειν ἅπασαν τὴν παρ' ἡμῖν ἀρχαιολογίαν καὶ διάταξιν τοῦ πολιτεύματος ἐκ τῶν Ἑβραϊκῶν μεθρημηνευμένην γραμμάτων. ἤδη μὲν οὖν καὶ πρότερον διειρηθῆναι, ὅτε τὸν πόλεμον συνέγραφον, δηλῶσαι τίνες ὄντες ἐξ ἀρχῆς Ἰουδαῖοι καὶ τίσι χρησάμενοι τύχαις ὑφ' οἷω τε παιδευθέντες νομοθέτη τὰ πρὸς εὐσέβειαν καὶ τὴν ἄλλην ἄσκησιν ἀρετῆς πόσους τε πολέμους ἐν μακροῖς πολεμήσαντες χρόνοις εἰς τὸν τελευταῖον ἄκοντες πρὸς Ῥωμαίους κατέστησαν. ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ μείζων ἦν ἢ τοῦδε τοῦ λόγου περιβολή, κατ' αὐτὸν ἐκείνον χωρίσας ταῖς ἰδίαις ἀρχαῖς αὐτοῦ καὶ τῷ τέλει τὴν γραφὴν συνεμέτρησα: χρόνου δὲ προϊόντος, ὅπερ φιλεῖ τοῖς μεγάλων ἄπτεσθαι διανοουμένοις, ὄκνος μοι καὶ μέλλησις ἐγένετο τηλικαύτην μετενεγκεῖν ὑπόθεσιν εἰς ἀλλοδαπὴν ἡμῖν καὶ ξένην διαλέκτου συνήθειαν. ἦσαν δὲ τινες, οἳ πόθω τῆς ἱστορίας ἐπ' αὐτὴν με προὔτρεπον, καὶ μάλιστα δὴ πάντων Ἐπαφρόδιτος ἀνὴρ ἅπασαν μὲν ἰδέαν παιδείας ἠγαπηκῶς, διαφερόντως δὲ χαίρων ἐμπειρίας πραγμάτων, ἅτε δὴ μεγάλοις μὲν αὐτὸς ὁμιλήσας πράγμασι καὶ τύχαις πολυτρόποις, ἐν ἅπασιν δὲ θαυμαστὴν φύσεως ἐπιδειξάμενος ἰσχὺν καὶ προαίρεσιν ἀρετῆς ἀμετακίνητον. τούτῳ δὲ πειθόμενος ὡς αἰεὶ τοῖς χρήσιμον ἢ καλὸν τι πράττειν δυναμένοις συμφιλοκαλοῦντι καὶ ἐμαυτὸν αἰσχυρόμενος, εἰ δόξαιμι ῥαθυμῖα πλέον ἢ τῷ περὶ τὰ κάλλιστα χαίρειν πόνῳ, προθυμότερον ἐπερρώσθην, ἔτι κάκεῖνα πρὸς τοῖς εἰρημένοις λογισάμενος οὐ παρέργως, περὶ τε τῶν ἡμετέρων προγόνων εἰ μεταδιδόναι τῶν τοιούτων ἤθελον, καὶ περὶ τῶν Ἑλλήνων εἴ τινες αὐτῶν γνῶναι τὰ παρ' ἡμῖν ἐσπούδασαν.

³⁶ Josephus would have been around 60 years of age at this time (c. 97 C.E.).

³⁷ Original Greek and English translation according to Whiston (Tr.) 1895. Flavius Josephus. The Works of Flavius Josephus in *Perseus Digital Library* [Online]. Available: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.01.0146> [3 December 2014].

Those who undertake to write histories, do not, I perceive, take that trouble on one and the same account, but for many reasons, and those such as are very different one from another. For some of them apply themselves to this part of learning **to show their skill in composition,** and that they may therein acquire **a reputation for speaking finely:** others of them there are, **who write histories in order to gratify those that happen to be concerned in them,** and on that account have spared no pains, **but rather gone beyond their own abilities in the performance:** but others there are, who, of necessity and by force, are driven to write history, because they are concerned in the facts, and so cannot excuse themselves from committing them to writing, for the advantage of posterity; nay, there are not a few who are induced to draw their historical facts out of darkness into light, and to produce them for the benefit of the public, on account of the great importance of the facts themselves with which they have been concerned. Now of these several reasons for writing history, I must profess the two last were my own reasons also; for since I was myself interested in that war which we Jews had with the Romans, and knew myself its particular actions, and what conclusion it had, **I was forced to give the history of it, because I saw that others perverted the truth of those actions in their writings.**

Now I have undertaken the present work, as thinking it will appear to all the Greeks worthy of their study; for it will contain all our antiquities, and the constitution of our government, as interpreted out of the Hebrew Scriptures. And indeed I did formerly intend, when I wrote of the war, to explain who the Jews originally were, - what fortunes they had been subject to, - and by what legislature they had been instructed in piety, and the exercise of other virtues, - what wars also they had made in remote ages, till they were unwillingly engaged in this last with the Romans: but because this work would take up a great compass, I separated it into a set treatise by itself, with a beginning of its own, and its own conclusion; but in process of time, as usually happens to such as undertake great things, I grew weary and went on slowly, it being a large subject, and a difficult thing to translate our history into a foreign, and to us unaccustomed language. However, some persons there were who desired to know our history, and so exhorted me to go on with it; and, above all the rest, **Epaphroditus, a man who is a lover of all kind of learning, but is principally delighted with the knowledge of history, and this on account of his having been himself concerned in great affairs, and many turns of fortune, and having shown a wonderful rigor of an excellent nature, and an immovable virtuous resolution in them all. I yielded to this man's persuasions, who always excites such as have abilities in what is useful and acceptable, to join their endeavors with his. I was also ashamed myself to permit any laziness of disposition to have a greater influence upon me, than the delight of taking pains in such studies as were very useful: I thereupon stirred up myself, and went on with my work more cheerfully. Besides the foregoing motives, I had others which I greatly reflected on; and these were, that our forefathers were willing to communicate such things to others; and that some of the Greeks took considerable pains to know the affairs of our nation. [My emphases for greater clarity NPLA].**

With reference to both Mason (2003) and Carrier's (2000) learned insights, notice how Josephus employs his two similar *πρόλογοι* to make his reader aware of the following key issues:

1. The topic is of extreme importance;
2. Previous authors had either given inaccurate accounts and/or did not apply the correct approach to the discipline of writing history and/or employed history writing as means of showing off their literary skills and/or had some personal and negative agenda that precluded them from telling the truth;
3. He, Josephus, is the best qualified and experienced historian to undertake the task in hand due to his personal standing and intimate (eye-witness) knowledge of both the Jewish and the Roman perspectives;
4. He, Josephus, felt compelled to set the record straight;
5. He is writing (in the latter case) for the benefit of a patron called Ἐπαφρόδιτος – a relatively common theophoric personal name derived from the goddess Ἀφροδίτη meaning, inter alia, “handsome”, “lovely” or “charming”;
6. Although obviously emotionally affected by what has happened he will still endeavour to conduct himself as an unbiased historian³⁸;
7. His underlying theory is that the anti-Roman, Jewish revolt was ultimately caused by a small group of power-hungry “tyrants” and “robbers” who did not act in accord with accepted high Jewish morals and principles; and
8. More normally, Jews, who had a long and proud history, were a pious nation of the highest moral fibre.

It is in these two *πρόλογοι* that Mason (2003: 254) believes the author(s) of Ev.Luc. and Act.Ap. first show(s) heavy reliance on the writings of Josephus:

Although the preface to Luke-Acts is much briefer than War's, in keeping with the work's brevity, the author manages to work in all of the crucial points.

Expanding on Mason's example, reproduced below is the *πρόλογος* as found in Ev.Luc.1: 1 - 4³⁹:

Ἐπειδὴ περ πολλοὶ ἐπεχείρησαν ἀνατάξασθαι διήγησιν περὶ τῶν
πεπληροφορημένων ἐν ἡμῖν πραγμάτων καθὼς παρέδοσαν ἡμῖν οἱ ἀπ'

³⁸ Of course this also assists Josephus in obtaining sympathy and hence buy-in from his reader.

³⁹ Greek text according to *NTOG*. 1882. Eds Brooke and Fenton: 114. NIV translation according to Holy Bible. 1989. NIV: *NT* 53.

ἀρχῆς αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρεταὶ γενόμενοι τοῦ λόγου, ἔδοξε κάμοί, παρηκολουθηκότι ἄνωθεν πᾶσιν ἀκριβῶς, καθεξῆς σοι γράψαι, κράτιστε Θεόφιλε, ἵνα ἐπιγνῶς περὶ ὧν κατηγήθης λόγων τὴν ἀσφάλειαν. [My emphases for clarity NPLA].

Many have undertaken to draw up an account of the things that have been fulfilled among us, **just as they were handed down to us by those who from the first were eyewitnesses** and servants of the word. With this in mind, **since I myself have carefully investigated everything from the beginning, I too decided to write an orderly account for you, most excellent Theophilus**, so that **you may know the certainty** of the things you have been taught. [My emphases for clarity NPLA].

In the same way, the preface to Act.Ap. (1: 1- 2)⁴⁰ is also set down for consideration:

Τὸν μὲν πρῶτον λόγον ἐποίησάμην περὶ πάντων, ὃ Θεόφιλε, ὧν ἤρξατο ὁ Ἰησοῦς ποιεῖν τε καὶ διδάσκειν ἄχρι ἧς ἡμέρας ἐντειλάμενος τοῖς ἀποστόλοις διὰ Πνεύματος Ἁγίου οὗς ἐξελέξατο ἀνελήφθη.

In my former book, Theophilus, I wrote about all that Jesus began to do and to teach until the day he was taken up to heaven, after giving instructions through the Holy Spirit to the apostles he had chosen. [My emphasis for clarity NPLA].

Central to Mason's thesis are what he claims to be significant similarities between the respective *πρόλογοι* of *War*, *Antiquities*, *Ev.Luc.* and *Act.Ap.*

The primary characteristics of the various proofs as supplied by Mason (2003: 254 – 259) will be described briefly below:

Mason (2003: 254) speculates that at first glance, due to its “familiarity”, the reader may not fully appreciate the dynamism of the employed language. Despite its cursory nature, the *πρόλογοι* of both *Ev.Luc.* and *Act.Ap.* still manage to contain all the essential elements that normally typify a late Hellenistic historical prologue (*ut supra*).

Mason considers that for an historian living in those times – especially when dealing with topics already covered by previous writers - originality of approach must have been of paramount importance. Mason is also careful to emphasise that *unlike* many other historians of the period, Luke refrains from openly condemning previous

⁴⁰ Greek text according to *NTOG*. 1882. Eds Brooke and Fenton: 245. NIV translation according to Holy Bible. 1989. NIV: *NT* 111.

writers⁴¹. However, Mason feels that Luke still manages to imply that his account will better confirm what others may have averred previously. In support of this insight Mason (2003: 255) believes that the specific reference in Ev.Luc.1: 1 to “πολλοὶ” (many) should be viewed as a rather “pejorative term”. After all, why would anyone bother to waste their time merely re-affirming what numerous authors had stated earlier? For this reason, Mason supports the obvious assumption that Luke wanted to upgrade significantly the quality of the previously imparted gospels. Thus, indirectly, Luke is strongly implying that the new undertaking would be an improvement upon what had hitherto been either a superficial and/or perfunctory account.

Furthermore, Mason claims that the passages that follow on from Luke's preface clearly strengthen this suspected interpretation. In this context, Mason (2003: 255) plainly states that the Greek verb ἐπεχείρησαν (which Luke employs to express the efforts made by many previous authors) has the meaning: “took it upon themselves”.

Certainly in support of this possibly strained argument, it could be demonstrated that ἐπεχείρησαν translates to, inter alia, “to put one's hand to”, “to attempt” and/or “to undertake”.

Furthermore, Mason (2003: 255) alleges (based on its other occurrences), that the verb ἐπεχείρησαν should be better translated in the sense of “presumptuous or misguided effort”. For substantiation, Mason compares this verb's employment in other Lucan texts, viz.:

1. The Jews who tried (ἐπεχείρουν) to kill the apostle Paul (albeit ineptly) (Act.Ap. 9: 29).
2. The unfortunate Jewish exorcists who (imprudently) took it upon themselves (ἐπεχείρησαν) to cast out devils in Jesus' name (Act.Ap. 19: 13);

In addition, in the previously mentioned πρόλογος as found in Ev.Luc.1: 1 – 4, verses 3 and 4 reflect that the author sets out to offer something never before provided for his eminent reader, viz.: everything carefully investigated from the beginning⁴² with a firm (non-slip) footing.

⁴¹ Of course, if Luke was indeed relying heavily on other authors for his content he would not have wanted to draw his readers' attention to this fact.

⁴² Mason (2003: 255) emphasises that promising to offer a precisely researched account from the beginning is typical of Hellenistic historical prologues.

Here, Mason (2003: 255) points out that the related adjective “ἀσφαλῆς” (which refers to the concept of, inter alia, a “secure footing” or “firm foundation”) appears three times in Act.Ap. viz.:

1. Act.Ap. 21: 34;
2. Act.Ap. 22: 30; and
3. Act.Ap. 25: 26.

According to Mason’s argument, the adjective ἀσφαλῆς is being deliberately employed by Luke in some subliminal sense to reinforce the understated import of his prologue and subtly convey the sense that steadfast, substantiated information is now being supplied by him as a foil to an environment once filled with inconsistent contentions.

On this very issue Mason (2003: 255) unequivocally states that:

The author [Luke] says, in effect: "you have read many competing accounts; now I shall set the record straight." Although his criticism is restrained, he clearly means to present a story that is superior to the others. [My insertion for clarity NPLA].

3.4 Portraying Christianity in a Jewish Context

3.4.1 Non-Lucan Gospels

Mason sees a unity between Ev.Luc. and Act.Ap. Here, he makes the intuitive contention that after a careful reading of both Ev.Luc. and Act.Ap. it becomes self-evident that Luke is in a superior position to his Christian counterparts. Specifically, only Luke, due to his unique situation, can offer a post-resurrection history of the early church and accordingly he is able to withhold certain data from Ev.Luc. which he carefully reserves for later inscription within his second book (i.e. Act.Ap.).

Mason (2003: 256) cites two notable examples from the other three *NT* gospels to back up his position:

In Ev.Marc. 3: 6⁴³ we read:

⁴³ Greek text according to *NTOG*. 1882. Eds Brooke and Fenton: 77. NIV translation according to Holy Bible. 1989. NIV: *NT* 35.

καὶ ἐξελθόντες οἱ Φαρισαῖοι εὐθὺς μετὰ τῶν Ἡρωδιανῶν συμβούλιον ἐδίδουν κατ' αὐτοῦ, ὅπως αὐτὸν ἀπολέσωσιν .

Then the Pharisees went out and began to plot with the Herodians how they might kill Jesus.

In a similar vein, in Ev.Jo. 5: 18⁴⁴ we read:

διὰ τοῦτο οὖν μᾶλλον ἐζήτουν αὐτὸν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἀποκτεῖναι, ὅτι οὐ μόνον ἔλυεν τὸ σάββατον, ἀλλὰ καὶ Πατέρα ἴδιον ἔλεγεν τὸν Θεόν, ἴσον ἑαυτὸν ποιῶν τῷ Θεῷ.

For this reason they tried all the more to kill him; not only was he breaking the Sabbath, but he was even calling God his own Father, making himself equal with God.

Here, the character of Jesus of Nazareth is clearly placed in a life and death situation as he incites the anger of the Jewish authorities. Mason (2003: 256) argues that in their different approaches these two pericopes underplay Jesus of Nazareth's ethnic Jewishness in favour of his more important role as (universal/Gentile) saviour.

3.4.2 Luke's Portrayal of Jesus of Nazareth

By stark contrast, in Ev.Luc. Jesus of Nazareth behaves more like a typical Jewish citizen, operating comfortably within his own community and undertaking normal Jewish activities.

For example in Ev.Luc. 2: 21, 2: 41 - 42, 2: 46 and 4: 15 - 22 we read variously concerning his:

1. Circumcision;
2. accompanying his parents to Jerusalem for the festival of Pesach;
3. debating with Jewish teachers in the Temple courts;
4. reading from the book of Isaiah in the Nazareth synagogue; and
5. eliciting approval from his Jewish peers.

Mason (2003: 267) also feels that Luke, due to his need to stress the Jewishness of Jesus of Nazareth (and by implication the foundations of the Christian faith),

⁴⁴ Greek text according to *NTOG*. 1882. Eds Brooke and Fenton: 198. NIV translation according to Holy Bible. 1989. NIV: *NT* 91.

consistently emphasises Jerusalem as a setting for his narratives. Obviously the other gospel writers tend to deal with a Jesus of Nazareth who not only (at times) seems somewhat antagonistic towards Judaism and/or Jewish practices but spends much of his time operating outside of the Jewish religious centre.

Conversely, Luke - unlike the other gospel writers – commences his gospel narrative in Jerusalem, the centre of Jewish culture and worship. To offset the fact that his sources seem to have consistently placed Jesus in more rural contexts, Luke consistently involves the city of Jerusalem in other ways. For example, as has already been seen, Jesus' parents visit Jerusalem for their son's circumcision as well as the festival of Pesach. Jesus sets "his face towards Jerusalem" in Ev.Luc. 9: 51 and the reader is repeatedly reminded of the Holy City in Ev.Luc 13: 33 - 34; 17: 11 and 19: 11.

3.4.3 Luke's Portrayal of the Origins of Christianity

Mason (2003: 267 – 268) also confirms that the Lucan material deviates from the standard Christian *fabula* as found in Ev.Marc. and Ev.Matt. Thus, following the resurrection account, Luke records the disciples as sojourning in Jerusalem where they witness the risen Christ in Ev.Luc. 24: 13 - 14; 18; 33 and 52 - 53. Indeed, in Ev.Luc. 24: 46 – 49⁴⁵ Luke presents Jesus as clearly and distinctly commanding his disciples to remain in Jerusalem and strongly implies that that city will be the starting point for the dispersal of the Christian gospel as well as being the headquarters of the new Christian church:

τότε διήνοιξεν αὐτῶν τὸν νοῦν τοῦ συνιέναι τὰς γραφάς, καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὅτι οὕτως γέγραπται παθεῖν τὸν χριστὸν καὶ ἀναστῆναι ἐκ νεκρῶν τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, καὶ κηρυχθῆναι ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ μετάνοιαν εἰς ἅφεςιν ἁμαρτιῶν εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη **ἀρξάμενοι ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλήμ**. ὑμεῖς μάρτυρες τούτων. καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἐξαποστέλλω τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πατρὸς μου ἐφ' ὑμᾶς· ὑμεῖς **δὲ καθίσατε ἐν τῇ πόλει** ἕως οὗ ἐνδύσησθε ἐξ ὕψους δύναμιν.

He told them, "This is what is written: The Christ will suffer and rise from the dead on the third day, and repentance and forgiveness of sins will be preached in his name to all nations, **beginning at Jerusalem**. You are witnesses of these things. I am going to send you what my Father has

⁴⁵ Greek text according to *NTOG*. 1882. Eds Brooke and Fenton: 185 - 186. NIV translation according to Holy Bible. 1989. NIV: *NT* 85.

promised; **but stay in the city** until you have been clothed with power from on high.” [My emphases for clarity NPLA].

In the subsequent Act.Ap. 1: 8⁴⁶ Jesus of Nazareth is also quoted as saying:

ἀλλὰ λήμψεσθε δύναμιν ἐπελθόντος τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ἐφ' ὑμᾶς, καὶ ἔσεσθέ μου μάρτυρες ἔν τε Ἱερουσαλὴμ καὶ [έν] πάσῃ τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ καὶ Σαμαρίᾳ καὶ ἕως ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς.

But you [my disciples] will receive power when the Holy Spirit comes on you; and you will be **my witnesses in Jerusalem, and in all Judea and Samaria, and to the ends of the earth.** [My insertion and emphases for greater clarity NPLA].

Mason (2003: 268) also stresses the fact that Jesus' disciples (i.e. whilst resident in Jerusalem) will take charge of the church's activities (cf. Act.Ap. 8: 1 and 14; 9: 26; 11: 22; 15: 2; 16: 4; and 21: 17-18). This, he maintains, is how Luke manages to sell the message that Christianity is a legitimate God-given institution, with roots as ancient as Judaism itself, replete with a world-renowned religious centre and a divinely sanctioned leadership.

However, Mason (2003: 256), who wants to stress Luke's need for strong Jewish ties, would also have his reader accept Luke's references to Jesus of Nazareth's interactions with the Pharisees (e.g. Ev.Luc. 7:36, 11: 37 and 14: 1) as good examples of what he describes as “consorting in a friendly manner with popular Jewish teachers ... and debating with other teachers the correct interpretation of Sabbath law.” This should be seen as quite misleading. Although one obtains the sense that in two of the Lucan accounts Jesus of Nazareth is initially a welcome guest of a particular Pharisee, in all cases, he ends up insulting his hosts and incurring their undisguised resentment. Consider as an example the account given in Ev.Luc. 11: 37 - 54⁴⁷:

Ἐν δὲ τῷ λαλῆσαι ἐρωτᾷ αὐτὸν Φαρισαῖος ὅπως ἀριστήσῃ παρ' αὐτῷ· εἰσελθὼν δὲ ἀνέπεσεν. ὁ δὲ Φαρισαῖος ἰδὼν ἐθαύμασεν ὅτι οὐ πρῶτον ἐβαπτίσθη πρὸ τοῦ ἀρίστου. εἶπεν δὲ ὁ κύριος πρὸς αὐτὸν ἰὼν ὑμεῖς οἱ Φαρισαῖοι τὸ ἕξωθεν τοῦ ποτηρίου καὶ τοῦ πίνακος καθαρίζετε, τὸ δὲ ἔσωθεν ὑμῶν γέμει ἀρπαγῆς καὶ πονηρίας. ἄφρονες, οὐχ ὁ ποιήσας

⁴⁶ Greek text according to *NTOG*. 1882. Eds Brooke and Fenton: 245. NIV translation according to Holy Bible. 1989. NIV: *NT* 111.

⁴⁷ Greek text according to *NTOG*. 1882. Eds Brooke and Fenton: 150 - 152. NIV translation according to Holy Bible. 1989. NIV: *NT* 69 - 70.

τὸ ἔξωθεν καὶ τὸ ἔσωθεν ἐποίησεν; πλὴν τὰ ἐνόητα δότε ἐλεημοσύνην, καὶ ἰδοὺ πάντα καθαρὰ ὑμῖν ἐστίν. ἀλλὰ οὐαὶ ὑμῖν τοῖς Φαρισαίοις, ὅτι ἀποδεκατοῦτε τὸ ἡδύοσμον καὶ τὸ πῆγανον καὶ πᾶν λάχανον, καὶ παρέργεσθε τὴν κρίσιν καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην τοῦ θεοῦ· ταῦτα δὲ ἔδει ποιῆσαι κάκεῖνα μὴ παρεῖναι. οὐαὶ ὑμῖν τοῖς Φαρισαίοις, ὅτι ἀγαπᾶτε τὴν πρωτοκαθεδρίαν ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς καὶ τοὺς ἀσπασμοὺς ἐν ταῖς ἀγοραῖς. οὐαὶ ὑμῖν, ὅτι ἐστὲ ὡς τὰ μνημεῖα τὰ ἀδηλα, καὶ οἱ ἄνθρωποι οἱ περιπατοῦντες ἐπάνω οὐκ οἶδασιν. Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ τις τῶν νομικῶν λέγει αὐτῷ διδάσκαλε, ταῦτα λέγων καὶ ἡμᾶς ὑβρίζεις. ὁ δὲ εἶπεν καὶ ὑμῖν τοῖς νομικοῖς οὐαὶ, ὅτι φορτίζετε τοὺς ἀνθρώπους φορτία δυσβάστακτα, καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐνὶ τῶν δακτύλων ὑμῶν οὐ προσψάυετε τοῖς φορτίοις. οὐαὶ ὑμῖν, ὅτι οἰκοδομεῖτε τὰ μνημεῖα τῶν προφητῶν οἱ δὲ πατέρες ὑμῶν ἀπέκτειναν αὐτούς. ἄρα μάρτυρές ἐστε καὶ συνευδοκεῖτε τοῖς ἔργοις τῶν πατέρων ὑμῶν, ὅτι αὐτοὶ μὲν ἀπέκτειναν αὐτούς ὑμεῖς δὲ οἰκοδομεῖτε. διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἡ σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ εἶπεν Ἀποστελῶ εἰς αὐτούς προφήτας καὶ ἀποστόλους, καὶ ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀποκτενοῦσιν καὶ διώξουσιν, ἵνα ἐκζητηθῇ τὸ αἷμα πάντων τῶν προφητῶν τὸ ἐκκεχυμένον ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου ἀπὸ τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης, ἀπὸ αἵματος Ἄβελ ἕως αἵματος Ζαχαρίου τοῦ ἀπολομένου μεταξὺ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου καὶ τοῦ οἴκου· ναί, λέγω ὑμῖν, ἐκζητηθήσεται ἀπὸ τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης. οὐαὶ ὑμῖν τοῖς νομικοῖς, ὅτι ἤρατε τὴν κλεῖδα τῆς γνώσεως· αὐτοὶ οὐκ εἰσήλθατε καὶ τοὺς εἰσερχομένους ἐκωλύσατε. κάκεῖθεν ἐξελθόντος αὐτοῦ ἤρξαντο οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι δεινῶς ἐνέχειν καὶ ἀποστοματίζειν αὐτὸν περὶ πλειόνων, ἐνεδρεύοντες αὐτὸν θηρεύσαι τι ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ. [My emphases for greater clarity NPLA].

When Jesus had finished speaking, a Pharisee invited him to eat with him; so he went in and reclined at the table. But the Pharisee was surprised when he noticed that Jesus did not first wash before the meal.

Then the Lord said to him, “Now then, you Pharisees clean the outside of the cup and dish, but inside **you are full of greed and wickedness. You foolish people!** Did not the one who made the outside make the inside also? But now as for what is inside you - be generous to the poor, and everything will be clean for you.

“**Woe to you Pharisees,** because you give God a tenth of your mint, rue and all other kinds of garden herbs, but **you neglect justice and the love of God.** You should have practiced the latter without leaving the former undone.

“**Woe to you Pharisees,** because you love the most important seats in the synagogues and respectful greetings in the marketplaces.

“**Woe to you,** because you are like unmarked graves, which people walk over without knowing it.”

One of the experts in the law answered him, “**Teacher, when you say these things, you insult us also.**”

Jesus replied, “And you **experts in the law, woe to you**, because you load people down with burdens they can hardly carry, and you yourselves will not lift one finger to help them.

“**Woe to you**, because you build tombs for the prophets, and **it was your ancestors who killed them**. So you testify that you approve of what your ancestors did; **they killed the prophets, and you build their tombs**. Because of this, God in his wisdom said, ‘I will send them prophets and apostles, some of whom they will kill and others they will persecute.’ Therefore **this generation will be held responsible for the blood of all the prophets that has been shed since the beginning of the world**, from the blood of Abel to the blood of Zechariah, who was killed between the altar and the sanctuary. Yes, I tell you, **this generation will be held responsible for it all**.

“**Woe to you experts in the law**, because **you have taken away the key to knowledge**. You yourselves have not entered, and **you have hindered those who were entering**.”

When Jesus went outside, **the Pharisees and the teachers of the law began to oppose him fiercely** and to **besiege him with questions, waiting to catch him in something he might say**. [My emphases for greater clarity NPLA].

This can hardly be described as an amicable discussion or intellectual debate between congenial fellows. Rather, Jesus of Nazareth is portrayed by Luke as a man of extraordinary confidence and authority (albeit also being self-righteous, antagonistic, unsympathetic, rude and unyielding). Indeed, initially the Pharisees and experts in the law seem to be the ones who are more patient and accommodating until, worn down by the incessant verbal abuse, they justifiably feel insulted and angrily set out to deliberately embarrass Jesus.

Mason does at least accede to the fact, that according to Ev.Luc. by the end of the narrative, a small number of Jewish authorities do conspire to have Jesus of Nazareth eradicated. What seems more correct is Mason’s overall assumption that the real antagonism against Jesus of Nazareth and his ultimate death only become an issue near the end of Ev.Luc. - whereas in the other *NT* gospels, Jesus of Nazareth is more normally portrayed as being under *constant* threat from Jewish authority.

3.5 Evidence of Historiographical Influence and Josephan Rhetoric

3.5.1 Josephan Rhetoric

Regardless, Mason sees Ev.Luc. as an introduction to Act.Ap. wherein step by step, sequential events lead up to a climax that is only found later at the culmination of Act.Ap. Specifically, Mason (2003: 256) explains:

At first, Christian leaders are told simply to refrain from teaching in the name of their recently crucified leader (Acts 4: 18). Over time, it is the successive revelations from God (Acts 8, 10 - 11) and the momentous decisions taken on the basis of them (Acts 15), which further lead to Christian criticism of the Jerusalem temple, of dietary and other laws, and of the Jewish people, and to the Christians' open dealings with Gentiles. These bring the conflict with Judaism to a climax only at the end of the second book (Acts 28: 23 - 28).

Because Luke goes to such lengths to ensure that he sets down his accounts in strict sequential order, Mason believes that his approach is strongly reminiscent of Josephus' own need to detail his narratives consecutively, episode by episode.

As a result, and as is the case for both authors, it is impossible to isolate one specific episode from the sum total of respective accounts and be able to fully appreciate the overall import of the combined message. The reader needs to be mindful of the complete sequential context in order to finally grasp the author's global point of view.

Mason also believes that it is pertinent that Luke seems to be imitating Josephus' propensity to refer to his previous writing whilst engaged in the process of writing the *πρόλογος* for a new book. For example, in his *Antiquities* 1, pr. / 4 Josephus refers to his previous oeuvre (i.e. *War*). Again, in the *πρόλογος* of his *Against Apion* I, pr. / 1 - 5 Josephus refers to his aims as previously stated in his earlier *Antiquities*.

Mason (2003: 256) also asserts that Josephus articulates his desire to enhance previous historical accounts in his *Antiquities* 1, pr. / 5 – 13. This is not quite true. Josephus only makes this specific point in his earlier *War* and he merely *reminds* his reader of this fact in his *Antiquities* 1, pr. / 4). Indeed, apart for a possible single exception (discussed below), at no point in the *πρόλογος* to the *Antiquities* does Josephus specifically mention that his new work will be a *better* version of what came before.

It is true that the *πρόλογος* of the older *War* is characterised by Josephus' overt criticism of other writers but in the specific context of his more recent *Antiquities* he takes a far softer approach. As has been previously discussed in some detail already, in his *Antiquities* Josephus merely mentions that previous writers of history are not all motivated for the same reasons. Certainly, only in one instance could he be accused of making a discernible disparaging remark, when he implies that some historians are motivated by the need to appease their reader and consequently exceed their own abilities in their performance. However, this negative comment is made in *Antiquities* 1, pr. / 2 and *not* in *Antiquities* 1, pr. / 5 – 13 as intimated by Mason.

Lastly, at the very end of the *πρόλογος* as found in *Antiquities* 1, pr. / 16 – 18 (i.e. *not* in *Antiquities* 1, pr. / 5 – 13), Josephus talks generally about the problems associated with information that was written in ancient times and the reliability of transcription. However, Josephus condemns no-one. He then promises to accurately record what he finds in the ancient Jewish records. Here, it would seem that Mason may have made an unqualified assumption.

Regardless, the only point that can be safely conceded from this discussion is the confirmation that Luke refers to his previous book (i.e. Ev. Luc.) when writing the *πρόλογος* for Act.Ap.

It is also true that both Luke and Josephus refer to a patron who has a theophoric name. In Luke's case he formally refers to “ὦ Θεόφιλε” (i.e. vocative derivative of “Θεόφιλος”) and, as has already been mentioned, Josephus refers to one Ἐπαφρόδιτος.

However, even Mason accepts that Ἐπαφρόδιτος, despite being theophoric in nature, is a very common Greek name and obviously refers to a specific member⁴⁸ of the Greek pantheon. Θεόφιλος is more overtly theophoric and refers to the sole representative of the monotheistic (Judeo-Christian) belief system. However, exactly like Ἐπαφρόδιτος it was once an extremely common name. Thus, taken at face value, this independent fact cannot be employed as useful evidence.

Mason (2003: 257) theorises that:

⁴⁸ I.e. Ἀφροδίτη (Aphrodite).

Since both Josephus' and Luke's addressees appear to have had some social status and wealth, but were unlikely to be highest-ranking aristocrats, they may have been freedmen who had become somewhat successful after gaining their freedom. This is especially likely in the case of Josephus' patron - a prominent man with a Greek name in Rome.

3.5.2 Invented Substitute Speeches

Mason (2003: 260) also draws his reader's attention to the typically Hellenistic practice of inventing plausible speeches for individuals as though they were recorded verbatim. Here Luke and Josephus are no exception. Mason again refers to Herodotus and Thucydides (*ut supra*) who retained a central function for invented historical speeches.

For example, in his *Thucy.Hist.* (1.22.1) Thucydides opined that the actual speeches of individuals could not be recreated with any real certainty⁴⁹:

As to the speeches which were made either before or during the war, it was hard for me, and for others who reported them to me, to recollect the exact words. I have therefore put into the mouth of each speaker the sentiments proper to the occasion, expressed as I thought he would be likely to express them, while at the same time I endeavoured, as nearly as I could, to give the general purport of what was actually said.

Thus, it was perfectly permissible for the historian to proffer a substitute that reflected the supposed tenor and import of the unrecorded event. Mason (2003: 260) puts this more succinctly:

...Thucydides does give his characters speeches appropriate to the occasion - the arrogant speak arrogantly, statesmen speak like statesmen - the speeches are his own creations. Some may be based on recollection of what was actually said, but they are all ultimately Thucydides' own statements, a means of making his own points and advancing his narrative.

Of course, as Mason confirms, such speeches were excellent opportunities for the historical writer to employ his rhetoric to supply a specific interpretation of events. In

⁴⁹ Cf. Thucydides: *History of the Peloponnesian War* 1.22.1 according to Jowett (Tr.). 1900. *Thucydides*, Second edition. Oxford, Clarendon Press in *Classic Persuasion* [Online]. Available: <http://www.classicpersuasion.org/pw/thucydides/jthucbk1rv2.htm> [2 February 2015].

short, an astute writer could literally put words into the mouths of his characters as he saw fit.

In the case of Josephus, his character's speeches are designed to strengthen his own personal agenda and/or narrative aims. For example, it will be recalled that Josephus' underlying premise is that Jerusalem and the Temple were destroyed due to the actions of certain ungodly Jewish rebel leaders who not only brought about the destruction of Jewish culture but were themselves punished by God. In his *War* 7, 8, 6 / 332⁵⁰ we read:

τὸ γὰρ πῦρ εἰς τοὺς πολεμίους φερόμενον οὐκ αὐτομάτως ἐπὶ τὸ κατασκευασθὲν τεῖχος ὑφ' ἡμῶν ἀνέστρεψεν, ἀλλ' ἔστι ταῦτα χόλος πολλῶν ἀδικημάτων, ἃ μανέντες εἰς τοὺς ὁμοφύλους ἐτολμήσαμεν.

for that fire which was driven upon our enemies did not of its own accord turn back upon the wall which we had built; this was the effect of God's anger against us for our manifold sins, which we have been guilty of in a most insolent and extravagant manner with regard to our own countrymen;

Here, near the end of Eleazar's long speech (i.e. *War* 7, 8, 6 / 320 – 336), a direct reference is made to Josephus' underlying thesis. Thus, Josephus manages to have one of his characters (e.g. Eleazar) emphasise his own unique Josephan assessment of the situation by simply composing a suitable speech for him.

Mason (2003: 262) emphasises that typical of a late Hellenistic author, Luke too, has his various characters re-affirm his own agenda:

In keeping with the expectations placed on Hellenistic authors, the writer of Acts has each of his characters speak in an appropriate way. We have already seen that Paul's remarks to Felix and Agrippa II are carefully chosen to make fun of those rulers' personal lives. Similarly, when Paul is in Athens he quotes from Greek poets rather than from Jewish Scriptures (17: 28), which would have meant nothing to his Athenian audience. Gamaliel's defense of Christianity is based on the kind of pragmatic grounds that a Jewish councilor might have advocated; he does not personally confess belief in Jesus or even real enthusiasm for the Christian movement (5: 35 - 39). And again, the proconsul Gallio speaks exactly as a Roman governor might, entirely jaded and caring nothing for the internal disputes of a subject nation (18: 14 - 15). (Sic).

⁵⁰ Original Greek and English translation according to Whiston (Tr.) 1895. Flavius Josephus. *The Works of Flavius Josephus in Perseus Digital Library* [Online]. Available: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0148%3Abook%3D7%3Awhiston+chapter%3D8%3Awhiston+section%3D6> [8 December 2014].

Mason (2003: 261) sums up this approach as follows:

...the challenge of the Hellenistic historian was to create speeches that, on the one hand, were appropriate to the speaker and occasion and, on the other hand, served to advance the author's own narrative aims. Those aims need not have been exclusively earnest, however. They might include large doses of entertainment and word - play. Ancient readers knew this, and were not expected to believe that such speeches were merely reproductions of what was really said on a given occasion.

Of course, as compared to any of Josephus' works, Act.Ap. is relatively short and generally speaking, Luke's characters do not have such long speeches. Mason (2003: 261 - 262) himself admits that long speeches are not to be found in Ev.Luc. – a deduction also supported by Dibelius (1937: 262) who once quipped:

These speeches, without doubt, are as they stand inventions of the author. For they are too short to have been actually given in this form; they are too similar to one another to have come from different persons; and in their content they occasionally reproduce a later standpoint (e.g. what Peter and James say about the Law in chap. xv).

Regardless, Mason goes on to point to the following examples of created speeches in Act.Ap. which he feels are still highly reminiscent of the kind of rhetoric found in Josephus:

1. Peter's advocacy to the 120 believers to appoint someone to take over Judas Iscariot's apostolic ministry (Act.Ap. 1: 16 - 22);
2. Peter's exhortation which resulted in the conversion of 3,000 Jews (Act.Ap. 2: 14 - 36);
3. Peter preaching to the Jewish onlookers at Solomon's Colonnade (Act.Ap. 3: 12 – 26);
4. Gamaliel the Pharisee's plea to the Sanhedrin to spare the lives of Peter and the apostles (Act.Ap. 5: 34 – 39);
5. Stephen's tedious monologue to the Sanhedrin (Act.Ap. 7: 1 - 53);
6. Peter's didactic message to Cornelius (Act.Ap. 10: 34 - 43);
7. Paul preaching to Jew and Gentile alike in the synagogue at Pisidian Antioch (Act.Ap. 13: 16 – 41);
8. James' exhortation to the apostles and elders of the Jerusalem church (Act.Ap. 15: 13 - 21);
9. Paul preaching to the meeting of the Areopagus in Athens (Act.Ap. 17: 22 - 31);

10. Paul's farewell speech to the Ephesian elders (Act.Ap. 20: 17- 35);
11. Paul's "defence" to his captors in Jerusalem (Act.Ap. 22: 3 - 21);
12. Paul's defence before Marcus Antonius Felix (Act.Ap. 24: 10 - 21); and
13. Paul's defence before Marcus Julius Agrippa (Act.Ap. 26: 2 - 23).

Mason still believes that given the brevity of the entire book, these thirteen noteworthy speeches serve a pivotal function in the sequential evolution of the overall narrative that ultimately epitomises Ev.Luc. and Act.Ap.

Of particular importance to this debate, Mason (2003: 262 – 263) notices that in all the Lucan-inspired speeches to non-Christians, a similar form of address is employed. Here, Mason identifies six Lucan strategies, viz.:

1. A direct address to the audience employing phrases such as "men of Israel" and "men and brothers";
2. An appeal for attention employing phrases such as "lend your ears", "let this be known to you" and "hear me";
3. A defining quotation from the LXX;
4. A condensed Christological synopsis;
5. A scriptural "proof"; and
6. A final proclamation of salvation.

In addition, the general organisation of each Lucan speech is almost identical and regardless of which character is being "quoted", the distinctive content of each structural component is unvarying.

Mason (2003: 263) corroborates these claims by pointing out that nearly all the Lucan characters begin their speeches with the term "Ἄνδρες" (i.e. Men). This is then immediately qualified with terms such as "Jews", "Israelites", "brothers", "fathers" or "Judeans".

Here, the following selected examples (as originally indicated by Mason) are pertinent:

In Act.Ap. 2: 14⁵¹ we read:

Σταθείς δὲ ὁ Πέτρος σὺν τοῖς ἑνδεκά ἐπῆρεν τὴν φωνὴν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀπεφθέγγετο αὐτοῖς **Ἄνδρες Ἰουδαῖοι** καὶ οἱ κατοικοῦντες Ἱερουσαλὴμ πάντες, τοῦτο ὑμῖν γνωστὸν ἔστω καὶ ἐνωτίσασθε τὰ ῥήματά μου. [My emphasis for clarity NPLA].

Then Peter stood up with the Eleven, raised his voice and addressed the crowd: “[**Men**] **Fellow Jews** and all of you who live in Jerusalem, let me explain this to you; listen carefully to what I say. [My emphasis and insertion for clarity NPLA].

Act.Ap. 3: 12⁵² yields:

ιδὼν δὲ ὁ Πέτρος ἀπεκρίνατο πρὸς τὸν λαόν **Ἄνδρες Ἰσραηλεῖται**, τί θαυμάζετε ἐπὶ τούτῳ, ἢ ἡμῖν τί ἀτενίζετε ὡς ἰδίᾳ δυνάμει ἢ εὐσεβείᾳ πεποιηκόσιν τοῦ περιπατεῖν αὐτόν; [My emphasis for clarity NPLA].

When Peter saw this, he said to them: “[**Men**] **Fellow Israelites**, why does this surprise you? Why do you stare at us as if by our own power or godliness we had made this man walk? [My emphasis and insertion for clarity NPLA].

In Act.Ap. 7: 2⁵³ we are told:

ὁ δὲ ἔφη **Ἄνδρες ἀδελφοὶ καὶ πατέρες**, ἀκούσατε. Ὁ θεὸς τῆς δόξης ὤφθη τῷ πατρὶ ἡμῶν Ἀβραάμ ὄντι ἐν τῇ Μεσοποταμίᾳ πρὶν ἢ κατοικῆσαι αὐτὸν ἐν Χαρράν, [My emphasis for clarity NPLA].

To this he replied: “[**Men**] **Brothers and fathers**, listen to me! The God of glory appeared to our father Abraham while he was still in Mesopotamia, before he lived in Harran. [My emphases and insertion for clarity NPLA].

And in Act.Ap.13: 16⁵⁴ we obtain the following:

ἀναστὰς δὲ Παῦλος καὶ κατασεισάσ τῇ χειρὶ εἶπεν **Ἄνδρες Ἰσραηλεῖται καὶ οἱ φοβούμενοι τὸν θεόν**, ἀκούσατε. [My emphasis for clarity NPLA].

Standing up, Paul motioned with his hand and said: “[**Men**] **Fellow**

⁵¹ Greek text according to *NTOG*. 1882. Eds Brooke and Fenton: 248. NIV translation according to Holy Bible. 1989. NIV: *NT* 112.

⁵² Greek text according to *NTOG*. 1882. Eds Brooke and Fenton: 251. NIV translation according to Holy Bible. 1989. NIV: *NT* 113.

⁵³ Greek text according to *NTOG*. 1882. Eds Brooke and Fenton: 259. NIV translation according to Holy Bible. 1989. NIV: *NT* 117.

⁵⁴ Greek text according to *NTOG*. 1882. Eds Brooke and Fenton: 276. NIV translation according to Holy Bible. 1989. NIV: *NT* 124.

Israelites and you Gentiles who worship God, listen to me! [My emphases and insertion for clarity NPLA].

This mode of address is not just limited to apostles. Indeed, both the angels as well as non-Christian speakers also adhere to this formula:

In Act.Ap. 1: 11⁵⁵ we read the speech of two angels:

οἱ καὶ εἶπαν **Ἄνδρες Γαλιλαῖοι**, τί ἐστήκατε βλέποντες / ἐμβλέποντες εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν; οὗτος ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὁ ἀναλημφθεὶς ἀφ' ὑμῶν εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν οὕτως ἐλεύσεται ὃν τρόπον ἐθεάσασθε αὐτὸν πορευόμενον εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν. [My emphasis for clarity NPLA].

“Men of Galilee,” they said, “why do you stand here looking into the sky? This same Jesus, who has been taken from you into heaven, will come back in the same way you have seen him go into heaven.” [My emphasis for clarity NPLA].

And in Act.Ap. 5: 35⁵⁶ Gamaliel the Pharisee addresses the Sanhedrin as follows:

Ἄνδρες Ἰσραηλεῖται, προσέχετε ἑαυτοῖς ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τούτοις τί μέλλετε πράσσειν. [My emphasis for clarity NPLA].

Men of Israel, consider carefully what you intend to do to these men. [My emphasis for clarity NPLA].

3.5.3 Creating Authority and the Role of Prophecy

When it comes to the issue of employing scriptural “proof” texts, Mason (2003: 263 n. 6) highlights the fact that both Peter and Paul utilise the identical material in exactly the same manner. Here, he draws our attention to the specific use of Ps. 16: 10⁵⁷ in Act.Ap. 2: 27 and Act.Ap. 13: 35 where both apostles interpret the self-same forced prophetic significance of the pericope which reads:

ὅτι οὐθὲν ἐθγκαταλείψεις τῆ_ν ψυχὴν μου εἰς ἄδην οὐθδὲ δώσεις το_ν ὄσιόν σου ἰθδεῖν διαφθοράν.

⁵⁵ Greek text according to *NTOG*. 1882. Eds Brooke and Fenton: 246. NIV translation according to Holy Bible. 1989. NIV: NT 111.

⁵⁶ Greek text according to *NTOG*. 1882. Eds Brooke and Fenton: 257. NIV translation according to Holy Bible. 1989. NIV: NT 116.

⁵⁷ Greek text according to *Septuaginta* (Greek Edition. 1979. Ed. Alfred Rahlfs. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft: NIV translation according to Holy Bible. 1989. NIV: LXX 476.

because you will not abandon me to the grave [underworld], nor will you let your Holy One see decay. [My insertion for clarity NPLA].

Obviously from a purely forced Christian viewpoint the text is meant to refer to Jesus of Nazareth as the “Holy One” and his believed resurrection (i.e. he escapes decay).

In addition, the very term “Holy One” and its implied association with Jesus of Nazareth as the “Child of God” forms part of what Mason describes as the “special vocabulary” of Act.Ap. - so orchestrated as to carefully harmonise with Luke’s own personal agenda.

Yet another piece of evidence that ostensibly supports Mason’s overall thesis is the issue of Luke’s modification of other leading Christian authority. Perhaps the most notable being how he seemingly undermines Paul’s more archetypal message as found in 1 Ep.Cor. Certainly, in Act.Ap. whenever Luke recalls one of Paul’s speeches, curiously, certain key Pauline themes are totally absent. As evidence, Mason (2003: 263 n. 7) cites the following Pauline lacunae:

1. Dying and rising with Christ;
2. The current evil age and the one that will witness the return of Jesus; and
3. Jesus’ flesh/spirit dichotomy.

Mason (2003: 263 n. 7) clarifies that:

Only in [Act.Ap.] 13: 38 - 39 do references to "freedom from the law of Moses" and righteousness through faith in Christ approach one of Paul's major themes. This parallel reflects the author's effort to make each of his speeches fit the speaker and situation. [My insertion for clarity NPLA].

In addition, Mason confirms that Luke portrays his characters such as Peter, Paul, and the martyr Stephen as promoting a form of Christianity that is founded on Jewish history and ancient prophecy. The following examples, as indicated by Mason (2003: 263 - 264) are germane:

In Act.Ap. 2: 14 – 40 Peter (in the company of the other disciples) addresses a large crowd. During this discourse (cf. Act.Ap. 2: 17 – 21) Peter manages to quote Jl. 2: 28 – 32 verbatim. Next (cf. Act.Ap. 2: 25 – 28) Peter recites Ps. 16: 8 - 11. Finally (cf. Act.Ap. 2: 34 – 35) Peter makes references to Ps. 110: 1. These various LXX

excerpts contain verses that Luke would have the reader believe are age-old Jewish prophecies whose divine purpose was solely to foretell the coming of Jesus of Nazareth and his divine ministry.

In Act.Ap. 7: 2 – 50 we read Stephen the martyr's long diatribe to the Sanhedrin which is almost totally a recapitulation of key passages from the LXX intended to confirm what Luke considered to be God's divine plan, supposedly foretold long ago in Jewish history, that would ultimately necessitate the coming of Jesus of Nazareth, viz.: Am. 5: 25 – 27; De. 18: 15; Ex. 1: 8; Ex. 2: 14; Ex. 3: 5 - 8 and 10; Ex. 32: 1; Ge. 12: 1; Ge. 15: 13 and 14; Is. 66: 1 and 2.

In Act.Ap. 13: 17 – 37 we witness Paul addressing an assembly of Jews and Gentiles at the synagogue in Pisidian Antioch. Again, much of Paul's invented speech consists of references to key episodes from the LXX in support of Luke's desire to see Christianity as the divinely prophesied augmentation of a venerable Jewish tradition. Thus, apart from general references and inferences to, inter alia, Joseph, Moses, Joshua, Samuel, Saul and David Paul is made to refer specifically to Ps. 2: 7, Ps. 16: 10 and Is. 55: 3.

In Act.Ap. 2: 38, Act.Ap. 5: 31 and Act.Ap. 10: 43 respectively Peter is made to refer specifically to the "forgiveness of sins". This is also the case with Paul, who is portrayed as making similar references in Act.Ap. 13: 28 and Act.Ap. 26: 18. Mason sees this reiteration as a device to emphasise one of Luke's central concerns first spelled out in Zechariah's Song (Ev.Luc. 1: 67 – 80)⁵⁸:

Καὶ Ζαχαρίας ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ ἐπλήσθη πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ ἐπροφήτευσεν λέγων Εὐλόγητός Κύριος ὁ θεὸς τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ, ὅτι ἐπεσκέψατο καὶ ἐποίησεν λύτρωσιν τῷ λαῷ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἤγειρεν κέρασ σωτηρίας ἡμῖν ἐν οἴκῳ Δαυεὶδ παιδὸς αὐτοῦ, καθὼς ἐλάλησεν διὰ στόματος τῶν ἁγίων ἀπ' αἰῶνος προφητῶν αὐτοῦ, σωτηρίαν ἐξ ἐχθρῶν ἡμῶν καὶ ἐκ χειρὸς πάντων τῶν μισούντων ἡμᾶς, ποιῆσαι ἔλεος μετὰ τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν καὶ μνησθῆναι διαθήκης ἁγίας αὐτοῦ, ὄρκον ὃν ὤμοσεν πρὸς Ἀβραάμ τὸν πατέρα ἡμῶν, τοῦ δοῦναι ἡμῖν ἀφόβως ἐκ χειρὸς ἐχθρῶν ῥυσθέντας λατρεύειν αὐτῷ ἐν ὁσιότητι καὶ δικαιοσύνῃ ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ πάσαις ταῖς ἡμέραις ἡμῶν. Καὶ σὺ δέ, παιδίον, προφήτης Ὑψίστου κληθήσῃ, προπορεύσῃ γὰρ ἐνώπιον Κυρίου ἐτοιμάσαι ὁδοὺς αὐτοῦ, τοῦ δοῦναι γνῶσιν σωτηρίας τῷ λαῷ αὐτοῦ ἐν ἀφέσει ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν, διὰ σπλάγχνα ἐλέους θεοῦ ἡμῶν, ἐν οἷς ἐπισκέπεται

⁵⁸ Greek text according to *NTOG*. 1882. Eds Brooke and Fenton: 118 - 119. NIV translation according to Holy Bible. 1989. NIV: *NT* 54 – 55.

ἡμᾶς ἀνατολή ἐξ ὕψους, ἐπιφᾶναι τοῖς ἐν σκότει καὶ σκιᾷ θανάτου καθημένοις, τοῦ κατευθῆναι τοὺς πόδας ἡμῶν εἰς ὁδὸν εἰρήνης. Τὸ δὲ παιδίον ἠΰξανε καὶ ἐκραταιοῦτο πνεύματι, καὶ ἦν ἐν ταῖς ἐρήμοις ἕως ἡμέρας ἀναδείξεως αὐτοῦ πρὸς τὸν Ἰσραήλ.

His father Zechariah was filled with the Holy Spirit and prophesied: “Praise be to the Lord, the God of Israel, because he has come to his people and **redeemed them**. He has **raised up a horn of salvation for us** in the house of his servant David (as he said through his holy prophets of long ago), **salvation from our enemies** and from the hand of all who hate us - to show mercy to our ancestors and to remember his holy covenant, the oath he swore to our father Abraham: to rescue us from the hand of our enemies, and to enable us to serve him without fear in holiness and righteousness before him all our days. And you, my child, will be called a prophet of the Most High; for you will go on before the Lord to prepare the way for him, to give his people the knowledge of **salvation through the forgiveness of their sins**, because of the tender mercy of our God, by which the rising sun will come to us from heaven to shine on those living in darkness and in the shadow of death, to guide our feet into the path of peace.” And the child grew and became strong in spirit; and he lived in the wilderness until he appeared publicly to Israel. [My emphases for greater clarity NPLA].

Again, in Ev.Luc. 24: 47⁵⁹ we read:

καὶ κηρυχθῆναι ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ μετάνοιαν εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη ἀρξάμενοι ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλήμ·

and repentance for **the forgiveness of sins** will be preached in his name to all nations, beginning at Jerusalem. [My emphasis for greater clarity NPLA].

Mason further substantiates the argument that Luke deliberately amends Pauls’ stance on sin by pointing out that in his undisputed letters⁶⁰, Paul views sin as a singular phenomenon which is characterised as an ungodly ontic force that is able to manipulate individuals – seemingly against their will:

1 Ep.Cor. 15: 56⁶¹

τὸ δὲ κέντρον τοῦ θανάτου ἡ ἁμαρτία, ἡ δὲ δύναμις τῆς ἁμαρτίας ὁ νόμος·

⁵⁹ Greek text according to *NTOG*. 1882. Eds Brooke and Fenton: 186. NIV translation according to Holy Bible. 1989. NIV: *NT* 85.

⁶⁰ Mason (2003: 263 n. 8) draws his reader’s attention to one possible exception, viz. Ep.Col. 1: 13 – 14: “For he has rescued us from the dominion of darkness and brought us into the kingdom of the Son he loves, in whom we have redemption, the forgiveness of sins”. However as is already well known, this is largely accepted as constituting a pseudo-Pauline epistle and thus does not impact negatively on Mason’s argument.

⁶¹ Greek text according to *NTOG*. 1882. Eds Brooke and Fenton: 400. NIV translation according to Holy Bible. 1989. NIV: *NT* 167.

The sting of death is sin, and **the power of sin** is the law. [My emphasis for greater clarity NPLA].

Ep.Rom. 2: 12⁶²

Ὅσοι γὰρ ἀνόμως ἥμαρτον, ἀνόμως καὶ ἀπολοῦνται· καὶ ὅσοι ἐν νόμῳ ἥμαρτον, διὰ νόμου κριθήσονται·

All who sin apart from the law will also perish apart from the law, and all who sin under the law will be judged by the law. [My emphases for greater clarity NPLA].

Ep.Rom. 3: 9⁶³

Τί οὖν; προεχόμεθα; οὐ πάντως, προητιασάμεθα γὰρ Ἰουδαίους τε καὶ Ἑλληνας πάντας ὑφ' ἁμαρτίαν εἶναι,

What shall we conclude then? Do we have any advantage? Not at all! For we have already made the charge that Jews and Gentiles alike are all **under the power of sin.** [My emphasis for greater clarity NPLA].

Ep.Rom. 6: 6⁶⁴

τοῦτο γινώσκοντες ὅτι ὁ παλαιὸς ἡμῶν ἄνθρωπος συνεσταυρώθη, ἵνα καταργηθῇ τὸ σῶμα τῆς ἁμαρτίας, τοῦ μηκέτι δουλεύειν ἡμᾶς τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, ὃ γὰρ ἀποθανῶν δεδικαιώται ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας.

For we know that our old self was crucified with him so that **the body ruled by sin** might be done away with, that we should no longer be slaves to sin - because anyone who has died has been set free from sin. [My emphasis for greater clarity NPLA].

Ep.Rom. 7: 13 - 25⁶⁵

Τὸ οὖν ἀγαθὸν ἐμοὶ ἐγένετο θάνατος; μὴ γένοιτο· ἀλλὰ ἡ ἁμαρτία, ἵνα φανῇ ἁμαρτία διὰ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ μοι κατεργαζομένη θάνατον· ἵνα γένηται καθ' ὑπερβολὴν ἁμαρτωλὸς ἡ ἁμαρτία διὰ τῆς ἐντολῆς. οἶδαμεν γὰρ ὅτι ὁ νόμος πνευματικός ἐστιν· ἐγὼ δὲ σάρκινός εἰμι, πεπραμένος ὑπὸ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν. ὃ γὰρ κατεργάζομαι οὐ γινώσκω· οὐ γὰρ ὃ θέλω τοῦτο πράσσω, ἀλλ' ὃ μισῶ τοῦτο ποιῶ. εἰ δὲ ὃ οὐ θέλω τοῦτο

⁶² Greek text according to *NTOG*. 1882. Eds Brooke and Fenton: 353 - 354. NIV translation according to Holy Bible. 1989. NIV: *NT* 143.

⁶³ Greek text according to *NTOG*. 1882. Eds Brooke and Fenton: 355. NIV translation according to Holy Bible. 1989. NIV: *NT* 144.

⁶⁴ Greek text according to *NTOG*. 1882. Eds Brooke and Fenton: 360. NIV translation according to Holy Bible. 1989. NIV: *NT* 146.

⁶⁵ Greek text according to *NTOG*. 1882. Eds Brooke and Fenton: 361 - 362. NIV translation according to Holy Bible. 1989. NIV: *NT* 147.

ποιῶ, σύνφημι τῷ νόμῳ ὅτι καλός. Νυνὶ δὲ οὐκέτι ἐγὼ κατεργάζομαι αὐτὸ ἀλλὰ ἡ ἐνοικοῦσα ἐν ἐμοὶ ἁμαρτία. οἶδα γὰρ ὅτι οὐκ οἰκεῖ ἐν ἐμοί, τοῦτ' ἔστιν ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου, ἀγαθόν· τὸ γὰρ θέλειν παράκειταί μοι, τὸ δὲ κατεργάζεσθαι τὸ καλὸν οὐ· οὐ γὰρ ὃ θέλω ποιῶ ἀγαθόν, ἀλλὰ ὃ οὐ θέλω κακὸν τοῦτο πράσσω. εἰ δὲ ὃ οὐ θέλω [ἐγὼ] τοῦτο ποιῶ, οὐκέτι ἐγὼ κατεργάζομαι αὐτὸ ἀλλὰ ἡ οἰκοῦσα ἐν ἐμοὶ ἁμαρτία.

Did that which is good, then, become death to me? By no means! Nevertheless, in order that **sin might be recognized as sin**, it used what is good to bring about my death, so that through the commandment **sin might become utterly sinful**. We know that the law is spiritual; but I am unspiritual, sold as **a slave to sin**. I do not understand what I do. For what I want to do I do not do, but what I hate I do. And if I do what I do not want to do, I agree that the law is good. As it is, it is no longer I myself who do it, but **it is sin living in me**. For I know that good itself does not dwell in me, that is, **in my sinful nature**. For I have the desire to do what is good, but I cannot carry it out. For I do not do the good I want to do, **but the evil I do not want to do** - this I keep on doing. Now if I do what I do not want to do, it is no longer I who do it, **but it is sin living in me that does it**. So I find this law at work: Although I want to do good, **evil is right there with me**. For in my inner being I delight in God's law; **but I see another law at work in me**, waging war against the law of my mind and making me a prisoner of **the law of sin at work within me**. What a wretched man I am! Who will rescue me from this body that is subject to death? Thanks be to God, who delivers me through Jesus Christ our Lord! So then, I myself in my mind am a slave to God's law, but **in my sinful nature a slave to the law of sin**. [My emphases for greater clarity NPLA].

Mason (2003: 264) sums up his findings as follows:

The result is that the Paul of Acts sounds remarkably like the Peter and Stephen of Acts. As with Thucydides or Josephus, one does not find here the striking differences of style or personal spoken mannerisms that one would expect in an anthology of speeches from different individuals. Although the author has provided each character with a speech appropriate to the occasion and has even introduced some Pauline language into one of Paul's speeches (13: 38 - 39), on the whole the speeches advance the author's own portrayal of Christian origins and belief. They are not mere reproductions of what was actually said.

Of course, here is an example where Luke does not seem to act in accordance with a Josephan approach.

3.6 Circumstantial Evidence of Plagiarism

3.6.1 Some Minor Parallels

Mason (2003: 282) also includes in his testimony a number of minor parallels that he has noted between Josephus and Luke-Acts. These, in themselves, are probably not

that conspicuous, but taken collectively, possibly add some weight to the primary evidence.

In this regard, Mason lists some of the less significant correspondences as follows:

1. Ev.Luc. 3: 1 seems to refer to both *War* 2, 11, 5 / 215 and *Antiquities* 19, 5, 1 / 275 with the reference to "Lysanias, tetrarch of Abilene"⁶⁶;
2. Ev.Luc. 19: 12 – 27 may be compared to *War* 1, 14, 4 / 282 – 285 if one considers the parable of the man who traveled to another country to receive his kingship, as being based on details of Herod's family;
3. Ev.Luc. 19: 43 – 44 seems to correspond to the whole of *War* 6, when one considers Luke's account of the destruction of Jerusalem;
4. Act.Ap. 11: 28 – 29 is a parallel to *Antiquities* 3, 15, 3 / 320⁶⁷, *Antiquities* 20, 2, 5 / 51 – 53 and *Antiquities* 20, 5, 2 / 101 with Luke's account of the famine and the relief received from Antioch⁶⁸; and
5. Ev.Luc. 13: 1 relates to *Antiquities* 18, 4, 1 / 85 – 87 where Pilate deals with Samaritans at Mount Gerizim.

Mason stresses that these suspected correspondences are not firm enough to validate any relationship between the texts indicated. However, taken as a large group of coincidences and coupled with the more measurable data discussed below they may become more pertinent.

3.6.2 Some Similar *Fabulae*

It is evident that Mason is perfectly able to illustrate at every turn that both Luke and Josephus conduct themselves in a manner that identifies them as typical late Hellenistic writers. However, to prove his thesis that Luke slavishly copied Josephus, he also needs to give clear unambiguous evidence. In this regard, Mason (2003: 264) even whilst pointing to a number of *fabulae* that seem (on the face of it) to

⁶⁶ It is interesting to note that Whiston, despite his huge expertise as one of the most celebrated translators of Josephus texts did not see the possibility of Luke's purloining. Indeed, he makes a note at *Antiquities* 19, 5, 1 / 275 pointing out that this very passage confirms Luke's version!

⁶⁷ Whiston makes a note to the effect that *Antiquities* 3, 15, 3 / 320 confirms Act.Ap. 11: 28!

⁶⁸ Unfortunately for Mason, neither *Antiquities* 3, 15, 3 / 320 nor *Antiquities* 20, 2, 5 / 51 – 53 nor *Antiquities* 20, 5, 2 / 101 mentions famine relief from Antioch. The latter two passages collectively confirm that Queen Helena of Adiabene (d. c. 56 C.E.) organised relief in the form of corn from Alexandria (Egypt) and dried figs from Cyprus.

corroborate his argument cannot find anything that in itself is standalone, impartial and conclusive evidence. Regardless, he gives the following supporting (albeit circumstantial) texts to uphold his suspicions:

Act.Ap. 27: 1 – 44 relates the story of Paul's journey to Rome. On the sea voyage he is shipwrecked and ends up on the Island of Malta with 276 survivors. Mason believes that this is highly reminiscent of Josephus' account in *Life* 14 – 16.

However, this latter narrative deals very cursorily with Josephus' travelling to Rome by sea, being shipwrecked and then stranded with 600 survivors in the Adriatic sea for a night and finally being part of a cohort of 80 who manage to be picked up by a passing Cyrenese ship before sailing on to Dieearchia (Puteoli).

On closer examination of this specific narrative, very little agrees with the Lucan account in Act.Ap. 27: 1 – 44 except the following two points:

1. Both Paul and Josephus were travelling by sea to Rome; and
2. Both were shipwrecked.

Considering that in Hellenistic times the most common way to travel efficiently from say Judea to Rome was by sea and given that sea voyages were always extremely precarious, a tale of a sea voyage and a shipwreck cannot in itself serve as useful evidence for plagiarism.

The following pericope (Act.Ap. 28: 3 – 6)⁶⁹ gives an account of the apostle Paul miraculously surviving a snake bite. Luke himself emphasises that such an event was normally interpreted as an act of divine justice. Indeed, in Act.Ap. 28: 4 – 6⁷⁰ we read:

ὡς δὲ εἶδαν οἱ βάρβαροι κρεμάμενον τὸ θηρίον ἐκ τῆς χειρὸς αὐτοῦ, πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἔλεγον Πάντως φονεὺς ἐστὶν ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος ὃν διασωθέντα ἐκ τῆς θαλάσσης ἡ δίκη ζῆν οὐκ εἶασεν. ὁ μὲν οὖν ἀποτινάξας τὸ θηρίον εἰς τὸ πῦρ ἔπαθεν οὐδὲν κακόν· οἱ δὲ προσεδόκων αὐτὸν μέλλειν πίμπρασθαι ἢ καταπίπτειν ἄφω νεκρόν. ἐπὶ πολὺ δὲ αὐτῶν προσδοκόντων καὶ θεωρούντων μηδὲν ἄτοπον εἰς αὐτὸν γινόμενον, μεταβαλόμενοι ἔλεγον αὐτὸν εἶναι θεόν.

⁶⁹ Mason (2003: 264) incorrectly refers to Act.Ap. 27!

⁷⁰ Greek text according to *NTOG*. 1882. Eds Brooke and Fenton: 312. NIV translation according to Holy Bible. 1989. NIV: *NT* 140.

When the islanders saw the snake hanging from his hand, they said to each other, “This man must be a murderer; for though he escaped from the sea, **the goddess Justice has not allowed him to live.**” But Paul shook the snake off into the fire and suffered no ill effects. The people expected him to swell up or suddenly fall dead; but after waiting a long time and **seeing nothing unusual happen to him, they changed their minds and said he was a god.** [My emphases for greater clarity NPLA].

Mason points out that Josephus too, gives numerous accounts of divine justice. For example in his *Antiquities* 4, 3, 3 / 51 – 53⁷¹ and *Antiquities* 4, 3, 4 / 54 – 58⁷² respectively, we read of the divine punishment meted out to Abiram, Dathan, Corah and all of their respective followers:

Ταῦτ' εἰπόντος καὶ δακρύνοντος σείεται μὲν αἰφνίδιον ἡ γῆ, σάλου δ' ἐπ' αὐτῆς κινήθεντος ὥσπερ ἐξ ἀνέμου βίας σαλευομένου κύματος πᾶς μὲν ἔδεισεν ὁ λαός, πατάγου δὲ καὶ σκληροῦ ραγέντος ἤχου κατὰ τὰς ἐκείνων σκιναῖς συνίζησεν ἡ γῆ καὶ πάνθ' ὅσα φίλα τούτοις ἦν ὑπήνεγκεν εἰς αὐτήν. ἠφανισμένων δ' οὕτως, ὡς μηδὲ φανῆναί τινας γνῶναι, συνῆει τε πάλιν τῆς γῆς τὸ περὶ ἐκείνοις κεχηγνός καὶ καθίστατο, ὡς μηδ' εἰ πάθοι τι τῶν προειρημένων φανερόν εἶναι τοῖς ὀρώσι. καὶ οἱ μὲν οὕτως ἀπόλοντο ἐπίδειξις τοῦ θεοῦ τῆς ἰσχύος γενόμενοι: ὀδύραιτο δ' ἂν τις οὐ μόνον τῆς συμφορᾶς αὐτοῦς καὶ καθ' ἑαυτὴν οὔσης ἀξίας οἴκτου, ἀλλ' ὅτι καὶ τοιαῦτα παθόντων ἐφήσθησαν οἱ συγγενεῖς: τῶν γὰρ συντεταγμένων ἐκλαθόμενοι πρὸς τὴν ὄψιν τοῦ συμβεβηκότος ἐβεβαίουν τὴν κρίσιν, καὶ νομίζοντες ὡς ἀλιτηρίου ἀπολωλέναι τοὺς περὶ Δαθάμην οὐδ' ἔλυποῦντο. Μωσῆς δ' ἐκάλει τοὺς περὶ τῆς ἱερωσύνης ἀμιλλωμένους διὰ τὴν τῶν ἱερέων δοκιμασίαν, ἵν' οὐ προσδέξεται τὴν θυσίαν ὁ θεὸς ἴδιον εἶη κεχειροτονημένος. συνελθόντων δὲ πεντήκοντα καὶ διακοσίων ἀνδρῶν, οἱ καὶ διὰ πατέρων ἀρετῆν ἐτιμῶντο παρὰ τῷ λαῷ καὶ διὰ τὴν αὐτῶν, ἧ κάκεινους ὑπερεβάλλοντο, προῆλθον καὶ Ααρὼν καὶ Κορῆς, καὶ πρὸ τῆς σκινηῆς πάντες καθήγγισαν ἐπὶ τοῖς θυμιατηρίοις ὅποσα κομίζοντες ἔτυχον. ἐξέλαμψε δὲ πῦρ τοσοῦτον ὅσον οὔτε χειροποιήτον ἰστόρησέ τις οὔτε γῆθεν ἀναδοθὲν κατὰ ὑποδρομὴν καύματος οὔτε κατὰ βίαν πνευμάτων ὕλης πρὸς αὐτὸ παρατριβείσης αὐτομάτως ἐξεκρούσθη, ἀλλ' ὅποιον θεοῦ κελεύσαντος ἀφθείη λαμπρὸν καὶ φλογωδέστατον: ὑφ' οὗ πάντες, οἳ τε διακόσιοι καὶ πεντήκοντα καὶ Κορῆς, ἄξαντος ἐπ' αὐτοὺς ἐφθάρησαν, ὡς καὶ τὰ σώματα αὐτῶν ἀφανῆ γεγονέναι. περισώζεται δὲ μόνος Ααρὼν μηδὲν ὑπὸ τοῦ πυρὸς βλαβεῖς τῷ τὸν θεὸν εἶναι τὸν οὖς ἔδει καίειν ἀπεσταλκότα. Μωσῆς δὲ τούτων ἀπολομένων βουλόμενος τὴν τιμωρίαν αὐτῶν μνήμη παραδοθῆναι καὶ τοὺς αὐτοὺς ἐσομένους αὐτὴν μαθεῖν,

⁷¹ Original Greek and English translation according to Whiston (Tr.) 1895. *Flavius Josephus. The Works of Flavius Josephus in Perseus Digital Library* [Online]. Available: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0146%3Abook%3D4%3Awhiston%20chapter%3D3%3Awhiston%20section%3D3> [10 December 2014].

⁷² Original Greek and English translation according to Whiston (Tr.) 1895. *Flavius Josephus. The Works of Flavius Josephus in Perseus Digital Library* [Online]. Available: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0146%3Abook%3D4%3Awhiston%20chapter%3D3%3Awhiston%20section%3D4> [10 December 2014].

ἐκέλευσεν Ἐλεάζαρον τὸν Ἀαρῶνος υἱὸν τὰ θυμιατήρια αὐτῶν παρὰ τὸν χάλκεον καταθέσθαι βωμόν, ὡς ἂν ὑπόμνησις εἴη τοῖς αὔθις ὧν ἔπαθον καὶ ὅτι τὴν ἰσχὺν τοῦ θεοῦ νομίσειαν ἀπατᾶσθαι δύνασθαι. καὶ Ἀαρὼν μὲν οὐκέτι τῇ Μωυσέος χάριτι τὴν ἀρχιερωσύνην ἔχειν δοκῶν, ἀλλὰ τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ κρίσει φανερᾷ γενομένη, μετὰ τῶν υἱῶν ἤδη βεβαίως ἀπέλαυε τῆς τιμῆς.

When Moses had said this, with tears in his eyes, the ground was moved on a sudden; and the agitation that set it in motion was like that which the wind produces in waves of the sea. The people were all affrighted; and the ground that was about their tents sunk down at the great noise, with a terrible sound, and carried whatsoever was dear to the seditious into itself, who so entirely perished, that there was not the least appearance that any man had ever been seen there, the earth that had opened itself about them, closing again, and becoming entire as it was before, insomuch that such as saw it afterward did not perceive that any such accident had happened to it. Thus did these men perish, and become a demonstration of the power of God. And truly, any one would lament them, not only on account of this calamity that befell them, which yet deserves our commiseration, but also because their kindred were pleased with their sufferings; for they forgot the relation they bare to them, and at the sight of this sad accident approved of the judgment given against them; and because they looked upon the people about Dathan as pestilent men, they thought they perished as such, and did not grieve for them. And now Moses called for those that contended about the priesthood, that trial might be made who should be priest, and that he whose sacrifice God was best pleased with might be ordained to that function. There attended two hundred and fifty men, who indeed were honored by the people, not only on account of the power of their ancestors, but also on account of their own, in which they excelled the others: Aaron also and Corah came forth, and they all offered incense, in those censers of theirs which they brought with them, before the tabernacle. Hereupon so great a fire shone out as no one ever saw in any that is made by the hand of man, neither in those eruptions out of the earth that are caused by subterraneous burn-rags, nor in such fires as arise of their own accord in the woods, when the agitation is caused by the trees rubbing one against another: but this fire was very bright, and had a terrible flame, such as is kindled at the command of God; by whose irruption on them, all the company, and Corah himself, were destroyed, and this so entirely, that their very bodies left no remains behind them. Aaron alone was preserved, and not at all hurt by the fire, because it was God that sent the fire to burn those only who ought to be burned. Hereupon Moses, after these men were destroyed, was desirous that the memory of this judgment might be delivered down to posterity, and that future ages might be acquainted with it; and so he commanded Eleazar, the son of Aaron, to put their censers near the brazen altar, that they might be a memorial to posterity of what these men suffered, for supposing that the power of God might be eluded. And thus Aaron was now no longer esteemed to have the priesthood by the favor of Moses, but by the public judgment of God; and thus he and his children peaceably enjoyed that honor afterward. [My spelling correction underlined NPLA].

Again, in his *Against Apion* 2, 14 / 137 – 143 Josephus informs his reader about

Apion who developed a pustule on his private parts as a punishment from God. This was as a consequence of his ridiculing the Jews for practicing circumcision whilst ignoring the fact that the priests of his own religion practiced this self-same ritual. Apion was thus guilty of lying and hypocrisy as well as discourteous behaviour to God's chosen people. His wound was so severe that it necessitated him being effectually circumcised and consequently, as a result of the gangrene that set in, he "died in great torment" ("έν δειναῖς ὀδύνας ἀπέθανεν").

In his *Against Apion* 2, 14 / 144⁷³ Josephus sums up this particular event as follows:

δεῖ γάρ τοὺς εὖ φρονοῦντας τοῖς μὲν οἰκείοις νόμοις περὶ τὴν εὐσέβειαν ἀκριβῶς ἐμμένειν, τοὺς δὲ τῶν ἄλλων μὴ λοιδορεῖν: ὁ δὲ τούτους μὲν ἔφυγεν, τῶν ἡμετέρων δὲ κατεψεύσατο. τοῦτο μὲν Ἀπίωνι τοῦ βίου τὸ τέλος ἐγένετο καὶ τοῦτο [παρ'] ἡμῶν ἐνταῦθα τὸ πέρας ἔστω τοῦ λόγου.

Now men of good tempers ought to observe their own laws concerning religion accurately, and to persevere therein, but not presently to abuse the laws of other nations, while this Apion deserted his own laws, and told lies about ours. And this was the end of Apion's life, and this shall be the conclusion of our discourse about him.

Even Mason (2003: 264) has to admit that these types of accounts (e.g. Paul's encounter with a snake, Corah's death and Apion's gangrene) were all common strategies particular to the literature of the period. Indeed, Luke alone, employs the theme of divine punishment on a few occasions including the well-known tales of Ananias and Sapphira (Act.Ap. 5: 1- 6) and of Herod Agrippa (Act.Ap. 12: 20 - 23).

However, there is little similarity between the two authors apropos the *specific* fabulae dealing with the theme of divine retribution/justice. The most that could be said is that both Luke and Josephus employ a similar strategy that was in itself quite common at the time. This in itself cannot be seen as hard evidence to prove that one particular author imitated the other.

⁷³ Original Greek and English translation according to Whiston (Tr.) 1895. *Flavius Josephus. The Works of Flavius Josephus in Perseus Digital Library* [Online]. Available: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0216%3Abook%3D2%3Awhiston+section%3D14> [10 December 2014].

3.6.3 Luke's alignment of Christianity with Judaism

Mason believes that Luke made use of Josephus' approach and certain of his content, because he had inadvertently supplied the early Christians with a method to bolster what he assumes was a failing public image. On this issue, Mason (2003: 265) conjectures that:

Both the Jewish and Christian communities faced massive image problems at the end of the first century. The reputation of the Jews ... suffered serious injury from the recent revolt in Judea ... To outsiders, the Christians were at first indistinguishable from Jews. By the end of the century, however, many Christian communities were entirely non-Jewish, thanks largely to the missionary efforts of Paul. Almost nothing was known about them in elite Roman circles and what was known was not good.

To back up this interpretation, Mason (2003: 265) points to comments ostensibly made by Tacitus which reveal that unlike Judaism (which was largely tolerated due to its great antiquity) early Christianity (when it was distinguished from its predecessor) was mistrusted because of its novelty.

It should be mentioned at this point that much evidence exists to suggest that comments made by Tacitus (and indeed the other Roman authors) which refer to subject matter of a Christian import are most likely forgeries perpetrated by Christian apologists of the second and third century of the Common Era⁷⁴. If so, this evidence (as supplied by Mason) is quite useless as it stands.

Regardless, Mason seems to accept the authenticity of Tacitus' alleged comments and follows the more popular contemporary view that early Christians were mistrusted by the Romans as a matter of course. For him, according to the perceptions of the average Roman citizen, Christians must have appeared highly suspicious. After all, did they not believe in and practice the communal consumption of their spiritual leader's body and blood? Then there was the issue of their purported religious practices such as gathering clandestinely at dawn to, inter alia, exchange private signs of brotherly and sisterly love in Christ. These speculations may well have been misconstrued by the more prejudiced and/or sceptically-minded Roman citizens as evidence of anti-Roman and/or sexually promiscuous activities. Even more heinous, Christians worshipped as a "God-man" or even God himself, a Jew

⁷⁴ Cf. Allen. 2015. *Clarifying the Scope of Pre-Fifth-Century C.E. Christian Interpolation in Josephus' Ιουδαϊκή Αρχαιολογία (c. 94 C.E.)*. Unpublished *Philosophiae Doctor* Thesis, Potchefstroom: North-West University: 29 - 40 and 50 - 54.

who had been shamefully executed as a low-class criminal or murderer.

3.6.4 Clarifying Roman Attitudes Towards Foreign Cults

Again it must be stressed here that the more popular clichéd perception that the Romans were *always* hateful towards the early Christians needs to be tempered with the known facts.

It is acknowledged that in the early fourth century C.E.⁷⁵ there was a period of some eight years when Christians were targeted for what would seem to be mostly political motives. However, more normally and contrary to more fashionable opinion, the Romans appear to have been fairly flexible when it came to specifically personal and private religious practice.

Green (2010: 1 - 2) corroborates that “Roman attitudes to the foreigners in their midst were, unsurprisingly, complex and contradictory”. In this regard, evidence suggests that everyday Romans (like the majority of people anywhere and in any period of history) hated change and could even become reasonably xenophobic when initially confronted by unaccustomed social circumstances that seemed to compromise their Roman sensibilities and conventions.

Despite these perfectly natural tendencies, it is known that during the Republican and Julio-Claudian periods, Romans were fairly indulgent when it came to Judaism. It is true that some individuals saw Judaism as a foreign and uncultured cult. For example, Cicero⁷⁶ describes the Jewish religion in his *Pro Flacco*⁷⁷, 6778:

⁷⁵ The Roman emperor *Gaius Aurelius Valerius Diocletianus Augustus* (245 - 311 C.E.), who reigned from 284 to 305 C.E. is credited with the instigation of the Diocletianic Persecution (303 - 311 C.E.), which was aimed primarily at restoring traditional Roman religious practices within the empire. As a consequence, Christians faced possibly their most difficult period of maltreatment which only dissipated after *Flavius Valerius Aurelius Constantinus Augustus* a.k.a. Constantine the Great (c. 272 - 337 C.E.) and *Gaius Valerius Licinianus Licinius Augustus* a.k.a. Licinius I (c. 263 - 325 C.E.) met in *Mediolanum* to establish, inter alia, a better dispensation for Christians within the empire in February 313 C.E. (i.e. the Edict of Milan).

⁷⁶ *Marcus Tullius Cicero* (106 - 43 B.C.E.).

⁷⁷ *In defense of Flaccus* (59 B.C.E.).

⁷⁸ Latin text and English translation according to Cicero 2014. *Pro Flacco*, 67 in *Perseus Under Philologic* [Online]. Available: <http://perseus.uchicago.edu/perseus/cgi/citequery3.pl?dbname=LatinAugust2012&query=Cic.%20Flac.%2067&getid=0> [1 September 2014].

*huic autem **barbarae superstitioni** resistere severitatis, multitudinem Iudaeorum flagrantem non numquam in contionibus pro re publica contemnere gravitatis summae fuit.*

But to resist this **barbarous superstition** were an act of dignity, to despise the multitude of Jews, which at times was most unruly in the assemblies in defence of the interests of the republic, was an act of the greatest wisdom. [My emphases].

On the other hand, as verified by Van Kooten (2007: 637 - 644), Varro⁷⁹ praised Judaism because of its great antiquity. It is also understood that certain Romans like Varro, viewed the Jewish God as equivalent to Jupiter as the chief deity of the official Roman Pantheon.

As confirmed by Rutgers (1994: 57), the Romans first developed an extensive corpus of edicts with respect to Jews at about the same time. With reference to Josephus (*Antiquities* 14, 10, 2 / 190 – 10, 25 / 264 and *Antiquities* 16, 6, 2 / 162 – 6, 7 / 173), Both Rutgers (1994: 57) and Green (2010: 5) support the interpretation that due largely to the initial policies of Julius Caesar⁸⁰ as from c. 50 B.C.E. to the beginning of the Common Era, Jews were mostly guaranteed their religious freedom. In this context they were legally permitted to, inter alia, meet freely as organised members of religious associations known as *thiasoi*, observe the Sabbath and the Jewish festivals, send money to the Temple in Jerusalem, and enjoy autonomy in their communal affairs. Jews were even absolved from compulsory enrolment in the Roman army.

Considering the general tolerance and/or acceptance of a well-established foreign cult like Judaism it is worth pointing out that perhaps, initially, the citizens of Rome would not have been able (or bothered) to have differentiated between Judaism and the nascent Christian practices.

Regardless, despite the normal protection granted to Judaism and its practice, it is also known that Jews were conceivably expelled from Rome in the reign of Tiberius (19 C.E.). We also know from Philo (*Legatio ad Gaius* 24:159 – 160) that under the tyranny of Sejanus⁸¹ (Tiberius' "*Socius Laborum*" and prefect of the Praetorian

⁷⁹ *Marcus Terentius Varro* (116 - 27 B.C.E.).

⁸⁰ *Gaius Iulius Gai filius Caesar* (100 - 44 B.C.E.).

⁸¹ *Lucius Aelius Seianus* (20 B.C.E. - 31 C.E.).

Guard), Jews suffered heavy victimisation that only ended with his final downfall in 31 C.E.

There is a possibility that an expulsion occurred again during the reign of Claudius⁸² (41 - 54 C.E.). Much literature exists that puts forward various inconclusive arguments for the actual cause and scale of these two occurrences. Regardless, the possibility that either dislodgment of large numbers of Jews was as a direct result of religious intolerance alone is slight. Rutgers (1994: 57) concurs, and in the case of the banishment under Tiberius (i.e. 19 C.E.) for which we have more accurate details, he states:

[W]e do know ... that the measures taken by the Roman state were confined to the Jewish community in Rome and not directed against the Jewish population in other parts of the Roman empire. As in the case of other troublemakers, the verdict was *relegatio* but not *deportatio*. Jews were banished from Rome, but it appears that their civic or religious liberty was not otherwise impeded. In fact, it is conceivable that they did not have to move very far away from the capital.

More typically, it is largely accepted that the Romans recognised, tolerated and/or neutralised numerous deities, both official and the more non-traditional.⁸³ Cowley (2008: 7) with reference to Wardman (1982: 2) confirms:

There is clear evidence that the religious atmosphere at Rome was open to innovation and adjustment at almost all periods, but also that Roman attitudes were deeply conservative and desired tradition. These two conflicting characteristics were able to exist at the same time because evaluating and accepting a new deity or cult was part of Roman tradition since Rome had always expanded to borrow, absorb, and incorporate new deities, ideas, and cults.

As has been witnessed already, the more conventional wisdom seems to be, that, by and large, the Romans were extremely superstitious and religious in outlook. Undeniably, they mostly ascribed their success at dominating the Mediterranean world due to their constant maintenance of good relations with the gods *collectively* (i.e. both traditional and foreign deities were respected).

⁸² *Tiberius Claudius Caesar Augustus Germanicus* (10 B.C.E. – 54 C.E.).

⁸³ Despite the fact that Cowley (2008: 53 - 59) takes the claimed Roman persecution of Christianity at face value and never questions possible Christian fraud as regards certain of the accounts of Roman intolerance of that specific religion, even she, accedes that by and large, depending on the social and economic conditions then prevalent, the Romans, if not always immediately tolerant were largely accommodating of other belief systems.

Despite having established that (for the most part), Romans were normally tolerant of private religious needs, it is also known that observant Jews took explicit and public issue with certain aspects of the Imperial cult originally popularised by Augustus Caesar. Undeniably, this practice ensured that emperors (living or dead) who had been granted divine status, were part and parcel of Imperial Rome's official pantheon. This view is supported by Magyar (2009: 385 - 386), who points out that the Roman emperors were worshipped as gods due to their status and not their transcendence. In this regard, they were never considered superior to other traditional deities.⁸⁴

It is therefore, quite possible that the Imperial cult was viewed as pivotal to Rome's endurance. In this regard, with reference to the findings of Magyar (2009: 392 - 394), to undermine or neglect its practices would have been seen as deleterious to the well-being of the state and also intimates strongly that perhaps Christians may have been aggressively persecuted if their opposition to any aspect of the Imperial cult was ever perceived as an act of sedition.

Therefore, if given some latitude, it is possible to conceive of a practicing Jew or nascent Christian (with reference to their abhorrence of graven images) overtly refusing to pay any form of homage or acknowledgment to, say, an official portrait bust of the Roman Emperor. In this regard, early Christians, like Jews, might well have viewed this practice as akin to idolatry.

Regardless, given that Judaism did have recognition in the early Roman Empire, perhaps, Luke is aligning Christianity to Judaism because he wants the new religion to be afforded the same tolerance that was afforded to the Jews? As has been alluded to earlier, Mason (2003: 267) attempts to show his reader that both Josephus and Luke employ their rhetoric to present their respective religions as being venerable and of the highest moral fibre. However, Luke needs to align Christianity with Judaism and share in its antiquity to offset the fact that as a breakaway cult it is in fact new and untested:

⁸⁴ However, it should be pointed out that scholars such as Magyar also seem to uncritically accept the various reports of Christian persecution at face value. As such his findings are biased. Cf. Magyar. 2009. *Imperial Cult and Christianity*: 385 - 394.

To impress these readers with the nobility of their communities, both Josephus and Luke must demonstrate both the antiquity and the virtue of those religions. "Virtue" in this context includes a high communal ethic, but also proven political respectability and cooperation with the Roman "peace." ...[Josephus] claims that only a small group of untypical Jews hijacked the conflict in Judea from the aristocracy (War); that Jewish tradition goes back to the remotest antiquity and is not a corruption of Egyptian religion (Antiquities); and that Moses' constitution, which Jews scrupulously follow, reflects the highest standard of moral philosophy and human aspiration; it is the envy of the world (Antiquities/Ap.).

3.7 Comparable Evidence of Plagiarism

3.7.1 The Respective Authors' Historical perspectives

When it comes to the issue of Luke and Josephus reporting on common historical occurrences, Mason is perhaps on a more secure footing. Thus, excluding the body of largely circumstantial evidence, he is able, on at least a few occasions, to point to what appears to be reliable fact and hence germane evidence. Of course, if this evidence pans out it then serves to bolster the other more contingent evidence.

Indeed, Mason (2003: 273) reminds his reader that the principle reason why various scholars have on occasion, suggested that there may be a connection between Luke and Josephus is because both authors make similar mention of specific historical events. In addition, of the four gospel writers, it is Luke who gives his reader a greater historical context to the Jesus story; supplying information concerning more worldly issues.

Mason (2003: 273) emphasises that in almost all cases where Luke speaks of some non-Christian event it also happens to have been mentioned previously by Josephus in his writings. Mason also points out that Luke and Josephus differ only in the manner which they refer to common historical occurrences. Thus, on first appraisal, one may feel that there is nothing out of the ordinary here. After all, both authors may have lived and written at the same time so it would make sense that they report on the same events. Mason also presents us with a number of possible scenarios: Perhaps Luke did read Josephus' accounts but only remembered them imperfectly at a much later date? Or did Luke deliberately plagiarise Josephus but cleverly alter the narratives to suit his own agenda?

3.7.2 Parallel *Fabulae*

There are three specific accounts that Mason concentrates on because they alone, more than any of the other accounts and references, seem to offer the best hope for proving a definite link between the two writers.

The Census Under Quirinius (c. 6 C.E.)

A number of parallel references to the census exist and which follow on from Josephus' account of the ethnarc, Archelaus⁸⁵ who lost Judea in 6 C.E. after being banished to Vienne in Gaul by Augustus.⁸⁶ Josephus informs his reader that this emperor had Archelaus' former lands placed under the administration of Quirinius⁸⁷ and that he subsequently conducted a census in Syria.

These references are to be found in *War* 2, 8, 1 / 117 – 118; *Antiquities* 17, 13, 5 / 355; and *Antiquities* 18, 1, 1 / 1 – 4. The relevant passages are reproduced below according to the assumed time of writing by Josephus:

War 2, 8, 1 / 117 – 118⁸⁸(c. 75 C.E.):

Τῆς δὲ Ἀρχελάου χώρας εἰς ἐπαρχίαν περιγραφείσης ἐπίτροπος τῆς ἰππικῆς παρὰ Ῥωμαίοις τάξεως Κοπώνιος πέμπεται μέχρι τοῦ κτείνειν λαβὼν παρὰ Καίσαρος ἐξουσίαν ἐπὶ τούτου τις ἀνὴρ Γαλιλαῖος Ἰούδας ὄνομα εἰς ἀπόστασιν ἐνήγε τοὺς ἐπιχωρίους κακίζὼν εἰ φόρον τε Ῥωμαίοις τελεῖν ὑπομενοῦσιν καὶ μετὰ τὸν θεὸν οἴσουσι θνητοὺς δεσπόταξ ἦν δ' οὗτος σοφιστῆς ἰδίας αἰρέσεως οὐδὲν τοῖς ἄλλοις προσεοικῶς

And now Archelaus' part of Judea was reduced into a province, and Coponius, one of the equestrian order among the Romans, was sent as a procurator, having the power of [life and] death put into his hands by Caesar. Under his administration it was that a certain Galilean, whose name was Judas, prevailed with his countrymen to revolt, and said they were cowards if they would endure to pay a tax to the Romans and would after God submit to mortal men as their lords. This man was a teacher of a peculiar sect of his own, and was not at all like the rest of those their leaders.

⁸⁵ *Herod Archelaus* (23 B.C.E. – c. 18 C.E.)

⁸⁶ *Gaius Iulius Caesar Octavianus* (after 44 B.C.E.); *Imperator Caesar Divi Filius Augustus* (after 27 B.C.E.) (63 B.C.E. – 14 C.E.).

⁸⁷ *Publius Sulpicius Quirinius* (c. 45 B.C.E. – 21 C.E.)

⁸⁸Original Greek and English translation according to Whiston (Tr.) 1895. *Flavius Josephus. The Works of Flavius Josephus, in Perseus Digital Library* [Online]. Available: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0148%3Abook%3D2%3Awhiston+chapter%3D8%3Awhiston+section%3D1>

Antiquities 17, 13, 5 / 355⁸⁹ (c. 94 C.E.):

τῆς δ' Ἀρχελάου χώρας ὑποτελοῦς προσνεμηθείσης τῇ Σύρων πέμπεται Κυρίνιος ὑπὸ Καίσαρος ἀνὴρ ὑπατικός **ἀποτιμησόμενός** τε τὰ ἐν Συρία καὶ τὸν Ἀρχελάου ἀποδωσόμενος οἶκον.

So Archelaus' country was laid to the province of Syria; and Cyrenius, one that had been consul, was sent by Caesar to take account of people's effects in Syria, and to sell the house of Archelaus.

Antiquities 18, 1, 1 / 1 – 4⁹⁰(c. 94 C.E.):

Κυρίνιος δὲ τῶν εἰς τὴν βουλὴν συναγομένων ἀνὴρ τὰς τε ἄλλας ἀρχὰς ἐπιτετελεκῶς καὶ διὰ πασῶν ὁδεύσας ὑπατος γενέσθαι τὰ τε ἄλλα ἀξιώματι μέγας σὺν ὀλίγοις ἐπὶ Συρίας παρῆν, ὑπὸ Καίσαρος δικαιοδότης τοῦ ἔθνους ἀπεσταλμένος καὶ **τιμητῆς** τῶν οὐσιῶν γενησόμενος, Κωπόνιος δὲ αὐτῷ συγκαταπέμπεται τάγματος τῶν ἰπέων, ἡγησόμενος Ἰουδαίων τῇ ἐπὶ πᾶσιν ἐξουσία. παρῆν δὲ καὶ Κυρίνιος εἰς τὴν Ἰουδαίαν προσθήκην τῆς Συρίας γενομένην ἀποτιμησόμενός τε αὐτῶν τὰς οὐσίας καὶ ἀποδωσόμενος τὰ Ἀρχελάου χρήματα. οἱ δὲ καίπερ τὸ κατ' ἀρχὰς ἐν δεινῷ φέροντες τὴν ἐπὶ ταῖς ἀπογραφαῖς ἀκρόασιν ὑποκατέβησαν τοῦ μὴ εἰς πλέον ἐναντιοῦσθαι πείσαντος αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἀρχιερέως Ἰωαζάρου, Βοηθοῦ δὲ οὗτος υἱὸς ἦν. καὶ οἱ μὲν ἠττηθέντες τοῦ Ἰωαζάρου τῶν λόγων ἀπετίμων τὰ χρήματα μηδὲν ἐνδοιάσαντες: Ἰούδας δὲ Γαυλανίτης ἀνὴρ ἐκ πόλεως ὄνομα Γάμαλα Σάδδωκον Φαρισαῖον προσλαβόμενος ἠπέιγετο ἐπὶ ἀποστάσει, τὴν τε **ἀποτίμησιν** οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἢ ἄντικρυς δουλείαν ἐπιφέρειν λέγοντες καὶ τῆς ἐλευθερίας ἐπ' ἀντιλήψει παρακαλοῦντες τὸ ἔθνος:

Now Cyrenius, a Roman senator, and one who had gone through other magistracies, and had passed through them till he had been consul, and one who, on other accounts, was of great dignity, came at this time into Syria, with a few others, being sent by Caesar to be a judge of that nation, and to take an account of their substance. Coponius also, a man of the equestrian order, was sent together with him, to have the supreme power over the Jews. Moreover, Cyrenius came himself into Judea, which was now added to the province of Syria, to take an account of their substance, and to dispose of Archelaus' money; but the Jews, although at the beginning they took the report of a taxation heinously, yet did they leave off any further opposition to it, by the persuasion of Joazar, who was the son of Beethus, and high priest; so they, being over-persuaded by Joazar's words, gave an account of their estates, without any dispute about it. Yet

⁸⁹Original Greek and English translation according to Whiston (Tr.) 1895. *Flavius Josephus. The Works of Flavius Josephus in Perseus Digital Library* [Online]. Available: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0146%3Abook%3D17%3Awhiston+chapter%3D13%3Awhiston+section%3D5>

⁹⁰Original Greek and English translation according to Whiston (Tr.) 1895. *Flavius Josephus. The Works of Flavius Josephus in Perseus Digital Library* [Online]. Available: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0146%3Abook%3D18%3Awhiston+chapter%3D1%3Awhiston+section%3D1>

was there one Judas, a Gaulonite, of a city whose name was Gamala, who, taking with him Sadduc, a Pharisee, became zealous to draw them to a revolt, who both said that this taxation was no better than an introduction to slavery, and exhorted the nation to assert their liberty; [My correction (underlined) NPLA].

In both the *War* and *Antiquities* versions of this account it can be seen that Josephus clearly blames this specific census as the very catalyst that resulted in rebel Jewish leaders like Judas the Galilean inciting civil unrest and disobedience which ultimately led to the destruction of the Temple in Jerusalem.

The removal of Herod Archelaus resulted in the Jews being taxed directly by Roman authority. To assist in this new process, Syria (i.e. only Syria and not the entire Roman world) was subjected to a census.

Mason (2003: 274) lays particular stress on Josephus' particular use of rhetoric to get his point across. Mason believes that Josephus may well have exaggerated the unity of the Jews at the time of the unrest. By means of his particular style of rhetoric he has created the illusion that the Jews were "welded ... into a single aberrant 'school of thought'" which owes its sole conception to Augustus Caesar's census under Quirinius in 6 C.E. Mason (2003: 274) elucidates:

But this means that it is Josephus who gives the census its crucial function, because of his own literary aims. A writer with a different viewpoint might not have seen so much significance in the census and its aftermath.

This point is central to Mason' thesis. Josephus employed the census as an idiosyncratic and largely exaggerated event in order to give legitimacy to his own personal agenda. This rhetorical strategy allowed him to present the Jews as an ancient, honourable, God-fearing nation who were led astray solely by the iniquitous actions of a few misguided individuals. God in his infinite wisdom allowed the Romans to chastise these wicked men and also those who lamentably, followed them. It was they and not the Romans who were ultimately responsible for God's divine punishment. Josephus (in *Antiquities* 20, 8, 5 / 166) confirms his personal belief when he informs his reader that:

διὰ τοῦτ' οἶμαι καὶ τὸν θεὸν μισήσαντα τὴν ἀσέβειαν αὐτῶν
ἀποστραφῆναι μὲν ἡμῶν τὴν πόλιν, τὸ δὲ ἱερὸν οὐκέτι καθαρὸν
οἰκητήριον αὐτῷ κρίναντα Ῥωμαίους ἐπαγαγεῖν ἡμῖν καὶ τῇ πόλει

καθάρσιον πῦρ καὶ δουλείαν ἐπιβαλεῖν σὺν γυναῖξιν καὶ τέκνοις
σωφρονίσει ταῖς συμφοραῖς βουλόμενον ἡμᾶς.

And this seems to me to have been the reason why God, out of his hatred of these men's wickedness, rejected our city; and as for the temple, he no longer esteemed it sufficiently pure for him to inhabit therein, but brought the Romans upon us, and threw a fire upon the city to purge it; and brought upon us, our wives, and children, slavery, as desirous to make us wiser by our calamities.

As an aside, Mason's thesis would suffer considerably if it could be shown that the Quirinius census event was undeniably of such enormous historical consequence that nobody (let alone Luke) would have failed to mention it. In short, the possibility exists that irrespective of Josephus' personal agenda and chosen rhetoric, the census under Quirinius was categorically the specific spark that ignited a chain of unendurable and cataclysmic occurrences that resulted in the demise of the Jewish state.

Irrespective, Mason feels that it is more than a coincidence that Luke employs the same watershed event to serve as the catalyst for his own rhetorical strategy.

Luke assigns the census under Quirinius as the very reason that Jesus as the (Gentile) saviour of the world must be born in Bethlehem and not Nazareth. In Ev.Luc. 2: 1 – 7⁹¹ we read:

Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις ἐξῆλθεν δόγμα παρὰ Καίσαρος Αὐγούστου ἀπογράφεσθαι πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην· αὕτη ἀπογραφή πρώτη ἐγένετο ἡγεμονεύοντος τῆς Συρίας Κυρηνίου καὶ ἐπορεύοντο πάντες ἀπογράφεσθαι, ἕκαστος εἰς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ πόλιν. Ἀνέβη δὲ καὶ Ἰωσήφ ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας ἐκ πόλεως Ναζαρέτ / Ναζαρέθ εἰς τὴν Ἰουδαίαν εἰς πόλιν Δαυεὶδ / Δαυὶδ ἣτις καλεῖται Βηθλεέμ, διὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν ἐξ οἴκου καὶ πατριᾶς Δαυεὶδ / Δαυίδ, ἀπογράψασθαι σὺν Μαριὰμ τῇ ἐμνηστευμένῃ αὐτῷ, οὕση ἐνκύω Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ εἶναι αὐτοὺς ἐκεῖ ἐπλήσθησαν αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ τεκεῖν αὐτήν, καὶ ἔτεκεν τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῆς τὸν πρωτότοκον, καὶ ἐσπαργάνωσεν αὐτὸν καὶ ἀνέκλινεν αὐτὸν ἐν φάτνῃ, διότι οὐκ ἦν αὐτοῖς τόπος ἐν τῷ καταλύματι.

⁹¹ Greek text according to *NTOG*. 1882. Eds Brooke and Fenton: 119. NIV translation according to Holy Bible. 1989. NIV: *NT* 55.

In those days Caesar Augustus issued a decree that a census should be taken of the entire Roman world. (This was the first census that took place while Quirinius was governor of Syria.) And everyone went to their own town to register. So Joseph also went up from the town of Nazareth in Galilee to Judea, to Bethlehem the town of David, because he belonged to the house and line of David. He went there to register with Mary, who was pledged to be married to him and was expecting a child. While they were there, the time came for the baby to be born, and she gave birth to her firstborn, she wrapped him in cloths and placed him in a manger, because there was no guest room available for them.

This account attempts to establish a direct link between Jesus of Nazareth and King David. Bethlehem is David's birthplace and it would help legitimise Jesus' claim to be a direct descendent of David if he could be born in the same town. Thus Luke needs to find a way to do this. The census offers Luke with the means.

Assuming for the sake of argument that Luke is giving a sincere historical account at this point (regardless of whether or not he borrows information from Josephus), he also needs to give an interpretation that is in accord with the then prevailing Christian tradition of the nativity as exemplified by Ev.Matt. 2: 1- 292:

Τοῦ δὲ Ἰησοῦ γεννηθέντος ἐν Βηθλεὲμ τῆς Ἰουδαίας ἐν ἡμέραις Ἡρώδου τοῦ βασιλέως, ἰδοὺ μάγοι ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν παρεγένοντο εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα λέγοντες Ποῦ ἐστὶν ὁ τεχθεὶς βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων; εἶδομεν γὰρ αὐτοῦ τὸν ἀστέρα ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ καὶ ἦλθομεν προσκυνῆσαι αὐτῷ.

After Jesus was born in Bethlehem in Judea, during the time of King Herod, Magi from the east came to Jerusalem and asked, "Where is the one who has been born king of the Jews? We saw his star when it rose and have come to worship him."

Indeed, Luke, no doubt attempting to write in accord with accepted Christian convention, ends up creating confusion by also insisting that Jesus' mother gave birth during the regency of Herod the Great⁹³. Obviously this would be impossible if the birth happened during a census that occurred a decade *after* the death of Herod the Great.

Luke's total unreliability as an historian is further evidenced by his reference to the afore-mentioned census occurring not only in Judea but the entire Roman world. It is worth remembering that in c. 6 C.E. Judea was still under Herodian control and therefore a Roman census at this time would have been:

⁹² Greek text according to *NTOG*. 1882. Eds Brooke and Fenton: 5. NIV translation according to Holy Bible. 1989. NIV: *NT* 2.

⁹³ Herod the Great (c. 74 B.C.E. – 4 B.C.E.).

1. a serious breach of diplomacy;
2. a completely superfluous action;
3. an exorbitantly lavish action; and most importantly
4. an impracticable action due to the total lack of human resources and available time.

Apart from Judea, it is also quite impossible for the Romans to have orchestrated a census of *all* individuals living within their *entire* empire at this time. It will also be recalled that Josephus gives an account of the Roman census occurring solely in Syria. He also supplies his reader with more convincing reasons for what must have been for the Romans, a very necessary (albeit costly) endeavour.

Mason also tries to clarify what was meant by a “census” in Roman times. Perhaps Luke is referring to something else? Mason (2003: 276) correctly explains that the Romans conducted two different kinds of census, viz.:

1. a regular audit conducted by high-ranking magistrates called *censōrēs* (s. *ensor*) to determine the number of Roman male citizens within the empire; and
2. a provincial census for the purposes of evaluating the value of a newly subjugated nation.

Of the former kind, it is known that under Augustus three such audits⁹⁴ were taken in 28 B.C.E., 8 B.C.E. and 14 C.E. respectively. Men had to affirm, inter alia, their family lineage, their occupation and personal worth. This was in order to ascertain their tax thresholds. Thanks to Varro⁹⁵ we have an actual account of a typical census. Here, the prolonged religious formalities with which the census was opened is given in a fragment of the *Tabulae Censoriae* as preserved by Varro.

The latter kind of census (as exemplified by the Syrian instance of 6 B.C.E.) only came into existence more gradually and over time. Its primary objective was to register property for the purpose of Roman taxation.

⁹⁴ Lo Cascio, 1994: 29 reminds his reader that we know the actual numbers of male citizens recorded in these three audits (i.e. 4,063,000, 4,233,000 and 4,937,000) from the *Res gestae divi Augusti* (c. 14 C.E.).

⁹⁵ *Marcus Terentius Varro* (116 - 27 B.C.E.)

Mason stresses that irrespective of which type of census was being carried out; no-one was ever expected to travel to their ancestral homes. Not only is no such event (outside of the *NT*) recorded but it would be quite impossible for the Romans to have managed such an absurd event.

Mason (2003: 276) gives an amusing case study to illustrate the outrageous implications of carrying out a census in accordance with Luke's far-fetched tale:

Joseph was separated from David by about one thousand years. Was everyone, then, supposed to figure out who his ancestor was a thousand years before and track down the ancestor's town, if it still existed? And how was this possible? Since both ancestors and descendants grow exponentially, it takes only twenty generations (500 - 600 years) for one to have one million ancestors from a given time period. Josephus was a descendant of most of David's contemporaries. Which ancestor and town should one choose? Given that David's son Solomon had one thousand wives and concubines (1 Kgs 11:3), who was not a descendant of David after a thousand years?

Of course, here is one of the most beguiling pieces of evidence. Not only does Luke cite the census and the same Jewish rebel leader (Judas the Galilean) he manages to mention them both in the same passage, exactly as Josephus does.

Mason (2003: 276 - 277) explains that it was Josephus who needed to showcase the cause and effect aspect of his divine retribution theme. Therefore, he had a justifiable reason to include what he perceived to be the catalyst (census under Quirinius) and its corollary (Judas the Galilean) in the same passage.

However, unless Luke is slavishly copying Josephus' rhetorical strategy (albeit to show support for his Christian agenda) there is absolutely no reason why he would want to independently relate the two self-same events and certainly not in such an obviously sequential way within an identical passage.

Because of his literary aims, Josephus is the one who makes the point that the census symbolized Roman occupation and so was opposed by the arch rebel Judas the Galilean. We suspect that other writers would not have given the census such prominence or made such connections with the rebel psychology. These observations suggest that Luke was familiar with Josephus' work.

Jewish Charlatans, Outlaws and Terrorists

Mason (2003: 277) reminds his reader that the three rebel leaders first mentioned by Josephus in both his *War* and *Antiquities* can each be ascribed their own dates of operation:

The sons of Judas the Galilean are recorded by Josephus as having been crucified by the governor Alexander⁹⁶ in c. 46 – 48 C.E.

Antiquities 20, / 5, 2 / 100 - 102⁹⁷

Ἦλθε δὲ Φάδῳ διάδοχος Τιβέριος Ἀλέξανδρος Ἀλεξάνδρου παῖς τοῦ καὶ ἀλαβαρχήσαντος ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ γένει τε καὶ πλούτῳ πρωτεύσαντος τῶν ἐκεῖ καθ' αὐτόν. διήνεγκε καὶ τῇ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν εὐσεβείᾳ τοῦ παιδὸς Ἀλεξάνδρου: τοῖς γὰρ πατρίοις οὐκ ἐνέμεινεν οὗτος ἔθεσιν. ἐπὶ τούτου δὲ καὶ τὸν μέγαν λιμὸν κατὰ τὴν Ἰουδαίαν συνέβη γενέσθαι, καθ' ὃν καὶ ἡ βασίλισσα Ἑλένη πολλῶν χρημάτων ὠνησαμένη σῖτον ἀπὸ τῆς Αἰγύπτου διένειμεν τοῖς ἀπορουμένοις, ὡς προεῖπον. πρὸς τούτοις δὲ καὶ οἱ παῖδες Ἰούδα τοῦ Γαλιλαίου ἀνήχθησαν τοῦ τὸν λαὸν ἀπὸ Ῥωμαίων ἀποστήσαντος Κυρινίου τῆς Ἰουδαίας τιμητέοντος, ὡς ἐν τοῖς πρὸ τούτων δεδηλώκαμεν, Ἰάκωβος καὶ Σίμων, οὓς ἀνασταυρῶσαι προσέταξεν Ἀλέξανδρος.

Then came Tiberius Alexander as successor to Fadus; he was the son of Alexander the alabarch of Alexandria, which Alexander was a principal person among all his contemporaries, both for his family and wealth: he was also more eminent for his piety than this his son Alexander, for he did not continue in the religion of his country. Under these procurators that great famine happened in Judea, in which queen Helena bought corn in Egypt at a great expense, and distributed it to those that were in want, as I have related already. And besides this, the sons of Judas of Galilee were now slain; I mean of that Judas who caused the people to revolt, when Cyrenius came to take an account of the estates of the Jews, as we have showed in a foregoing book. The names of those sons were James and Simon, whom Alexander commanded to be crucified.

A son of Judas the Galilean⁹⁸ becomes a leader during the great uprising of c. 6 - 7 C.E. (cf. *War* 2, 8, 1 / 117 - 118; *Antiquities* 18, 1, 1 / 4 -10 and 1, 6 / 23 - 25).

⁹⁶ *Tiberias Iulius Alexander* (c. 46 - 48 C.E.).

⁹⁷ Original Greek and English translation according to Whiston (Tr.) 1895. *Flavius Josephus. The Works of Flavius Josephus* in *Perseus Digital Library* [Online]. Available: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0146%3Abook%3D20%3Awhiston%20chapter%3D5%3Awhiston%20section%3D2>

⁹⁸ The Jewish Encyclopedia mentions that it is quite likely that Judas the Galilean is identical to Judas the son of Hezekias (Grätz, 1853 – 1875: iii, 251, 260, 364; Schürer, 1886: 420 and 486). Unfortunately, here both Grätz and Schürer seem to conflate the identity of Judas the Galilean with Judas, son of Hezekias. A closer inspection reveals that they are in error.

Theudas⁹⁹ appears on the scene in c. 44 - 46 C.E. during the prefecture of Fadus¹⁰⁰.

Antiquities 20, / 5, 1 / 97 – 99¹⁰¹:

Φάδου δὲ τῆς Ἰουδαίας ἐπιτροπεύοντος γόης τις ἀνὴρ Θευδᾶς ὀνόματι πείθει τὸν πλείστον ὄχλον ἀναλαβόντα τὰς κτήσεις ἔπεσθαι πρὸς τὸν Ἰορδάνην ποταμὸν αὐτῷ: προφήτης γὰρ ἔλεγεν εἶναι, καὶ προστάγματι τὸν ποταμὸν σχίσας δίοδον ἔχειν ἔφη παρέξειν αὐτοῖς ῥαδίαν. καὶ ταῦτα λέγων πολλοὺς ἠπάτησεν. οὐ μὴν εἶασεν αὐτοὺς τῆς ἀφροσύνης ὄνασθαι Φᾶδος, ἀλλ' ἐξέπεμψεν ἕλην ἰππέων ἐπ' αὐτούς, ἧτις ἀπροσδόκητος ἐπιπεσοῦσα πολλοὺς μὲν ἀνεῖλεν, πολλοὺς δὲ ζῶντας ἔλαβεν, αὐτὸν δὲ τὸν Θευδᾶν ζωγρήσαντες ἀποτέμνουσι τὴν κεφαλὴν καὶ κομίζουσιν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα. τὰ μὲν οὖν συμβάντα τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις κατὰ τοῦς Κουσπίου Φάδου τῆς ἐπιτροπῆς χρόνους ταῦτ' ἐγένετο

Now it came to pass, while Fadus was procurator of Judea, that a certain magician, whose name was Theudas, persuaded a great part of the people to take their effects with them, and follow him to the river Jordan; for he told them he was a prophet, and that he would, by his own command, divide the river, and afford them an easy passage over it; and many were deluded by his words. However, Fadus did not permit them to make any advantage of his wild attempt, but sent a troop of horsemen out against them; who, falling upon them unexpectedly, slew many of them, and took many of them alive. They also took Theudas alive, and cut off his head, and carried it to Jerusalem. This was what befell the Jews in the time of Cuspius Fadus' government.

The Egyptian False Prophet is recorded as appearing in Judea when Felix¹⁰² was governor (c. 52 – 60 C.E.).

Judas the son of Hezekias or Hezekiah, whilst hailing from Galilee, was based at Sepphoris (confirmed twice by Josephus [*Antiquities* 17, 10, 5 / 271 - 272; *War* 2, 4, 1 / 56]). This was sometime either during the prefecture of *Cuspius Fadus* (c. 44 - 46 C.E.) or *Tiberias Iulius Alexander* (c. 46 - 48 C.E.). Judas the Galilean was based at Gamala (confirmed twice by Josephus [*War* 2, 8, 1 / 117 - 118; *Antiquities* 18, 1, 1 / 4]) during the procuratorship of *Coponius* (c. 6 - 9 C.E.).

⁹⁹ Theudas the charlatan (45 C.E.) (cf. *Antiquities* 20, 5, 1 / 97 - 99).

¹⁰⁰ *Cuspius Fadus* (c. 44 - 46 C.E.).

¹⁰¹ Original Greek and English translation according to Whiston (Tr.) 1895. *Flavius Josephus. The Works of Flavius Josephus in Perseus Digital Library* [Online]. Available: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0146%3Abook%3D20%3Awhiston+chapter%3D5%3Awhiston+section%3D1>

¹⁰² *Marcus Antonius Felix* (born c. 5 – 10 C.E.).

War 2, 13, 5 / 261 – 263¹⁰³:

Μεΐζονι δὲ τούτου πληγῆ Ἰουδαίους ἐκάκωσεν ὁ Αἰγύπτιος ψευδοπροφήτης: παραγενόμενος γὰρ εἰς τὴν χώραν ἄνθρωπος γόης καὶ προφήτου πίστιν ἐπιθείς ἑαυτῷ περὶ τρισμυρίους μὲν ἀθροίζει τῶν ἡπατημένων, περιαγαγὼν δὲ αὐτοὺς ἐκ τῆς ἐρημίας εἰς τὸ ἐλαιῶν καλούμενον ὄρος ἐκεῖθεν οἷός τε ἦν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα παρελθεῖν βιάζεσθαι καὶ κρατήσας τῆς τε Ῥωμαϊκῆς φρουρᾶς καὶ τοῦ δήμου τυραννεῖν χρώμενος τοῖς συνεισπεσοῦσιν δορυφόροις. φθάνει δ' αὐτοῦ τὴν ὁρμὴν Φῆλιξ ὑπαντήσας μετὰ τῶν Ῥωμαϊκῶν ὀπλιτῶν, καὶ πᾶς ὁ δῆμος συνεφήψατο τῆς ἀμύνης, ὥστε συμβολῆς γενομένης τὸν μὲν Αἰγύπτιον φυγεῖν μετ' ὀλίγων, διαφθαρῆναι δὲ καὶ ζωγρηθῆναι πλείστους τῶν σὺν αὐτῷ, τὸ δὲ λοιπὸν πλῆθος σκεδασθὲν ἐπὶ τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἕκαστον διαλαθεῖν.

But there was an Egyptian false prophet that did the Jews more mischief than the former; for he was a cheat, and pretended to be a prophet also, and got together thirty thousand men that were deluded by him; these he led round about from the wilderness to the mount which was called the Mount of Olives, and was ready to break into Jerusalem by force from that place; and if he could but once conquer the Roman garrison and the people, he intended to domineer over them by the assistance of those guards of his that were to break into the city with him. But Felix prevented his attempt, and met him with his Roman soldiers, while all the people assisted him in his attack upon them, insomuch that when it came to a battle, the Egyptian ran away, with a few others, while the greatest part of those that were with him were either destroyed or taken alive; but the rest of the multitude were dispersed every one to their own homes, and there concealed themselves.

Antiquities 20, 8, 6 / 169 - 172¹⁰⁴:

ἀφικνεῖται δὲ τις ἐξ Αἰγύπτου κατὰ τοῦτον τὸν καιρὸν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα προφήτης εἶναι λέγων καὶ συμβουλευὼν τῷ δημοτικῷ πλήθει σὺν αὐτῷ πρὸς ὄρος τὸ προσαγορευόμενον ἐλαιῶν, ὃ τῆς πόλεως ἀντικρυς κείμενον ἀπέχει στάδια πέντε: θέλειν γὰρ ἔφασκεν αὐτοῖς ἐκεῖθεν ἐπιδειξάιναι, ὡς κελεύσαντος αὐτοῦ πίπτοι τὰ τῶν Ἱεροσολυμιτῶν τείχη, δι' ὧν καὶ τὴν εἴσοδον αὐτοῖς παρέξειν ἐπηγγέλλετο. Φῆλιξ δ' ὡς ἐπόθετο ταῦτα, κελεύει τοὺς στρατιώτας ἀναλαβεῖν τὰ ὄπλα καὶ μετὰ πολλῶν ἰπέων τε καὶ πεζῶν ὁρμήσας ἀπὸ τῶν Ἱεροσολύμων προσβάλλει τοῖς περὶ τὸν Αἰγύπτιον, καὶ τετρακοσίους μὲν αὐτῶν ἀνεῖλεν, διακοσίους δὲ ζῶντας ἔλαβεν. ὁ δ' Αἰγύπτιος αὐτὸς διαδράς ἐκ τῆς μάχης ἀφανῆς ἐγένετο. πάλιν δ' οἱ λησταὶ τὸν δῆμον εἰς τὸν πρὸς Ῥωμαίους πόλεμον ἠρέθιζον μηδὲν ὑπακούειν αὐτοῖς λέγοντες, καὶ τὰς

¹⁰³Original Greek and English translation according to Whiston (Tr.) 1895. *Flavius Josephus. The Works of Flavius Josephus in Perseus Digital Library* [Online]. Available: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0148%3Abook%3D2%3Awhiston%20chapter%3D13%3Awhiston%20section%3D5>

¹⁰⁴Original Greek and English translation according to Whiston (Tr.) 1895. *Flavius Josephus. The Works of Flavius Josephus in Perseus Digital Library* [Online]. Available:

τῶν ἀπειθούντων κώμας ἐμπιπράντες διήρπαζον. [My emphases for clarity NPLA].

Moreover, there came out of Egypt about this time to Jerusalem one that said he was a prophet, and advised the multitude of the common people to go along with him to the Mount of Olives, as it was called, which lay over against the city, and at the distance of five furlongs. He said further, that he would show them from hence how, at his command, the walls of Jerusalem would fall down; and he promised them that he would procure them an entrance into the city through those walls, when they were fallen down. Now when Felix was informed of these things, he ordered his soldiers to take their **weapons**, and came against them with a great number of horsemen and footmen from Jerusalem, and attacked the **Egyptian** and the people that were with him. He also slew four hundred of them, and took two hundred alive. But the **Egyptian** himself escaped out of the fight, but did not appear any more. And again the **robbers** stirred up the people to make war with the Romans, and said they ought not to obey them at all; and when any persons would not comply with them, they set fire to their villages, and plundered them. [My emphases for clarity NPLA].

However, although Josephus gives priority to Judas the Galilean, Theudas, and the Egyptian Prophet he also tells us that there were many such activists including Eleazar the son of Dineas and many such deceivers who fooled the gullible that they could perform miracles.

War 2, 13, 2 / 252 - 253¹⁰⁵

Τὴν μὲν οὖν μικρὰν Ἀρμενίαν δίδωσιν βασιλεύειν Ἀριστοβούλῳ τῷ Ἡρώδου, τῇ δ' Ἀγρίππα βασιλείᾳ τέσσαρας πόλεις προστίθησιν σὺν ταῖς τοπαρχίαις, Ἄβελα μὲν καὶ Ἰουλιάδα κατὰ τὴν Περαιάν, Ταριχέας δὲ καὶ Τιβεριάδα τῆς Γαλιλαίας, εἰς δὲ τὴν λοιπὴν Ἰουδαίαν Φήλικά κατέστησεν ἐπίτροπον. οὗτος τὸν τε ἀρχιληστήν Ἐλεάζαρον ἔτεσιν εἴκοσι τὴν χώραν λησάμενον καὶ πολλοὺς τῶν σὺν αὐτῷ ζωγρήσας ἀνέπεμψεν εἰς Ῥώμην: τῶν δ' ἀνασταυρωθέντων ὑπ' αὐτοῦ ληστῶν καὶ τῶν ἐπὶ κοινωσίᾳ φωραθέντων δημοτῶν οὓς ἐκόλασεν, ἄπειρόν τι πλῆθος ἦν.

Nero therefore bestowed the kingdom of the Lesser Armenia upon Aristobulus, Herod's son, and he added to Agrippa's kingdom four cities, with the toparchies to them belonging; I mean Abila, and that Julias which is in Perea, Tarichea also, and Tiberias of Galilee; but over the rest of Judea he made Felix procurator. This Felix took Eleazar the arch-robber, and many that were with him, alive, when they had ravaged the country for twenty years together, and sent them to Rome; but as to the number of the robbers whom he caused to be crucified, and of those who were caught

¹⁰⁵ Original Greek and English translation according to Whiston (Tr.) 1895. *Flavius Josephus. The Works of Flavius Josephus in Perseus Digital Library* [Online]. Available: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0148%3Abook%3D2%3Awhiston%20chapter%3D13%3Awhiston%20section%3D2>

among them, and whom he brought to punishment, they were a multitude not to be enumerated.

Antiquities 20, 8, 5 / 160 – 161¹⁰⁶:

Τὰ δὲ κατὰ τὴν Ἰουδαίαν πράγματα πρὸς τὸ χεῖρον αἰεὶ τὴν ἐπίδοσιν ἐλάμβανεν: ληστηρίων γὰρ ἡ χώρα πάλιν ἀνεπλήσθη καὶ γοήτων ἀνθρώπων, οἱ τὸν ὄχλον ἠπάτων. ἀλλὰ τούτους μὲν ὁ Φῆλιξ πολλοὺς καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν σὺν τοῖς λησταῖς λαμβάνων ἀνήρει, καὶ Ἐλεάζαρον δὲ τὸν Διναίου παῖδα τὸν συστησάμενον τῶν ληστῶν τὸ σύνταγμα δι' ἐνέδρας εἶλεν ζῶντα: πίστιν γὰρ αὐτῷ προτείνας ὑπὲρ τοῦ μηδὲν πείσεσθαι κακὸν πείθει πρὸς αὐτὸν ἀφικέσθαι καὶ δῆσας ἀνέπεμψεν εἰς Ῥώμην.

Now as for the affairs of the Jews, they grew worse and worse continually, for the country was again filled with robbers and impostors, who deluded the multitude. Yet did Felix catch and put to death many of those impostors every day, together with the robbers. He also caught Eleazar, the son of Dineas, who had gotten together a company of robbers; and this he did by treachery; for he gave him assurance that he should suffer no harm, and thereby persuaded him to come to him; but when he came, he bound him, and sent him to Rome.

Antiquities 20, 8, 6 / 167 – 168¹⁰⁷:

Τὰ μὲν οὖν τῶν ληστῶν ἔργα τοιαύτης ἀνοσιότητος ἐπλήρου τὴν πόλιν, οἱ δὲ γοήτες καὶ ἀπατεῶνες ἄνθρωποι τὸν ὄχλον ἔπειθον αὐτοῖς εἰς τὴν ἐρημίαν ἔπεσθαι: δείξειν γὰρ ἔφασαν ἐναργῆ τέρατα καὶ σημεῖα κατὰ τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ πρόνοιαν γινόμενα. καὶ πολλοὶ πεισθέντες τῆς ἀφροσύνης τιμωρίας ὑπέσχον: ἀναχθέντας γὰρ αὐτοὺς Φῆλιξ ἐκόλασεν.

These works, that were done by the robbers, filled the city with all sorts of impiety. And now these impostors and deceivers persuaded the multitude to follow them into the wilderness, and pretended that they would exhibit manifest wonders and signs, that should be performed by the providence of God. And many that were prevailed on by them suffered the punishments of their folly; for Felix brought them back, and then punished them.

Mason (2003: 278) calls our attention to Josephus' distinction between false prophets or "religious impostors" and those seemingly admired revolutionary leaders who were

¹⁰⁶ Original Greek and English translation according to Whiston (Tr.) 1895. *Flavius Josephus. The Works of Flavius Josephus in Perseus Digital Library* [Online]. Available:

¹⁰⁷ Original Greek and English translation according to Whiston (Tr.) 1895. *Flavius Josephus. The Works of Flavius Josephus in Perseus Digital Library* [Online]. Available:

involved in guerrilla conflict. Perhaps the most famous of these belligerent groups was the σικάριοι who seem to have come on the scene by c. 52 - 60 C.E.¹⁰⁸

In this regard, in *War* 2, 13, 3 / 254 – 257¹⁰⁹ we are told:

Καθαρθείσης δὲ τῆς χώρας ἕτερον εἶδος ληστῶν ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ἐπεφύετο, οἱ καλούμενοι σικάριοι, μεθ' ἡμέραν καὶ ἐν μέσῃ τῇ πόλει φονεύοντες ἀνθρώπους, μάλιστα [δὲ] ἐν ταῖς ἑορταῖς μισγόμενοι τῷ πλήθει καὶ ταῖς ἐσθῆσιν ὑποκρύπτοντες μικρὰ ξιφίδια, τούτοις ἔνυττον τοὺς διαφόρους, ἔπειτα πεσόντων μέρος ἐγίνοντο τῶν ἐπαγανακτούντων οἱ πεφονευκότες, διὸ καὶ παντάπασιν ὑπὸ ἀξιοπιστίας ἦσαν ἀνεύρετοι. πρῶτος μὲν οὖν ὑπ' αὐτῶν Ἰωνάθης ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς ἀποσφάττεται, μετὰ δ' αὐτὸν καθ' ἡμέραν ἀνηροῦντο πολλοί: καὶ τῶν συμφορῶν ὁ φόβος ἦν χαλεπώτερος, ἐκάστου καθάπερ ἐν πολέμῳ καθ' ὄραν τὸν θάνατον προσδεχομένου. προεσκοποῦντο δὲ πόρρωθεν τοὺς διαφόρους, καὶ οὐδὲ τοῖς φίλοις προσιοῦσιν πίστις ἦν, ἐν μέσαις δὲ ταῖς ὑπονοίαις καὶ ταῖς φυλακαῖς ἀνηροῦντο: τοσοῦτον τῶν ἐπιβουλευόντων τὸ τάχος ἦν καὶ τοῦ λαθεῖν ἢ τέχνη.

When the country was purged of these, there sprang up another sort of robbers in Jerusalem, which were called Sicarii, who slew men in the day time, and in the midst of the city; this they did chiefly at the festivals, when they mingled themselves among the multitude, and concealed daggers under their garments, with which they stabbed those that were their enemies; and when any fell down dead, the murderers became a part of those that had indignation against them; by which means they appeared persons of such reputation, that they could by no means be discovered. The first man who was slain by them was Jonathan the high priest, after whose death many were slain every day, while the fear men were in of being so served was more afflicting than the calamity itself; and while everybody expected death every hour, as men do in war, so men were obliged to look before them, and to take notice of their enemies at a great distance; nor, if their friends were coming to them, durst they trust them any longer; but, in the midst of their suspicions and guarding of themselves, they were slain. Such was the celerity of the plotters against them, and so cunning was their contrivance. [My spelling correction underlined NPLA].

On this issue, what seems significant to Mason (2003: 278) is that Josephus first speaks about the political rebels (i.e. οἱ σικάριοι) before giving his account of the religious imposter (i.e. the Egyptian). Mason refers to this as Josephus; “unique narrative arrangement”. Yet when one compares this information to that presented in Luke-Acts, Mason becomes aware of two distinct facts:

¹⁰⁸ Some confusion exists here in that a similar group are sometimes reported as being present at the time of the governor Quirinius.

¹⁰⁹ Original Greek and English translation according to Whiston (Tr.) 1895. *Flavius Josephus. The Works of Flavius Josephus in Perseus Digital Library* [Online]. Available: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0148%3Abook%3D2%3Awhiston%20chapter%3D13%3Awhiston%20section%3D3>

1. Luke just happens to mention the same three rebel figures who are featured by Josephus; and
2. Luke relates them in a manner which seems resonant with Josephus' accounts.

For example, Judas the Galilean and Theudas are mentioned together in Gamaliel's speech in which he advises the Jewish council to leave the Christians alone:

Act.Ap. 5: 36 – 37¹¹⁰:

πρὸ γὰρ τούτων τῶν ἡμερῶν ἀνέστη Θευδᾶς, λέγων εἶναι τινα ἑαυτόν, ᾧ προσεκλίθη ἀνδρῶν ἀριθμὸς ὡς τετρακοσίων· ὃς ἀνηρέθη, καὶ πάντες ὅσοι ἐπέιθοντο αὐτῷ διελύθησαν καὶ ἐγένοντο εἰς οὐδέν. μετὰ τοῦτον ἀνέστη Ἰούδας ὁ Γαλιλαῖος ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τῆς ἀπογραφῆς καὶ ἀπέστησε λαὸν ὀπίσω αὐτοῦ· κακεῖνος ἀπώλετο, καὶ πάντες ὅσοι ἐπέιθοντο αὐτῷ διεσκορπίσθησαν.

Some time ago Theudas appeared, claiming to be somebody, and about four hundred men rallied to him. He was killed, all his followers were dispersed, and it all came to nothing. After him, Judas the Galilean appeared in the days of the census and led a band of people in revolt. He too was killed, and all his followers were scattered.

Mason (2003: 279) makes a number of conjectures that if valid, offer valuable support for his thesis:

Firstly, Mason has difficulty with Luke's order of events. Luke records Judas the Galilean's revolt as occurring well *after* the census (c. 6 C.E.) Indeed, Luke records it taking place after the time of Theudas (i.e. c. 45 C.E.)¹¹¹.

We cannot ascribe this event to a different Theudas since no such individual is described in any source. Therefore, Mason believes that Luke simply reversed the order of the two characters. Mason (2003: 279) explains his logic:

Indeed, if the author wanted to mention Josephus' Theudas, he would face the problem that the speech of Gamaliel (Acts 5) occurs before the conversion of Paul (Acts 9), and therefore in the early 30s, at least a decade before Josephus' Theudas was killed. So if Luke wanted Gamaliel to cite Theudas as an example of a failed popular leader, he would be

¹¹⁰ Greek text according to *NTOG*. 1882. Eds Brooke and Fenton: 257. NIV translation according to Holy Bible. 1989. NIV: *NT* 116.

¹¹¹ Hata (in Cohen and Schwartz, 2007: 94) correctly notes that the individual named Theudas, as mentioned by Josephus, lived far later (i.e. c. 44 – 46 C.E.) than the individual with the same name mentioned in *Act.Ap*.

forced to redate this figure. But that raises a critical question for our study: why, if there were so many other popular leaders around, did Luke find it necessary to use Theudas - even rearranging the chronology to do so - rather than choosing some other figure?

Mason believes that the answer to his question is quite simple. Luke did not have the knowledge to draw on other individuals for his potted history. As he was totally reliant on Josephus for his data he had to arrange his narrative as he saw fit to suit his own particular rhetorical agenda. It is here that Mason is on very firm ground. The rationale behind his finding is difficult to disprove. Even assuming that Josephus' agenda of showing popular Jewish rebellion after the Roman census in Syria has resulted in a certain degree of hyperbole in his accounts, we are still safe in assuming that large numbers of rebel leaders were involved in paramilitary activities over several years. This would be true whether or not the census was the actual catalyst for subsequent Jewish civil disobedience in the first century of the Common Era.

Therefore, if Luke really *knew* his history he would have known that his chronology was critically inaccurate. In addition, safely assuming that he primarily focused on the needs of his own personal agenda, if he was a real historian, he could easily have mentioned any number of rebel Jewish political leaders and false prophets as useful characters to serve as a more accurate historical context for his spiritual message. Instead, for some incomprehensible reason he seems to be slavishly reliant on the same three names and associated data as once supplied by Josephus - even to the point of writing a fictitious history. This also says something about the deficient critical faculty of his intended readership. Why would Luke have taken such a risk by knowingly writing invented history? Surely he must have considered the implications should one of his readers point out the inaccuracies? Why would anyone believe a spiritual message that claimed to be the ultimate truth if it was associated with the basest of inaccuracies and falsehoods? Obviously, assuming that a single author composed this passage and the inaccuracies are not the result of successive redactions, he seemingly had no fear of making up facts and was not concerned with being caught out.

In this latter context, we must assume that there are up to four (possibly interrelated) possibilities:

1. Luke was so naïve and/or arrogant that he was totally convinced of the accuracy of what was in reality very threadbare historical knowledge; and/or
2. Luke had no fears of anyone pointing out his errors since none of his readership was capable of critically evaluating his historical context; and/or
3. Successive redactions, necessitated by fluctuating Christologies created the inconsistencies ; and/or
4. Luke was not trying to write historical fact at the time of composition. It was only the later, more literalist Christian communities that assumed this.

Thus Luke clearly does not know the real history – certainly not at first-hand. Armed with Josephus' texts he merely borrows indiscriminately what he needs to create an invented history that is peculiarly Lucan in flavour. The entire history is thus a rhetorical device that serves only to strengthen his strategy to present an acceptable Christology, one that will seem pre-ordained since ancient times by God himself. Although not mentioned by Mason, surely the real possibility here is that Luke was knowingly writing a religious myth?

Mason (2003: 280) also conjectures that perhaps Luke ingenuously did not really know when an individual like Theudas lived? He speculates as follows:

[A]s with the census, he knew of a significant event that he could use in his narrative but did not know the details. Yet that possibility also suggests that he knew of these events from having read or heard Josephus at some time, for Josephus is the one who isolates Judas and Theudas from among the many popular leaders of the time.

As we have already seen, Josephus immediately follows his narrative concerning Theudas (cf. *Antiquities* 20, 5, 1 / 97 – 99) with that of Judas the Galilean and his two crucified sons (James and Simon) (cf. *Antiquities* 20, 5, 2 / 102). Mason (2003: 280) points out that having just finished giving his account of Theudas' execution at the instigation of Fadus, Josephus briefly mentions Fadus' successor as procurator of Judea (i.e. Tiberius Alexander) as well as a famine in Judea. At his point, Josephus mentions the crucifixion of James and Simon (i.e. the sons of Judas) thus creating an opportunity to remind his reader of Judas the Galilean. In this context,

Josephus (*Antiquities* 20, 5, 2 / 102)¹¹² seems to appeal to his reader's memory by stating the following:

πρὸς τούτοις δὲ καὶ οἱ παῖδες Ἰούδα τοῦ Γαλιλαίου ἀνήχθησαν τοῦ τὸν λαὸν ἀπὸ Ῥωμαίων ἀποστήσαντος Κυρινίου τῆς Ἰουδαίας τιμητεύοντος, ὡς ἐν τοῖς πρὸ τούτων δεδηλώκαμεν,

[T]hat Judas who **caused the people to revolt**, when Cyrenius came to take an account of the estates of the Jews, as we have showed in a foregoing book. [My emphases for clarity NPLA].

Mason (2003: 279 – 280) correctly shows that this formula seems similar to what is employed by Luke. Indeed, as we have already witnessed in Act.Ap. 5: 37¹¹³ (*ut supra*) Luke uses a similar formula:

μετὰ τοῦτον ἀνέστη Ἰούδας ὁ Γαλιλαῖος ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τῆς ἀπογραφῆς **καὶ ἀπέστησε λαὸν ὀπίσω αὐτοῦ**. κάκεῖνος ἀπόλετο, καὶ πάντες ὅσοι ἐπέιθοντο αὐτῷ διεσκορπίσθησαν.

After him, Judas the Galilean appeared in the days of the census **and led a band of people in revolt**. He too was killed, and all his followers were scattered. [My emphases for clarity NPLA].

What is most telling here, is that if one reads Josephus in context, it is quite clear that Judas the Galilean first came on the scene in c. 6 C.E. and that nearly four decades later Theudas appeared. If Luke was recalling the Josephan flashback in *Antiquities* 20, 5, 2 / 102 (*ut supra*) it would explain why he got the order of events wrong in Act.Ap. 5: 36 -37.

Mason (2003: 280) confirms his suspicions as follows:

Since Josephus links Theudas and Judas in this order for his own narrative purposes, the reproduction of this connection in Acts is either another noteworthy coincidence or the result of Luke's knowledge of Josephus.

¹¹² Original Greek and English translation according to Whiston (Tr.) 1895. *Flavius Josephus. The Works of Flavius Josephus in Perseus Digital Library* [Online]. Available: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0146%3Abook%3D20%3Awhiston+chapter%3D5%3Awhiston+section%3D2> [22 January 2015].

¹¹³ Greek text according to *NTOG*. 1882. Eds Brooke and Fenton: 257. NIV translation according to Holy Bible. 1989. NIV: *NT* 116.

Another occurrence of this nature is witnessed in Act.Ap. 21. Here, Josephus' account of the Egyptian false prophet is recalled. Specifically, in Act.Ap. 21: 27 – 36 Luke deals with Paul's unwelcome visit to the Temple in Jerusalem. Paul is attacked by a Jewish mob and saved by a Roman commander who takes him into custody. What is important to this debate is the ensuing dialogue between the commander and Paul. The pertinent text (Act.Ap. 21: 37 – 38)¹¹⁴ is reproduced below:

Μέλλον τε εἰσάγεσθαι εἰς τὴν παρεμβολὴν ὁ Παῦλος λέγει τῷ χιλιάρχῳ
Εἰ ἔξεστίν μοι εἰπεῖν τι πρὸς σέ; ὁ δὲ ἔφη Ἑλληνιστὶ γινώσκεις; οὐκ
ἄρα σὺ εἶ ὁ Αἰγύπτιος ὁ πρὸ τούτων τῶν ἡμερῶν ἀναστατώσας καὶ
ἐξαγαγὼν εἰς τὴν ἔρημον τοὺς τετρακισχιλίους ἄνδρας τῶν **σικαρίων**;
[My emphasis for clarification NPLA].

As the soldiers were about to take Paul into the barracks, he asked the commander, “May I say something to you?”

“Do you speak Greek?” he replied. “Aren't you the Egyptian who started a revolt and led four thousand terrorists [*sicarii*] out into the wilderness some time ago?” [My insert for clarification NPLA].

Here, the reader is expected to believe that because Paul has been the cause of a fracas and has now surprised the commander by speaking Greek and not Aramaic, he is immediately assumed to be the Greek-speaking Egyptian extremist who once commanded 4000 *sicarii*. This assumption on the part of the commander is made all the more preposterous and unlikely given that Greek was supposedly the *lingua franca* of the time.

Mason (2003: 280) points out that the Roman commander's remark is clearly at odds with Josephus' own account. However, Mason equally believes that there is an inconsistency here that ironically points to Luke being very aware of Josephus' text.

Firstly, Luke's account of Paul's arrest occurs when Felix is procurator of Judea. Coincidentally, this is the very time that Josephus (cf. *War* 2, 13, 5 / 261 - 263) claims that the Egyptian false prophet was operating. In the preceding *War* 2, 13, 4 / 258 - 260¹¹⁵ we read:

¹¹⁴ Greek text according to *NTOG*. 1882. Eds Brooke and Fenton: 299. NIV translation according to Holy Bible. 1989. NIV: *NT* 134.

¹¹⁵ Original Greek and English translation according to Whiston (Tr.) 1895. *Flavius Josephus. The Works of Flavius Josephus in Perseus Digital Library* [Online]. Available: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0148%3Abook%3D2%3Awhiston%20chapter%3D13%3Awhiston%20section%3D4>

Συνέστη δὲ πρὸς τούτοις στίφος ἕτερον πονηρῶν χειρὶ μὲν καθαρώτερον, ταῖς γνώμαις δὲ ἀσεβέστερον, ὅπερ οὐδὲν ἦτον **τῶν σφαγέων** τὴν εὐδαιμονίαν τῆς πόλεως ἔλυμήνατο. πλάνοι γὰρ ἄνθρωποι καὶ ἀπατεῶνες προσχήματι θειασμοῦ νεωτερισμοὺς καὶ μεταβολὰς πραγματευόμενοι **δαιμονᾶν** τὸ πλῆθος ἔπειθον καὶ προῆγον εἰς τὴν ἐρημίαν ὡς ἐκεῖ τοῦ θεοῦ δείξοντος αὐτοῖς σημεῖα ἐλευθερίας. ἐπὶ τούτοις Φῆλιξ, ἐδόκει γὰρ ἀποστάσεως εἶναι καταβολή, πέμψας ἵππεῖς καὶ πεζοὺς ὀπίστας πολὺ πλῆθος διέφθειρεν. [My emphases for clarity NPLA].

There was also another body of wicked men gotten together, not so impure in their actions, but more wicked in their intentions, which laid waste the happy state of the city no less than did these **murderers** [literally slaughterers]. These were such men as deceived and deluded the people under pretence of Divine inspiration, but were for procuring innovations and changes of the government; and these prevailed with the multitude to act like **madmen** [literally as demons], and went before them into the wilderness, as pretending that God would there show them the signals of liberty. But Felix thought this procedure was to be the beginning of a revolt; so he sent some horsemen and footmen both armed, who destroyed a great number of them [My spelling correction underlined and emphasis and insertions for clarity NPLA].

As has been intimated already, this account is immediately followed by an account of the Egyptian false prophet and his attempt to lead 30,000 men (i.e. *War* 2, 13, 5 / 261 - 263). Mason confirms that the preceding text (cf. *War* 2, 13 / 3 / 254 – 257) speaks of the *sicarii* (σικάρριοι). Thus, in his *War* Josephus first speaks of the politically orientated groups like the *sicarii*, and then afterwards, he speaks about pseudo-religious figures and their followers. Finally, he gives an account of the Egyptian as an example of one such religious deceiver.

Mason (2003: 280) questions why Luke, if he had based his account on Josephus, would speak of both the Egyptian and the *sicarii* in the same sentence, clearly portraying the Egyptian as though he were the political terrorist leader of the *sicarii*? As we have seen, Josephus himself seems to speak about religious deceivers and terrorists in the same sentence (cf. *Antiquities* 20, 8, 6 / 167 – 168) but only after having *previously* established them as separate entities. Again, in *War* 2, 13, 5 / 261 – 263 Josephus speaks of the Egyptian leading 30,000 men into the wilderness but he does not label these rebellious men “*sicarii*”.

Mason then points out (2003: 281) that the very term *sicarii* is problematic since it was a Latin term and unless Luke had read Josephus he would not have known about it. Even Josephus only uses the term because he was ultimately exposed to Roman customs and wanted his Roman audience to be presented with what for them

would have been a more familiar idiom. A Jew living in Judea would certainly not have referred to “dagger men” or terrorists/guerrillas as “σικάριοι”. On this issue, Mason (2003: 281) confirms that:

[I]t is most unlikely that the Judean group in question called themselves by this Latin title; it seems entirely likely that "official" outsiders such as Josephus applied the title to them. How, then, did Luke, who also writes in Greek, happen upon the Latin word? That he derived it from a source is clear because he uses it casually, without betraying any knowledge of its significance as a reference to assassins who carried concealed daggers. So who was his source?

Mason (2003: 281) concludes that the simplest recourse is to assume that Luke must have had some knowledge of Josephus' writings and uncritically made the connection between the Egyptian and the *sicarii* as is quite possible by a misreading of, inter alia, *Antiquities* 20, 8, 6 / 167 – 168 and *War* 2, 13, 5 / 261 – 263. Again, although *War* 2, 13, 4 / 258 – 260 mentions individuals who claimed divine directives who were “not so impure in their actions, but more wicked in their intentions” and who led men into the wilderness.

A closer reading shows that Josephus is referring not to paramilitary leaders but to religious deceivers like the Egyptian. If Luke had been influenced by this text he possibly conflated the import of this statement and simply assumed that the Egyptian was a generally wicked man who led terrorists into the desert. Thus for Luke, the not so subtle distinction between false prophet and terrorist leader becomes blurred since they all caused havoc and led men into the wilderness.

There are a number of Hebrew terms for murderer or killer which could also be synonyms for terrorist. Contrary to popular opinion and despite the fact that modern Hebrew now seems to accept סיקריקים as the translated term for *sicarii* – the MT does not make use of the term. For example, words based on the stem צָרַח (“murder”) occur some 47 times in the MT¹¹⁶ but given that *sicarii* is Latin, nothing vaguely approaching סיקריקים seems to exist.

¹¹⁶Cf. Strong. 1890. *A Concise Dictionary of the Words in the Hebrew Bible; With their Renderings in the Authorized English Version*. Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon Press: “7523 ratsach raw-tsakh' a primitive root; properly, to dash in pieces, i.e. kill (a human being), especially to murder: - put to death, kill, (man-) slay(-er), murder(-er).”

For example, Isaiah 1: 21 yields:

אֵיכָה הָיְתָה לְזוֹנָה, קָרְיָה נְאֻמָּנָה; מְלֵאֲתֵי מִשְׁפָּט, צְדָק יָלִין בָּהּ--וַעֲתָה מְרֻצָּחִים.

How has she become a harlot, a faithful city; full of justice, in which righteousness would lodge, but now **murderers**. [My emphasis for clarity NPLA].

However, as confirmed by the JVL (2012)¹¹⁷ there are a few references to terrorists/murderers specifically called “סיקריים” or “סיקרי” (“*sicarii*”) in the *Talmud*. These usages are not consistent and in addition, these all postdate the destruction of the Temple (c. 68 – 70 C.E.)¹¹⁸ and refer primarily to the work of Josephus. For example, in Makhshirim 1: 6 we are told:

It once happened that the men of Jerusalem hid their fig-cakes in the water because of the Sicarii¹¹⁹, and the sages declared them not susceptible [to ritual uncleanness].

The Jewish aggadic work *Avot de-Rabbi Natan*¹²⁰ (c.700 - 900 C.E.) states:

When Vespasian came and surrounded Jerusalem... the Sicarii took the initiative and set fire to all the granaries.

Furthermore, in Eccles. R. to 7:12 we are informed that Ben Batiaḥ was the leader of the Sicarii in Jerusalem.

," and to the same category of information belongs the story of *Abba Sikra, the leader of the *biryonim*, the son of the sister of Rabban *Johanān b. Zakkai (Git. 56a).

If the line of argument is followed thus far, it becomes clear that Mason ultimately

¹¹⁷ Cf. Zealots and Sicarii in *Jewish Virtual Library* [Online]. Available: http://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/jsource/judaica/ejud_0002_0021_0_21428.html [26 January 2015].

¹¹⁸ The Jewish notion is that the destruction of the Temple occurred in c. 68 C.E.

¹¹⁹According to Brauner (2010: 3) סיקרי is based on the Latin “*sicarii*” and refers to armed terrorists who plagued Jerusalem in the last days of the Second Temple period. Another reading yields סיקרייקי “confiscators of property” cf. Bik. I, 2; II, 3; Git. 55b cf. Brauner. 2010. The Soncino Babylonian Talmud: Machshirin in *Free Primary Jewish Sources ad Resources on The Internet*. [Online]. Available: <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1ZfHfZsLh2qYBM6Q6Qp18csQvYQMBUOvjfwPCRn9iyJk/mobilebasic#id.4a617aadb53a> [25 January 2015].

¹²⁰ Schechter. 1945. *Abot de-Rabbi Natan*: 20

makes a convincing case for Luke's actual dependence on Josephus.

If Luke had indeed obtained his information from another source and had never read Josephus it is not possible for him to have conflated the account of the Egyptian and the information about the *sicarii*. Mason (2003: 281) explains that:

Luke's placing of the *sicarii* in the desert indicates that he knows their name but is not clear about what they do. This confusion is best explained if he is relying on a source that led him to link the *sicarii* with the Egyptian, and the Egyptian with the desert. Luke's use of this group is symptomatic of his general relation to non-Christian affairs. Like Judas and the census, Theudas, and the Egyptian, the *sicarii* lend an air of realism to Luke's narrative-an important quality in Hellenistic history-writing.

As we have already witnessed, Mason emphasises that Luke is not concerned with precise historical facts and details. However, Luke does seem intent on giving his writing an historical feel. It is again evident, that if Mason is correct in his assumptions, that Luke could never have been very concerned about his intended reader taking issue on historical accuracy.

As an aside, does this say something about the non-intellectual character of Luke's expected audience, the true purpose of his writing or both? Even if it transpires that Luke did not plagiarise Josephus, why was he so concerned with inventing history rather than trying to accurately recording it. This becomes even more pressing if Luke required plausible sounding historical context within which to place his primary Christological narrative.

Mason (2003: 281 – 282) does not seem to be concerned with these latter observations. He is primarily involved with proving that Luke copied Josephus. His summation of the problem is to point out that although Luke needed Josephus for his data he does not bother to record it truthfully. Thus, for Mason, it makes sense that Luke's references to political events (even if misplaced) could only be dependent on a cursory reading of Josephus. Mason (2003: 282 and 282 n. 14) even considers that Luke may have been present at Josephus' recitation of his work and that he later had to rely on his faulty memory of what he had heard for his historical information. Regardless, the bottom line for Mason (2003: 182) is that if Luke did not have any knowledge of Josephus – however rudimentary – we cannot explain the incredible number of coincidences that are found in Luke-Acts:

1. The census and Judas the Galilean as watershed events;
2. The link between Theudas and Judas the Galilean;
3. The link between the Egyptian and the *sicarii*;
4. The Egyptian activist leading men into the desert;
5. The specific selection, by name, of the three rebel Jewish leaders from a host of other possibilities; and
6. The specific employment of the Roman term "*sicarii*".

3.8 Correspondences Between Literary Themes and Choice of Vocabulary

3.8.1 The Objectives of Josephus and Luke

Mason (2003: 283) claims that whilst attempting to gauge the degree of possible affiliation between Josephus and the author(s) of Luke-Acts, researchers have mostly overlooked these two writers' respective objectives. Indeed, in this context, Mason is so bold as to state that such a belated action may in fact yield the most illuminating attestation to his claimed supposition.

Mason (2003: 283) also posits two inter-related reasons why this obvious approach has been largely neglected until quite recently, viz.:

1. The literary aims of Josephus have been largely ignored; and
2. Only Luke's intentions have been earnestly contemplated in a determined fashion.

To remedy this perceived lacuna, Mason proceeds to present a comparison between Josephus and Luke apropos their respective chosen literary themes and choice of vocabulary. This is undertaken to highlight major similarities between the two authors' works and associated literary approaches to their chosen topics.

As has been explicated carefully on a previous occasion, Josephus seems intent on presenting to his largely Roman readers the import of Judaism as a venerable, highly dignified and widely respected, national philosophy which has been passed down untarnished, through countless ages. In this regard, Mason (2003: 283) reminds his reader that Josephus stresses that Judaism has engendered such renowned dignitaries as, inter alia, Abraham, Moses and Solomon (all of whom were respected

philosophers as well as superior leaders in their time). Of course we can even add such luminaries as Jacob, Joseph and David to this list.

In addition, Mason (2003: 284) mentions Josephus' comparison of the achievements of Jewish culture with that of Græco-Roman society. For example, Josephus informs his typically Hellenised reader that the Jews also have philosophical schools wherein such topics as free will and the soul's immortality are debated. Moreover, it can be shown that Josephus analogises between leading Jewish schools of thought and those of the Greeks, viz.:

1. the Sadducees in relation to the Epicureans;
2. the Pharisees compared to the Stoics; and
3. the Essenes are likened to the Pythagoreans.

This edification was necessary due no doubt to counter the perceptions of those uninformed Greeks and Romans who more typically viewed Judaism as some foreign superstitious cult. Thus, Josephus goes out of his way to set the record straight giving his non-Jewish audiences a comprehensive overview of Jewish culture. On this very issue Mason (2003: 284) confirms that, compared to other Jewish apologists:

Josephus offers by far the most comprehensive attempt to interpret the whole of Jewish culture - its origins, history, leading figures, ethics, and religious groups - in philosophical terms.

Within this context, Mason feels that we should see it as more than just a coincidence that Luke too wants to present Christianity as an important philosophical school which grew out of a proud Jewish tradition.

Mason (2003: 284) elucidates that although Luke does make any overt claims, he does manage to tinge his language with philosophical nuances. Luke mimics Josephus' exposé of Judaism as a commendable age-old philosophy and attempts to link Christianity to venerable Jewish history and its many achievements - even going so far as to imply that Jesus of Nazareth founded a philosophical school grounded in Jewish wisdom.

Mason (2003: 284 - 285) offers the following kinds of evidence for his claims:

3.8.2 First Correspondence

The prologue to Ev.Luc. employs two motifs that are normally used by the Graeco-Roman philosophical schools:

1. The notion of knowledge, being passed down from revered teacher to revered teacher; and
2. The motif of knowledge with a firm foundation.

Knowledge that is Handed Down

Luke presents the concept of knowledge passing down from teacher to teacher. In Ev.Luc 1: 2¹²¹ he states:

καθὼς παρέδοσαν ἡμῖν οἱ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρέται γενόμενοι τοῦ λόγου,

just as they were handed down to us by those who from the first were eyewitnesses and servants of the word,

Mason (2003: 284 – 285) sees this as confirmation that Luke will record the accomplishments of Jesus of Nazareth and accurately hand them down to the reader. Mason goes on to state that this “handing down” motif is identical to the one employed by Josephus when he describes Moses' "handing down" of the laws via the succession of priests, and the traditions of the Pharisees.

As is the case for Josephus who stresses that the traditions have been passed down unchanged and uncorrupted so does Luke want to claim that Jesus' divinely inspired philosophy will also be handed down intact and free from any error. Thus Mason (2003: 285) suggests that Luke is acting in a manner that is reminiscent of the Græco-Roman philosophical schools which pride themselves on preserving their various traditions via successive teachers and sages.

¹²¹ Greek text according to *NTOG*. 1882. Eds Brooke and Fenton: 114. NIV translation according to Holy Bible. 1989. NIV: *NT* 53.

Knowledge with a Secure Footing

As has been discussed briefly already, another term that Luke makes use of is the adjective “ἀσφαλὲς”. Mason (2003: 285) demonstrates that Luke employs this term to emphasise that his patron (i.e. Θεόφιλος) will be convinced of the “firm foundation” of the message that he is teaching him.

Mason compares Luke’s approach with that of Plutarch¹²² another Hellenistic philosopher who ensures that his reader is aware that he is able to provide real secure philosophy rather than say superstition. Mason refers specifically to *Superst.* 171E. Mason also refers to Justin Martyr¹²³ who in his *TID*, 8: 1¹²⁴ informs his reader of his conversion to Christianity as follows:

At once a fire was lit in my soul, and a love for the prophets and for the men who are dear to Christ took hold of me. When I considered his words for myself, **I found this alone to be a firm and beneficial philosophy.** [My emphasis for clarity NPLA].

Finally, Mason (2003: 285) refers to Lucian¹²⁵ who gives an account of an individual who turns to philosophy in order to find a “plain, solid path in life” (*Men.* 4)¹²⁶:

Men. 4 page 71 80 LCL 162 80 -81

ἐπεὶ δὲ διηπόρουν, ἔδοξέ μοι ἐλθόντα παρὰ τοὺς καλουμένους τούτους φιλοσόφους ἐγχειρίσαι τε ἑμαυτὸν καὶ δεηθῆναι αὐτῶν χρῆσθαι μοι ὃ τι βούλοιντο καὶ τινα ὁδὸν ἀπλῆν καὶ βέβαιον ὑποδεῖξαι τοῦ βίου.

Since I was in a dilemma, I resolved to go to the men whom they call philosophers and put myself into their hands, begging them to deal with me as they would, and to show me a plain, solid path in life.

Ταῦτα μὲν δὴ φρονῶν προσῆειν αὐτοῖς, ἐλελήθειν δ’ ἑμαυτὸν εἰς αὐτό, φασί, τὸ πῦρ ἐκ τοῦ καπνοῦ βιαζόμενος. παρὰ γὰρ δὴ τούτοις μάλιστα

¹²² Plutarch (Πλούταρχος) a.k.a. *Lucius Mestrius Plutarchus* (Λούκιος Μέστριος Πλούταρχος) (c. 46 – 120 C.E.).

¹²³ Justin [the] Martyr (fl. c. 100 - 165 C.E.).

¹²⁴ English translation according to Spade (Tr.) 1995. A Translation from the Greek text in Van Winden, J. C. M. 1971. *An Early Christian Philosopher: Justin Martyr’s Dialogue with Trypho, Chapters One to Nine*, (“*Philosophia patrum*,” Vol. I), Leiden: E. J. Brill: 10.

¹²⁵ Lucian of Samosata (Λουκιανὸς ὁ Σαμοσατεύς) (c. 125 – after 180 C.E.).

¹²⁶ English translation according to Page, Capps, Rouse, Post and Warmington (Eds).1961. *Lucian* Vol. IV. 2nd Ed. The Loeb Classical Library, Tr. A.M. Harmon. London: William Heinemann Ltd.

εὔρισκον ἐπισκοπῶν τὴν ἄγνοιαν καὶ τὴν ἀπορίαν πλείονα, ὥστε μοι τάχιστα χρυσοῦν ἀπέδειξαν οὗτοι τὸν τῶν ἰδιωτῶν τοῦτον βίον.

That was what I had in mind when I went to them, but I was unconsciously struggling out of the smoke, as the proverb goes, right into the fire! For I found in the course of my investigation that among these men in particular the ignorance and the perplexity was greater than elsewhere, so that they speedily convinced me that the ordinary man's way of living is as good as gold.

3.8.3 Second Correspondence

The Motifs of Wealth and Poverty

The second feature of the prologue of Ev.Luc. that Mason (2003: 285) draws his reader's attention to, concerns Luke's handling of the themes of wealth and poverty as metaphors for falsehood and truth.

Mason (2003: 285) confirms that Luke-Acts gives great attention to the themes of affluence, extravagance, and the duplicity of the great and powerful – all of which had essential roles in Græco-Roman philosophy.

Indeed, it is well-known that various schools of philosophy advocated poverty and the uncluttered life which in turn were often linked to truth and the chasteness of the soul.

Mason (2003: 285 – 287) sees a similar tendency in Luke-Acts. Set down below is an expanded summary based on his arguments:

Seneca was ostensibly a contemporary of the apostle Paul. Seneca's Epistles (Sen.Ep.) corroborate the Græco-Roman concern with the themes of wealth and poverty:

Sen.Ep. 17: 2 - 3¹²⁷:

But what if it is something to be desired? **Riches have shut off many a man from the attainment of wisdom; poverty is unburdened and free from care.** [My emphasis for clarity NPLA].

¹²⁷ English translation according to Gunmere 1917 – 1925. Lucius Annaeus Seneca: *Moral Epistles* Vol. I. [Online]. Available: http://www.stoics.com/seneca_epistles_book_1.html#%E2%80%98XVII1 [2 February 2015].

Mason points out that even though Seneca was himself a wealthy man he still firmly advocated that wealth could be a stumbling block to successfully acquiring wisdom.

Sen.Ep. 108: 11¹²⁸:

We talk much about despising money, and we give advice on this subject in the lengthiest of speeches, that mankind may believe true riches to exist in the mind and not in one's bank account, and that the man who adapts himself to his slender means and makes himself wealthy on a little sum, is the truly rich man.

Mason highlights Seneca's claims that when the philosophers pronounce against greed, such as "The poor lack much; the greedy man lacks all" or "He needs but little who desires but little," the crowds (including both the wealthy and the greedy) break out in thunderous applause. Indeed in Sen.Ep. 108. 9¹²⁹ we read:

At such verses as these, your meanest miser claps applause and rejoices to hear his own sins reviled.

In Arrian's *Diatr.* 3.22.27¹³⁰ Epictetus records Socrates as saying:

Men, whither are you hurrying, what are you doing, wretches? Like blind people you are wandering up and down: you are going by another road, and have left the true road: **you seek for prosperity and happiness where they are not**, and if another shows you where they are, you do not believe him.

Epictetus continues:

Why do you seek it without? In the body? It is not there. If you doubt, look at Myro, look at Ophellius. In possessions? It is not there. But if you do not believe me, look at Croesus: **look at those who are now rich, with what lamentations their life is filled. It is not in possessions. If you doubt that, look at the rich nowadays, the amount of lamentation with which their life is filled.** [My emphases for clarity NPLA].

¹²⁸ English translation according to Gunmere 1917 – 1925. Lucius Annaeus Seneca: *Moral Epistles* Vol. III. [Online] in http://www.stoics.com/seneca_epistles_book_3.html#%E2%80%98CVIII1 [2 February 2015].

¹²⁹ English translation according to Gunmere 1917 – 1925. Lucius Annaeus Seneca: *Moral Epistles* Vol. III. [Online] in http://www.stoics.com/seneca_epistles_book_3.html#%E2%80%98CVIII1 [2 February 2015].

¹³⁰ Oldfather (Tr.) 1956. *Epictetus: The Discourses as Reported by Arrian, the Manual, and Fragments*. Two Volumes. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. [Online]. Available: http://archive.org/stream/epictetusdiscour01epicuoft/epictetusdiscour01epicuoft_djvu.txt [2 February 2015].

In his Sen.Ep. 20.2¹³¹ Seneca also warns against hypocrisy and assigns one of his moral epistles to the leitmotif of "practice what you preach":

Philosophy teaches us to act, not to speak; it exacts of every man that he should live according to his own standards that his life should not be out of harmony with his words ...This, I say, is the highest duty and the highest proof of wisdom, - that deed and word should be in accord.

Lucian also picks up on hypocrisy when he rebuffs teachers who fail to live according to the principles that they claim to uphold (*Men.* 5). Again, Arrian has his character Epictetus callously ridiculing philosophers who do practice what they preach (*Diatr.* 2.9.13-22)¹³².

Mason goes on to proffer Socrates as a good example of a philosopher who believed that one of the primary purposes of philosophy was to challenge the status quo. In particular, Mason holds up Socrates as the well-known "gadfly," who ceaselessly defied the authorities. In this context, Mason (2003: 286) claims the following:

Ever since Socrates, the image of the philosopher as "gadfly," relentlessly challenging the established order and especially those in power, had been basic to the enterprise of philosophy.

Although Mason's meaning is well understood and Socrates did indeed compare Athens as a sluggish horse that was in need of his "stinging" (*Plat.Ap.* 30e – 31a) in point of fact Plato never specifically describes Socrates as being a "gadfly" – the Latin term for which is *oestrus* and which can refer to a gadfly, a sting, or even frenzy. The Ancient Greek term was *οἶστρος*.

It is true that Plato records Socrates as claiming to be god's gift to the Athenians (*Apologia Socratis* 31a-b).

Regardless, Luke (cf. Ev.Luc. 14: 1 – 14) also depicts Jesus of Nazareth as rebuking his wealthy host for only inviting his friends and affluent neighbours. In the same vein, Ev.Luc. 16: 19 – 31 relates the moral tale of the rich man and his mistreatment

¹³¹ English translation according to Gunmere 1917 – 1925. *Lucius Annaeus Seneca: Moral Epistles* Vol. I. [Online] in

http://www.stoics.com/seneca_epistles_book_1.html#%E2%80%98XVII1 [2 February 2015].

¹³² Oldfather (Tr.) 1956. *Epictetus: The Discourses as Reported by Arrian, the Manual, and Fragments*. Two Volumes. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. [Online]. Available: http://archive.org/stream/epictetusdiscour01epicuoft/epictetusdiscour01epicuoft_djvu.txt [2 February 2015].

of the poverty-stricken Lazarus. Here, the reader is instructed apropos the divine retribution that can be expected for the misuse of wealth as well as the heavenly reward that might be received for leading a simple life.

Again, of all the canonised gospels, only Luke (cf. Ev.Luc. 18: 1 – 14) relates the parable of the godless and misogynist judge who eventually succumbs to the needs of the determined widow in need of justice. This tale is then followed by the parable of the self-righteous Pharisee contrasted with the introspective and repentant tax-collector.

Thus, Mason stresses that it is mostly in Ev.Luc. that we witness a Jesus of Nazareth who champions the poor whilst juxtaposed against an arrogant, advantaged society whose leading representatives are, inter alia, materialistic, avaricious and mercenary. Here, Jesus exposes the supposedly erudite and sanctimonious Pharisees and Sadducees as conducting themselves in ways that are wholly detrimental to those whom they supposedly wish to serve.

An additional point raised by Mason concerns Luke's version of Jesus of Nazareth as based on that of the life of Socrates whose death is recounted in Plato's *Phædo* 15¹³³

Within this context, Mason sees Luke-Acts as overtly portraying Jesus of Nazareth and his disciples as firmly grounded in typical Græco-Roman moral philosophical concerns. Jesus is portrayed as being impoverished, no doubt to emphasise his purity of soul. Indeed, despite being touted as a kingly messiah, he still manages to be born destitute in an animal stable (Ev.Luc. 2: 7 – 16). Although not specifically stated in Ev.Luc. even with a basic knowledge of Jewish law it is obvious that Jesus' parents must have been too poor to be able to purchase a lamb for sacrifice at the temple¹³⁴. This would best explain why in Ev.Luc. 2: 24 Jesus' parents had to resort to offering either a pair of doves or young pigeons when they wanted to consecrate their baby to the Lord.

¹³³ Original Greek and English translation according to Burnett, (Ed.) 1903. Plato. *Platonis Opera*, in *Perseus Digital Library* [Online]. Available: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.01.0146> [3 December 2014].

¹³⁴ With reference to Lev. 12: 8, in Mosaic law, if a Jewish mother was too poor to offer a lamb on the birth of her child she was permitted to bring two young pigeons or two doves to the altar. One was for the burnt offering and the other for the sin offering. Only then could she be atoned from sin by the attendant priest and made ritualistically clean.

In Ev.Luc. 4: 18¹³⁵, Jesus of Nazareth verifies that he was sent to preach specifically to the poor:

Πνεῦμα Κυρίου ἐπ' ἐμέ, οὗ εἵνεκεν ἔχρισέν με εὐαγγελίσασθαι πτωχοῖς,
ἀπέσταλκέν με κηρύξαι αἰχμαλώτοις ἄφεςιν καὶ τυφλοῖς ἀνάβλεψιν,
ἀποστεῖλαι τεθραυσμένους ἐν ἀφέσει,

The Spirit of the Lord is on me, because he has anointed me to preach good news to the poor.

In the same vein, the well-known “Sermon on the Mount” event (Ev.Luc. 6: 17 – 26) reveals this central concern of Luke’s Jesus of Nazareth. For example, in Ev.Luc. 6: 20¹³⁶ Jesus instructs the crowd:

Καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπάρας τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ εἰς τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ ἔλεγεν
Μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοί, ὅτι ὑμετέρα ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ.

Blessed are you who are poor, for yours is the kingdom of God.

This is again confirmed, in Ev.Luc. 6: 24¹³⁷ when Jesus warns:

Πλὴν οὐαὶ ὑμῖν τοῖς πλουσίοις, ὅτι ἀπέχετε τὴν παράκλησιν ὑμῶν.

But woe to you who are rich, for you have already received your comfort.

Here, Jesus of Nazareth clearly promises that his ministry will favour the poor.

Mason stresses that even Luke’s version of the Baptist narrative emphasises his central concern with poverty as a moral philosophical theme. In Ev.Luc. 3: 10 – 14 John the Baptist recommends a frugal and moderate lifestyle to the crowds who come to be baptised by him. Specifically, after the Baptist has admonished the crowds for their sinful ways and hypocrisy they understandably ask: “What should we do then?” Ev.Luc. 3: 10 - 11¹³⁸ portrays the Baptist instructing the crowds as follows:

¹³⁵ Greek text according to *NTOG*. 1882. Eds Brooke and Fenton: 126. NIV translation according to Holy Bible. 1989. NIV: *NT* 58.

¹³⁶ Greek text according to *NTOG*. 1882. Eds Brooke and Fenton: 132. NIV translation according to Holy Bible. 1989. NIV: *NT* 61.

¹³⁷ Greek text according to *NTOG*. 1882. Eds Brooke and Fenton: 132. NIV translation according to Holy Bible. 1989. NIV: *NT* 61.

¹³⁸ Greek text according to *NTOG*. 1882. Eds Brooke and Fenton: 123. NIV translation according to Holy Bible. 1989. NIV: *NT* 57.

καὶ ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν οἱ ὄχλοι λέγοντες Τί οὖν ποιήσωμεν; ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς Ὁ ἔχων δύο χιτῶνας μεταδότω τῷ μὴ ἔχοντι, καὶ ὁ ἔχων βρώματα ὁμοίως ποιείτω.

The man with two tunics should share with him who has none, and the one who has food should do the same.

Mason (2003: 286) also points out that like unlike the other canonised gospel writers, it is solely Luke (cf. Ev.Luc. 12: 13 – 21) who presents Jesus of Nazareth recounting the parable of the Rich Fool. Specifically, Ev.Luc. 12: 16 – 21 deals with the tale of the wealthy man who after having grown a bumper crop realises that his barns are now too small.

Accordingly he decides to tear them down and rebuild bigger storage facilities in preparation for an envisioned long life of ease and leisure. God admonishes him because he should have rather prepared for his spiritual security and emphasises that one cannot employ stored material possessions in the next world.

Mason (2003: 286) also reminds his reader that only the apocryphal Ev.Thom. 63¹³⁹ repeats a similar version of this tale:

63. (1) ΠΕΧΕ ΙC ΧΕ ΝΕΥΝ ΟΥΡΩΜΕ ΜΠΛΟΥCΙΟC ΕΥΝΤΑ4 ΜΜΑΥ
ΝΖΑΖ ΝΧΡΗΜΑ (2) ΠΕΧΑ4 ΧΕ †ΝΑΡΧΡΩ ΝΝΑΧΡΗΜΑ ΧΕΚΑΑC
ΕΕΙΝΑΧΟ ΝΤΑΩCΖ ΝΤΑΤΩCΕ ΝΤΑΜΟΥΖ ΝΝΑΕΖΩΡ ΝΚΑΡΠΟC ΩΙΝΑ
ΧΕ ΝΙΡ ΩΡΩΖ ΛΑΑΑΥ (3) ΝΑΕΙ ΝΕΝΕCΜΕΕΥΕ ΕΡΟΥΖ ΖΜ ΠΕCΖΗΤ
ΑΥΩ ΖΝ ΤΟΥΩΗ ΕΤΜΜΑΥ ΑCΜΟΥ ΠΕΤΕΥΜ ΜΑΧΕ ΜΜΟ4
ΜΑΡΕCΩΤΜ

Jesus said, "There was a rich man who had much money. He said, 'I shall put my money to use so that I may sow, reap, plant, and fill my storehouse with produce, with the result that I shall lack nothing.' Such were his intentions, but that same night he died. Let him who has ears hear."

Another pertinent example may be found in Ev.Luc. 16: 13 – 14 where Jesus of Nazareth points out the error of attempting to serve both God and money

¹³⁹ Coptic and English translation according to Grondin (Tr.) 1997 – 2002. *Grondin`s Interlinear Coptic/English translation of The Gospel of Thomas* (Revised November 22, 2002) [Online]. Available: http://www.google.co.za/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=2&ved=0CCIQFjAB&url=http%3A%2F%2Fgospel-thomas.net%2Fgtbypage_112702.pdf&ei=LjfPVLrzNqrB7AbXiYGYDQ&usg=AFQjCNHpdMCAI9d-y8KWuQ1ZLCINEawspA&sig2=kDi0zcvLq8jvGTZnKHxhzg [2 February 2015].

simultaneously. In addition he is depicted as reprimanding an ingenuous Pharisee who (whilst ensuring that he appeared favourable in the sight of his peers) was unwittingly eschewing the approbation of God.

In keeping with his portrayal of Jesus, Luke goes on to claim that Jesus' followers shared all of their goods in common. According to Act.Ap. 2: 44 – 45¹⁴⁰:

πάντες δὲ οἱ πιστεύσαντες ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ εἶχον ἅπαντα κοινά, καὶ τὰ κτήματα καὶ τὰς ὑπάρξεις ἐπίπρασκον καὶ διεμέριζον αὐτὰ πᾶσιν καθότι ἂν τις χρεῖαν εἶχεν.

All the believers were together and had everything in common. Selling their possessions and goods, they gave to anyone as he had need.

Again in Act.Ap. 4: 32 - 35¹⁴¹ we are informed:

Τοῦ δὲ πλήθους τῶν πιστευσάντων ἦν καρδία καὶ ψυχὴ μία, καὶ οὐδὲ εἷς τι τῶν ὑπαρχόντων αὐτῷ ἔλεγεν ἴδιον εἶναι, ἀλλ' ἦν αὐτοῖς πάντα κοινά. καὶ δυνάμει μεγάλῃ ἀπεδίδουν τὸ μαρτύριον οἱ ἀπόστολοι τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ τῆς ἀναστάσεως, χάρις τε μεγάλη ἦν ἐπὶ πάντας αὐτούς. οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐνδεής τις ἦν ἐν αὐτοῖς· ὅσοι γὰρ κτήτορες χωρίων ἢ οἰκιῶν ὑπῆρχον, πωλοῦντες ἔφερον τὰς τιμὰς τῶν πιπρασκομένων καὶ ἐτίθουν παρὰ τοῦς πόδας τῶν ἀποστόλων· διεδίδετο δὲ ἐκάστῳ καθότι ἂν τις χρεῖαν εἶχεν.

All the believers were one in heart and mind. No one claimed that any of their possessions was their own, but they shared everything they had. With great power the apostles continued to testify to the resurrection of the Lord Jesus. And God's grace was so powerfully at work in them all that there were no needy persons among them. **For from time to time those who owned land or houses sold them, brought the money from the sales and put it at the apostles' feet, and it was distributed to anyone who had need.** [My emphasis of pertinent passages NPLA].

Mason (2003: 287) views Luke's ideal picture of the Christian community as being strongly reminiscent of both Josephus' depiction of the Essene community as well as the legendary Pythagorean community.

As an aside, it is also worth noting that all the examples that Mason supplies thus far also form part of the hypothetical Q. sayings. In this regard, Mason fails to prove his point that this is an exclusively Lucan phenomenon due to his purloining from

¹⁴⁰ Greek text according to NTOG. 1882. Eds Brooke and Fenton: 250. NIV translation according to Holy Bible. 1989. NIV: NT 113.

¹⁴¹ Greek text according to NTOG. 1882. Eds Brooke and Fenton: 254. NIV translation according to Holy Bible. 1989. NIV: NT 115.

Josephus. If Q. is the actual source then it is the author of Q. and not Ev.Luc. who should be compared to Josephus.

3.8.4 Third Correspondence

The Appeal to Philosophical Discourse

It will be recalled that when Luke recounts his tale of the apostle Paul at the meeting of the Areopagus in Athens (Act.Ap. 17: 16 - 34) he is depicted as being engaged in philosophical dispute with both Epicureans and Stoics. Because this is a meeting place of seasoned philosophers, Luke realises that his Paul cannot rely solely on an appeal to Hebrew scripture to make his case for Christianity.

Thus Paul is made to resort to philosophical persuasion to convince his largely Greek audience. Indeed, in Act.Ap. 17: 18¹⁴² we witness the Epicurean and Stoic philosophers accidentally coming across Paul whilst he is preaching about Jesus as the Christ and thus, initially, they ridicule him:

τινὲς δὲ καὶ τῶν Ἐπικουρίων καὶ Στωικῶν φιλοσόφων συνέβαλλον αὐτῷ, καὶ τινες ἔλεγον Τί ἂν θέλοι ὁ σπερμολόγος οὗτος λέγειν; οἱ δὲ Ἑένων δαμονίων δοκεῖ καταγγελεὺς εἶναι· ὅτι τὸν Ἰησοῦν καὶ τὴν ἀνάστασιν εὐηγγελίζετο.

A group of Epicurean and Stoic philosophers began to debate with him. Some of them asked, "What is this babbler trying to say?" Others remarked, "He seems to be advocating foreign gods." They said this because Paul was preaching the good news about Jesus and the resurrection.

Subsequently, in his invented speech, delivered at the meeting of the Areopagus, Paul first confirms diplomatically that his antagonists are religious men and then with reference to an inscription on an altar dedicated to "an unknown god" he argues that there is but one, self-same, nameless God who underscores the spiritual desires of all nations To back up his claims, Paul seems to resort to quoting directly from the refrains of two well-known Greek poems:

1. all nations are God's "offspring"; and

¹⁴² Greek text according to *NTOG*. 1882. Eds Brooke and Fenton: 287. NIV translation according to Holy Bible. 1989. NIV: *NT* 129.

2. it is in God that we as humans are able to “live and move and have our being.”

Mason (2003: 287) correctly identifies the source of these refrains as Aratus¹⁴³ and Epimenides¹⁴⁴ respectively.

For clarity, the relevant section of the poem ascribed to Epimenides’ *Cretica* and which has come down to us via a ninth century C.E. commentary of Act.Ap. by Isho'dad of Merv¹⁴⁵ in Syriac, is set down below:

They fashioned a tomb for you, holy and high one [i.e. Zeus],
Cretans, always liars, evil beasts, idle bellies.
But you are not dead: you live and abide forever,
For in you we live and move and have our being.
[My insertion and emphasis for clarity NPLA].

It is generally accepted, (cf. Harris, 1906: 305 – 317) but not conclusive, that the fourth line of Epimenides’ *Cretica* (Κρητικά) is the source for the *first* part of the text that appears in Act.Ap. 17: 28 (*ut infra*):

Ἐν γὰρ σοὶ ζῶμεν καὶ κινύμεθ’ ἠδὲ καὶ ἐσμέν.

For in you we live and move and have our being.¹⁴⁶
In the same vein, the relevant section of Aratus’ famous poem *Arat.Phæn.* (*Phænomena*). *Arat.Phæn.* 1 - 5)¹⁴⁷ reads as follows:

ἐκ Διὸς ἀρχώμεσθα, τὸν οὐδέποτε ἄνδρες ἐῶμεν
ἄρρητον: μεστὰὶ δὲ Διὸς πᾶσαι μὲν ἀγυαί,
πᾶσαι δ’ ἀνθρώπων ἀγοραί, μεστή δὲ θάλασσα
καὶ λιμένες: πάντη δὲ Διὸς κεχρήμεθα πάντες.
τοῦ γὰρ καὶ γένος εἰμέν:

Let us begin with Zeus, whom we mortals never leave unspoken.
For every street, every market-place is full of Zeus.

¹⁴³ *Aratus Solensis* (Cilicia) (c. 315 - 240 B.C.E.)

¹⁴⁴ Epimenides of Knossos, possibly legendary (c. 6th – 7th century B.C.E.).

¹⁴⁵ Isho'dad of Merv, Bishop of Hdatta (fl. c. 850 C.E.).

¹⁴⁶ Greek text and translation according to James Rendel Harris, “The Cretans Always Liars,” in *Expositor* seventh series 2.4 (Oct. 1906, 305–17).

¹⁴⁷ Greek text according to Mair, G.R. (Ed.) 1921. *Aratus Solensis. Phaenomena*. (English translation according to A.W. Mair). London: William Heinemann in *Perseus Digital Library* [Online]. Available:

<http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A2008.01.0483> [5th January 2015].

Even the sea and the harbour are full of this deity.
Everywhere everyone is indebted to Zeus.
For we are indeed his offspring...
[My emphases for clarity NPLA].

Here the fifth line is widely accepted as the source for the *latter* part of Act.Ap. 17: 28 (*ut infra*).

For clarity, the entire passage (i.e. Act.Ap. 17: 28)¹⁴⁸ reads as follows:

ἐν αὐτῷ γὰρ ζῶμεν καὶ κινούμεθα καὶ ἐσμέν, ὡς καὶ τινες τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς ποιητῶν εἰρήκασιν Τοῦ γὰρ καὶ γένος ἐσμέν.

“For in him we live and move and have our being.” As some of your own poets have said, “We are his offspring.”

Here, Mason (2003: 287 – 288) explicates:

But these slogans were precisely what the Stoics believed - that there was one divine spirit animating all of life. Luke's Paul here anticipates Christian apologists such as Justin Martyr.

In this regard, Justin Martyr connected Christian teaching with the best of Græco-Roman philosophy on the basis that the one principle of *Logos* embodied in the Christ, was already given to individuals of all times and places who "lived reasonably" (1 Apol. 1.46).

Thus Luke uses Paul's speech to the Greek philosophers to strengthen his own demonstration of Christianity as a valid philosophy.

3.8.5 Fourth Correspondence

The Importance of Speaking Fearlessly

Mason's fourth proof concerns what he claims to be an important objective of first century C.E. philosophers to employ *παρηρησία* in order to stimulate and instruct their often apathetic audiences. This Ancient Greek practice, which emphasised the

¹⁴⁸ Greek text according to *NTOG*. 1882. Eds Brooke and Fenton: 288. NIV translation according to Holy Bible. 1989. NIV: *NT* 129.

importance of fearlessly speaking the truth or *παρρησία* has in fact a much older history than intimated by Mason.

Indeed, according to Foucault (1983: 1) it can be dated back to the end of the fifth century B.C.E. appearing for the first time in the works of Euripides¹⁴⁹ and still occurring as late as the fifth century C.E. in, inter alia, the works of John Chrysostom¹⁵⁰.

Regardless, Mason (2003: 288) stresses that the practice of *παρρησία* often got a philosopher into trouble and mentions that several moral thinkers were either executed or exiled for criticising the principles of say an emperor.

Mason emphasises that one of the distinctions of being a true philosopher (c. 100 C.E.) was to speak with *παρρησία* – to tell the honest truth, boldly and directly without fear or favour.

Thus, for Mason, it is no coincidence that Luke posits *παρρησία* as being a characteristic of the early Christian evangelists. As evidence, Mason (2003: 288) affirms that the term “(with) *parrhesia*” (*μετὰ παρρησίας* or *παρρησίαν*) appears strategically on five occasions in Act.Ap. viz.:

Act.Ap. 2: 29¹⁵¹:

Ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί, ἐξὸν εἰπεῖν **μετὰ παρρησίας** πρὸς ὑμᾶς περὶ τοῦ πατριάρχου Δαυεὶδ, ὅτι καὶ ἐτελεύτησεν καὶ ἐτάφη καὶ τὸ μνήμα αὐτοῦ ἔστιν ἐν ἡμῖν ἄχρι τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης·

Fellow Israelites, I can tell you **confidently** that the patriarch David died and was buried, and his tomb is here to this day. [My emphasis for clarity NPLA].

Act.Ap. 4: 13¹⁵²:

Θεωροῦντες δὲ τὴν τοῦ Πέτρου **παρρησίαν** καὶ Ἰωάννου, καὶ καταλαβόμενοι ὅτι ἄνθρωποι ἀγράμματοί εἰσιν καὶ ἰδιῶται, ἐθαύμαζον, ἐπεγίνωσκόν τε αὐτοὺς ὅτι σὺν τῷ Ἰησοῦ ἦσαν,

¹⁴⁹ Εὐριπίδης (*Euripides*) (c. 484 - 407 B.C.E.).

¹⁵⁰ Ἰωάννης ὁ Χρυσόστομος a.k.a. John Chrysostom, Archbishop of Constantinople (c. 345/349 – 407 C.E.).

¹⁵¹ Greek text according to *NTOG*. 1882. Eds Brooke and Fenton: 249. NIV translation according to Holy Bible. 1989. NIV: *NT* 112.

¹⁵² Greek text according to *NTOG*. 1882. Eds Brooke and Fenton: 253. NIV translation according to Holy Bible. 1989. NIV: *NT* 114.

When they saw the **courage** of Peter and John and realized that they were unschooled, ordinary men, they were astonished and they took note that these men had been with Jesus. [My emphasis for clarity NPLA].

Act.Ap. 4: 29¹⁵³:

καὶ τὰ νῦν, κύριε, ἔπιθε ἐπὶ τὰς ἀπειλὰς αὐτῶν, καὶ δὸς τοῖς δούλοις σου **μετὰ παρρησίας** πάσης λαλεῖν τὸν λόγον σου,

Now, Lord, consider their threats and enable your servants to speak your word with **great boldness**. [My emphasis for clarity NPLA].

Act.Ap. 4: 31¹⁵⁴:

καὶ δεηθέντων αὐτῶν ἐσαλεύθη ὁ τόπος ἐν ᾧ ἦσαν συνηγμένοι, καὶ ἐπλήσθησαν ἅπαντες τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος, καὶ ἐλάλουν τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ **μετὰ παρρησίας**.

After they prayed, the place where they were meeting was shaken. And they were all filled with the Holy Spirit and spoke the word of God **boldly**. [My emphasis for clarity NPLA].

Act.Ap. 28: 31¹⁵⁵:

κηρύσσων τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ διδάσκων τὰ περὶ τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ **μετὰ πάσης παρρησίας** ἀκωλύτως.

He proclaimed the kingdom of God and taught about the Lord Jesus Christ - with all **boldness** and without hindrance! [My emphasis for clarity NPLA].

Mason (2003: 288) explains that

Just as Jesus appeared in the gospel of Luke as a tenacious critic of the wealthy and powerful, so his followers now appear as a fearless but persecuted, truth-loving minority.

¹⁵³ Greek text according to *NTOG*. 1882. Eds Brooke and Fenton: 254. NIV translation according to Holy Bible. 1989. NIV: *NT* 115.

¹⁵⁴ Greek text according to *NTOG*. 1882. Eds Brooke and Fenton: 254. NIV translation according to Holy Bible. 1989. NIV: *NT* 115.

¹⁵⁵ Greek text according to *NTOG*. 1882. Eds Brooke and Fenton: 314. NIV translation according to Holy Bible. 1989. NIV: *NT* 141.

3.8.6 Fifth Correspondence

Christianity as a Reputable Jewish School of Philosophy

Mason (2003: 288) also sees a notable coincidence in Act.Ap. wherein Luke appears to borrow Josephus' classification of the Pharisees and Sadducees as "philosophical schools" or "haireseis" (αἱρέσεις).

In his *War* 2, 8, 2 / 119¹⁵⁶ (c. 75 C.E.), Josephus states the following:

Τρία γὰρ παρὰ Ἰουδαίοις εἶδη φιλοσοφεῖται, καὶ τοῦ μὲν αἰρετισταὶ Φαρισαῖοι, τοῦ δὲ Σαδδουκαῖοι, τρίτον δέ, ὃ δὴ καὶ δοκεῖ σεμνότητα ἀσκεῖν, Ἑσσηνοὶ καλοῦνται, Ἰουδαῖοι μὲν γένος ὄντες, φιλάλληλοι δὲ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων πλέον.

For there are three philosophical sects among the Jews. The followers of the first of which are the Pharisees; of the second, the Sadducees; and the third sect, which pretends to a severer discipline, are called Essenes.

Again, in his autobiographical *Life* I, 1, 2 / 10¹⁵⁷ Josephus confirms this information:

περὶ δὲ ἑκκαίδεκα ἔτη γενόμενος ἐβουλήθην τῶν παρ' ἡμῖν **αἱρέσεων** ἐμπειρίαν λαβεῖν: τρεῖς δ' εἰσὶν αὐταί, Φαρισαίων μὲν ἢ πρώτη, καὶ Σαδδουκαίων ἢ δευτέρα, τρίτη δ' Ἑσσηνῶν, καθὼς πολλακίς εἶπομεν: οὕτως γὰρ ὄμην **αἰρήσεσθαι** τὴν ἀρίστην, εἰ πάσας καταμάθοιμι.

When I was about sixteen years old, I chose to gain expertise in the **philosophical schools** among us. There are three of these: the first, Pharisees; the second, Sadducees; and the third, Essenes, **as we have often said**. In this way I intended to choose the best [school] - if I might examine them all. [My emphases for clarity NPLA].

¹⁵⁶ Original Greek and English translation according to Whiston (Tr.) s.a. Flavius Josephus: The Judean War in *Project on Ancient Cultural Engagement* [Online]. Available: <http://pace-ancient.mcmaster.ca/york/york/showText?book=2&chapter=8&textChunk=whistonSection&chunkId=2&text=wars&version=whiston&direction=&tab=&layout=split&go.x=14&go.y=6> [24 June 2014].

¹⁵⁷ Original Greek and English translation according to Whiston (Tr.) s.a. Flavius Josephus: The Life of Josephus in *Project on Ancient Cultural Engagement* [Online]. Available: <http://pace-Ancient.mcmaster.ca/york/york/showText?book=1&chapter=1&textChunk=nieseSection&chunkId=1&up.x=10&up.y=5&text=vita&version=&direction=up&tab=&layout=split> [24 June 2014].

Act.Ap. 5: 17¹⁵⁸

Ἀναστάς δὲ ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς καὶ πάντες οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ, ἡ οὖσα **αἵρεσις** τῶν Σαδδουκαίων, ἐπλήσθησαν ζήλου

Then the high priest and all his associates, who were members of the **party** of the Sadducees, were filled with jealousy. [My emphasis for clarity NPLA].

Act.Ap. 15: 5¹⁵⁹

Ἐξανέστησαν δὲ τινες τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς **αἰρέσεως** τῶν Φαρισαίων πεπιστευκότες, λέγοντες ὅτι δεῖ περιτέμνειν αὐτοὺς παραγγέλλειν τε τηρεῖν τὸν νόμον Μωσέως.

Then some of the believers who belonged to the **party** of the Pharisees stood up and said, “The Gentiles must be circumcised and required to keep the Law of Moses.” [My editing underlined and emphasis for clarity NPLA].

Act.Ap. 26: 5¹⁶⁰

προγινώσκοντές με ἄνωθεν, ἐὰν θέλωσι μαρτυρεῖν, ὅτι κατὰ τὴν **ἀκριβεστάτην αἵρεσιν** τῆς ἡμετέρας θρησκείας ἔζησα Φαρισαῖος.

They have known me for a long time and can testify, if they are willing, that I conformed to the **strictest sect** of our religion, living as a Pharisee. [My emphasis for clarity NPLA].

Mason translates the term “haireseis” strictly as “philosophical school” rather than as say “heresy”, “sect”, “group” or “party” – all of which are perfectly acceptable equivalents depending on the context.

He sees the term “haireseis” as emphasising the interplay between the powerful philosophical schools of the Jews and that of the Christians much the same way as Josephus distinguishes between the three branches of Judaism.

¹⁵⁸ Greek text according to *NTOG*. 1882. Eds Brooke and Fenton: 256. NIV translation according to Holy Bible. 1989. NIV: *NT* 115.

¹⁵⁹ Greek text according to *NTOG*. 1882. Eds Brooke and Fenton: 281. NIV translation according to Holy Bible. 1989. NIV: *NT* 126.

¹⁶⁰ Greek text according to *NTOG*. 1882. Eds Brooke and Fenton: 307. NIV translation according to Holy Bible. 1989. NIV: *NT* 138.

Mason also comments on Luke having the apostle Paul refer to the Pharisees as the “ἀκριβεστάτην αἵρεσιν” which he translates as the "most precise school" among the Jews.

Mason sums up his position as follows:

This is a triple coincidence because: the school language is part of Josephus' presentation; "precision" (akribeia) is also one of Josephus' key terms; and Josephus routinely claims that the Pharisees are reputed to be the most precise of the schools (War 1.110; 2.162; Ant. 17.41; Life 189). We do not know of any author but Josephus who called the Pharisees and Sadducees "philosophical schools" or the Pharisees the most precise school, yet we do know that this presentation fits with Josephus' carefully developed defense of Judaism. If Luke did not know of Josephus' work, how did this language suggest itself to him?

Mason (2003: 289) feels that Act.Ap. portrays Lucan Christianity as one of the established Jewish schools. As evidence he points to Act.Ap. 24: 5¹⁶¹ where the Jewish accusers angrily state:

εὐρόντες γὰρ τὸν ἄνδρα τοῦτον λοιμὸν καὶ κινοῦντα στάσεις πᾶσι τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις τοῖς κατὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην πρωτοστάτην τε τῆς τῶν Ναζωραίων **αἱρέσεως**,

We have found this man [Paul] to be a troublemaker, stirring up riots among the Jews all over the world. He is a ringleader of the Nazarene **sect**: [My emphases and insertion for clarity NPLA].

What is also informative here, is that when Paul defends himself he corrects the terminology employed by the Jews but admits that they refer to Christians as being a “αἵρεσιν”. As evidence, the first half of Act.Ap. 24: 14¹⁶² reads as follows:

ὁμολογῶ δὲ τοῦτό σοι ὅτι κατὰ τὴν ὁδὸν ἣν λέγουσιν **αἵρεσιν** οὕτως λατρεύω τῷ πατρώῳ θεῷ,

However, I admit that I worship the God of our ancestors as a follower of the Way, which they call a **sect**. [My emphasis for clarity NPLA].

In a similar vein, Act.Ap. 28: 22¹⁶³ reveals that even the Jews in Rome are aware of this unwelcome “αἱρέσεως”:

¹⁶¹ Greek text according to *NTOG*. 1882. Eds Brooke and Fenton: 304. NIV translation according to Holy Bible. 1989. NIV: *NT* 136.

¹⁶² Greek text according to *NTOG*. 1882. Eds Brooke and Fenton: 304. NIV translation according to Holy Bible. 1989. NIV: *NT* 136.

ἀξιοῦμεν δὲ παρὰ σοῦ ἀκοῦσαι ἃ φρονεῖς, περὶ μὲν γὰρ τῆς αἰρέσεως ταύτης γνωστὸν ἡμῖν ἐστὶν ὅτι πανταχοῦ ἀντιλέγεται.

But we want to hear what your views are, for we know that people everywhere are talking against this **sect** [My emphasis for clarity NPLA].

Mason feels that when Luke depicts Christianity as a “haireseis” he is giving it equal status to the Pharisee and Sadducee schools.

Mason (2003: 289) argues that when Luke has the apostle Paul seemingly unhappy with the “school” nomenclature he is not in fact anti-school of philosophy, rather he wants to emphasise that the Christian “way” or “path” is for all Jews.

Mason (2003: 289) elucidates as follows:

[Luke] does not want the Christian truth claims to be seen as matters of dispute like the mundane issues that divide the other schools. Nevertheless, although Luke and his Paul would prefer that all Jews recognized Jesus as Messiah and Lord, he is quite happy to concede that, until then, they do at least recognize the church as one school within the Jewish community. By placing this acknowledgment matter-of-factly on the lips of the Jewish leadership, he cleverly avoids the impression that it is he who is bidding to bring the church under the sociopolitical shelter of Judaism. He can have his cake and eat it too.

Thus, Luke is happy to stress the “school” association since it helps him identify Christianity as a valid philosophy with a firm foundation rooted in Jewish antiquity. Although possibly based on Josephus’ distinction between the philosophical schools of the Pharisees, Sadducees and the Essenes, Luke chooses to totally ignore the Essenes and replace its former Josephan prominence with his own, viz.: Christianity. Indeed, this makes sense since if Luke had mentioned the morally-upright Essenes in the same context as his virtuous Christians; he would have seriously detracted from his principal objective.

Mason (2003: 290 – 291) concludes by stating that his theory:

explains why Luke, if he is drawing details of Jewish life from Josephus, makes no mention of the Essenes, whom Josephus admires so greatly. The obvious explanation for this omission is that in Luke's portrayal the Christians take the place of the Essenes. Recall that Josephus had

¹⁶³ Greek text according to *NTOG*. 1882. Eds Brooke and Fenton: 314. NIV translation according to Holy Bible. 1989. NIV: *NT* 141.

depicted that group as the most philosophical of all Jews, sharing everything in common, living peaceful and disciplined lives, and accordingly having powers of healing and prophecy. In Acts, it is the school of the Nazarenes, or Christians, that fulfills this role. They share their goods, live in peace, practice healing, exorcism, and prophecy, and shame all other Jews with their love of the truth. To include the Essenes in his narrative would have caused needless problems for the author of Acts, for that group would have been in direct competition with the Christians! (Sic.)

3.9 Chapter Three Summary

With specific reference to Mason (2003: 291 – 293) as well as the foregoing information discussed in this chapter, the Mason thesis may be summarised as following:

Of all the *NT* books, only *Ev.Luc* and *Act.Ap.* exhibit comparable correspondences with certain of Josephus' accounts. Specifically both authors (i.e. Josephus and Luke) are recognisable due to the following common attributes of their writing:

1. Josephus and Luke both employ the same genre or literary type to convey their message (Hellenistic history writing);
2. Both Josephus and Luke represent a minority group within a broader Græco-Roman ethos;
3. Both writers present their minority group as having a valuable role to play within the greater system;
4. Both writers downplay any dissension (real or perceived) within their respective groupings and stress more ideal group characteristics, such as union, discipline and accord;
5. Both authors hold up the religious values and ancient traditions of their respective sub-group as eminently worthy of consideration and respect;
6. Although they primarily write for a broader Græco-Roman audience they also cater for the specific needs of their own sub-group; and
7. Both authors go to great lengths to ensure that they set down their respective accounts in strict sequential order, episode by episode.

However, considering that these two authors existed at more or less the same time and possibly shared similar influences these correspondences in themselves are not good proof that one author influenced the other.

In this regard the following commonly reported events are possibly more difficult to explain away unless one accepts a degree of plagiarism or collusion. These include narratives involving, inter alia:

1. Agrippa I's death;
2. Felix and Drusilla;
3. Agrippa II and Bernice

Next, there exists a group of commonly reported events that also contain elements of incongruity (certainly from an accurate historical perspective):

1. The Census under Quirinius;
2. Judas the Galilean;
3. Theudas;
4. The Egyptian False Prophet; and
5. The *Sicarii*.

As the historical discrepancies could only have occurred as a result of Luke conflating specific information presented in Josephus' writings this is seen as important *prima facie* evidence of influence.

This body of evidence, both circumstantial and as well as comparable, is strengthened by Mason's observation that Luke presents Christianity as a "philosophical school" within Judaism, alongside the other schools which are only known to us via Josephus. Here the only credible competition to Christianity (i.e. Essenism) may well have been intentionally circumvented by Luke.

Mason (2003: 292) sums up the situation well when he makes the following trenchant statement:

I cannot prove beyond doubt that Luke knew the writings of Josephus. If he did not, however, we have a nearly incredible series of coincidences, which require that Luke knew something that closely approximated Josephus' narrative in several distinct ways. This source (or these sources) spoke of: Agrippa's death after his robes shone; the extramarital affairs of both Felix and Agrippa II; the harshness of the Sadducees toward Christianity; the census under Quirinius as a water-shed event in Palestine; Judas the Galilean as an arch rebel at the time of the census; Judas, Theudas, and the unnamed "Egyptian" as three rebels in the

Jerusalem area worthy of special mention among a host of others; Theudas and Judas in the same piece of narrative; the Egyptian, the desert, and the sicarii in close proximity; Judaism as a philosophical system; the Pharisees and Sadducees as philosophical schools; and the Pharisees as the most precise of the schools. We know of no other work that even remotely approximated Josephus' presentation on such a wide range of issues. I find it easier to believe that Luke knew something.

CHAPTER FOUR

Arguments in Favour of the Mason Thesis

4.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to ascertain where certain aspects of Mason's thesis may be successfully corroborated, amplified or even invalidated. In this regard the most assertive support has come from Carrier whose well-known article entitled Luke and Josephus (2000) carefully summarises Mason's thesis on his Infidels.org website¹⁶⁴. Carrier also makes additional contributions to the debate based on his own research and his insights also assist in questioning aspects of Mason's thesis that are not completely watertight.

4.2 General Points of Agreement

Generally speaking, Carrier (2000) firmly supports Mason's thesis as originally published in 1992 as a verification that the Lucan material in the *NT* is slavishly dependant on the various writings of Josephus and further, intimates strongly that the entire content of all the Lucan material may be artificially composed. If true this means that the information concerning other non-Josephan material is also highly suspect and seriously undermines any claim that the Lucan material might offer its reader with, inter alia, a valid historical portrait of Jesus of Nazareth and/or his alleged ministry in Galilee and Judea c. 30 C.E.

As already confirmed by Mason (2003: 251 – 295) Carrier (2000) also believes that due to the fact that both Josephus and Luke may well have conceivably co-existed at an analogous time, any similarity of presentation and historical content in their respective writings cannot in itself be considered useful evidence in either support or refutation of any of the three Josephus-Luke conjectures currently in circulation.

Carrier (2000) supports Mason's acknowledgement of the widely accepted notion that (apart from Josephus) the Lucan material was predominantly influenced by both the hypothetical Q. as well as Ev.Marc.

¹⁶⁴ Carrier. 2000. "Luke and Josephus," in *Infidel.org* [Online]. Available: http://infidels.org/library/modern/richard_carrier/lukeandjosephus.html [28 January 2015].

Carrier (2000) agrees with what Mason believes to be most pertinent evidence, viz.: the similarity of the Lucan material to Josephus' writings apropos their avowed purpose or aim, comparable (if not almost identical) themes and choice of words, strongly suggesting a great degree of obvious reliance on Josephus' idiosyncratic defence of Judaism.

In addition, if one considers that the other *NT* gospel writers do not seem to be too concerned with historicity, the Lucan texts clearly stand out as being fairly unique because they seem to be overtly recycling a distinctly Josephan rhetorical strategy. As we have observed already, this observation allows Mason to explain why Luke's historical accounts are so different to the other gospel writers.

In this regard Carrier (2000) comments that the Mason thesis:

... undermines the historicity of certain details in the Christ story unique to Luke, such as his account of the Nativity, since these have been drawn from Josephus, who does not mention them in connection with Jesus, and thus it is more than possible that they never were linked with Jesus until Luke decided they were.

Thus Mason (and as supported by Carrier, 2000) manages to show that there is the very real possibility that Luke is more likely *inventing* history rather than faithfully recording it.

4.2.1 Dating Luke-Acts

In addition, if some of the Lucan material was indeed plagiarised from Josephus' writings then it must have been executed (certainly in the case of material that seems to hail from the *War*) sometime *after* 79 C.E. Obviously where material from the *Antiquities* is concerned, this date can be pushed easily into the second century C.E.

Carrier (2000) also verifies that given the slow rate of publication and dissemination in ancient times, hand-made copies of Josephus' works would have taken quite some time to reach the specific hands of those responsible for the initial creation of Ev.Luc and Act.Ap.

4.2.2 Possible Correspondences Between Josephus and Luke

Carrier (2000) with reference to Mason's thesis, conveniently lists the key generic parallels between the Lucan and Josephan material. Obviously, each stated correspondence cannot in itself be viewed in any way as conclusive evidence. However, Carrier (2000) believes that taken as a whole they seem to prove that where there is smoke there is most likely a fire. In this context, both the Josephan and the Lucan material display the following common features:

1. historical preambles;
2. self- pronounced and systematised historical accounts;
3. written in Koinê Greek;
4. presentation of a distinctly apologetic agenda in order to justify why wicked individuals are ultimately responsible for misfortune and righteous persons should be revered (Josephus applies this to the Jews whereas Luke applies this principle to the Christians);
5. slavish dependence on Jewish scripture and tradition;
6. a bipartite structure to the narrative wherein the author first emphasises some event of great importance and then follows this up with an historical review to justify or explain the significance of said notable event. In this regard, Carrier (2000: n. 3) explains that both authors have produced a book consisting of two parts, viz.:
 - The *War* commences with the Judean War as the most important event in history. The *Antiquities* then provides an explanation of this war's significance.
 - Act.Ap. commences with the incarnation of God as the most important event. This is followed up by an explanation of Christ's significance.
7. dedicated to a patron who is justified as the catalyst for the actual writing of the narrative¹⁶⁵;
8. employment of the same historical conventions for re-creating the supposed words of unrecorded speeches; and
9. accentuating the antiquity and merit of their respective religions with specific reference to Jerusalem as the Holy City.

¹⁶⁵ Carrier (2000: n. 4) also refers to the fact that both Ev.Luc. and *Antiquities* are dedicated to a patron with a theophoric name.

In addition to the generic parallels one should also consider the correspondences between certain of the Josephan and Lucan *fabulae*, Mason (2003:273) states:

More than any other gospel writer, Luke includes references to the non-Christian world of affairs. Almost every incident of this kind that he mentions turns up somewhere in Josephus' narratives. Yet Luke and Josephus differ significantly in their reporting of these common events.

For clarity, the most oft repeated examples (cf. Carrier, 2000) include the following, viz.:

1. The rhetorical role of the accounts given of the census of Quirinius¹⁶⁶ as recorded in *War* 2, 8, 1 / 117; *Antiquities* 18, 1, 1 / 1 – 8 and Ev.Luc. 3: 1;
2. The almost identical references to the three rebel Jewish leaders, viz.: Judas the Galilean specifically connected with the census (*War* 2, 8, 1 / 117 – 118; *Antiquities* 18, 1, 1 / 1 – 5 and Act.Ap. 5: 34 - 37); Theudas (*Antiquities* 20, 5, 1 / 97 – 99) and The Egyptian false prophet (*War* 2, 13, 5 / 261; *Antiquities* 20, 8, 6 / 167 – 172 and Act.Ap. 21: 37 – 38);
3. The death of Agrippa I as God's vengeance for accepting praise as a god (*Antiquities* 19, 8, 1 / 344 – 350 and Act.Ap.12: 21 – 23);
4. The association of Agrippa II with Bernice (*Antiquities* 20, 7, 3 / 145 – 147; Act.Ap. 25: 13; Act.Ap. 25: 23 and Act.Ap. 26:30);
5. The association of Felix with Drusilla (Act.Ap. 24: 24 – 26 and *Antiquities* 20, 7, 3 / 141 - 144);
6. Felix sending priests to Rome for trial on petty charges (*Life* 13) possibly serves as a model for Luke recording Paul being sent to Rome (Act.Ap.);
7. The references to Lysanias and/or tetrarch of Abilene (Ev.Luc. 3:1; *War* 2, 11, 5 / 215; 2, 12, 8 / 247 and *Antiquities* 19, 5, 1 / 275);
8. The parable of the hated king is reminiscent of Josephus' comments concerning Herod the Great (Ev.Luc. 19: 12 – 27 and *War* 1, 282 - 285);
9. Ev.Luc. 19: 43 – 44 and *War* 6 demonstrate similarities in the description of the siege of Jerusalem as well as references to slaughtered children (cf. *War* 6, 5, 1 / 271);
10. Mention of a famine in the reign of Claudius (Act.Ap. 11: 28 - 29; *Antiquities* 3, 15, 3 / 320; 20, 2, 5 / 51 – 53 and 20, 5, 2 / 101);
11. Luke's account of Pilate's attack on the Galileans (Ev.Luc. 13: 1) seems to recall

¹⁶⁶ *Publius Sulpicius Quirinius* (c. 45 B.C.E. – 21 C.E.)

Josephus' account of Pilate's attack on the Samaritans at Gerizim (*Antiquities* 18, 4, 1 / 85 – 87); and
12. References to the *sicarii* (*War* 2, 13, 3 / 254 – 255 and *Act.Ap.* 21: 38).

Of course, not all of these correspondences are strong arguments when taken individually. However, taken collectively they are most convincing evidence that the Josephan and Lucan material at least share (albeit unexplained) some common ground.

4.3 Comparable Parallels

For Carrier (2000), the most convincing evidence is to be found in the first three comparable correspondences. These are, the census of c. 6 C.E., the reference to the same three rebel Jewish leaders and the specific mention of terrorists called “*sicarii*”.

4.3.1 The Census

Carrier (2000) explains that the reference to the census of c. 6 C.E. is important for three primary reasons:

Firstly, Josephus uses the census as a defining moment in his narrative. The Jewish response to the unpopular census results in lawlessness that ultimately causes the loss of the Temple. This *fabula* is repeated in the Lucan material except that here, the census plays a pivotal role in the birth of Christ as the divine saviour of the World and his rejection leads to eventual loss of the Temple.

As an aside, Carrier (2000: n. 7) makes a most important observation on this issue. He finds it more than a coincidence that the antihero in Josephus' *fabula* is a man named Judas from Galilee, whilst the outlaw in *Ev.Luc.* is also a man by the same name and designation. However, Carrier believes that in this case it is more likely that the author of *Ev.Luc.* obtained his information via *Ev.Marc.* and not Josephus directly. Carrier also considers that after first gleaning the idea from *Ev.Marc.* the author of *Ev.Luc.* may well have then turned to Josephus for his material.

Secondly, of all his contemporaries, only Josephus seems to have found the census of *Quirinius* useful as a catalyst which gave rise to what many Josephus researchers now believe to be highly unlikely, viz.: a united and cohesive group of law breakers featuring none other than Judas the Galilean. Therefore, the fact that the Lucan material also makes use of the identical *fabula* and also refers to the self-same Judas must surely be evidence of some association between the two authorities.

Thirdly, the gospel account in Ev.Matt. fails to corroborate the Lucan description of, inter alia, the nativity event. If it transpires that the Lucan version is based on Josephan material then it follows that it is not based on a genuine Jesus tradition.

In addition, since Josephus' enormous scholarly output can be shown to be, by and large, consistently accurate – certainly for classical times - it is assumed that his accounts apropos Quirinius, Judas the Galilean and the *Sicarii* etc. are far more likely to be candid and resolute, whereas the Lucan material is prone to embellishment and historical errors.

4.3.2 The Rebel Jewish Leaders

It is a fact that the only ante-Nicean Christian writer to mention the Rebel Jewish Leaders (*a la* Josephus) is the author of Ev.Luc.

Further, the Lucan material mentions the same specific three individuals that Josephus writes about in his *Antiquities* and his *War*. This should be seen as astonishing since Josephus tells his reader that there were *many* such wicked men and for his own specific rhetorical needs he specifically chose to mention these three individuals. As evidence of this fact one needs only to read the contents of, inter alia, the following Josephan material:

- *War* 2, 13, 2 / 253;
- *War* 2, 13, 4 / 258 – 260;
- *War* 2, 13, 6 / 264 – 265;
- *War* 2, 13,7 / 266 – 270;
- *Antiquities* 20, 8, 5 / 160 -166; and
- *Antiquities* 20, 8, 6 / 167 – 172;

The argument here is that if Luke was a genuine historian he might well have given an account of rebel Jewish leaders but would have picked other specific individuals. For greater clarity these texts are reproduced below:

Josephus' References to Judas the Galilean

War 2, 8, 1 / 117 – 118¹⁶⁷

Τῆς δὲ Ἀρχελάου χώρας εἰς ἐπαρχίαν περιγραφείσης ἐπίτροπος τῆς ἱππικῆς παρὰ Ῥωμαίοις τάξεως Κωπώνιος πέμπεται μέχρι τοῦ κτείνειν λαβὼν παρὰ Καίσαρος ἐξουσίαν. ἐπὶ τούτου τις ἀνὴρ **Γαλιλαῖος Ἰούδας ὄνομα** εἰς ἀπόστασιν ἐνήγηε τοὺς ἐπιχωρίους κακίζων, εἰ φόρον τε Ῥωμαίοις τελεῖν ὑπομενοῦσιν καὶ μετὰ τὸν θεὸν οἴσουσι θνητοὺς δεσπότας. ἦν δ' οὗτος σοφιστῆς ἰδίας αἰρέσεως οὐδὲν τοῖς ἄλλοις προσεικώς.

AND now Archelaus' part of Judea was reduced into a province, and Coronius, one of the equestrian order among the Romans, was sent as a procurator, having the power of [life and] death put into his hands by Caesar. Under his administration it was that a certain **Galilean, whose name was Judas**, prevailed with his countrymen to revolt, and said they were cowards if they would endure to pay a tax to the Romans and would after God submit to mortal men as their lords. This man was a teacher of a peculiar sect of his own, and was not at all like the rest of those their leaders.

Antiquities 18, 1, 1 / 1 – 5¹⁶⁸

Κυρίνιος δὲ τῶν εἰς τὴν βουλήν συναγομένων ἀνὴρ τὰς τε ἄλλας ἀρχὰς ἐπιτετελεκώς καὶ διὰ πασῶν ὀδεύσας ὕπατος γενέσθαι τὰ τε ἄλλα ἀξιώματι μέγας σὺν ὀλίγοις ἐπὶ Συρίας παρῆν, ὑπὸ Καίσαρος δικαιοδότης τοῦ ἔθνους ἀπεσταλμένος καὶ τιμητῆς τῶν οὐσιῶν γενησόμενος, Κωπώνιος τε αὐτῷ συγκαταπέμπεται τάγματος τῶν ἱπέων, ἡγησόμενος Ἰουδαίων τῇ ἐπὶ πᾶσιν ἐξουσίᾳ. παρῆν δὲ καὶ Κυρίνιος εἰς τὴν Ἰουδαίαν προσθήκη τῆς Συρίας γενομένην ἀποτιμησόμενός τε αὐτῶν τὰς οὐσίας καὶ ἀποδωσόμενος τὰ Ἀρχελάου χρήματα. οἱ δὲ καίπερ τὸ κατ' ἀρχὰς ἐν δεινῷ φέροντες τὴν ἐπὶ ταῖς ἀπογραφαῖς ἀκρόασιν ὑποκατέβησαν τοῦ μὴ εἰς πλέον ἐναντιοῦσθαι πείσαντος αὐτοὺς τοῦ ἀρχιερέως Ἰωαζάρου, Βοηθοῦ δὲ οὗτος υἱὸς ἦν. καὶ οἱ μὲν ἠττηθέντες τοῦ Ἰωαζάρου τῶν λόγων ἀπετίμων τὰ χρήματα μηδὲν ἐνδοιάσαντες: **Ἰούδας δὲ Γαυλανίτης ἀνὴρ ἐκ πόλεως ὄνομα Γάμαλα** Σάδδωκον Φαρισαῖον προσλαβόμενος ἠπέιγετο ἐπὶ ἀποστάσει, τὴν τε ἀποτίμησιν οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἢ ἀντικρυς δουλείαν ἐπιφέρειν λέγοντες καὶ τῆς ἐλευθερίας ἐπ' ἀντιλήψει παρακαλοῦντες τὸ ἔθνος: ὡς παρασχὸν μὲν κατορθοῦν εἰς

¹⁶⁷ Original Greek and English translation according to Whiston, (Tr. and Ed.). 1895.

Flavius Josephus. The Works of Flavius Josephus, in *Perseus Digital Library*, [Online]. Available:

<http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0148%3Abook%3D2%3Awhiston+chapter%3D8%3Awhiston+section%3D1> [19 November 2014].

¹⁶⁸ Original Greek and English translation according to Whiston, (Tr. and Ed.). 1895.

Flavius Josephus. The Works of Flavius Josephus, in *Perseus Digital Library*, [Online]. Available:

<http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0146%3Abook%3D18%3Awhiston+chapter%3D1%3Awhiston+section%3D1> [19 November 2014].

τὸ εὐδαιμον ἀνακειμένης τῆς κτήσεως, σφαλεῖσιν δὲ τοῦ ταύτης περιόντος ἀγαθοῦ τιμὴν καὶ κλέος ποιήσεσθαι τοῦ μεγαλόφρονος,

Now Cyrenius, a Roman senator, and one who had gone through other magistracies, and had passed through them till he had been consul, and one who, on other accounts, was of great dignity, came at this time into Syria, with a few others, being sent by Caesar to be a judge of that nation, and to take an account of their substance. Coponius also, a man of the equestrian order, was sent together with him, to have the supreme power over the Jews. Moreover, Cyrenius came himself into Judea, which was now added to the province of Syria, to take an account of their substance, and to dispose of Archelaus' money; but the Jews, although at the beginning they took the report of a taxation heinously, yet did they leave off any further opposition to it, by the persuasion of Joazar, who was the son of Beethus, and high priest; so they, being over-persuaded by Joazar's words, gave an account of their estates, without any dispute about it. Yet was there one **Judas, a Gaulonite, of a city whose name was Gamala**, who, taking with him Sadduc, a Pharisee, became zealous to draw them to a revolt, who both said that this taxation was no better than an introduction to slavery, and exhorted the nation to assert their liberty; as if they could procure them happiness and security for what they possessed, and an assured enjoyment of a still greater good, which was that of the honour and glory they would thereby acquire for magnanimity. [Spelling corrections (underlined) NPLA]

Josephus' References to Eleazar and/or Nameless Outlaws (Robbers)

War 2, 13, 2 / 253¹⁶⁹

οὗτος τὸν τε ἀρχιληστήν **Ἐλεάζαρον** ἔτεσιν εἴκοσι τὴν χώραν λησάμενον καὶ πολλοὺς τῶν σὺν αὐτῷ ζωγήσας ἀπέπεμψεν εἰς Ῥώμην: τῶν δ' ἀνασταυρωθέντων ὑπ' αὐτοῦ **ληστῶν** καὶ τῶν ἐπὶ κοινωσίᾳ φωραθέντων δημοτῶν οὐς ἐκόλασεν, ἄπειρόν τι πλῆθος ἦν.

[This Felix] took **Eleazar** the arch-robber, and many that were with him, alive, when they had ravaged the country for twenty years together, and sent them to Rome; but as to the number of the **robbers** whom he caused to be crucified, and of those who were caught among them, and whom he brought to punishment, they were a multitude not to be enumerated. [Inserted text implied by context of the previous paragraph; my emboldened text for emphasis. NPLA].

¹⁶⁹ Original Greek and English translation according to Whiston, (Tr. and Ed.). 1895. Flavius Josephus. The Works of Flavius Josephus, in *Perseus Digital Library*, [Online]. Available: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0148%3Abook%3D2%3Awhiston+chapter%3D13%3Awhiston+section%3D2> [19 November 2014].

Συνέστη δὲ πρὸς τούτοις στίφος ἕτερον πονηρῶν χειρὶ μὲν καθαρώτερον, ταῖς γνώμαις δὲ ἀσεβέστερον, ὅπερ οὐδὲν ἦττον τῶν σφαγέων τὴν εὐδαιμονίαν τῆς πόλεως ἔλυμήνατο. πλάνοι γὰρ ἄνθρωποι καὶ ἀπατεῶνες προσήματι θειασμοῦ νεωτερισμοὺς καὶ μεταβολὰς πραγματευόμενοι δαμονῶν τὸ πλῆθος ἔπειθον καὶ προῆγον εἰς τὴν ἐρημίαν ὡς ἐκεῖ τοῦ θεοῦ δεῖξοντος αὐτοῖς σημεῖα ἐλευθερίας. ἐπὶ τούτοις Φῆλιξ, ἐδόκει γὰρ ἀποστάσεως εἶναι καταβολή, πέμψας ἵππεῖς καὶ πεζοὺς ὀπλίτας πολὺ πλῆθος διέφθειρεν.

There was also another body of wicked men gotten together, not so impure in their actions, but more wicked in their intentions, which laid waste the happy state of the city no less than did these murderers. These were such men as deceived and deluded the people under pretence of Divine inspiration, but were for procuring innovations and changes of the government; and these prevailed with the multitude to act like madmen, and went before them into the wilderness, as pretending that God would there show them the signals of liberty. But Felix thought this procedure was to be the beginning of a revolt; so he sent some horsemen and footmen both armed, who destroyed a great number of them. [My spelling correction underlined NPLA].

Κατεσταλμένων δὲ καὶ τούτων ὥσπερ ἐν νοσοῦντι σώματι πάλιν ἕτερον μέρος ἐφλέγμαινεν. οἱ γὰρ **γόητες καὶ ληστρικοὶ** συναχθέντες πολλοὺς εἰς ἀπόστασιν ἐνήγον καὶ πρὸς ἐλευθερίαν παρεκρότουσαν θάνατον ἐπιτιμῶντες τοῖς πειθαρχοῦσιν τῇ Ῥωμαίων ἡγεμονίᾳ καὶ πρὸς βίαν ἀφαιρήσεσθαι λέγοντες τοὺς ἐκουσίως δουλεύειν προαιρουμένους. μεριζόμενοι δὲ εἰς τὴν χώραν κατὰ λόχους διήρπαζόν τε τὰς τῶν δυνατῶν οἰκίας καὶ αὐτοὺς ἀνήρουν καὶ τὰς κόμας ἐνεπίμπρασαν, ὥστε τῆς ἀπονοίας αὐτῶν πᾶσαν τὴν Ἰουδαίαν ἀνατίμπλασθαι. καὶ οὗτος μὲν ὁ πόλεμος καθ' ἡμέραν ἀνερριπίζετο. [My emphases for clarity NPLA].

Now when these were quieted, it happened, as it does in a diseased body, that another part was subject to an inflammation; for a company of **deceivers and robbers** got together, and persuaded the Jews to revolt, and exhorted them to assert their liberty, inflicting death on those that continued in obedience to the Roman government, and saying, that such as willingly chose slavery ought to be forced from such their desired

¹⁷⁰ Original Greek and English translation according to Whiston, (Tr. and Ed.). 1895. Flavius Josephus. The Works of Flavius Josephus, in *Perseus Digital Library*, [Online]. Available: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0146%3Abook%3D20%3Awhiston+chapter%3D8%3Awhiston+section%3D6> [19 November 2014].

¹⁷¹ Original Greek and English translation according to Whiston, (Tr. and Ed.). 1895. Flavius Josephus. The Works of Flavius Josephus, in *Perseus Digital Library*, [Online]. Available: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0148%3Abook%3D2%3Awhiston+chapter%3D13%3Awhiston+section%3D6> [29 January 2015].

inclinations; for they parted themselves into different bodies, and lay in wait up and down the country, and plundered the houses of the great men, and slew the men themselves, and set the villages on fire; and this till all Judea was filled with the effects of their madness. And thus the flame was every day more and more blown up, till it came to a direct war. [My emphases for clarity NPLA].

Antiquities 20, 8, 6 / 167 – 172¹⁷²

Τὰ μὲν οὖν **τῶν ληστῶν** ἔργα τοιαύτης ἀνοσιότητος ἐπλήρου τὴν πόλιν, οἱ δὲ γόητες καὶ ἀπατεῶνες ἄνθρωποι τὸν ὄχλον ἔπειθον αὐτοῖς εἰς τὴν ἐρημίαν ἔπεσθαι: δείξειν γὰρ ἔφασαν ἑναργῆ τέρατα καὶ σημεῖα κατὰ τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ πρόνοιαν γινόμενα. καὶ πολλοὶ πεισθέντες τῆς ἀφροσύνης τιμωρίας ὑπέσχον: ἀναχθέντας γὰρ αὐτοὺς Φῆλιξ ἐκόλασεν. ἀφικνεῖται δὲ τις ἐξ Αἰγύπτου κατὰ τοῦτον τὸν καιρὸν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα **προφήτης εἶναι λέγων** καὶ συμβουλευὼν τῷ δημοτικῷ πλήθει σὺν αὐτῷ πρὸς ὄρος τὸ προσαγορευόμενον ἔλαιων, ὃ τῆς πόλεως ἄντικρυς κείμενον ἀπέχει στάδια πέντε: θέλειν γὰρ ἔφασκεν αὐτοῖς ἐκεῖθεν ἐπιδεῖξαι, ὡς κελεύσαντος αὐτοῦ πίπτοι τὰ τῶν Ἱεροσολυμιτῶν τείχη, δι' ὧν καὶ τὴν εἴσοδον αὐτοῖς παρέξειν ἐπηγγέλλετο. Φῆλιξ δ' ὡς ἐπόθετο ταῦτα, κελεύει τοὺς στρατιώτας ἀναλαβεῖν τὰ **ὄπλα** καὶ μετὰ πολλῶν ἰπέων τε καὶ πεζῶν ὀρμήσας ἀπὸ τῶν Ἱεροσολύμων προσβάλλει τοῖς περὶ τὸν **Αἰγύπτιον**, καὶ τετρακοσίους μὲν αὐτῶν ἀνεῖλεν, διακοσίους δὲ ζῶντας ἔλαβεν. ὃ δ' **Αἰγύπτιος** αὐτὸς διαδράς ἐκ τῆς μάχης ἀφανῆς ἐγένετο. πάλιν δ' **οἱ λησταὶ** τὸν δῆμον εἰς τὸν πρὸς Ῥωμαίους πόλεμον ἠρέθιζον μηδὲν ὑπακούειν αὐτοῖς λέγοντες, καὶ τὰς τῶν ἀπειθούντων κώμας ἐμπιπράντες διήρπαζον. [My emphases for clarity NPLA].

These works, that were done by **the robbers**, filled the city with all sorts of impiety. And now these impostors and deceivers persuaded the multitude to follow them into the wilderness, and pretended that they would exhibit manifest wonders and signs, that should be performed by the providence of God. And many that were prevailed on by them suffered the punishments of their folly; for Felix brought them back, and then punished them. Moreover, there came out of Egypt about this time to Jerusalem **one that said he was a prophet**, and advised the multitude of the common people to go along with him to the Mount of Olives, as it was called, which lay over against the city, and at the distance of five furlongs. He said further, that he would show them from hence how, at his command, the walls of Jerusalem would fall down; and he promised them that he would procure them an entrance into the city through those walls, when they were fallen down. Now when Felix was informed of these things, he ordered his soldiers to take their **weapons**, and came against them with a great number of horsemen and footmen from Jerusalem, and attacked the

¹⁷² Original Greek and English translation according to Whiston, (Tr. and Ed.). 1895. Flavius Josephus. The Works of Flavius Josephus, in *Perseus Digital Library*, [Online]. Available: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0146%3Abook%3D20%3Awhiston+chapter%3D5%3Awhiston+section%3D1> [19 November 2014].

Egyptian and the people that were with him. He also slew four hundred of them, and took two hundred alive. But the **Egyptian** himself escaped out of the fight, but did not appear any more. And again **the robbers** stirred up the people to make war with the Romans, and said they ought not to obey them at all; and when any persons would not comply with them, they set fire to their villages, and plundered them. [My emphases for clarity NPLA].

Josephus' References to Theudas

Antiquities 20, 5, 1 / 97 – 99¹⁷³

Φάδου δὲ τῆς Ἰουδαίας ἐπιτροπεύοντος γόης τις ἀνὴρ **Θευδᾶς** ὀνόματι πείθει τὸν πλεῖστον ὄχλον ἀναλαβόντα τὰς κτήσεις ἔπεσθαι πρὸς τὸν Ἰορδάνην ποταμὸν αὐτῷ: προφήτης γὰρ ἔλεγεν εἶναι, καὶ προστάγματι τὸν ποταμὸν σχίσας δίοδον ἔχειν ἔφη παρέξειν αὐτοῖς ῥαδίαν. καὶ ταῦτα λέγων πολλοὺς ἠπάτησεν. οὐ μὴν εἶασεν αὐτοὺς τῆς ἀφροσύνης ὄνασθαι Φᾶδος, ἀλλ' ἐξέπεμψεν ἴλην ἰπέων ἐπ' αὐτούς, ἧτις ἀπροσδόκητος ἐπιπεσοῦσα πολλοὺς μὲν ἀνεῖλεν, πολλοὺς δὲ ζῶντας ἔλαβεν, αὐτὸν δὲ τὸν Θευδᾶν ζωγρήσαντες ἀποτέμνουσι τὴν κεφαλὴν καὶ κομίζουσιν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα. τὰ μὲν οὖν συμβάντα τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις κατὰ τοὺς Κουσπίου Φάδου τῆς ἐπιτροπῆς χρόνους ταῦτ' ἐγένετο.

Now it came to pass, while Fadus was procurator of Judea, that a certain magician, whose name was **Theudas**, persuaded a great part of the people to take their effects with them, and follow him to the river Jordan; for he told them he was a prophet, and that he would, by his own command, divide the river, and afford them an easy passage over it; and many were deluded by his words. However, Fadus did not permit them to make any advantage of his wild attempt, but sent a troop of horsemen out against them; who, falling upon them unexpectedly, slew many of them, and took many of them alive. They also took Theudas alive, and cut off his head, and carried it to Jerusalem. This was what befell the Jews in the time of Cuspius Fadus' government.

Josephus' References to the Egyptian

War 2, 13, 5 / 261 - 263¹⁷⁴

Μεῖζονι δὲ τούτου πληγῇ Ἰουδαίους ἐκάκωσεν ὁ **Αἰγύπτιος** ψευδοπροφήτης: παραγενόμενος γὰρ εἰς τὴν χώραν ἄνθρωπος γόης καὶ προφήτου πίστιν ἐπιθείς ἑαυτῷ περὶ τρισμυρίου μὲν ἀθροίζει τῶν

¹⁷³ Original Greek and English translation according to Whiston, (Tr. and Ed.). 1895. Flavius Josephus. The Works of Flavius Josephus, in *Perseus Digital Library*, [Online]. Available: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0146%3Abook%3D20%3Awhiston+chapter%3D5%3Awhiston+section%3D1> [19 November 2014].

¹⁷⁴ Original Greek and English translation according to Whiston, (Tr. and Ed.). 1895. Flavius Josephus. The Works of Flavius Josephus, in *Perseus Digital Library*, [Online]. Available: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0148%3Abook%3D2%3Awhiston+chapter%3D13%3Awhiston+section%3D5> [29 January 2015].

ἡπατημένων, περιαγαγὼν δὲ αὐτοὺς ἐκ τῆς ἐρημίας εἰς τὸ ἐλαιῶν καλούμενον ὄρος ἐκεῖθεν οἷός τε ἦν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα παρελθεῖν βιάζεσθαι καὶ κρατήσας τῆς τε Ῥωμαϊκῆς φρουρᾶς καὶ τοῦ δήμου τυραννεῖν χρώμενος τοῖς συνεισπεσοῦσιν δορυφόροις. φθάνει δ' αὐτοῦ τὴν ὄρμην Φῆλιξ ὑπαντήσας μετὰ τῶν Ῥωμαϊκῶν ὀπλιτῶν, καὶ πᾶς ὁ δῆμος συνεφήσατο τῆς ἀμόνης, ὥστε συμβολῆς γενομένης τὸν μὲν **Αἰγύπτιον** φυγεῖν μετ' ὀλίγων, διαφθαρῆναι δὲ καὶ ζωγρηθῆναι πλείστους τῶν σὺν αὐτῷ, τὸ δὲ λοιπὸν πλῆθος σκεδασθὲν ἐπὶ τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἕκαστον διαλαθεῖν. [My emphases for clarity NPLA].

But there was an **Egyptian** false prophet that did the Jews more mischief than the former; for he was a cheat, and pretended to be a prophet also, and got together thirty thousand men that were deluded by him; these he led round about from the wilderness to the mount which was called the Mount of Olives, and was ready to break into Jerusalem by force from that place; and if he could but once conquer the Roman garrison and the people, he intended to domineer over them by the assistance of those guards of his that were to break into the city with him. But Felix prevented his attempt, and met him with his Roman soldiers, while all the people assisted him in his attack upon them, insomuch that when it came to a battle, the **Egyptian** ran away, with a few others, while the greatest part of those that were with him were either destroyed or taken alive; but the rest of the multitude were dispersed every one to their own homes, and there concealed themselves. [My emphases for clarity NPLA].

Josephus' References to the *Sicarii*

War 2, 13, 3 / 254 – 255¹⁷⁵

Καθαρθείσης δὲ τῆς χώρας ἕτερον εἶδος ληστῶν ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ἐπεφύετο, οἱ καλούμενοι **σικάριοι**, μεθ' ἡμέραν καὶ ἐν μέσῃ τῇ πόλει φονεύοντες ἀνθρώπους, μάλιστα [δὲ] ἐν ταῖς ἑορταῖς μισγόμενοι τῷ πλήθει καὶ ταῖς ἐσθῆσιν ὑποκρύπτοντες **μικρὰ ξιφίδια**, τούτοις ἔνυττον τοὺς διαφόρους, ἔπειτα πεσόντων μέρος ἐγίνοντο τῶν ἐπαγανακτούντων οἱ πεφονευκότες, διὸ καὶ παντάπασιν ὑπὸ ἀξιοπιστίας ἦσαν ἀνεύρετοι. [My emphases for clarity NPLA].

When the country was purged of these, there sprang up another sort of robbers in Jerusalem, which were called **Sicarii**, who slew men in the day time, and in the midst of the city; this they did chiefly at the festivals, when they mingled themselves among the multitude, and concealed **daggers** [literally small knives] under their garments, with which they stabbed those that were their enemies; and when any fell down dead, the murderers became a part of those that had indignation against them; by which means

¹⁷⁵ Original Greek and English translation according to Whiston, (Tr. and Ed.). 1895.

Flavius Josephus. The Works of Flavius Josephus, in *Perseus Digital Library*, [Online].

Available:

<http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0148%3Abook%3D2%3Awhiston+chapter%3D13%3Awhiston+section%3D3> [19 November 2014].

they appeared persons of such reputation, that they could by no means be discovered. [My insertion and emboldened text for emphasis. NPLA].

War 2, 17, 6 / 425b – 426a¹⁷⁶

τῷ δ' ἀσθενεῖ λαῷ συνεισρύντας πολλοὺς τῶν **σικαρίων**, οὕτως γὰρ ἐκάλουν τοὺς ληστὰς ἔχοντας ὑπὸ τοῖς κόλποις **ξίφη**, προσλαβόντες θαρραλεώτερον ἤπτοντο τῆς ἐπιχειρήσεως. ἠττώοντο δ' οἱ βασιλικοὶ πλήθει τε καὶ τόλμῃ, καὶ βιασαμένοις εἶκον ἐκ τῆς ἄνω πόλεως. [My emphases for clarity NPLA].

And when they had joined to themselves many of the **Sicarii**, who crowded in among the weaker people, (that was the name for such robbers as had under their bosoms swords called **Sicae**,) they grew bolder, and carried their undertaking further; insomuch that the king's soldiers were overpowered by their multitude and boldness; and so they gave way, and were driven out of the upper city by force. [My emphases for clarity NPLA].

War 4, 7, 2 / 400¹⁷⁷

τοῦτο κατειληφότες οἱ προσαγορευόμενοι **σικάριοι** τέως μὲν τὰς πλησίον χώρας κατέτρεχον οὐδὲν πλέον τῶν ἐπιτηδείων ποριζόμενοι: [My emphases for clarity NPLA].

Those that were called **Sicarii** had taken possession of it [Masada] formerly, but at this time they overran the neighboring countries, aiming only to procure to themselves necessaries; for the fear they were then in prevented their further ravages. [My insertion and emboldened text for emphasis. NPLA].

War 4, 9, 5 / 516¹⁷⁸

οἱ δὲ ἄρχοντες τῆς Ἰδουμαίας κατὰ τάχος ἀθροίσαντες ἐκ τῆς χώρας τὸ μαχιμώτατον περὶ πεντακισχιλίους καὶ δισμυρίους, τοὺς δὲ πολλοὺς

¹⁷⁶ Original Greek and English translation according to Whiston, (Tr. and Ed.). 1895. Flavius Josephus. The Works of Flavius Josephus, in *Perseus Digital Library*, [Online]. Available:

<http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0148%3Abook%3D2%3Awhiston+chapter%3D17%3Awhiston+section%3D6> [29 January 2015].

¹⁷⁷ Original Greek and English translation according to Whiston, (Tr. and Ed.). 1895. Flavius Josephus. The Works of Flavius Josephus, in *Perseus Digital Library*, [Online]. Available:

<http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0148%3Abook%3D4%3Awhiston+chapter%3D7%3Awhiston+section%3D2> [29 January 2015].

¹⁷⁸ Original Greek and English translation according to Whiston, (Tr. and Ed.). 1895. Flavius Josephus. The Works of Flavius Josephus, in *Perseus Digital Library*, [Online]. Available:

<http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0148%3Abook%3D4%3Awhiston+chapter%3D9%3Awhiston+section%3D5> [29 January 2015].

ἔασαντες φρουρεῖν τὰ σφέτερα διὰ τὰς τῶν ἐν Μασάδα **σικαρίων** καταδρομάς, [My emphases for clarity NPLA].

Hereupon the rulers of the Idumeans got together on the sudden the most warlike part of their people, about twenty-five thousand in number, and permitted the rest to be a guard to their own country, by reason of the incursions that were made by the **Sicarii** that were at Masada. [My emphases for clarity NPLA].

War 7, 10, 1 / 408 - 418

οὐδὲ γὰρ ὑπελείπετό τις τῶν κατὰ τὴν χώραν πολεμίων, ἀλλ' ἤδη πᾶσα διὰ μακροῦ τοῦ πολέμου κατέστραπτο πολλοῖς καὶ τῶν ἀπωτάτω κατοικοῦντων αἴσθησιν καὶ κίνδυνον ταραχῆς παρασχόντος. ἔτι δὲ καὶ περὶ Ἀλεξάνδρειαν τὴν ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ μετὰ ταῦτα συνέβη πολλοὺς Ἰουδαίων ἀποθανεῖν: τοῖς γὰρ ἐκ τῆς στάσεως τῶν **σικαρίων** ἐκεῖ διαφυγεῖν δυναθεῖσιν οὐκ ἀπέχρη τὸ σώζεσθαι, πάλιν δὲ καινότεροις ἐνεχείρουν πράγμασι καὶ πολλοὺς τῶν ὑποδεξαμένων ἔπειθον τῆς ἐλευθερίας ἀντιποιεῖσθαι, καὶ Ῥωμαίους μὲν μηδὲν κρείττους αὐτῶν ὑπολαμβάνειν, θεὸν δὲ μόνον ἠγεῖσθαι δεσπότην. ἐπεὶ δὲ αὐτοῖς τῶν οὐκ ἀφανῶν τινες Ἰουδαίων ἀντέβαινον, τοὺς μὲν ἀπέσφαζαν, τοῖς δ' ἄλλοις ἐνέκειντο πρὸς τὴν ἀπόστασιν παρακαλοῦντες. ὁρῶντες δ' αὐτῶν τὴν ἀπόνοιαν οἱ πρωτεύοντες τῆς γερουσίας οὐκέτ' ἀσφαλὲς αὐτοῖς ἐνόμιζον περιορᾶν, ἀλλὰ πάντας ἀθροίσαντες εἰς ἐκκλησίαν τοὺς Ἰουδαίους ἠλεγχον τὴν ἀπόνοιαν τῶν **σικαρίων** πάντων αἰτίους ἀποφαίνοντες ἐκείνους τῶν κακῶν: καὶ νῦν ἔφασαν αὐτούς, ἐπεὶ οὐδὲ πεφευγότες τῆς σωτηρίας ἐλπίδα βεβαίαν ἔχουσιν, γνωσθέντας γὰρ ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίων εὐθὺς ἀπολεῖσθαι, τῆς αὐτοῖς προσηκούσης συμφορᾶς ἀναπιμπλάναι τοὺς μηδενὸς τῶν ἀμαρτημάτων μετασχόντας. φυλάξασθαι τοῖνυν τὸν ἐξ αὐτῶν ὄλεθρον τὸ πλῆθος παρεκάλουν καὶ περὶ αὐτῶν πρὸς Ῥωμαίους ἀπολογήσασθαι τῇ τούτων παραδόσει. συνιδόντες τοῦ κινδύνου τὸ μέγεθος ἐπέισθησαν τοῖς λεγομένοις, καὶ μετὰ πολλῆς ὀρμῆς ἐπὶ τοὺς **σικαρίους** ἄξαντες συνήρπαζον αὐτούς. τῶν δ' ἑξακόσιοι μὲν εὐθὺς ἐάλωσαν, ὅσοι δ' εἰς τὴν Αἴγυπτον καὶ τὰς ἐκεῖ Θήβας διέφυγον, οὐκ εἰς μακρὰν συλληφθέντες ἐπανήχθησαν. ἐφ' ὧν οὐκ ἔστιν ὅς οὐ τὴν καρτερίαν καὶ τὴν εἴτε ἀπόνοιαν εἴτε τῆς γνώμης ἰσχὺν χρῆ λῆγειν οὐ κατεπλάγη: πάσης γὰρ ἐπ' αὐτούς βασάνου καὶ λύμης τῶν σωμάτων ἐπινοηθείσης ἐφ' ἑν τούτῳ μόνον, ὅπως αὐτῶν Καίσαρα δεσπότην ὁμολογήσωσιν, οὐδεὶς ἐνέδωκεν οὐδὲ ἐμέλλησεν εἰπεῖν, ἀλλὰ πάντες ὑπερτέραν τῆς ἀνάγκης τὴν αὐτῶν γνώμην διεφύλαξαν, ὥσπερ ἀναισθήτοις σώμασι χαιρούση μόνον οὐχὶ τῇ ψυχῇ τὰς βασάνους καὶ τὸ πῦρ δεχόμενοι. [My emphases for clarity NPLA].

for there were now no enemies left in the country, but it was all overthrown by so long a war. Yet did this war afford disturbances and dangerous disorders even in places very far remote from Judea; for still it came to pass that many Jews were slain at Alexandria in Egypt; for as many of the **Sicarii** as were able to fly thither, out of the seditious wars in Judea, were not content to have saved themselves, but must needs be undertaking to make new disturbances, and persuaded many of those that entertained

them to assert their liberty, to esteem the Romans to be no better than themselves, and to look upon God as their only Lord and Master. But when part of the Jews of reputation opposed them, they slew some of them, and with the others they were very pressing in their exhortations to revolt from the Romans; but when the principal men of the senate saw what madness they were come to, they thought it no longer safe for themselves to overlook them. So they got all the Jews together to an assembly, and accused the madness of the **Sicarii**, and demonstrated that they had been the authors of all the evils that had come upon them. They said also that "these men, now they were run away from Judea, having no sure hope of escaping, because as soon as ever they shall be known, they will be soon destroyed by the Romans, they come hither and fill us full of those calamities which belong to them, while we have not been partakers with them in any of their sins." Accordingly, they exhorted the multitude to have a care, lest they should be brought to destruction by their means, and to make their apology to the Romans for what had been done, by delivering these men up to them; who being thus apprised of the greatness of the danger they were in, complied with what was proposed, and ran with great violence upon the **Sicarii**, and seized upon them; and indeed six hundred of them were caught immediately: but as to all those that fled into Egypt and to the Egyptian Thebes, it was not long ere they were caught also, and brought back, whose courage, or whether we ought to call it madness, or hardiness in their opinions, everybody was amazed at. For when all sorts of torments and vexations of their bodies that could be devised were made use of to them, they could not get any one of them to comply so far as to confess, or seem to confess, that Caesar was their lord; but they preserved their own opinion, in spite of all the distress they were brought to, as if they received these torments and the fire itself with bodies insensible of pain, and with a soul that in a manner rejoiced under them. [My spelling corrections underlined and emphasis for clarity NPLA].

Mason (2008: 207) confirms that Josephus' employment of the term "*sicarii*" seems to indicate that it indicated a discreet collective.

Antiquities 20, 8, 5 / 160 – 165¹⁷⁹

Τὰ δὲ κατὰ τὴν Ἰουδαίαν πράγματα πρὸς τὸ χεῖρον ἀεὶ τὴν ἐπίδοσιν ἐλάμβανεν: ληστηρίων γὰρ ἡ χώρα πάλιν **ἀνεπλήσθη καὶ γοήτων ἀνθρώπων**, οἱ τὸν ὄχλον ἠπάτων. ἀλλὰ τούτους μὲν ὁ Φῆλιξ πολλοὺς καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν σὺν τοῖς **λησταῖς λαμβάνων ἀνήρει**, καὶ **Ἐλεάζαρον** δὲ τὸν Διναίου παῖδα τὸν συστησάμενον τῶν **ληστῶν** τὸ σύνταγμα δι' ἐνέδρας εἶλεν ζῶντα: πίστιν γὰρ αὐτῷ προτείνας ὑπὲρ τοῦ μηδὲν πείσεσθαι κακὸν πείθει πρὸς αὐτὸν ἀφικέσθαι καὶ δῆσας ἀνέπεμψεν εἰς Ῥώμην. ἔχων δὲ καὶ ἀπεχθῶς πρὸς τὸν ἀρχιερέα Ἰωνάθην ὁ Φῆλιξ διὰ τὸ πολλακίς ὑπ' αὐτοῦ νοουθετεῖσθαι περὶ τοῦ κρειττόνως προῖστασθαι

¹⁷⁹ Original Greek and English translation according to Whiston, (Tr. and Ed.). 1895. Flavius Josephus. The Works of Flavius Josephus, in *Perseus Digital Library*, [Online]. Available: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0146%3Abook%3D20%3Awhiston+chapter%3D8%3Awhiston+section%3D5> [29 January 2015].

τῶν κατὰ τὴν Ἰουδαίαν πραγμάτων, μὴ καὶ μέμψιν αὐτὸς ὀφλοῖη παρὰ τοῖς πλήθεσιν αἰτησάμενος ἐκεῖνον παρὰ τοῦ Καίσαρος πεμφθῆναι τῆς Ἰουδαίας ἐπίτροπον, πρόφασιν ἐπενόει δι' ἧς μεταστήσεται τὸν συνεχῶς ὀχληρὸν αὐτῷ γινόμενον: βαρὺ γὰρ τοῖς ἀδικεῖν θέλουσιν τὸ συνεχῶς νουθετοῦν. καὶ δὴ διὰ τῆς αἰτίας ὁ Φῆλιξ τὸν πιστότατον τῶν Ἰωνάθου φίλων Ἱεροσολυμίτην τὸ γένος Δωρᾶν ὀνόματι πείθει πολλὰ χρήματα δώσειν ὑπισχνούμενος ἐπαγαγεῖν τῷ Ἰωνάθῃ τοὺς **ληστὰς** ἀναιρήσοντας, κάκεῖνος ὑπακούσας ἐμηχανήσατο διὰ τῶν **ληστῶν**πραχθῆναι τοιοῦτω τρόπῳ τὸν φόνον: ἀνέβησάν τινες αὐτῶν εἰς τὴν πόλιν ὡς προσκυνήσοντες τὸν θεὸν ὑπὸ τὰς ἐσθῆτας ἔχοντες **ξιφίδια** καὶ συναναμιγνύμενοι τῷ Ἰωνάθῃ κτείνουσιν αὐτόν. ἀνεκδικήτου δὲ τούτου τοῦ φόνου μεμενηκότες μετὰ πάσης τὸ λοιπὸν ἀδείας ἀναβαίνοντες ἐν ταῖς ἐορταῖς οἱ **λησταὶ** καὶ τὸν **σίδηρον ὁμοίως κεκρυμμένον** ἔχοντες συναναμιγνύμενοι τοῖς πλήθεσιν ἀνήρουν μὲν τινὰς ἑαυτῶν ἐχθρούς, οὓς δ' ἐπὶ χρήμασιν ἄλλοις ὑπηρετοῦντες, οὐ μόνον κατὰ τὴν ἄλλην πόλιν ἀλλὰ καὶ κατὰ τὸ ἱερόν ἐνίους: καὶ γὰρ ἐκεῖ σφάττειν ἐτόλμων, οὐδ' ἐν τούτῳ δοκοῦντες ἀσεβεῖν. [My emphases for clarity NPLA].

Now as for the affairs of the Jews, they grew worse and worse continually, for the country was again filled with **robbers and impostors**, who deluded the multitude. Yet did Felix catch and put to death many of those **impostors** every day, together with the **robbers**. He also caught **Eleazar**, the son of Dineas, who had gotten together a company of **robbers**; and this he did by treachery; for he gave him assurance that he should suffer no harm, and thereby persuaded him to come to him; but when he came, he bound him, and sent him to Rome. Felix also bore an ill-will to Jonathan, the high priest, because he frequently gave him admonitions about governing the Jewish affairs better than he did, lest he should himself have complaints made of him by the multitude, since he it was who had desired Caesar to send him as procurator of Judea. So Felix contrived a method whereby he might get rid of him, now he was become so continually troublesome to him; for such continual admonitions are grievous to those who are disposed to act unjustly. Wherefore Felix persuaded one of Jonathan's most faithful friends, a citizen of Jerusalem, whose name was Doras, to bring the **robbers** upon Jonathan, in order to kill him; and this he did by promising to give him a great deal of money for so doing. Doras complied with the proposal, and contrived matters so, that the **robbers** might murder him after the following manner: Certain of those **robbers** went up to the city, as if they were going to worship God, while they had **daggers** under their garments, and by thus mingling themselves among the multitude they slew Jonathan and as this murder was never avenged, the **robbers** went up with the greatest security at the festivals after this time; and having **weapons** [literally iron-like objects] concealed in like manner as before, and mingling themselves among the multitude, they slew certain of their own enemies, and were subservient to other men for money; and slew others, not only in remote parts of the city, but in the temple itself also; for they had the boldness to murder men there, without thinking of the impiety of which they were guilty. [My emphases for clarity NPLA].

However, a short while later in *Antiquities* 20, 8, 10 / 185 – 188¹⁸⁰we read:

Ἀφικομένου δὲ εἰς τὴν Ἰουδαίαν Φῆστου συνέβαινε τὴν Ἰουδαίαν ὑπὸ τῶν **ληστῶν** κακοῦσθαι τῶν κωμῶν ἀπασῶν ἐμπιπραμένων τε καὶ διαρπαζομένων. καὶ οἱ **σικάριοι** δὲ καλούμενοι, **λησταὶ** δὲ εἰσιν οὗτοι, τότε μάλιστα ἐπλήθυσεν χρώμενοι **ξιφιδίοις** παραπλησίσι μὲν τὸ μέγεθος τοῖς τῶν Περσῶν ἀκινάκαις, ἐπικαμπέσι δὲ καὶ ὁμοίαις ταῖς ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίων **σίκαις** καλουμέναις, ἀφ' ὧν καὶ τὴν προσηγορίαν οἱ **ληστεύοντες** ἔλαβον πολλοὺς ἀναιροῦντες. ἀναμιγνύμενοι γὰρ ἐν ταῖς ἑορταῖς, καθὼς καὶ πρότερον εἶπομεν, τῷ πλήθει τῶν πανταχόθεν εἰς τὴν πόλιν ἐπὶ τὴν εὐσέβειαν συρρεόντων οὓς βουλευθεῖεν ῥαδίως ἀπέσφαττον, πολλάκις δὲ καὶ μεθ' **ὄπλων** ἐπὶ τὰς κώμας τῶν ἐχθρῶν ἀφικόμενοι διήρπαζον καὶ ἐνεπίμπρασαν. πέμπει δὲ Φῆστος δύναμιν ἰππικὴν τε καὶ πεζικὴν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀπατηθέντας ὑπὸ τινος ἀνθρώπου γόητος σωτηρίαν αὐτοῖς ἐπαγγελλομένου καὶ παῦλαν κακῶν, εἰ βουλευθεῖεν ἔπεσθαι μέχρι τῆς ἐρημίας αὐτῶ, καὶ αὐτὸν τε ἐκεῖνον τὸν ἀπατήσαντα καὶ τοὺς ἀκολουθήσαντας διέφθειραν οἱ πεμφθέντες. [My emphases for clarity NPLA].

Upon Festus' coming into Judea, it happened that Judea was afflicted by the **robbers**, while all the villages were set on fire, and plundered by them. And then it was that the **sicarii**, as they were called, who were **robbers**, grew numerous. They made use of **small swords**, not much different in length from the Persian acinacae, but somewhat crooked, and like the Roman **sicae**, [or sickles,] as they were called; and from these **weapons** these **robbers** got their denomination; and with these **weapons** they slew a great many; for they mingled themselves among the multitude at their festivals, when they were come up in crowds from all parts to the city to worship God, as we said before, and easily slew those that they had a mind to slay. They also came frequently upon the villages belonging to their enemies, with their **weapons**, and plundered them, and set them on fire. So Festus sent forces, both horsemen and footmen, to fall upon those that had been seduced by a certain impostor, who promised them deliverance and freedom from the miseries they were under, if they would but follow him as far as the wilderness. Accordingly, those forces that were sent destroyed both him that had deluded them, and those that were his followers also. [My emphases for clarity NPLA].

It will be noted in the above examples (and indeed elsewhere in his books) that Josephus prefers to refer to a robber by using the Greek noun “ὁ ληστής”. This specifically refers to a person who steals or plunders and not necessarily to a person who specialises in assassination or murder. However, in *Antiquities* 20, 8, 10 / 185 – 188 his preferred generic term for robbers is now employed to describe murderers who are described as doing exactly what his “sicarii” undertake in other sections of

¹⁸⁰ Original Greek and English translation according to Whiston, (Tr. and Ed.). 1895. Flavius Josephus. The Works of Flavius Josephus, in *Perseus Digital Library*, [Online]. Available: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0146%3Abook%3D20%3Awhiston+chapter%3D8%3Awhiston+section%3D10> [29 January 2015].

his work. It would seem that, on occasion, Josephus is not too concerned about employing a more precise designation. It is quite likely that he specifically employs the term “sicarii” for the benefit of his better informed Roman readership. The fact that he bothers to go to some length to explain the etymology of the term to persons who well understand the meaning of “sicarii” suggests that he also needed to educate his non-Roman reader.

Mason (2008: 207) also confirms other areas where he claims that Josephus’ “usage of the term shows a degree of slippage”. For example in *War* 4, 400; 516; 7, 253 – 311) where huge numbers of individuals collectively termed “*sicarii*” flee to Alexandria where they continue to cause unrest. Then after they have all been rounded up (to a man!) Josephus informs his reader that the “madness of the sicarii” reappears incredibly in Cyrene. However these particular “*sicarii*” are merely trouble-makers and do not engage in murderous activities.

Mason (2008: 207) thus concludes that, as is the case with “οἱ λησται” (which is employed for “robbers”) Josephus also is capable of employing the term “οἱ σικάριοι” in a more flexible way when he wants to amplify the vividness of a group of troublemakers’ activities. Here Mason compares its usage to say the modern term “terrorists” which can also refer to, inter alia, “gunmen” or “bombers” etc.

Luke’s Reference to Judas the Galilean

Act.Ap.5:34 - 37¹⁸¹

Ἀναστάς δέ τις ἐν τῷ συνεδρίῳ Φαρισαῖος ὀνόματι Γαμαλιήλ, νομοδιδάσκαλος τίμιος παντὶ τῷ λαῷ, ἐκέλευσεν ἔξω βραχὺ τι τοὺς ἀποστόλους ποιῆσαι, εἰπέ τε πρὸς αὐτούς· ἄνδρες Ἰσραηλῖται, προσέχετε ἑαυτοῖς ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τούτοις τί μέλλετε πράσσειν. πρὸ γὰρ τούτων τῶν ἡμερῶν ἀνέστη Θεοδᾶς, λέγων εἶναί τινα ἑαυτόν, ᾧ προσεκλίθη ἀριθμὸς ἀνδρῶν ὡσεὶ τετρακοσίων· ὃς ἀνηρέθη, καὶ πάντες ὅσοι ἐπέιθοντο αὐτῷ διελύθησαν καὶ ἐγένοντο εἰς οὐδέν. μετὰ τοῦτον ἀνέστη Ἰούδας ὁ Γαλιλαῖος ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τῆς ἀπογραφῆς καὶ ἀπέστησε λαὸν ἱκανὸν ὀπίσω αὐτοῦ· κάκεῖνος ἀπώλετο, καὶ πάντες ὅσοι ἐπέιθοντο αὐτῷ διεσκορπίσθησαν. [My emphases for clarity NPLA].

Then stood there up one in the council, a Pharisee, named Gamaliel, a doctor of the law, had in reputation among all the people, and commanded

¹⁸¹Original Greek and English translation according to The New Testament in *Elpenor* [Online]. Available: <http://www.ellopos.net/elpenor/greek-texts/new-testament/acts/5.asp> [19 November 2014].

to put the apostles forth a little space; And said unto them, Ye men of Israel, take heed to yourselves what ye intend to do as touching these men. For before these days rose up Theudas, boasting himself to be somebody; to whom a number of men, about four hundred, joined themselves: who was slain; and all, as many as obeyed him, were scattered, and brought to nought. After this man rose up **Judas of Galilee** in the days of the taxing, and drew away much people after him: he also perished; and all, even as many as obeyed him, were dispersed. [My emphases for clarity NPLA].

Luke's Reference to the Egyptian and the *Sicarii*

Act.Ap.21: 37 - 38¹⁸²

Μέλλον τε εἰσάγεσθαι εἰς τὴν παρεμβολὴν ὁ Παῦλος λέγει τῷ χιλιάρχῳ· εἰ ἔξεστί μοι εἰπεῖν τι πρὸς σε; ὁ δὲ ἔφη· Ἑλληνιστὶ γινώσκεις; οὐκ ἄρα σὺ εἶ ὁ **Αἰγύπτιος** ὁ πρὸ τούτων τῶν ἡμερῶν ἀναστατώσας καὶ ἐξαγαγὼν εἰς τὴν ἔρημον τοὺς τετρακισχιλίους ἄνδρας τῶν **σικαρίων**; [My emphases for greater clarity NPLA].

And as Paul was to be led into the castle, he said unto the chief captain, May I speak unto thee? Who said, Canst thou speak Greek? Art not thou that **Egyptian**, which before these days madest an uproar, and leddest out into the wilderness four thousand men that were murderers [*sicarii*]? [My emphasis and insertion for greater clarity NPLA].

4.3.2 Herod Agrippa and Bernice

Josephus' References to Herod Agrippa

Antiquities 19, 8, 1 / 344 - 350¹⁸³

δευτέρα δὴ τῶν θεωριῶν ἡμέρα στολὴν ἐνδύς ἐξ ἀργύρου πεποιημένην πᾶσαν, ὡς θαυμάσιον ὑφὴν εἶναι, παρῆλθεν εἰς τὸ θέατρον ἀρχομένης ἡμέρας. ἔνθα ταῖς πρώταις τῶν ἡλιακῶν ἀκτίνων ἐπιβολαῖς ὁ ἄργυρος καταυγασθεὶς θαυμασίως ἀπέστιλβε μαρμαίρων τι φοβερὸν καὶ τοῖς εἰς αὐτὸν ἀτενίζουσι φρικῶδες. εὐθύς δὲ οἱ κόλακες τὰς οὐδὲ ἐκείνῳ πρὸς ἀγαθοῦ ἄλλος ἄλλοθεν φωνὰς ἀνεβόων, θεὸν προσαγορεύοντες εὐμενῆς τε εἶης ἐπιλέγοντες, 'εἰ καὶ μέχρι νῦν ὡς ἄνθρωπον ἐφοβήθημεν, ἀλλὰ τούντεῦθεν κρείττονά σε θνητῆς φύσεως ὁμολογοῦμεν.' οὐκ ἐπέπληξεν

¹⁸²Original Greek and English translation according to The New Testament in *Elpenor* [Online]. Available: <http://www.ellopos.net/elpenor/greek-texts/new-testament/acts/21.asp> [19 November 2014].

¹⁸³Original Greek and English translation according to Whiston, (Tr. and Ed.). 1895. Flavius Josephus. The Works of Flavius Josephus, in *Perseus Digital Library*, [Online]. Available: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0146%3Abook%3D19%3Awhiston+chapter%3D8%3Awhiston+section%3D1> [19 November 2014].

τούτοις ὁ βασιλεὺς οὐδὲ τὴν κολακείαν ἀσεβοῦσαν ἀπετρίψατο. ἀνακύνας δ' οὖν μετ' ὀλίγον τὸν βουβῶνα τῆς ἑαυτοῦ κεφαλῆς ὑπερκαθιζόμενον εἶδεν ἐπὶ σχοινίου τινός. ἄγγελον τοῦτον εὐθύς ἐνόησεν κακῶν εἶναι τὸν καὶ ποτε τῶν ἀγαθῶν γενόμενον, καὶ διακάρδιον ἔσχεν ὀδύνην, ἄθρουν δ' αὐτῷ τῆς κοιλίας προσέφυσεν ἄλγημα μετὰ σφοδρότητος ἀρζάμενον. ἀναθορῶν οὖν πρὸς τοὺς φίλους, 'ὁ θεὸς ὑμῖν ἐγώ, φησίν, ἤδη καταστρέφειν ἐπιτάττωμαι τὸν βίον, παραχρῆμα τῆς εἰμαρμένης τὰς ἄρτι μου κατεψευσμένας φωνὰς ἐλεγχούσης: ὁ κληθεὶς ἀθάνατος ὑφ' ὑμῶν ἤδη θανεῖν ἀπάγομαι. δεκτέον δὲ τὴν πεπρωμένην, ἧ θεὸς βεβούληται: καὶ γὰρ βεβιώκαμεν οὐδαμῆ φαύλως, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τῆς μακαριζομένης λαμπρότητος.' ταῦθ' ἅμα λέγων ἐπιτάσει τῆς ὀδύνης κατεπονεῖτο: μετὰ σπουδῆς οὖν εἰς τὸ βασιλεῖον ἐκομίσθη καὶ διῆξε λόγος εἰς πάντας, ὡς ἔχει τοῦ τεθνάναι παντάπασι μετ' ὀλίγον. ἡ πληθὺς δ' αὐτίκα σὺν γυναιξίν καὶ παισίν ἐπὶ σάκκων καθεσθεῖσα τῷ πατρίῳ νόμῳ τὸν θεὸν ἰκέτευεν ὑπὲρ τοῦ βασιλέως, οἰμωγῆς δὲ πάντ' ἦν ἀνάπλευα καὶ θρήνων. ἐν ὑψηλῷ δ' ὁ βασιλεὺς δωματίῳ κατακείμενος καὶ κάτω βλέπων αὐτοὺς πρηνεῖς καταπίπτοντας ἄδακρυς οὐδ' αὐτὸς διέμενεν. συνεχεῖς δ' ἐφ' ἡμέρας πέντε τῷ τῆς γαστρὸς ἀλγήματι διεργασθεὶς τὸν βίον κατέστρεψεν, ἀπὸ γενέσεως ἄγων πεντηκοστὸν ἔτος καὶ τέταρτον, τῆς βασιλείας δ' ἔβδομον.

On the second day of which shows he [Agrippa] put on a garment made wholly of silver, and of a contexture truly wonderful, and came into the theatre early in the morning; at which time the silver of his garment being illuminated by the fresh reflection of the sun's rays upon it, shone out after a surprising manner, and was so resplendent as to spread a horror over those that looked intently upon him; and presently his flatterers cried out, one from one place, and another from another, (though not for his good,) that he was a god; and they added, "Be thou merciful to us; for although we have hitherto revered thee only as a man, yet shall we henceforth own thee as superior to mortal nature." Upon this the king did neither rebuke them, nor reject their impious flattery. But as he presently afterward looked up, he saw an owl sitting on a certain rope over his head, and immediately understood that this bird was the messenger of ill tidings, as it had once been the messenger of good tidings to him; and fell into the deepest sorrow. A severe pain also arose in his belly, and began in a most violent manner. He therefore looked upon his friends, and said, "I, whom you call a god, am commanded presently to depart this life; while Providence thus reproves the lying words you just now said to me; and I, who was by you called immortal, am immediately to be hurried away by death. But I am bound to accept of what Providence allots, as it pleases God; for we have by no means lived ill, but in a splendid and happy manner." When he said this, his pain was become violent. Accordingly he was carried into the palace, and the rumour went abroad everywhere, that he would certainly die in a little time. But the multitude presently sat in sackcloth, with their wives and children, after the law of their country, and besought God for the king's recovery. All places were also full of mourning and lamentation. Now the king rested in a high chamber, and as he saw them below lying prostrate on the ground, he could not himself forbear weeping. And when he had been quite worn out by the pain in his belly for five days, he departed this life, being in the fifty-fourth year of his age, and in the seventh year of his reign; [My insertion for greater clarity and spelling corrections (underlined) NPLA].

Luke's Reference to Herod Agrippa

Act.Ap.12: 21 - 23¹⁸⁴

τακτῆ δὲ ἡμέρᾳ ὁ Ἡρώδης ἐνδυσάμενος ἐσθῆτα βασιλικὴν καὶ καθίσας ἐπὶ τοῦ βήματος ἐδημηγόρει πρὸς αὐτούς. ὁ δὲ δῆμος ἐπεφώνει· Θεοῦ φωνὴ καὶ οὐκ ἀνθρώπου. παραχρῆμα δὲ ἐπάταξεν αὐτὸν ἄγγελος Κυρίου ἀνθ' ὧν οὐκ ἔδωκε τὴν δόξαν τῷ Θεῷ, καὶ γενόμενος σκωληκόβρωτος ἐξέψυξεν.

And upon a set day Herod, arrayed in royal apparel, sat upon his throne, and made an oration unto them. And the people gave a shout, saying, "It is the voice of a god, and not of a man". And immediately the angel of the Lord smote him, because he gave not God the glory: and he was eaten of worms, and gave up the ghost.

Josephus' References to Bernice

Antiquities 20, 7, 3 / 145 - 147¹⁸⁵

Βερενίκη δὲ μετὰ τὴν Ἡρώδου τελευτήν, ὅς αὐτῆς ἀνὴρ καὶ θεῖος ἐγγόνει, πολὺν χρόνον ἐπιηρέυσασα, φήμης ἐπισχούσης, ὅτι τὰδελφῶ συνείη, πείθει Πολέμωνα, Κιλικίας δὲ ἦν οὗτος βασιλεύς, περιτεμόμενον ἀγαγέσθαι πρὸς γάμον αὐτήν: οὕτως γὰρ ἐλέγξειν ὦετο ψευδεῖς τὰς διαβολάς. καὶ ὁ Πολέμων ἐπέισθη μάλιστα διὰ τὸν πλοῦτον αὐτῆς: οὐ μὴν ἐπὶ πολὺ συνέμεινεν ὁ γάμος, ἀλλ' ἡ Βερενίκη δι' ἀκολασίαν, ὡς ἔφασαν, καταλείπει τὸν Πολέμωνα. ὁ δ' ἅμα τοῦ τε γάμου καὶ τοῦ τοῖς ἔθεσι τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐμμένειν ἀπήλλακτο. τῷ αὐτῷ δὲ καιρῷ καὶ Μαριάμμη παραιτησαμένη τὸν Ἀρχέλαον συνώκησε Δημητρίῳ τῶν ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ Ἰουδαίων πρωτεύοντι γένει τε καὶ πλούτῳ: τότε δὴ καὶ τὴν ἀλαβαρχίαν αὐτὸς εἶχεν. γενόμενον δ' αὐτῆ παιδίον ἐξ ἐκείνου Ἀγριππῖνον προσηγόρευσεν. ἀλλὰ περὶ μὲν ἐκάστου τούτων μετὰ ἀκριβείας ὕστερον ἀπαγγελοῦμεν.

But as for Bernice, she lived a widow a long while after the death of Herod [king of Chalcis], who was both her husband and her uncle; but when the report went that she had criminal conversation with her brother, [Agrippa, junior,] she persuaded Poleme, who was king of Cilicia, to be circumcised, and to marry her, as supposing that by this means she should prove those calumnies upon her to be false; and Poleme was prevailed upon, and that chiefly on account of her riches. Yet did not this matrimony endure long;

¹⁸⁴Original Greek and English translation according to *The New Testament in Elpenor* [Online]. Available: <http://www.ellopos.net/elpenor/greek-texts/new-testament/acts/12.asp> [19 November 2014].

¹⁸⁵Original Greek and English translation according to Whiston, (Tr. and Ed.). 1895. Flavius Josephus. *The Works of Flavius Josephus*, in *Perseus Digital Library*, [Online]. Available: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0146%3Abook%3D20%3Awhiston+chapter%3D7%3Awhiston+section%3D3> [19 November 2014].

but Bernice left Poleme, and, as was said, with impure intentions. So he forsook at once this matrimony, and the Jewish religion; and, at the same time, Mariamme put away Archelaus, and was married to Demetrius, the principal man among the Alexandrian Jews, both for his family and his wealth; and indeed he was then their alabarch. So she named her son whom she had by him Agrippinus. But of all these particulars we shall hereafter treat more exactly [My correction to spelling underlined NPLA].

Luke's References to Bernice

Act.Ap. 25:13¹⁸⁶

Ἡμερῶν δὲ διαγενομένων τινῶν Ἀγρίππας ὁ βασιλεὺς καὶ Βερνίκη κατήντησαν εἰς Καισάρειαν ἀσπασόμενοι τὸν Φῆστον.

And after certain days king Agrippa and Bernice came unto Caesarea to salute Festus.

Act.Ap. 25:23¹⁸⁷

Τῇ οὖν ἐπαύριον ἐλθόντος τοῦ Ἀγρίππα καὶ τῆς Βερνίκης μετὰ πολλῆς φαντασίας καὶ εἰσελθόντων εἰς τὸ ἀκροατήριον σὺν τε τοῖς χιλιάρχοις καὶ ἀνδράσι τοῖς κατ' ἐξοχὴν οὓσι τῆς πόλεως, καὶ κελεύσαντος τοῦ Φῆστου ἦχθη ὁ Παῦλος.

And on the morrow, when Agrippa was come, and Bernice, with great pomp, and was entered into the place of hearing, with the chief captains, and principal men of the city, at Festus' commandment Paul was brought forth

Act.Ap. 26:30¹⁸⁸

Καὶ ταῦτα εἰπόντος αὐτοῦ ἀνέστη ὁ βασιλεὺς καὶ ὁ ἡγεμὼν ἢ τε Βερνίκη καὶ οἱ συγκαθήμενοι αὐτοῖς,

And when he had thus spoken, the king rose up, and the governor, and Bernice, and they that sat with them:

¹⁸⁶ Original Greek and English translation according to The New Testament in *Elpenor* [Online]. Available: <http://www.ellopos.net/elpenor/greek-texts/new-testament/acts/25.asp> [19 November 2014].

¹⁸⁷ Original Greek and English translation according to The New Testament in *Elpenor* [Online]. Available: <http://www.ellopos.net/elpenor/greek-texts/new-testament/acts/25.asp> [19 November 2014].

¹⁸⁸ Original Greek and English translation according to The New Testament in *Elpenor* [Online]. Available: <http://www.ellopos.net/elpenor/greek-texts/new-testament/acts/25.asp> [19 November 2014].

Carrier (2000) argues that it should be seen as reasonable for an author like Luke to plagiarise Josephus since he knew that he was writing for a Roman audience. In short, if the Romans had knowledge of Jewish rebellious leaders they might well be primed by their knowledge of Josephus' accounts. Again, Carrier (2000) points out that from Josephus' perspective the three named rebel leaders were presented as the antitheses of what constituted a good Jew. In the same vein, Luke borrows the rhetorical agenda by mentioning the same individuals as examples of what is antithetical to good Christian practice.

Carrier (2000) explicates his point of view:

If the Romans knew any Jewish rebels, it would be these three men. Just as Josephus named them as examples of what good Jews are not, Luke names them specifically as examples of what the Christians are not--and as the latter two were specifically painted by Josephus as religious figures, messianic prophets, similar to Jesus, it would have behoved Luke to disassociate Jesus with these men, recently popularized to Romans by Josephus as villains. Similarly with Judas, who was a military rebel, very much the opposite of Jesus, the peaceful religious reformer.

Carrier (2000) illustrates how Luke moderates what is ostensibly Jesus' rather pugnacious act of overturning the money lenders' tables in the Jerusalem Temple by stressing Jesus' didactic role (cf. *Ev. Luc.* 19: 45 – 48; *Ev. Marc.* 11: 15 – 18; *Ev. Matt.* 21: 12 – 16; and *Ev. Jo.* 2: 13 – 16).

Most damning is Carrier's (2000) support for Mason's observation that Luke makes errors in the employment of individuals that finds an intriguing source in the Josephan text.

Specifically, Theudas and Judas are recalled in the same speech. However, with reference to Josephus' writings, Luke swaps the names around so that Theudas appears in the speech before Judas. This may not seem to be much of an issue until one realises that according to Josephus, 15 years separates the actions of his Theudas from the Lucan version.

Carrier (2000) reports as follows:

That Luke should be forced to use a rebel leader before his time is best explained by the fact that he needed someone to mention, and Josephus, his likely source, only details three distinct movements (though he goes

into the rebel relatives of Judas, they are all associated with Judas). And when Josephus mentions Theudas, he immediately follows with a description of the fate of the sons of Judas (JA 20.97-102) and uses the occasion to recap the actions of Judas himself (associating him with the census, as Acts does). Thus, that Luke should repeat this very same incorrect sequence, which makes sense in Josephus but not in Acts, is a signature of borrowing.

Carrier (2000) also supports his claim with the fact that both Luke and Josephus employ the self-same and/or similar terms, viz.:

- *Aphistêmi*: incited; and
- *Laos*: people.

Antiquities 20, 7, 3 / 145 - 147¹⁸⁹

Βερενίκη δὲ μετὰ τὴν Ἡρώδου τελευταίην, ὅς αὐτῆς ἀνὴρ καὶ θεῖος ἐγεγόνει, πολὺν χρόνον ἐπιχηρεύουσα, φήμης ἐπισχούσης, ὅτι τὰδελφῶ συνείη, πείθει Πολέμωνα, Κιλικίας δὲ ἦν οὗτος βασιλεύς, περιτεμόμενον ἀγαγέσθαι πρὸς γάμον αὐτήν: οὕτως γὰρ ἐλέγξειν ὥετο ψευδεῖς τὰς διαβολάς. καὶ ὁ Πολέμων ἐπέισθη μάλιστα διὰ τὸν πλοῦτον αὐτῆς: οὐ μὴν ἐπὶ πολὺ συνέμεινεν ὁ γάμος, ἀλλ' ἡ Βερενίκη δι' ἀκολασίαν, ὡς ἔφασαν, καταλείπει τὸν Πολέμωνα. ὁ δ' ἅμα τοῦ τε γάμου καὶ τοῦ τοῖς ἔθεσι τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐμμένειν ἀπήλλακτο. τῷ αὐτῷ δὲ καιρῷ καὶ Μαριάμμη παραιτησαμένη τὸν Ἀρχέλαον συνώκησε Δημητρίῳ τῶν ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ Ἰουδαίων πρωτεύοντι γένει τε καὶ πλούτῳ: τότε δὴ καὶ τὴν ἀλαβαρχίαν αὐτὸς εἶχεν. γενόμενον δ' αὐτῆ παιδίον ἐξ ἐκείνου Ἀγριππῖνον προσηγόρευσεν. ἀλλὰ περὶ μὲν ἐκάστου τούτων μετὰ ἀκριβείας ὕστερον ἀπαγγελοῦμεν.

But as for Bernice, she lived a widow a long while after the death of Herod [king of Chalcis], who was both her husband and her uncle; but when the report went that she had criminal conversation with her brother, [Agrippa, junior,] she persuaded Poleme, who was king of Cilicia, to be circumcised, and to marry her, as supposing that by this means she should prove those calumnies upon her to be false; and Poleme was prevailed upon, and that chiefly on account of her riches. Yet did not this matrimony endure long; but Bernice left Poleme, and, as was said, with impure intentions. So he forsook at once this matrimony, and the Jewish religion; and, at the same time, Mariamme put away Archelaus, and was married to Demetrius, the principal man among the Alexandrian Jews, both for his family and his wealth; and indeed he was then their alabarch. So she named her son

¹⁸⁹ Original Greek and English translation according to Whiston, (Tr. and Ed.). 1895. Flavius Josephus. The Works of Flavius Josephus, in *Perseus Digital Library*, [Online]. Available: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0146%3Abook%3D20%3Awhiston+chapter%3D7%3Awhiston+section%3D3> [20 November 2014].

whom she had by him Agrippinus. But of all these particulars we shall hereafter treat more exactly. [My corrections to spelling underlined NPLA].

Act.Ap. 24: 24-26¹⁹⁰

Μετὰ δὲ ἡμέρας τινὰς παραγενόμενος ὁ Φῆλιξ σὺν Δρουσίλλῃ τῇ γυναικὶ αὐτοῦ, οὕσῃ Ἰουδαία, μετεπέμψατο τὸν Παῦλον καὶ ἤκουσεν αὐτοῦ περὶ τῆς εἰς Χριστὸν πίστεως. 25 διαλεγόμενου δὲ αὐτοῦ περὶ δικαιοσύνης καὶ ἐγκρατείας καὶ τοῦ κρίματος τοῦ μέλλοντος ἔσεσθαι, ἔμφοβος γενόμενος ὁ Φῆλιξ ἀπεκρίθη· τὸ νῦν ἔχον πορεύου, καιρὸν δὲ μεταλαβὼν μετακαλέσομαί σε, 26 ἅμα δὲ καὶ ἐλπίζων ὅτι χρήματα δοθήσεται αὐτῷ ὑπὸ τοῦ Παύλου ὅπως λύσῃ αὐτόν· διὸ καὶ πυκνότερον αὐτὸν μεταπεμπόμενος ὠμίλει αὐτῷ.

And after certain days, when Felix came with his wife Drusilla, which was a Jewess, he sent for Paul, and heard him concerning the faith in Christ. And as he reasoned of righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come, Felix trembled, and answered, Go thy way for this time; when I have a convenient season, I will call for thee. He hoped also that money should have been given him of Paul, that he might loose him: wherefore he sent for him the oftener, and communed with him.

Antiquities 20, 7, 3 / 141 - 144¹⁹¹

Διαλύονται δὲ τῇ Δρουσίλλῃ πρὸς τὸν Ἀζίζον οἱ γάμοι μετ' οὐ πολὺν χρόνον τοιαύτης ἐμπεισούσης αἰτίας· καθ' ὃν χρόνον τῆς Ἰουδαίας ἐπετρόπευε Φῆλιξ θεασάμενος ταύτην, καὶ γὰρ ἦν κάλλει πασῶν διαφέρουσα, λαμβάνει τῆς γυναικὸς ἐπιθυμίαν, καὶ Ἄτομον ὀνόματι τῶν ἐαυτοῦ φίλων Ἰουδαῖον, Κύπριον δὲ τὸ γένος, μάγον εἶναι σκηπτόμενον πέμπων πρὸς αὐτὴν ἔπειθεν τὸν ἄνδρα καταλιποῦσαν αὐτῷ γήμασθαι, μακαρίαν ποιῆσειν ἐπαγγελλόμενος μὴ ὑπερηφανήσασαν αὐτόν. ἡ δὲ κακῶς πράττουσα καὶ φυγεῖν τὸν ἐκ τῆς ἀδελφῆς Βερενίκης βουλομένη φθόνον αὐτῇ διὰ τὸ κάλλος παρεκάλει παρ' ἐκείνης οἴομενος οὐκ ἐν ὀλίγοις ἔβλαπτεν, παραβῆναί τε τὰ πάτρια νόμιμα πείθεται καὶ τῷ Φήλικι γήμασθαι. τεκοῦσα δ' ἐξ αὐτοῦ παῖδα προσηγόρευσε Ἀγρίππαν. ἀλλ' ὃν μὲν τρόπον ὁ νεανίας οὗτος σὺν τῇ γυναικὶ κατὰ τὴν ἐκτύρωσιν τοῦ Βεσβίου ὄρους ἐπὶ τῶν Τίτου Καίσαρος χρόνων ἠφανίσθη, μετὰ ταῦτα δηλώσω.

But for the marriage of Drusilla with Azizus, it was in no long time afterward dissolved upon the following occasion: While Felix was procurator of Judea, he saw this Drusilla, and fell in love with her; for she

¹⁹⁰Original Greek and English translation according to *The New Testament in Elpenor* [Online]. Available: <http://www.ellopos.net/elpenor/greek-texts/new-testament/acts/24.asp> [20 November 2014].

¹⁹¹Original Greek and English translation according to Whiston, (Tr. and Ed.). 1895. Flavius Josephus. *The Works of Flavius Josephus*, in *Perseus Digital Library*, [Online]. Available: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0146%3Abook%3D20%3Awhiston+chapter%3D7%3Awhiston+section%3D2> [20 November 2014].

did indeed exceed all other women in beauty; and he sent to her a person whose name was Simon one of his friends; a Jew he was, and by birth a Cypriot, and one who pretended to be a magician, and endeavoured to persuade her to forsake her present husband, and marry him; and promised, that if she would not refuse him, he would make her a happy woman. Accordingly she acted ill, and because she was desirous to avoid her sister Bernice's envy, for she was very ill treated by her on account of her beauty, was prevailed upon to transgress the laws of her forefathers, and to marry Felix; and when he had had a son by her, he named him Agrippa. But after what manner that young man, with his wife, perished at the conflagration of the mountain Vesuvius, in the days of Titus Caesar, shall be related hereafter. [My correction to spelling underlined NPLA].

Felix sending priests, "excellent men," to Rome for trial on petty charges (*Life* 13)

Life 3 / 13-16¹⁹²

Μετ' εἰκοστὸν δὲ καὶ ἕκτον ἑνιαυτὸν εἰς Ῥώμην μοι συνέπεσεν ἀναβῆναι διὰ τὴν λεχθησομένην αἰτίαν: καθ' ὃν χρόνον Φῆλιξ τῆς Ἰουδαίας ἐπετρόπευεν ἱερεῖς τινὰς συνήθεις ἐμοὶ καλοὺς κάγαθοὺς διὰ μικρὰν καὶ τὴν τυχοῦσαν αἰτίαν δῆσας εἰς τὴν Ῥώμην ἔπεμψε λόγον ὑφέζοντας τῷ Καίσαρι. οἷς ἐγὼ πόρον εὐρέσθαι βουλόμενος σωτηρίας, μάλιστα δὲ πυθόμενος ὅτι καίπερ ἐν κακοῖς ὄντες οὐκ ἐπελάθοντο τῆς εἰς τὸ θεῖον εὐσεβείας, διατρέφοντο δὲ σύκοις καὶ καρύοις, ἀφικόμην εἰς τὴν Ῥώμην πολλὰ κινδυνεύσας κατὰ θάλασσαν. βαπτισθέντος γὰρ ἡμῶν τοῦ πλοίου κατὰ μέσον τὸν Ἀδρίαν περὶ ἑξακοσίους τὸν ἀριθμὸν ὄντες δι' ὅλης τῆς νυκτὸς ἐνηξάμεθα, καὶ περὶ ἀρχομένην ἡμέραν ἐπιφανέντος ἡμῖν κατὰ θεοῦ πρόνοιαν Κυρηναϊκοῦ πλοίου φθάσαντες τοὺς ἄλλους ἐγὼ τε καὶ τινες ἕτεροι περὶ ὀγδοήκοντα σύμπαντες ἀνελήφθημεν εἰς τὸ πλοῖον. διασωθεὶς δ' εἰς τὴν Δικαιάρχειαν, ἣν Ποτιόλους Ἴταλοι καλοῦσιν, διὰ φιλίας ἀφικόμην Ἀλιτύρῳ, μιμολόγος δ' ἦν οὗτος μάλιστα τῷ Νέρωνι καταθύμιος Ἰουδαῖος τὸ γένος, καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ Ποππαία τῇ τοῦ Καίσαρος γυναικὶ γνωσθεὶς προνοῶ ὡς τάχιστα παρακαλέσας αὐτὴν τοὺς ἱερεῖς λυθῆναι. μεγάλων δὲ δωρεῶν πρὸς τῇ εὐεργεσίᾳ ταύτῃ τυχῶν παρὰ τῆς Ποππαίας ὑπέστρεφον ἐπὶ τὴν οἰκίαν.

But when I was in the twenty-sixth year of my age, it happened that I took a voyage to Rome, and this on the occasion which I shall now describe. At the time when Felix was procurator of Judea there were certain priests of my acquaintance, and very excellent persons they were, whom on a small and trifling occasion he had put into bonds, and sent to Rome to plead their cause before Caesar. These I was desirous to procure deliverance for, and that especially because I was informed that they were not unmindful of piety towards God, even under their afflictions, but supported themselves with figs and nuts. Accordingly I came to Rome, though it were through a great number of hazards by sea; for as our ship was drowned in

¹⁹² Original Greek and English translation according to Whiston, (Tr. and Ed.). 1895.

Flavius Josephus. The Works of Flavius Josephus, in *Perseus Digital Library*, [Online].

Available:

<http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0150%3Awhiston+section%3D3> [20 November 2014].

the Adriatic Sea, we that were in it, being about six hundred in number, swam for our lives all the night; when, upon the first appearance of the day, and upon our sight of a ship of Cyrene, I and some others, eighty in all, by God's providence, prevented the rest, and were taken up into the other ship. And when I had thus escaped, and was come to Dieearchia, which the Italians call Puteoli, I became acquainted with Aliturius, an actor of plays, and much beloved by Nero, but a Jew by birth; and through his interest became known to Poppea, Caesar's wife, and took care, as soon as possible, to entreat her to procure that the priests might be set at liberty. And when, besides this favor, I had obtained many presents from Poppea, I returned home again.

Could this have been Luke's pretext or model for having the same thing happen to Paul?

*Life 38 / 191*¹⁹³

ὁ δὲ Σίμων οὗτος ἦν πόλεως μὲν Ἱεροσολύμων, γένους δὲ σφόδρα λαμπροῦ, τῆς δὲ Φαρισαίων αἰρέσεως, οἱ περὶ τὰ πάτρια νόμιμα δοκοῦσιν τῶν ἄλλων ἀκριβεῖα διαφέρειν.

This Simon was of the city of Jerusalem, and of a very noble family of the sect of the Pharisees, which are supposed to excel others in the accurate knowledge of the laws of their country.

*War 1, 5 / 110*¹⁹⁴

Παραφύονται δὲ αὐτῆς εἰς τὴν ἐξουσίαν Φαρισαῖοι, σύνταγμά τι Ἰουδαίων δοκοῦν εὐσεβέστερον εἶναι τῶν ἄλλων καὶ τοὺς νόμους ἀκριβέστερον ἀφηγεῖσθαι

And now the Pharisees joined themselves to her, to assist her in the government. These are a certain sect of the Jews that appear more religious than others, and seem to interpret the laws more accurately.

¹⁹³ Original Greek and English translation according to Whiston, (Tr. and Ed.). 1895. Flavius Josephus. The Works of Flavius Josephus, in *Perseus Digital Library*, [Online]. Available: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0150%3Awhiston+section%3D38> [20 November 2014].

¹⁹⁴ Original Greek and English translation according to Whiston, (Tr. and Ed.). 1895. Flavius Josephus. The Works of Flavius Josephus, in *Perseus Digital Library*, [Online]. Available: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0148%3Abook%3D1%3Awhiston+chapter%3D5> [20 November 2014].

καὶ ἦν γὰρ μόνον τι Ἰουδαϊκὸν ἀνθρώπων ἐπ' ἐξακριβώσει μέγα φρονοῦν τοῦ πατρίου καὶ νόμων οἷς χαίρει τὸ θεῖον προσποιουμένων, οἷς ὑπήκτο ἡ γυναικωνίτις, Φαρισαῖοι καλοῦνται, βασιλεῖ δυναμένω μάλιστα πράσσειν προμηθεῖς κάκ τοῦ προύπτου εἰς τὸ πολεμεῖν τε καὶ βλάπτειν ἐπηρμένοι.

For there was a certain sect of men that were Jews, who valued themselves highly upon the exact skill they had in the law of their fathers, and made men believe they were highly favoured by God, by whom this set of women were inveigled. These are those that are called the sect of the Pharisees, who were in a capacity of greatly opposing kings. [My spelling correction (underlined) NPLA].

Carrier (2000) concludes his summary of Mason's thesis with the following provocative suggestion:

[Luke] curiously never mentions the third school, the Essenes. Yet Josephus praised them above all. They also happened to be much like Christians in many respects. Mason advances the hypothesis that Luke intended the Christians to take the place of the Essenes--and certainly wanted to avoid competing with them--so that Christianity would appear to Roman readers as this very third school: the most like Greek philosophy, the most like Christianity, and the most praised by Josephus. We lack the data necessary to prove or refute this hypothesis, but it is worth considering in light of all the evidence so far. It certainly fits.

4.4 Chapter Four Summary

Carrier (2000) firmly supports Mason's thesis. However, from a strictly objective stance not all of his substantiation is convincing. This is especially true when one considers much of the seemingly circumstantial corroboration that only really appears to have any claim to validity after one has considered the more pertinent evidence.

One good example of this is the fact that only Luke seems to be concerned with giving historical accounts as opposed to the other three gospel writers. This fact in isolation means very little. Even when coupled with the fact that Luke's history is

¹⁹⁵ Original Greek and English translation according to Whiston, (Tr. and Ed.). 1895. Flavius Josephus. *The Works of Flavius Josephus*, in *Perseus Digital Library*, [Online]. Available: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0146%3Abook%3D17%3Awhiston+chapter%3D2%3Awhiston+section%3D4> [20 November 2014].

highly inaccurate and seems to be employed for purely rhetorical reasons – one still has nothing tangible to link Luke to Josephus.

In the same vein, if Luke had mentioned the Essenes they may well have been perceived as more legitimate competition for nascent Christianity. This could well explain why they are not recorded in the *NT* gospels. However, even if true this does not assist one in the task of ascertaining plagiarism.

However, suspicions are clearly raised, when one considers some of the *content* of Luke's invented history and its prodigious alignment with accounts only supplied by Josephus. These suspicions become even more palpable when one realises that Luke is clearly employing a rhetorical strategy that also closely parallels Josephus' supposedly unique approach. In this latter regard, the claim that at the time, *all* Hellenistic history writers employed similar tactics is inadmissible because each normally prided themselves on having some feature that made their particular history better or more noteworthy. Luke's approach is *not* original and further he seems to consistently make errors in the employment of individuals that consistently appear to have their source in the Josephan text.

The three comparable correspondences, viz.: the census of c. 6 C.E.; the reference to the same three rebel Jewish leaders; and the specific mention of terrorists called "*sicarii*" is possibly the most convincing body of evidence. Here claims that historians working at more or less the same time would have recorded the same events is immediately countered by certain additional facts:

1. Both Josephus and Luke recall Theudas and Judas in the *same* speech. This is an extraordinary coincidence as it stands because the Theudas and Judas events are separated by 15 years. In addition, when compared to Josephus' versions, Luke also swaps the names around so that Theudas appears in the speech *before* Judas. This is good evidence that Luke is not an historian at all as, unlike Josephus, he is totally unaware of the actual order of events. In short, Luke gives the distinct impression that he is not writing a history based on personal knowledge and is very likely solely dependent on an outside source such as Josephus for his information;
2. *Sicarii* is almost certainly Josephus' own preferred generic term for not only specific Jewish terrorists but also robbers and murderers in general. Most

importantly, he quite likely employs the term “*sicarii*” for the benefit of an informed Roman readership. Even more revealing is the fact that the only reason Josephus occasionally goes to some length to explain the etymology of “*sicarii*” is because he is obviously using the opportunity to instruct his non-Roman readership. Thus, if Luke was a non-Roman he is not likely to have known about this term, let alone employ it, without explication for immediate ingestion by a heterogeneous audience that included, inter alia, Jews, Christianised Jews and Christianised Gentiles.

Carrier (2000) supplies a list of nine similarities between Josephus and Luke. However, if one removes those that could be explained away as plausible given the period within which the two authors operated only four perplexing parallels remain:

1. The employment of a conspicuously apologetic agenda in order to explain why the wicked are ultimately responsible for tribulation whereas the righteous are venerated;
2. The habitual reliance on Jewish scripture and tradition;
3. The bipartite structure of the narrative wherein the author first accentuates an incident of immense significance and then subsequently provides an historical evaluation in order to explain the import of said event.
4. The emphasis on the antiquity and importance of their respective religions with reference to Jerusalem as the Holy City.

Carrier (2000) also supplies his reader with 11 more generic parallels. All of these are circumstantial in themselves but when added to the more comparable correspondences certainly seem to add weight.

CHAPTER FIVE

Alternate Views to the Mason Thesis

5.1 Introduction

This chapter attempts to present (whenever possible) more rational arguments that might be considered threatening to Mason's overall thesis. Here, where it is obvious that an argument is not wholly satisfactory it is highlighted and subjected to critical scrutiny.

5.2 Conservative Christian Arguments

Most, if not all, prominent conservative Christian scholars largely refute Mason's thesis. For example, Holding¹⁹⁶ who is a well-known Christian apologist takes issue with, inter alia, the following points:

1. The Census: Holding (2014) feels that Mason labours under the misconception that the author(s) of Ev.Luc. report the same census as Josephus. However, Holding ingenuously argues for an event that occurred before 6 C.E.
2. The Egyptian, Judas, and Theudas: Given that these three individuals most likely did exist in history – Holding (2014) does not find it unusual that the author(s) of Ev.Luc. should also report on them.
3. The *Sicarii*: According to Holding (2014) Mason assumes mundanely that because the term "*Sicarii*" does not appear before Josephus' employment of this specific idiom, the author(s) of Act.Ap. must have copied it. Holding (2014) explains: "Mason contradicts those scholars who allege that the sicarii group existed and were associated with Jesus, at a time when Josephus was a toddler".

The problem with this kind of response is that it is not the result of a concerted effort to establish the most likely "truth". Rather, it is a blatant case of selectively employing data to manufacture a response that protects the scholar's preferred worldview.

¹⁹⁶ Cf. Holding. Luke and Josephus. 2014. in *Tekton Apologetics* [Online]. Available: <http://www.tektonics.org/lp/lukeandjoe.php> [10 October 2014].

In this context, this chapter attempts to set down the more dispassionate attempts at countering and/or amending Mason' thesis and/or which offer a demonstrable alternate scholarly opinion apropos the most likely characteristics of Luke-Acts as well as determining its most likely import.

This chapter has been set out according to broad, encompassing themes. In this context, an attempt has been made, wherever possible, to systematise the various issues under dispute. These are heavily dependent on the previous insights of many scholars, and in particular individuals such as Cadbury (1922), Bruce (1951), Berger (1984), Pervo (1987), Sterling (1992), Marguerat (2004), Walters (2009), Dicken (2012), Verheyden (2012) and Lüdemann (2013). Also, due largely to the fact that many of the topics covered are (more often than not), closely interrelated with each other, there will, on occasion, be a certain amount of necessary and unavoidable repetition or overlap of themes.

Lastly, where it is found that an author's argument is lacking, attention is drawn to this fact and where possible the argument is either strengthened or even refuted.

5.3 The Dating of Luke-Acts

The establishment of a plausible date for Luke-Acts is critically important to those scholars who wish to counter the Mason thesis. Put bluntly, the earlier that Luke-Acts can be shown to have been composed, the less likely it is for Josephus to have been an influence.

Robinson (1976: 9) reminds his reader that generally speaking, modern scholars are not too concerned with accurately dating New Testament texts. For most, a widely accepted consensus date is deemed quite satisfactory. On this issue, he warns:

No one since Harnack¹⁹⁷ has really gone back to look at it for its own sake or to examine the presuppositions on which the current consensus rests. It is only when one pauses to do this that one realizes how thin is the foundation for some of the textbook answers and how circular the arguments for many of the relative datings. Disturb the position of one major piece and the pattern starts disconcertingly to dissolve.

¹⁹⁷ Adolf von Harnack (1851 – 1930).

As far as Luke-Acts is concerned scholars have conjectured both an early (c. 57-62 C.E.) and a late (c. 100 C.E.) date. According to Tyson (2006: 1) the resultant consensus date becomes c. 80-85 C.E. Here Tyson quotes Fitzmyer (1998: 54) who states: “Many NT interpreters use the date A.D. 80-85 for the composition of Luke-Acts, and there is no good reason to oppose that date, even if there is no real proof for it.” What is most surprising is that Fitzmyer (1998: 55) goes on to claim that “it is a matter of little concern when or where Luke-Acts was composed, since the interpretation of it, especially of Acts, depends little on its date or place of composition.”

Indeed, from a fundamentalist perspective the problem of accurately dating Luke-Acts, although largely deemed unimportant, also (naively) seems quite straightforward. Because it is assumed that the books are wholly accurate and factual, it is obvious that the author (even if not Luke himself) was a travelling companion of Paul. Based on the assumption that Paul’s ministry lasted between c. 35/6 – 60 / 62 C.E. Of course these dates and the estimated period that each event as recorded in Act.Ap. and the various epistles still vary according to which scholar is opining.

Set down below (Fig. 1) is a typically imagined timescale for Paul’s ministry (cf. Bacon, 1921: 165 – 166) that reflects the largely accepted world-view of more conservative scholars:

Estimated Date	Claimed Event	Sources
29 C.E.	Crucifixion of Jesus of Nazareth	Ev.Matt. 20: 19; 23: 24; 26: 2; 27: 22 – 23; 27: 31; 27: 54; Ev.Marc. 15: 5; 15: 13 – 14; 15: 20; 15: 24; Ev.Luc. 23: 21; 23: 48; Ev.Jo. 19: 6; 19: 15 – 16; 19: 41; Act.Ap. 1: 3; 10: 39; 1 Ep.Cor. 1: 13*; 1: 18**; 1: 23; 2: 2 and 2: 8***; Ep.Gal. 3: 1 and Ep.Hebr. 6: 6.
34 C.E.	Martyrdom of Stephen	Act.Ap. 7: 59 and 22: 20.
38 C.E.	Paul’s Conversion	Act.Ap. 9: 3 – 4; 22: 7; 22: 10 – 11, and 26: 12 - 19.
38 C.E.	Escape from Damascus	Act.Ap. 9: 25.
44 C.E.	Famine	Act.Ap. 7: 11 and 11:

		28.
44 C.E.	Death of Agrippa I	Act.Ap. 12: 23
44 - 45 C.E.	Visit of Paul and Barnabas to Jerusalem	Act.Ap. 12: 25.
45 - 47 C.E.	First Missionary Journey	Act.Ap. 13:1 – 14: 28.
48 C.E.	Council in Jerusalem	Act.Ap. 15: 1 – 21.
49 - 51 C.E.	Second Missionary Journey	Act.Ap. 15: 22 – 17: 34.
55 C.E. (Jan/Mar)	Paul arrives in Corinth	Act.Ap. 18: 1 – 17.
55 C.E. (May)	Arrest in Jerusalem	Act.Ap. 21: 27 – 23: 22.
55 - 57 C.E.	Imprisonment in Caesarea	Act.Ap. 23: 23 – 24: 21.
57 C.E.	Recall of Felix	Act.Ap. 24: 22 – 26.
57 C.E. (Oct)	Departure for Rome	Act.Ap. 27: 1.
58 C.E. (Jan/Feb)	Arrival in Rome	Act.Ap. 28: 11.
60 C.E. (Feb)	End of "two years" of semi-liberty	Act.Ap. 28: 16 – 28.
* Crucifixion of Jesus implied.		
** Reference to "message of the cross" but not crucifixion per se.		
*** Reference to "crucified the Lord of glory" – a possible reference to a transcendental being called Christ?		

Figure 1

A Typical Conjectural Timeline for the Apostle Paul's Ministry

5.3.1 Dicken's Conventional Dating Method

When it comes to determining a particular scholar's opinion about the authorship of Luke-Acts it can be shown to be totally dependent on that individual's worldview. For example, if a person believes by faith alone that the apostle Paul had a colleague called Luke and he actually wrote Luke-Acts then the finding is very simple: Luke wrote his books sometime before he died.

Dicken (2012: 17 – 25) represents a good example of a scholar who typically attempts to establish what he/she believes are plausible dates for Luke-Acts based largely on a trusting acceptance of the reliability of what is written in the *NT*.

Dicken (2012: 24 – 25) points out that 1 Clem. (a.k.a. the *Epistle to the Corinthians* (idealistically ascribed to Clement I¹⁹⁸) was written in 96 C.E. and is possibly dependent on Act.Ap. Accordingly, there would not have been sufficient time for Luke to have borrowed from Josephus' *Antiquities* (c. 94 C.E.) before his Act.Ap. was borrowed by Clement I.

¹⁹⁸ Pope Clement I a.k.a. Κλήμης Ῥώμης a.k.a. *Clemens Romanus* (d. 99 C.E.).

To prove an early date for Luke-Acts, Dicken sets out to address two fundamental questions, viz.:

1. Ascertain the earliest possible date (*terminus a quo*) for Luke-Acts; and
2. Determine the latest possible date (*terminus ad quem*) for Luke-Acts.

In this context, a synopsis will be given of Dicken's rationale as regards a plausible date for Luke-Acts. Thereafter, critical flaws in his argument will be explored.

Dicken's *Terminus a quo*

Dicken (2012: 18) explains that a number of factors should assist the researcher in determine the *terminus a quo* for Luke-Acts:

1. The date of the *very last* event recorded in Luke-Acts;
2. An indication as to whether or not the author was aware of Paul's death;
3. The date that Ev.Marc. was authored; and
4. Ev.Luc. 21: 20 as a redaction of information contained in of Ev.Marc. 13: 1 – 2 and 14 – 20 (i.e. the destruction of Jerusalem).

Dicken (2012: 18 - 25) explains his methodology and resultant deductions as follows:

The last event recorded in Luke-Acts is Paul's imprisonment in Rome whereas the last datable event is the procuratorship of Festus (i.e. c. 57 – 59 C.E.). Dicken apportions crudely one year for Pauls' trial and sea voyages (cf. Act.Ap. 27 and 28) and accordingly determines a worse-case scenario date of c. 60 C.E. In short, Dicken cannot see a date for the creation of Luke-Acts before this date.

Next Dicken tackles the issue of Luke's knowledge of his companion Pauls' death. As confirmed by Marguerat (2002: 229) Dicken ultimately accepts that although not explicitly stated, if one refers to Act.Ap. 23: 11; 25: 11 – 12; 26: 32 and 27: 24 the Lucan author probably knew about Paul's last trial. In addition, if one refers specifically to Act.Ap. 20: 18 – 38 he most likely knew about Paul's impending death as well. As an aside, if Luke had *not* known about Paul's death it must be assumed that he finished writing Luke-Acts before c. 62 C.E. Therefore, Dicken estimates that

Paul must have died by say 65 C.E. As a consequence of these assumptions, Dicken ascribes 65 C.E. as a provisional *terminus a quo*.

The third issue concerns the establishment of a plausible date for the creation of Ev.Marc. because as is confirmed by, inter alia, Fitzmyer (1981: 66 - 73), Nolland (1989: xxxvii), Evans (1990: 3), Shellard (2002: 215) and Pervo (2006: 26) the majority of Christian scholars accept that Ev.Marc. was an important influence on Luke-Acts. Here, Dicken needs to find a date for Ev.Marc. that still gives it time to have become available to the Lucan author(s) as a source document. To this end Dicken simply accepts the conservative wisdom that Ev.Marc. was written in c. 65 – 70 C.E. Accordingly, Dicken ascribes a thumb-suck date of c. 75 C.E. to allow the Lucan author time to acquire an Ev.Luc. manuscript.

The fourth and final issue is dependent on the nature of the suspected Lucan redaction of Ev.Marc. Here Dicken refers to both Marshall (1978: 770 - 771) and Fitzmyer (1985: 1344 – 1347). Specifically, Marshall details the extent of the Lucan redaction of the destruction narrative as follows:

1. Ev.Luc. 19: 41 makes specific mention of Jerusalem whereas Ev.Marc. 13: 14 refers to “the abomination that causes desolation”¹⁹⁹;
2. Luke’s version includes a warning to keep away from Jerusalem whereas Mark’s version cautions about a delay; and
3. Unlike Ev.Marc 13: 20 which refers to God shortening the period of desolation for the sake of the elect, Ev.Luc. 19: 43 – 44 refers to the death of the Jews and Jerusalem’s suppression by Gentiles.

Based on these three observations and given the fact that Ev.Luc. 19: 41 – 44 portrays Jesus of Nazareth prophesying the destruction of Jerusalem in an idiom that recalls the actual siege of Jerusalem, Dicken is happy to concede a *terminus a quo* for Luke-Acts of between c. 75 and 80 C.E.

Dicken’s *Terminus ad quem*

Dicken points out that as the author of Luke-Acts is unknown to us we cannot rationalise a date for his death. Accordingly, Dicken opts for any external attestations

¹⁹⁹ Of course this specific verse is lifted from Daniel 9:27; 11:31 and 12:11.

of Luke-Acts. With reference to Haenchen (1971: 8 – 9) Dicken accepts that Luke-Acts was considered authoritative by at least the mid second century C.E. As we have already ascertained, Marcion accepted a version of what we now call Ev.Luc. as canonical – an event that occurred in c. 140 C.E. Therefore, Dicken suggests an initial date of c. 130 - 135 C.E. as a potential *Terminus ad quem*.

Next, Dicken looks at the Phil. (Epistle to the Philippians) by Polycarp of Smyrna²⁰⁰ who he claims was aware of many of the early Christian writings that were ultimately canonised in 325 C.E. With reference to, inter alia, Pervo (2006: 20) and Shellard (2002: 25) Dicken attempts to demonstrate the similarity of passages from Act.Ap. 2: 24 and Phil. 1.2 respectively. In this regard, the two pertinent passages are set down below for ease of comparison:

Act.Ap. 2: 24²⁰¹

ὄν ὁ θεὸς ἀνέστησεν **λύσας τὰς ὠδῖνας τοῦ θανάτου**, καθότι οὐκ ἦν δυνατὸν κρατεῖσθαι αὐτὸν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ.

But God raised him from the dead, **freeing him from the agony of death**, because it was impossible for death to keep its hold on him. [My emphases for clarity NPLA].

Phil. 1.2²⁰²

καὶ ὅτι ἡ βεβαία τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν **ρίζα**, ἐξ ἀρχαίων καταγγελομένη χρόνων, μέχρι νῦν διαμένει καὶ καρποφορεῖ εἰς τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, ὃς ὑπέμεινεν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν ἕως θανάτου κατανήσαι, ὃν ἤγειρεν ὁ θεός, **λύσας τὰς ὠδῖνας τοῦ ᾄδου**.

and because the strong root of your faith, spoken of in days long gone by, endures even until now, and brings forth fruit to our Lord Jesus Christ, who for our sins suffered even unto death, [but] "whom God raised from the dead, having **loosed the bands of the grave**." [My emphases for clarity NPLA].

This comparison becomes more believable if one considers that Hades and death are vaguely synonymous terms.

Dicken then employs Haenchen (1971: 3 and 6) to show the correspondences

²⁰⁰ Polycarp of Smyrna (Πολύκαρπος) (c. 80 – 167 C.E.).

²⁰¹ Greek text according to *NTOG*. 1882. Eds Brooke and Fenton: 249. NIV translation according to Holy Bible. 1989. NIV: *NT* 112.

²⁰² Original Greek and English translation according to Palmer (Tr.) 2010. *The Epistle of Polycarp to the Philippians*: 4 [Online]. Available at <http://www.bibletranslation.ws/> [2 February 2015].

between the following, viz.:

1. Act.Ap. 1: 25 and Phil. 9.2; and
2. Act.Ap. 20: 35 and Phil. 2.3.

Based on this evidence, Dicken pushes the *Terminus ad quem* back to c. 120 - 125 C.E. Finally, Dicken investigates a passage in the Ep.Smyrn. (Epistle to the Smyrnaeans) by Ignatius of Antioch²⁰³. In this regard, he endeavours to establish the similarity of passages from Act.Ap. 10: 41 and Ep.Smyrn. 3.3 respectively. The two pertinent passages are set down below for ease of comparison:

Ap. 10: 41²⁰⁴

οὐ παντὶ τῷ λαῷ ἀλλὰ μάρτυσι τοῖς προκεχειροτονημένοις ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ, ἡμῖν, **οἵτινες συνεφάγομεν καὶ συνεπίομεν αὐτῷ μετὰ τὸ ἀναστήναι αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν.**

He was not seen by all the people, but by witnesses whom God had already chosen - **by us who ate and drank with him after he rose from the dead.** [My emphases for clarity NPLA].

Ep.Smyrn. 3.3²⁰⁵

μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἀνάστασιν **συνέφαγεν αὐτοῖς καὶ συνέπιεν ὡς σαρκικός,** καίπερ πνευματικῶς ἠνωμένος τῷ πατρί.

And after his resurrection **He ate and drank with them, as being possessed of flesh,** although spiritually He was united to the Father. [My emphases for clarity NPLA].

Dicken intimates that Act.Ap. 10: 41 and Ep.Smyrn. 3.3 are the earliest Christian texts to employ this particular idiom in order to uphold the convention that after his resurrection, Jesus of Nazareth ate and drank with his disciples. Dicken (2012: 23 n.

²⁰³ Ignatius of Antioch (Ἰγνάτιος Ἀντιοχείας) a.k.a. Ignatius Theophorus (Ἰγνάτιος ὁ Θεοφόρος) (c. 35 / 50 – 98/117 C.E.).

²⁰⁴ Greek text according to *NTOG*. 1882. Eds Brooke and Fenton: 249. NIV translation according to Holy Bible. 1989. NIV: *NT* 112.

²⁰⁵ Original Greek for ΤΟΥ ΑΓΙΟΥ ΠΟΛΥΚΑΡΠΟΥ ΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΟΥ ΣΜΥΡΝΗΣ ΚΑΙ ΙΕΡΟΜΑΡΤΥΡΟΣ ΠΡΟΣ ΦΙΛΙΠΠΗΣΙΟΥΣ ΕΠΙΣΤΟΛΗ according to *Apostolic Fathers* [Online]. Available: <http://www.ccel.org/lake/fathers/ignatius-smyrnaeans.htm> [2 February 2015]. English translation according to Robert, Donaldson and Coxe (Eds and Trs). 1885. *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. 1. Revised and edited for New Advent by Kevin Knight [Online]. Available: <http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/0109.htm> [2 February 2015].

65) also specifically points out that Ev.Jo. 21: 9 – 15 refers to Jesus (after the resurrection) sharing a grilled fish breakfast with his disciples on the shores of Lake Galilee but it does not employ the distinctive vocabulary employed in Act.Ap. 10: 41 and Ep.Smyrn. 3.3.

Dicken goes somewhat further and claims that it is more likely that Ignatius copied Luke rather than the other way round. In support of this assumption he refers to Ep.Smyrn. 1.2 , Ev.Luc. 23: 1 – 15 and Act.Ap. 4: 26 – 27 which all speak to Pilate and Herod Antipas' involvement at Jesus' trial and subsequent execution. More importantly, the only canonical scripture to involve Herod Antipas in the passion story is Luke-Acts.

In the light of this reasoning, and knowing that the Epistle to the Smyrnaeans was written in c. 115 C.E. Dicken now ascribes a date of c. 100 - 110 C.E. as a possible *terminus ad quem* for Luke-Acts.

Finally, Dicken turns to the 1 Clem. (1st Epistle to the Corinthians) supposedly written by Pope Clement I. With reference to Ehrman (2003: 25), Dicken prefers a date for this book of c. 95 C.E. Dicken relies heavily on Pervo (2006: 203 – 209) to point out that 1 Clem. 42. 1 – 4 and 44. 2 – 3 is clearly dependant on Act.Ap. However, 1 Clem. 18.1 seems to almost quote Act.Ap. 13: 22 verbatim:

Act.Ap. 13: 22²⁰⁶

καὶ μεταστήσας αὐτὸν ἤγειρεν τὸν Δαυεὶδ αὐτοῖς εἰς βασιλέα, ᾧ καὶ εἶπεν μαρτυρήσας Ἐὐρὸν Δαυεὶδ τὸν τοῦ Ἰεσσαί, ἄνδρα κατὰ τὴν καρδίαν μου, ὃς ποιήσει πάντα τὰ θελήματά μου.

After removing him [Saul], he made David their king. God testified concerning him: **“I have found David son of Jesse, a man after my own heart; he will do everything I want him to do.”** [My insertion and emphases for clarity NPLA].

²⁰⁶ Greek text according to *NTOG*. 1882. Eds Brooke and Fenton: 277. NIV translation according to Holy Bible. 1989. NIV: *NT* 124.

1 Clem. 18.1²⁰⁷

Τί δὲ εἶπωμεν ἐπὶ τῷ μεμαρτυρημένῳ Δαυεῖδ ἐφ' οὗ εἶπεν ὁ θεός·
**Εὗρον ἄνδρα κατὰ τὴν καρδίαν μου, Δαυεῖδ τὸν τοῦ Ἰεσσαί, ἐν
ἐλέει αἰωνίῳ ἔχρισα αὐτόν.** [My emphasis for clarity NPLA].

But what must we say of David that obtained a good report? Of whom God said, *I have found a man after my heart, David the son of Jesse: with eternal mercy have I anointed him.* [Italics according to Lightfoot].

In addition 1 Clem. 13.2 may be compared favourably with Ev.Luc. 6: 31:

1 Clem. 13:2²⁰⁸

οὕτως γὰρ εἶπεν· Ἐλεᾶτε, ἵνα ἐλεηθῆτε· ἀφίετε, ἵνα ἀφεθῇ ὑμῖν· ὡς
χρηστεύεσθε, οὕτως ψηστευθήσεται ὑμῖν· **ὃ μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε, ἐν αὐτῷ
μετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν.** [My emphases for clarity NPLA].

For thus He spake; *Have mercy, that ye may receive mercy: forgive, that it may be forgiven to you. As ye do, so shall it be done to you. As ye give, so shall it be given unto you. As ye judge, so shall ye be judged. As ye show kindness, so shall kindness be showed unto you. With what measure ye mete, it shall be measured withal to you.* [Italics according to Lightfoot].

Ev.Luc. 6:31²⁰⁹

καὶ καθὼς θέλετε ἵνα ποιῶσιν ὑμῖν οἱ ἄνθρωποι, ποιεῖτε αὐτοῖς ὁμοίως.

Do to others as you would like them to do to you.

Although careful to point out some possible concerns - including the fact that Green (1995: 4 – 6) has indicated that 1 Clem. 13.2 has far more in common with Ev.Matt. 5 – 7 than Ev.Luc. 6: 31 (quoted above) Dicken seems to accept that Luke-Acts was an influence on both Clement I and Ignatius. However, if we re-visit Green's concerns we find that indeed, Ev.Matt. is a more likely influence than Luke-Acts. For example Ev.Matt. 7: 1 may be directly compared to 1 Clem. 13.2:

²⁰⁷ Greek text according to Lightfoot (Ed. and Tr.) 1869. *S. Clement of Rome: The Two Epistles to the Corinthians*: 79. English translation according to Lightfoot (Ed. and Tr.) 1889. *The Apostolic Fathers: The Epistle of S. Clement to the Corinthians*.: 65.

²⁰⁸ Greek text according to Lightfoot (Ed. and Tr.) 1869. *S. Clement of Rome: The Two Epistles to the Corinthians*: 67. English translation according to Lightfoot (Ed. and Tr.) 1889. *The Apostolic Fathers: The Epistle of S. Clement to the Corinthians*.: 62.

²⁰⁹ Greek text according to NTOG. 1882. Eds Brooke and Fenton: 132. NIV translation according to Holy Bible. 1989. NIV: NT 61.

Ev.Matt. 7: 1²¹⁰

Μὴ κρίνετε, ἵνα μὴ κριθῆτε· ἐν ᾧ γὰρ κρίματι κρίνετε κριθήσεσθε, καὶ ἐν ᾧ μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε μετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν.

Do not judge, or you too will be judged. For in the same way you judge others, you will be judged, and with the measure you use, it will be measured to you. [My emphasis for clarity NPLA].

Regardless, Dicken seems to be happy to accept a final *terminus ad quem* for Luke-Acts. of c. 85 - 90 C.E.

5.3.2 Flaws in Dicken's Dating of Luke-Acts

Although admirable and perfectly logical as it stands, some aspects of Dicken's estimation are negated due to a number of factors that he does not consider in his argument.

Firstly, Dicken assumes that the information recorded in Luke-Acts is wholly factual. It is quite evident that Luke needs his narratives to appear historiographical for the sense of realism but as has already been determined he either places correct information in the wrong context or he simply invents history. Based on this track record, what chance is there that we can take a "known" historical event (e.g. the procuratorship of Festus) and then assume that a possibly fictitious account that has been linked to it for rhetorical purposes is able to be ascribed the same date? In addition, certain accepted historical dates (e.g. the procuratorship of Festus) are quite possibly wrong in themselves, let alone after redaction by Luke.

As an aside, recent, critically important discoveries made in the numismatic field by Kokkinos (2010: 363 - 400) have yielded evidence that must place some doubt on conventional wisdom. To understand the context of this evidence, one must turn to the issue of the terms of office for, inter alia, Cumanus²¹¹, Felix²¹², Festus²¹³ and

²¹⁰ Greek text according to *NTOG*. 1882. Eds Brooke and Fenton: 16. NIV translation according to Holy Bible. 1989. NIV: *NT* 6.

²¹¹ *Ventidius Cumanus* (fl. c. 48 – 52 C.E.).

²¹² *Marcus Antonius Felix* (born c. 5 – 10 C.E.).

²¹³ *Porcius Festus* (fl. c. 55 – 62 C.E.?).

Albinus²¹⁴ as procurator in Judea. Certainly, the dates for their tenures are still hotly disputed.²¹⁵

However, Kokkinos believes that the year in which Festus succeeded Felix can be proven with some certainty based on the numismatic evidence supplied by extant procuratorial coins. In this context, Kokkinos (2010: 385) points to specific coins²¹⁶ issued under Felix's term dated to year 14 of the reign of the emperor Claudius (10 B.C.E. - 54 C.E.), which equates to the period occurring between January and October 54 C.E.

According to Josephus (*War* 2, 12, 1 / 223) Cumanus, became procurator of Judea in the summer of 48 C.E., immediately after the death of Herod of Chalcis in the autumn of 48 C.E. However, Josephus also informs his reader (*Antiquities* 20, 5, 2 / 103) that this event occurred *before* Herod of Chalcis' death proving that Josephus does not always get things right. Regardless, Kokkinos is certain that Cumanus' arrival occurred shortly after or even during the Jewish revolt which culminated with the crucifixion of the sons of Judas the Galilean under the prefecture of Tiberius Alexander during the period of **נרנ** in 48 C.E. According to Josephus (*War* 2, 12, 2 / 223 – 240 and *Antiquities* 20, 6, 1 / 118 – 124) Cumanus' failure to adequately respond to an anti-Jewish murder in Samaritan territory led to a violent conflict between Jews and Samaritans.

Following an investigation by the governor of Syria, Quadratus²¹⁷, Cumanus was sent to Rome for a hearing before the emperor Claudius who held him personally responsible for the violence and accordingly, sentenced him to exile. This trial could not have occurred *before* 51 C.E. It is well known that Felix immediately succeeded Cumanus, therefore, the earliest date for Felix's arrival in Judea as procurator would have to have been c. 51 - 52 C.E.²¹⁸

Kokkinos (2012: 385) emphasises here that it should be accepted that Felix must have served as procurator for at least two years *before* his first coins were minted.

²¹⁴ *Lucceius Albinus* (fl. c. 62 – 69 C.E.).

²¹⁵ Kokkinos (2010: 385) refers his readers to, inter alia, Smallwood, 1976: 269 n. 40; Jewett, 1979: 40 - 44; Kindler, 1981: 20 - 21; Bruce, 1986: 284 – 287; and Schwartz, 1992: 218 - 242.

²¹⁶ Kokkinos (2010: 385) refers to various extant examples of procuratorial coins dated to the fourteenth year of Claudius' reign (January 54 to October 54 C.E.) as catalogued in, inter alia, Meshorer, 1982: 284 – 285.

²¹⁷ *Gaius Ummidius Durmius Quadratus* (12 B.C.E. - c. 60 C.E.).

²¹⁸ This revised dating completely changes Dicken's argument. Cf. Dicken (2012: 18 - 25) who would have the procuratorship of Festus dated to c. 57 – 59 C.E.

Now, Festus' coins were minted in year five of the reign of the emperor Nero (i.e. between October 58 and October 59 C.E.)²¹⁹ which means that as his coins were minted at least a year *after* his arrival, he must have taken office sometime before 57 - 58 C.E. If accurate, this would place Paul's journey to Rome (cf. Act.Ap. 25: 12 – 27; 27: 1 – 44; 28: 1 - 31) in the winter of 58/59 C.E. Kokkinos' very sound arguments result in the following *provisional* dates of procuratorship, viz.:

- Felix: c. 52 – 57/58 C.E.
- Festus: c. 57/58 – 62 C.E.
- Albinus: 62 – 64 C.E.

According to Kokkinos (2012: 385 - 386) there is yet further evidence that Festus died whilst in office which makes it possible for his procuratorship to have ended even earlier than was previously believed. Again, this is backed up by undisputable numismatic evidence. Kokkinos (2012: 385 - 386) explains that more conventional dating places the renaming of *Panias/Caesarea* to *Neronias* to the period 62 - 64 C.E. but datable coins prove that the *Neronias* era commenced in 60/61 C.E., an event overseen by Albinus himself. This means that he must have already arrived in Judea as early as 59 C.E. and not in 62 C.E. as is normally believed.

Critics fuelled by more conventional wisdom may raise the issue that western history favours a date of no earlier than c. 62 C.E. for Albinus' arrival in Jerusalem. However, in point of fact, much uncertainty exists about the accuracy of the western dating system, especially in the context of the Julian-Claudian period. By way of example, Jewish authorities have always favoured a date of c. 68 C.E. for the destruction of the Temple which is nearly two years earlier than the western date of 70 C.E. In addition the periods of reigns for many of the Julio-Claudian emperors differ quite considerably depending on whether the source is say Josephus, Dio²²⁰ or Epiphanius²²¹ etc.

Dicken's fourth issue which was dependant on the nature of the suspected Lucan redaction of Ev.Marc. is also flawed. Based on Marshall (1978: 770 - 771) and Fitzmyer (1985: 1344 – 1347). Dicken sees Ev.Luc. 19: 41 as a redaction of Ev.Marc. 13: 14 for rhetorical / propagandistic purposes. He claims that Mark does not mention

²¹⁹ Kokkinos (2010: 385), refers to catalogued examples of Festus' coins in, inter alia, Meshorer, 1982: 285 - 286.

²²⁰ (*Claudius* or *Lucius*) *Cassius Dio Cocceianus* (155 – 235 C.E.).

²²¹ Epiphanius, Bishop of Salamis/Constantia (c. 310/320 – 403 C.E.).

Jerusalem whereas Luke, who often mentions the Holy City, obviously does. Although true as this contention stands, a perusal of Ev.Marc. reveals that the reader is never in any doubt that Mark is indeed referring to Jerusalem. The fact that he is discussing, inter alia, the Holy Temple and the Mount of Olives means that the prophesied event is going to affect Jerusalem as well as Judea.

The charge that Luke's version *includes* a warning to keep away from Jerusalem whereas Mark's version only cautions about a delay is forced. Ev.Marc also implies very strongly that one would not want to be in Judea when the tribulation starts. For example, Ev.Marc. 13: 14 – 19²²² clearly states:

Ὅταν δὲ ἴδητε τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως ἐστηκότα ὅπου οὐ δεῖ, ὁ ἀναγινώσκων νοεῖτω, τότε οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ φευγέτωσαν εἰς τὰ ὄρη, ὁ ἐπὶ τοῦ δώματος μὴ καταβάτω μηδὲ εἰσελθάτω τι ἄραι ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας αὐτοῦ, καὶ ὁ εἰς τὸν ἀγρὸν μὴ ἐπιστρεψάτω εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω ἄραι τὸ ἱμάτιον αὐτοῦ. οὐαὶ δὲ ταῖς ἐν γαστρὶ ἐχούσαις καὶ ταῖς θηλαζούσαις ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις. προσεύχεσθε δὲ ἵνα μὴ γένηται χειμῶνος· ἔσονται γὰρ αἱ ἡμέραι ἐκεῖναι θλίμης οἷα οὐ γέγονεν τοιαύτη ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κτίσεως ἢν ἔκτισεν ὁ θεὸς ἕως τοῦ νῦν καὶ οὐ μὴ γένηται.

When you see “the abomination that causes desolation” standing where it does not belong - let the reader understand - then let those who are in Judea flee to the mountains. Let no one on the housetop go down or enter the house to take anything out. Let no one in the field go back to get their cloak. How dreadful it will be in those days for pregnant women and nursing mothers! Pray that this will not take place in winter, because those will be days of distress unequaled from the beginning, when God created the world, until now - and never to be equalled again [Spelling corrections (underlined) NPLA].

The only real pointed anti-Semitic redaction concerns Luke's mention of the impending death of the Jews (cf. Ev.Luc. 19: 43 – 44).

Lastly, Dicken's argument that there would not have been sufficient time for Luke to have copied Josephus is extremely flawed and again reflects the thinking of an individual who uses research to prove the validity of his belief structure rather than using scientific means to establish a plausible truth.

Dicken (2012: 24) states:

²²² Greek text according to NTOG. 1882. Eds Brooke and Fenton: 104. NIV translation according to Holy Bible. 1989. NIV: NT 47 - 48.

[T]he slightly more developed ecclesiology of 1 Clem. and Ignatius, with ideas of apostolic succession and an early version of the one bishop system of church governance, concepts that are absent in Acts, seems to point to a later date than Acts for those writings.

Shortly thereafter (Dicken, 2012: 25) - in an attempt to discredit Josephus as a source for Act.Ap. - Dicken seemingly reneges on this late date and would have his reader accept an earlier date for 1 Clem. of not later than the mid-90s C.E. One assumes that as Dicken takes Clement I to be the actual author he needs 1 Clem. to have been written before Clement I's death in 99 C.E.? Regardless, based on this "revised" dating, Dicken then explains why *Antiquities* (completed by c. 94 C.E.) would not have had enough time to have been read and absorbed by Luke who completed his Act.Ap. before the mid-90s C.E. In short, Dicken rules out Josephus as an influence on Act.Ap. because he cannot see how it was possible for Clement I to have read Act.Ap. before his death. Of course this latter requirement has absolutely nothing to do with the topic in hand and is a conflation.

Besides, more than a century ago Van Den Bergh Van Eysinga (1908: 1 – 61) confirmed that there is no good evidence to link Pope Clement I with the epistle now known as 1 Clem.

Van Den Bergh Van Eysinga (1908: 9) informs his reader that according to Eusebius' highly suspect *Historia Ecclesiastica*²²³ (specifically *Historia Ecclesiastica*, 4, 2 / 7) Hegessippus²²⁴ travelled to Rome and lived there between the episcopacy of Anicetus²²⁵ and Eleutherius²²⁶. Eleutherius is normally assumed to have commenced his reign in c. 174 C.E. We also know that it was during his reign that Hegessippus supposedly wrote his *Hypomnemata* which makes mention of the epistle

²²³ Hata (in Cohen and Schwartz, 2007: 92) has calculated that the first three books of the *Historia Ecclesiastica* contain 16 passages from *War*, 13 passages from *Antiquities* one passage from the *Against Apion* and another from *Life*. This translates to more than 12% of the entire *Historia Ecclesiastica* consisting of quoted texts from Josephus. Cf. Allen, 2015. *Clarifying the Scope of Pre-Fifth-Century C.E. Christian Interpolation in Josephus' Ιουδαϊκὴ Ἀρχαιολογία* (c. 94 C.E.).

²²⁴ There is some evidence that Hegesippus is not the actual name of the author of the now lost *Hypomnemata*. According to Kirby (2013), he may be associated with, Josephus in Alexandria and then corrupted to the name of Hegesippus in Caesarea. Regardless, his writings are only known to us through, inter alia, *Eusebius Pamphili*. Cf. Kirby. 2013. *Chasing Hegesippus* [Online]. Available: <http://peterkirby.com/chasing-hegesippus.html> [13 January 2015].

²²⁵ Pope Anicetus (Ανίκητος) (reigned c. 153 / 157 - 168 C.E.).

²²⁶ Pope Eleutherius or Eleuterus (Ελευθέριος) (reigned 171 / 177 – 185 / 193 C.E.).

of Clement to the church in Corinth (i.e. 1 Clem.). As this is reported by Eusebius, we do not know who actually is responsible for inferring knowledge of authorship.

Van Den Bergh Van Eysinga (1908: 10 - 11) also informs us that according to Irenaeus²²⁷ (cf. *Contra haereses* 3, 3 / 3) there was a great sedition within the Corinthian church during Clement I's reign. In this context, Clement I urged Rome to send an epistle to the Christian brethren situated in Corinth. However the text does not mention whether or not the epistle was authored by Clement I.

In addition, Irenaeus' list of Roman bishops, wherein the comment is found, cannot possibly predate the reign of Pope Soter²²⁸. Thus the epistle had no specified author before c. 170 C.E. at the earliest possible date.

Likewise, Van Den Bergh Van Eysinga (1908: 52) alludes to the strong and quite mature Roman Catholic theology that permeates this particular epistle - including advanced references to the Blessed Trinity and traces of knowledge of patripassianism. Thus the epistle contains information that is far too advanced for an author living in either the late first century or the early second century of the Common Era.

Lastly, unless one forces meaning onto the text, nowhere is it conclusive that 1 Clem. is based on Luke-Acts. There are some vague references to the apostles but far more of the content deals with, inter alia, Adam, Cain, Abel, Abraham, Jacob, Joseph and Moses - which is of course LXX-based.

By way of example, the following extracts from 1 Clem. and which supposedly refer to the *NT* are most informative:

1 Clem. 5: 4²²⁹ states:

Ὁ Πέτρος ὃς διὰ ζῆλον ἄδικον οὐχ εἶνα ου]δὲ δύο ἀλλὰ πλείονας ὑπήνεγκεν] πόνους, καὶ οὕτω μαρτυ[ρήσας] ἐπορεύθη εἰς τὸν ὀφειλ[όμενον] τόπον τῆς δόξης.

²²⁷ Irenaeus (Εἰρηναῖος) (fl. 180 – c. 202 C.E.).

²²⁸ Pope Soter (σωτήρ) (162 / 168 - 170 / 177 C.E.).

²²⁹ Greek text according to Lightfoot (Ed. and Tr.) 1869. *S. Clement of Rome: The Two Epistles to the Corinthians*: 46 - 48. English translation according to Lightfoot (Ed. and Tr.) 1889. *The Apostolic Fathers: The Epistle of S. Clement to the Corinthians*: 274.

There was Peter who by reason of unrighteous jealousy endured not one but many labours, and thus having borne his testimony went to his appointed place of glory.

This sole comment concerning the disciple Peter could be based on any source including a prevailing Christian tradition. Nothing in this passage even hints at Ev.Luc. or Act.Ap. specifically.

In a similar vein, 1 Clem. 5: 5 - 7²³⁰ states:

Διὰ ζῆλον [καὶ οἱ] Παῦλος ὑπομονῆς βραβεῖον [ὑπέδει]ξεν, ἑπτὰκις δεσμὰ φορέσας, [φυγα]δευθείς, λιθασθείς, κήρυξ γ[ε]νόμ[ε]νος ἐν τε τῇ ἀνατολῇ καὶ ἐ[ν τῇ] δύσει, τὸ γενναῖον τῆς πίστεως αὐτοῦ κλέος ἔλαβεν, δικαιοσύνην διδάξας ὅλον τὸν κόσμον καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ τέλος τῆς δόσεως ἐλθὼν· καὶ μαρτυρήσας ἐπὶ τῶν ἡγουμένων, οὕτως ἀπηλλάγη τοῦ κόσμου καὶ εἰς τὸν ἅγιον τόπον ἐπορεύθη, ὑπομονῆς γενόμενος μέγιστος ὑπογραμμός.

By reason of jealousy and strife Paul by his example pointed out the prize of patient endurance. After that he had been seven times in bonds, had been driven into exile, had been stoned, had preached in the East and in the West, he won the noble renown which was the reward of his faith, having taught righteousness unto the whole world and having reached the farthest bounds of the West; and when he had borne his testimony before the rulers, so he departed from the world and went unto the holy place, having been found a notable pattern of patient endurance.

In addition, 1 Clem. 47: 1²³¹ yields:

Ἀναλάβετε τὴν ἐπιστολὴν τοῦ μακαρίου Παύλου τοῦ ἀποστόλου.

Take up the epistle of the blessed Paul the Apostle.

As before, these two sole references to the apostle Paul are very vague and could be based on any source including a prevailing Christian tradition.

Lastly, Dicken conveniently leaves *War* out of the equation. Indeed, even if he was totally correct and Luke-Acts was indeed written as early as say c. 85 C.E. it could still have been based in part on *War* (c. 74 C.E.).

¹⁶⁵ Greek text according to Lightfoot (Ed. and Tr.) 1869. *S. Clement of Rome: The Two Epistles to the Corinthians*: 48 - 50. English translation according to Lightfoot (Ed. and Tr.) 1889. *The Apostolic Fathers: The Epistle of S. Clement to the Corinthians.*: 274.

²³¹ Greek text according to Lightfoot (Ed. and Tr.) 1869. *S. Clement of Rome: The Two Epistles to the Corinthians*: 144. English translation according to Lightfoot (Ed. and Tr.) 1889. *The Apostolic Fathers: The Epistle of S. Clement to the Corinthians.*: 296.

5.3.3 Sterling's Conventional Dating

Again. No doubt due to his religious viewpoint, Sterling (1992: 329 – 330) despite the fact that he knows full well that Ev.Luc. was only first recorded in the late second century of the Common Era would like his reader to consider a late first century date for the actual writing of this book. With reference to, inter alia, the rather pedestrian and ultra-conservative Bruce (1951: 10 – 14; 1954: 22 - 23) Sterling presents the general Christian consensus date of c. 80 – 90 C.E. This is largely based on the naïve acceptance of Ev.Marc. having been written no later than say c.65 – 70 C.E. and, as has already been witnessed, the fact that Luke-Acts never accurately represents the standard Pauline doctrine²³².

Furthermore, Sterling (1992: 330) picks up on the fact that Luke-Acts presents Christianity as a movement within the Roman Empire; where there is a sense of genuine historicity. In this latter context, Sterling (1992: 330 n. 96) reminds his reader that unlike both Ev.Matt. and Ev.Marc., only Ev.Luc. has a sequel. Consequently, Sterling does not accept a date later than say the mid-90s C.E. for the actual composition of Luke-Acts.

Thus, when attempting to determine whether Josephus influenced Luke or vice versa, the dating of subsequent documents – especially if purely based on faith-based reasoning – only serves to detract from the task at hand.

If we briefly re-consider Mason's perspectives at this point we can determine that Sterling, for one, would not be able to accept Josephus' *Antiquities* as an influence due to its accepted later date of c. 94 C.E. Thus, if scholars like Sterling and Bruce were ever proven to be correct, only Josephus' *War* would be left as a possible stimulus for Luke-Acts.

5.3.4 Conservative Scholars Who Theorise a late Date for Luke Acts

Some scholars, not directly concerned or involved in the Josephus-Luke-Acts debate have each posited a very late date for the creation of Luke-Acts. These findings are of special import to this dissertation. If their arguments hold water they will serve to

²³² Cf. Dicken (2012: 7 – 27). Ultimately Dicken settles on a date for Luke-Acts between c. 75 C.E. and c. 90 C.E. As with most Christian faith-based deductions, this date is based predominantly on the assumption that the contents of Luke-Acts are historically accurate.

bolster the *possibility* that Luke-Acts made use of later material – including the works of Josephus. However, it must also be realised that proving a late date does not in itself prove dependence on Josephus. Conversely, as intimated earlier, if it could be proven beyond a shadow of a doubt that Luke-Acts was indeed written before say 62 C.E. (early date theory) it would rule out the influence of Josephus once and for all.

Baur

In the nineteenth century, Baur²³³ (of Tübingen School fame), dated Luke-Acts to the middle of the second century C.E. Baur (cf. Tyson 2006: 3-6) believed that early Christianity was characterised by the tension between two competing camps: Jewish Christians (led by Peter) who still adhered to Torah and Gentile-Christians (led by Paul) who denounced Torah in favour of sole faith in Jesus. Baur saw Acts as an apologetic text deliberately composed to create the illusion of accord between the two factions. In short, Acts was a literary compromise wherein Paul is made to appear more Petrine and Peter is made to appear more Pauline. Because Baur argued that tensions between the two groups extended through the first century and continued into the second century, the assuaging composition of Acts could not have been written until well into the second century (c. 140-150 C.E.).

Tyson

Tyson (2006: 10-11) points out that an external reference provides a definite *terminus ad quem* for a text. Based on the available literature, external references to Acts are all relatively late. In short, according to Tyson, no ancient author can confirm the existence of Acts before the middle of the second century C.E. In this regard, he cites Conzelmann (1987: xxvii-xxxiii) and Haenchen (1971: 8). The latter confirming that the earliest Christian reference to Acts comes from the pen of Justyn Martyr (cf. 1 *Apology* 50:12).²³⁴

Lastly, in his seminal *Marcion and Luke-Acts: A Defining Struggle* (2006), Tyson convincingly argues that the position first advanced by the Baur was indeed largely correct. According to him, Luke-Acts was written in the middle of the second century as a response to both the teaching and canonical initiative of Marcion. Tyson gives

²³³ Ferdinand Christian Baur (1792 – 1860).

²³⁴ 1 *Apology* is dated to 155-157 C.E. This is based on a reference to Felix as a recent prefect of Egypt (cf. Grant 1988).

an account of Marcion's lionising the Gentile-Christian leader Paul over and against Peter and the other Jewish-Christian apostles. Acts is then shown to be a positive response to Marcion's more negative and heterodox doctrines. Unlike Baur's "apologetic" theory, Tyson argues that because of Marcion's rejection of Peter and his Jewish-Christian stance, Acts (as an apologetic) did not need to make Paul look more Petrine so much as it needed to revitalise the significance of Peter and his teaching. As previously reviewed in section 3.6.4, the author of Acts appears to be aligning Christianity to Judaism, in order to, inter alia, impress upon the reader that because of its noble Jewish ancestry, the newer Christian faith is equally authoritative and of the highest moral fibre. Here it is important for the author to both distinguish between Jew and Christian (for doctrinal reasons) as well as convince the reader that the Jewish traditions prophecy Christ. In this context, despite the need to identify Jewish difference, the author still believes that Judaism and Christianity form a continuum.

In contradistinction to this approach, Marcion wanted to show that the age of Christian faith and the age of Jewish Torah are distinctly different and separate. For Marcion, there can be no continuity between Judaism and Christianity. Accordingly, Tyson concludes that Acts was written in c. 120-125 C.E. at a time (second century C.E.) when Marcion's heterodoxy was becoming a clear threat to the Christian status quo.

5.4 The Authorship of Luke-Acts

Sterling (1992: 321 – 327) goes to some length to review what is currently known about the provenance of Luke-Acts. For example, he reminds his reader that a common authorship could be assumed from the inferences made in the two texts themselves. In short, there is a perceived stylistic commonality to these two books that strongly ties them together. This of course does not mean that a single author was at work.

With reference to Λογίων Κυριακῶν Ἐξήγησις (*Exposition of the Sayings of the Lord*) the five lost books by Papias²³⁵ and which have only come down to us in fragmentary form via the works of Eusebius²³⁶ and Irenaeus²³⁷, Sterling (1992: 321) infers that by

²³⁵ Papias (Παπίας) Bishop of Hierapolis (c. 60 – 130 C.E.).

²³⁶ *Eusebius Pamphili* a.k.a. Eusebius of Caesarea (c. 263 – c. 339 C.E.).

130 C.E. no mention had yet been made of Ev.Luc. or even a similar document. The seeming corollary to this observation is the fact that in his *Adv. Marc. (Adversus Marcionem)* 4.2.3²³⁸ Tertullian²³⁹ wrote of Marcion²⁴⁰:

Contra Marcion evangelio, scilicet suo, nullum adscribit auctorem, quasi non licuerit illi titulum quoque affingere, cui nefas non fuit ipsum corpus evertere. Et possem hic iam gradum figere, non agnoscendum contendens opus quod non erigat frontem, quod nullam constantiam praeferat, nullam fidem repromittat de plenitudine tituli et professione debita auctoris.

Marcion, on the other hand, you must know, ascribes no author to his Gospel, as if it could not be allowed him to affix a title to that from which it was no crime (in his eyes) to subvert the very body. And here I might now make a stand, and contend that a work ought not to be recognised, which holds not its head erect, which exhibits no consistency, which gives no promise of credibility from the fullness of its title and the just profession of its author.

Thus we are informed that Marcion rejected what are now known as Ev.Matt., Ev.Marc. and Ev.Jo. and referred only to a redacted (albeit anonymous) version of Ev.Luc.

Only from the late second century of the Common Era onward is there a concerted effort in Christian writing to ascribe Luke as the author of these two books and here it is quite obvious that this assertion is based solely on the then prevailing Christian tradition as backed up by unsubstantiated references found in selected *NT* passages.

Thus based on a reading of, inter alia, Ep.Col. 4: 14; Ep.Philem. 24; 2 Ep.Ti. 4: 10 – 11; Act.Ap. 16: 10 – 17; 20: 5 – 15; 21: 1 – 18; 27: 1 – 28: 16 and Ev.Luc. 1: 2 - 3 it was accepted that Luke was a physician who was born in Antioch. He was unmarried, a companion of the apostle Paul and he lived a long life, dying in Boetia at the age of 84. Sterling (1992: 322) confirms that even here, the actual name of the author (i.e. Luke) is not available in any *NT* source.

²³⁷ *Irenaeus* (Εἰρηναῖος) Bishop of Lugdunum (fl. 180 – c. 202 C.E.).

²³⁸ Latin text according to Evans, (Ed.). 1972. *Tertullian: Adversus Marcionem*: 262. English translation according to Holmes, Peter (Tr.) 1868. The Five Books of Quintus Sept. Flor. Tertullianus Against Marcion, in Roberts and Donaldson, (Eds) 1868. *Ante-Nicene Christian Library: Translations of the Writings of the Fathers Down to A.D. 325. Vol. VII.*: 180 – 181.

²³⁹ *Quintus Septimius Florens Tertullianus* (c. 160 - 225 C.E.).

²⁴⁰ Marcion of Sinope (Μαρκίων Σινώπης) (c. 85 - c. 160 C.E.).

The association of Luke as the author of Luke-Acts was due no doubt to the then sagacious need to correlate texts of Christian import and that were deemed to be spiritually authoritative with the name of a known disciple or apostle²⁴¹. Thus, although Luke is not mentioned by name, it was possible for Christian apologists to infer from the context of various *NT* texts that Luke was at least the most likely candidate. In this context, Sterling (1992: 323) confirms that in the light of the fact that there exists no clear historical evidence - we have no choice but to look to the text itself to determine whether or not the two books in question have a common authorship.

What is interesting here (and quite possibly this is due to Sterling's worldview and faith) is that he seems to accept the traditional view that Luke-Acts is non-Jewish (i.e. Gentile) in character. This flies in the face of Mason's views that expressly focuses on the fact that Ev.Luc. for one, is determined to create a Jewish setting for the story of Jesus of Nazareth. In addition, Sterling (1992: 327) takes a fairly conservative view that Luke must have been a second generation Christian whereas he sees Paul as first generation. This observation is fraught with problems since if the *NT* is largely apocryphal in nature - nothing in it can be trusted as being historically valid. Furthermore, even if we want to naively accept the politically motivated *fabulae* that it contains and attempt to reconstruct some form of potted chronology, surely Paul would also be a second generation Christian since, like Luke, he never knew Jesus personally and started his ministry sometime after that of the disciples?

Despite this strange observation, Sterling (1992: 327 – 329) goes on to argue that whatever his actual name (although he seems to buy into the possibility that the Christian tradition however flawed may have a basis of fact) Luke was certainly a very knowledgeable individual who knew his LXX and could easily have been a Jew (albeit Hellenised) as well. His ultimate conclusion is that whoever the author was; he most likely lived and wrote in the Eastern Roman Empire in a Hellenised centre. Here, Sterling (1992: 329 n. 93), inter alia, offers as support for this contention, the work of Harnack (1909: 20 – 24) who (quite conventionally) places Luke in Syria – specifically Antioch.

What no scholar seems to have considered here is that if Luke-Acts was created for a specific purpose, during a time when early Christian apologists were suddenly

²⁴¹ Cf. Dicken (2012: 7 – 27) for a detailed account of the problems associated with dating early Christian writings.

faced with the sad reality that no historical material existed to corroborate the existence of an historical Jesus of Nazareth, it would have become imperative to create such things as nativity stories, faked genealogies, accounts of Jesus' childhood and family etc.

Is it not more likely given the reality of this possibility that not one but several early Christian authorities collaborated in their efforts to create the gospels and specifically Ev.Luc, and Act.Ap? which collectively contain the first biography of Jesus as well as the only *NT* history of the early church suitable for keeping any nagging questions at bay? Would not this action have ensured simultaneously that the primary Christian dogma was encapsulated in a powerful (albeit simplified) literary form – one suitable for easy digestion, memorisation and dissemination amongst the mostly illiterate recipients?

Again, if one is going to create a forgery, then one needs to make sure that the text contains certain details to back up the illusion of authenticity. For example, much has been written about proving that an individual called “Luke” actually wrote Luke-Acts. This is almost totally as a result of conservative Christian scholarship – one based on justifying a confession of faith and not objective scientific enquiry for its own sake. For example, Dicken (2012: 11 – 13) reminds us that four pericopes exist, wherein the assumed author of Act.Ap. gives an account in the first person plural instead of the more normal third person.

Collectively, these four passages which make use of pronouns like “we” and “us” are referred to as the “we sections” and they alone buttress the traditional contention that Luke is the sole author of Luke-Acts, viz.:

1. The “we sections” of Act.Ap. indicate that the “author” was an eyewitness to the events recorded in those specific pericopes;
2. Certain of these “we sections” may be compared to Pauls’ Prison Epistles²⁴² allowing us to reduce the number of potential candidates who might constitute the “we”; and

²⁴² The Prison Epistles refers to Ep.Eph., Ep.Phil., Ep.Col. and Ep.Philem. all of which were supposedly written by the apostle Paul when he was living under house arrest in Rome (c. 60 – 62 C.E.).

3. It is assumed that the testimony of the early Christian writers who ascribed authorship of Luke-Acts to the very Luke mentioned in Paul's Prison Epistles is wholly persuasive.

The longest "we section" is Act.Ap. 27: 1 - 28: 16 which deals with Paul's sea voyage to Rome, his shipwreck and eventual arrival in Rome. The other three slightly shorter pericopes ("we sections") are reproduced below for clarity:

Act.Ap. 16: 10 – 17²⁴³:

ὡς δὲ τὸ ὄραμα εἶδεν, εὐθέως ἐζητήσαμεν ἐξελθεῖν εἰς Μακεδονίαν, συνβιβάζοντες ὅτι προσκέκληται ἡμᾶς ὁ θεὸς εὐαγγελίσασθαι αὐτούς. Ἀναχθέντες οὖν ἀπὸ Τρωάδος εὐθυδρομήσαμεν εἰς Σαμοθράκην, τῇ δὲ ἐπιούσῃ εἰς Νεάν Πόλιν, κάκειθεν εἰς Φιλίππους, ἣτις ἐστὶν πρώτη τῆς μερίδος Μακεδονίας πόλις, κολωνία. Ἦμεν δὲ ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ πόλει διατρίβοντες ἡμέρας τινάς. τῇ τε ἡμέρᾳ τῶν σαββάτων ἐξήλθομεν ἔξω τῆς πύλης παρὰ ποταμὸν οὗ ἐνομιζόμεν προσευχὴν εἶναι, καὶ καθίσαντες ἐλαλοῦμεν ταῖς συνελθούσαις γυναῖξιν. καὶ τις γυνὴ ὀνόματι Λυδία, πορφυρόπωλις πόλεως Θυατείρων σεβομένη τὸν θεόν, ἤκουεν, ἣς ὁ κύριος διήνοιξεν τὴν καρδίαν προσέχειν τοῖς λαλουμένοις ὑπὸ Παύλου. ὡς δὲ ἐβαπτίσθη καὶ ὁ οἶκος αὐτῆς, παρεκάλεσεν λέγουσα Εἰ κεκρίκατέ με πιστὴν τῷ κυρίῳ εἶναι, εἰσελθόντες εἰς τὸν οἶκόν μου μένετε· καὶ παρεβιάσατο ἡμᾶς. Ἐγένετο δὲ πορευομένων ἡμῶν εἰς τὴν προσευχὴν παιδίσκην τινὰ ἔχουσαν πνεῦμα πύθωνα ὑπαντήσαι ἡμῖν, ἣτις ἐργασίαν πολλὴν παρεῖχεν τοῖς κυρίοις αὐτῆς μαντευομένη· αὕτη κατακολουθοῦσα τῷ Παύλῳ καὶ ἡμῖν ἔκραζεν λέγουσα Οὗτοι οἱ ἄνθρωποι δοῦλοι τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου εἰσίν, οἵτινες καταγγέλλουσιν ὑμῖν ὁδὸν σωτηρίας.

After Paul had seen the vision, we got ready at once to leave for Macedonia, concluding that God had called us to preach the gospel to them. From Troas we put out to sea and sailed straight for Samothrace, and the next day we went on to Neapolis. From there we travelled to Philippi, a Roman colony and the leading city of that district of Macedonia. And we stayed there several days. On the Sabbath we went outside the city gate to the river, where we expected to find a place of prayer. We sat down and began to speak to the women who had gathered there. One of those listening was a woman from the city of Thyatira named Lydia, a dealer in purple cloth. She was a worshiper of God. The Lord opened her heart to respond to Paul's message. When she and the members of her household were baptized, she invited us to her home. "If you consider me a believer in the Lord," she said, "come and stay at my house." And she persuaded us. Once when we were going to the place of prayer, we were met by a female slave who had a spirit by which she predicted the future. She earned a great deal of money for her owners by fortune-telling. She

²⁴³Greek text according to *NTOG*. 1882. Eds Brooke and Fenton: 284 - 285. NIV translation according to Holy Bible. 1989. NIV: *NT* 128.

followed Paul and the rest of us, shouting, "These men are servants of the Most High God, who are telling you the way to be saved."

Act.Ap. 20: 5 – 15²⁴⁴:

οὔτοι δὲ προσελθόντες ἔμενον ἡμᾶς ἐν Τρωάδι· ἡμεῖς δὲ ἐξεπλεύσαμεν μετὰ τὰς ἡμέρας τῶν ἀζύμων ἀπὸ Φιλίππων, καὶ ἦλθομεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς εἰς τὴν Τρωάδα ἄχρι ἡμερῶν πέντε, οὓς διετρίψαμεν ἡμέρας ἑπτὰ. Ἐν δὲ τῇ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων συνηγμένων ἡμῶν κλάσαι ἄρτον ὁ Παῦλος διελέγετο αὐτοῖς, μέλλων ἐξιέναι τῇ ἐπαύριον, παρέτεινεν τε τὸν λόγον μέχρι μεσονυκτίου. ἦσαν δὲ λαμπάδες ἱκαναὶ ἐν τῷ ὑπερώφῳ οὓς ἤμεν συνηγμένοι· καθεζόμενος δὲ τις νεανίας ὀνόματι Εὐτυχὸς ἐπὶ τῆς θυρίδος, καταφερόμενος ὕπνῳ βαθεῖ διαλεγόμενου τοῦ Παύλου ἐπὶ πλεῖον, κατενεχθεὶς ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕπνου ἔπεσεν ἀπὸ τοῦ τριστεγίου κάτω καὶ ἦρθη νεκρός. καταβάς δὲ ὁ Παῦλος ἐπέπεσεν αὐτῷ καὶ συνπεριλαβὼν εἶπεν Μὴ θορυβεῖσθε, ἡ γὰρ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ ἐστὶν ἀναβὰς δὲ καὶ κλάσας τὸν ἄρτον καὶ γευσάμενος ἐφ' ἱκανόν τε ὀμιλήσας ἄχρι αὐγῆς οὕτως ἐξῆλθεν. ἦγαγον δὲ τὸν παῖδα ζῶντα, καὶ παρεκλήθησαν οὐ μετρίως. Ἡμεῖς δὲ προσελθόντες ἐπὶ τὸ πλοῖον ἀνήχθημεν ἐπὶ τὴν Ἄσσον, ἐκεῖθεν μέλλοντες ἀναλαμβάνειν τὸν Παῦλον, οὕτως γὰρ διατεταγμένος ἦν μέλλων αὐτὸς πεζεύειν. ὥς δὲ συνέβαλλεν ἡμῖν εἰς τὴν Ἄσσον, ἀναλαβόντες αὐτὸν ἦλθομεν εἰς Μιτυλήνην, κάκειθεν ἀποπλεύσαντες τῇ ἐπιούσῃ κατηντήσαμεν ἄντικρυς Χίου, τῇ δὲ ἐτέρᾳ παρεβάλομεν εἰς Σάμον, τῇ δὲ ἐχομένη ἦλθομεν εἰς Μίλητον·

These men went on ahead and waited for us at Troas. But we sailed from Philippi after the Festival of Unleavened Bread, and five days later joined the others at Troas, where we stayed seven days. On the first day of the week we came together to break bread. Paul spoke to the people and, because he intended to leave the next day, kept on talking until midnight. There were many lamps in the upstairs room where we were meeting. Seated in a window was a young man named Eutychus, who was sinking into a deep sleep as Paul talked on and on. When he was sound asleep, he fell to the ground from the third story and was picked up dead. Paul went down, threw himself on the young man and put his arms around him. "Don't be alarmed," he said. "He's alive!" Then he went upstairs again and broke bread and ate. After talking until daylight, he left. The people took the young man home alive and were greatly comforted. We went on ahead to the ship and sailed for Assos, where we were going to take Paul aboard. He had made this arrangement because he was going there on foot. When he met us at Assos, we took him aboard and went on to Mitylene. The next day we set sail from there and arrived off Chios. The day after that we crossed over to Samos, and on the following day arrived at Miletus.

²⁴⁴ Greek text according to *NTOG*. 1882. Eds Brooke and Fenton: 294. NIV translation according to Holy Bible. 1989. NIV: *NT* 132.

Ὡς δὲ ἐγένετο ἀναχθῆναι ἡμᾶς ἀποσπασθέντας ἀπ' αὐτῶν, εὐθυδρομήσαντες ἤλθομεν εἰς τὴν Κῶ, τῇ δὲ ἐξῆς εἰς τὴν Ῥόδον, κάκειθεν εἰς Πάταρα· καὶ εὐρόντες πλοῖον διαπερῶν εἰς Φοινίκην ἐπιβάντες ἀνήχθημεν. ἀναφάναντες δὲ τὴν Κύπρον καὶ καταλιπόντες αὐτὴν εὐώνυμον ἐπλέομεν εἰς Συρίαν, καὶ κατήλθομεν εἰς Τύρον, ἐκεῖσε γὰρ τὸ πλοῖον ἦν ἀποφορτιζόμενον τὸν γόμον. ἀνευρόντες δὲ τοὺς μαθητὰς ἐπεμείναμεν αὐτοῦ ἡμέρας ἑπτὰ, οἵτινες τῷ Παύλῳ ἔλεγον διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος μὴ ἐπιβαίνειν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα. ὅτε δὲ ἐγένετο ἐξαρτίσαι ἡμᾶς τὰς ἡμέρας, ἐξελθόντες ἐπορευόμεθα προπεμπόντων ἡμᾶς πάντων σὺν γυναιξὶ καὶ τέκνοις ἕως ἔξω τῆς πόλεως, καὶ θέντες τὰ γόνατα ἐπὶ τὸν αἰγιαλὸν προσευξάμενοι ἀησπασάμεθα ἀλλήλους, καὶ ἐνέβημεν εἰς τὸ πλοῖον, ἐκεῖνοι δὲ ὑπέστρεψαν εἰς τὰ ἴδια. Ἡμεῖς δὲ τὸν πλοῦν διανύσαντες ἀπὸ Τύρου κατηντήσαμεν εἰς Πτολεμαῖδα, καὶ ἀσπασάμενοι τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς ἐμείναμεν ἡμέραν μίαν παρ' αὐτοῖς. τῇ δὲ ἐπαύριον ἐξελθόντες ἤλθαμεν εἰς Καισαρίαν, καὶ εἰσελθόντες εἰς τὸν οἶκον Φιλίππου τοῦ εὐαγγελιστοῦ ὄντος ἐκ τῶν ἑπτὰ ἐμείναμεν παρ' αὐτῷ. τούτῳ δὲ ἦσαν θυγατέρες τέσσαρες παρθένοι προφητεύουσαι. Ἐπιμενόντων δὲ ἡμέρας πλείους κατήλθεν τις ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰουδαίας προφήτης ὄνοματι Ἄγαβος, καὶ ἐλθὼν πρὸς ἡμᾶς καὶ ἄρας τὴν ζώνην τοῦ Παύλου δήσας ἑαυτοῦ τοὺς πόδας καὶ τὰς χεῖρας εἶπεν Τάδε λέγει τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον Τὸν ἄνδρα οὗ ἐστὶν ἡ ζώνη αὕτη οὕτως δήσουσιν ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι καὶ παραδώσουσιν εἰς χεῖρας ἐθνῶν. ὥς δὲ ἠκούσαμεν ταῦτα, παρεκαλοῦμεν ἡμεῖς τε καὶ οἱ ἐντόπιοι τοῦ μὴ ἀναβαίνειν αὐτὸν εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ. τότε ἀπεκρίθη ὁ Παῦλος Τί ποιεῖτε κλαίοντες καὶ συνθρύπτοντές μου τὴν καρδίαν; ἐγὼ γὰρ οὐ μόνον δεθῆναι ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀποθανεῖν εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἐτοιμῶς ἔχω ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ. μὴ πειθομένου δὲ αὐτοῦ ἠσυχάσαμεν εἰπόντες Τοῦ κυρίου τὸ θέλημα γινέσθω. Μετὰ δὲ τὰς ἡμέρας ταύτας ἐπισκευασάμενοι ἀνεβαίνομεν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα· συνῆλθον δὲ καὶ τῶν μαθητῶν ἀπὸ Καισαρίας σὺν ἡμῖν, ἄγοντες παρ' ᾧ ξενισθῶμεν Μνάσωνί τινι Κυπρίῳ, ἀρχαίῳ μαθητῇ. Γενομένων δὲ ἡμῶν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα ἀσμένως ἀπεδέξαντο ἡμᾶς οἱ ἀδελφοί. τῇ δὲ ἐπιούσῃ εἰσήει ὁ Παῦλος σὺν ἡμῖν πρὸς Ἰάκωβον, πάντες τε παρεγένοντο οἱ πρεσβύτεροι.

After we had torn ourselves away from them, we put out to sea and sailed straight to Kos. The next day we went to Rhodes and from there to Patara. We found a ship crossing over to Phoenicia, went on board and set sail. After sighting Cyprus and passing to the south of it, we sailed on to Syria. We landed at Tyre, where our ship was to unload its cargo. We sought out the disciples there and stayed with them seven days. Through the Spirit they urged Paul not to go on to Jerusalem. When it was time to leave, we left and continued on our way. All of them, including wives and children, accompanied us out of the city, and there on the beach we knelt to pray. After saying goodbye to each other, we went aboard the ship, and they returned home. We continued our voyage from Tyre and landed at Ptolemais, where we greeted the brothers and sisters and stayed with

²⁴⁵ Greek text according to NTOG. 1882. Eds Brooke and Fenton: 296 - 297. NIV translation according to Holy Bible. 1989. NIV: NT 133.

them for a day. Leaving the next day, we reached Caesarea and stayed at the house of Philip the evangelist, one of the Seven. He had four unmarried daughters who prophesied. After we had been there a number of days, a prophet named Agabus came down from Judea. Coming over to us, he took Paul's belt, tied his own hands and feet with it and said, "The Holy Spirit says, 'In this way the Jewish leaders in Jerusalem will bind the owner of this belt and will hand him over to the Gentiles.'" When we heard this, we and the people there pleaded with Paul not to go up to Jerusalem. Then Paul answered, "Why are you weeping and breaking my heart? I am ready not only to be bound, but also to die in Jerusalem for the name of the Lord Jesus." When he would not be dissuaded, we gave up and said, "The Lord's will be done." After this, we started on our way up to Jerusalem. Some of the disciples from Caesarea accompanied us and brought us to the home of Mnason, where we were to stay. He was a man from Cyprus and one of the early disciples. When we arrived at Jerusalem, the brothers and sisters received us warmly. The next day Paul and the rest of us went to see James, and all the elders were present.

Is it not peculiar that the only references to the first person plural, in the entire Act.Ap. exist in only four discreet and fairly sizeable blocks of text? If an author was writing consistently as a co-witness to an unfolding drama would he not be more likely to maintain the first person mode more or less continuously throughout the narration? This in itself is highly suspicious and does not support the notion that the hand of a single author was involved.

Dicken (2012: 11) confirms that we should not merely assume that the "we sections" refer to an actual eyewitness account:

[T]he "we sections" may be a literary convention or perhaps are based on one of the author's sources (cf. Luke 1:1 - 4). Furthermore, an eyewitness would likely have been more explicit about his participation in events he deemed so significant.

Dicken (2012: 12 – 13) also reminds his reader that we obviously cannot trust the historical accuracy - let alone the authenticity of many (if not all of the Pauline epistles) and we most certainly cannot accept Luke as the author of Luke-Acts simply because the Christian tradition has maintained this conjecture for such a long time! Many alternative scenarios have been presented over the years.

For example, as supported by Dicken, the "we sections" could well be literary devices so designed as to better involve and engage the reader – not to mention (cf. Bovon, 2002: 8) making the narrative more interesting and lively. Dicken (2012: 12 – 13 and 13 n. 21) also makes mention of Robbins (1978: 215 – 242) who proffered that the

“we sections” were common to narratives involving sea voyages in ancient literature. Also, as has been dealt with elsewhere we witness extensive Lucan invention of historical events and in this context Pervo (1987: 138) has posited that the historical events were in fact embroidered by the writer merely to create a more regaling and appealing narrative.

Dicken (2012: 13 – 14) provides us with many more examples of hypothetical skulduggery, including the following:

1. Scholars who have conjectured that the “we sections” are based on one of the author’s many sources. For example Haenchen (1971: 85 – 87) demonstrates that the “we sections” are possibly based on a number of diaries and/or travelogues;
2. Porter (1994: 545 – 574) has determined that a single “we” source informs the “we sections” and Dicken feels that the fact that the Lucan author claims to rely on eyewitness accounts for his sources makes this a feasible possibility. Dicken also theorises that there could have been any number of “we” sources which were then combined into the larger narrative;
3. With specific reference to the supposedly authentic Pauline epistles (i.e. Ep.Rom., 1 Ep.Cor., 2 Ep.Cor., Ep.Gal., Ep.Phil., 1 Ep.Thess. and Ep.Philem.) both Paul’s theology and history is misrepresented; and
4. Neither the Lucan author’s supposed personal association with Paul nor his supposed employment of the Pauline Epistles can emphatically confirm that the author of Luke-Acts was the same Luke mentioned in the Prison Epistles.

What this tells us is that the jury is still out as regards deciding who or how many authors were involved in creating Luke-Acts. Certainly, even if there was ever an initiating and sole author for either Ev.Luc. and/or Act.Ap. we would be very naïve not to accept that subsequently, other hands have become involved. This redaction process may have occurred several times over several decades and as the evolving Christian dogma started to coalesce may have necessitated both minor adjustments, as well as major overhauls.

5.5 The Unity of Luke-Acts

Verheyden (2012: 27 - 29) confirms that four prevailing views currently exist as regards whether or not Luke-Acts represents a single opus. The majority view is that Luke-Acts was planned from the beginning as being two parts of one conceptual piece. Later, it was deliberately split into two works – an action that may have necessitated some minor redaction to the concluding passages of the first part and the beginning of the second part

This majority view may be juxtaposed against three minority opinions, viz.:

1. Luke originally wrote two autonomous works but later decided to link them. To do this he needed to rewrite the end of book one (Ev.Luc.) and the beginning of book two (Act.Ap.).
2. Luke wrote Act.Ap. *before* Ev.Luc. and he even intended to write a third book.
3. Luke first wrote proto-Luke which included elements of what would eventually become known as Ev.Luc. and the first 15 chapters of what would become Act.Ap. Later, he completed the work by adding more information gleaned from Ev.Marc. and Q. resulting in the present separation of the gospel account (Ev.Luc.) from the narrative concerning the disciples (Act.Ap.).

The majority view designation (i.e. “Luke-Acts”) - now so commonly employed in contemporary literature - was itself largely the invention of Cadbury (1927: 8 – 11). Cadbury (1922: 491 – 492) also firmly believed that there could be no question that originally Luke-Acts formed a single lengthy document that necessitated it being split up as well as supplied with separate prologues – one per book:

[I]t was the custom in antiquity, on account of the purely physical conditions of writing, to divide works into volumes, to prefix to the first a preface for the whole, and to add secondary prefaces to the beginning of the each later one. The impression made on the English reader by Acts i, 1, that the author is making a new start or at least preparing a kind of sequel to his gospel, would not occur to an early reader. The book of Acts is no afterthought. The word “treatise” implies a more complete work than does *logos*. The reference to the preceding book, and the renewed address to the patron, are typical of these secondary prefaces in Greek and Latin literature.

By this reasoning, Cadbury (1922: 489) goes so far as to prescribe that there was but one author for Luke-Acts who was addressing the same individual (i.e. Theophilus).

Perhaps the most important contribution to this debate concerns Sterling's views on whether or not Luke-Acts constitutes a genuine unity. In short, is Act.Ap. emphatically an intended sequel to Ev.Luc. as supported by, inter alia, Mason?

On this very issue, Sterling (1992: 331) states:

There can be no question that the two books are related, the question is how: Was Acts an afterthought or were the gospel and Acts conceived as a single work and subsequently separated in the formation of the Christian canon?

Sterling (1992: 332 - 333) presents to his reader a number of scholars who all concur that Luke-Acts may originally have constituted a single work. These include Talbert (1974a: 16 – 18) who reveals certain architectonic parallels between Ev.Luc. and Act.Ap.; Tannehill (1986: 2) who clearly shows a narrative unity between the two books; and researchers like Flender (1967) who have successfully demonstrated that a common theology is espoused in the two books.

Verheyden (2012: 27) also confirms the unity of Luke-Acts when he summarises as follows:

The story itself begins by resuming the last episode that was told in that Gospel; it continues by telling the stories of two of the major protagonists in the earliest Christian communities and frequently it does so in a way that invites comparing one with the other and both with Jesus. Much of what Jesus did is done by Peter as well and then also repeated once more by Paul; the apostles are largely modelled after the figure of Jesus.

However, Sterling also correctly feels that we should not rule out the possibility that Ev.Luc. was in fact written first and then, sometime later, Act.Ap. was produced as a conscious sequel. As an aside, Sterling's (1992: 335) arguments already point towards the Lucan author(s) having deliberately kept back certain information in Ev.Luc. that only appears later in Act.Ap. As has been discussed already, this offers some evidence that the author(s) of Ev.Luc. might have planned to write a sequel before the commencement of Ev.Luc.

Here, Sterling would most likely agree, since he believes that there is evidence in the text itself that points to this very possibility. Sterling (1992: 333) refers to the certain intriguing scriptural evidence.

In this regard, each of the three synoptic gospels concludes with Jesus of Nazareth delivering an obviously ersatz farewell speech to his disciples. In each case, Jesus is portrayed as instructing his adherents apropos their future obligations and assignments. In short, the disciples are being presented with their future commissions. For greater clarity these passages have been reproduced below:

Ev.Matt. 28: 18 – 20²⁴⁶:

καὶ προσελθὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐλάλησεν αὐτοῖς λέγων Ἐδόθη μοι πᾶσα ἐξουσία ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς· πορευθέντες οὖν μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, βαπτίζοντες αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος, διδάσκοντες αὐτοὺς τηρεῖν πάντα ὅσα ἐνετειλάμην ὑμῖν· καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμὶ πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας ἕως τῆς συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος.

Then Jesus came to them and said, “All authority in heaven and on earth has been given to me. Therefore go and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, and teaching them to obey everything I have commanded you. And surely I am with you always, to the very end of the age.”

Ev.Marc. 16: 15 – 18²⁴⁷:

καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς Πορευθέντες εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἅπαντα κηρύξατε τὸ εὐαγγέλιον πάσῃ τῇ κτίσει· πορευθέντες οὖν μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, βαπτίζοντες αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος, σημεῖα δὲ τοῖς πιστεύουσιν ἀκολουθήσει ταῦτα, ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου δαιμόνια ἐκβαλοῦσιν, γλώσσαις λαλήσουσιν, καὶ ἐν ταῖς χερσὶν ὄφεις ἀροῦσιν κἂν θανάσιμόν τι πίωσιν οὐ μὴ αὐτοὺς βλάβῃ, ἐπὶ ἄρρώστους χεῖρας ἐπιθήσουσιν καὶ καλῶς ἔξουσιν.

He said to them, “Go into all the world and preach the gospel to all creation. Whoever believes and is baptized will be saved, but whoever does not believe will be condemned. And these signs will accompany those who believe: In my name they will drive out demons; they will speak in new tongues; they will pick up snakes with their hands; and when they

²⁴⁶ Greek text according to *NTOG*. 1882. Eds Brooke and Fenton: 71. NIV translation according to Holy Bible. 1989. NIV: *NT* 32.

²⁴⁷ Greek text according to *NTOG*. 1882. Eds Brooke and Fenton: 113. NIV translation according to Holy Bible. 1989. NIV: *NT* 52.

drink deadly poison, it will not hurt them at all; they will place their hands on sick people, and they will get well.”

Ev.Luc. 24: 44 – 49²⁴⁸:

Εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς αὐτούς Οὗτοι οἱ λόγοι μου οὐς ἐλάλησα πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἔτι ὧν σὺν ὑμῖν, ὅτι δεῖ πληρωθῆναι πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα ἐν τῷ νόμῳ Μωυσέως καὶ τοῖς προφήταις καὶ Ψαλμοῖς περὶ ἐμοῦ. τότε διήνοιξεν αὐτῶν τὸν νοῦν τοῦ συνιέναι τὰς γραφάς, καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὅτι οὕτως γέγραπται παθεῖν τὸν χριστὸν καὶ ἀναστῆναι ἐκ νεκρῶν τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, καὶ κηρυχθῆναι ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ μετάνοιαν εἰς ἄφεςιν ἁμαρτιῶν εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, ἀρξάμενοι ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλήμ· ὑμεῖς μάρτυρες τούτων. καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἐξαποστέλλω τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πατρὸς μου ἐφ' ὑμᾶς· ὑμεῖς δὲ καθίσατε ἐν τῇ πόλει ἕως οὗ ἐνδύσησθε ἐξ ὕψους δύναμιν.

He said to them, “This is what I told you while I was still with you: Everything must be fulfilled that is written about me in the Law of Moses, the Prophets and the Psalms.” Then he opened their minds so they could understand the Scriptures. He told them, “This is what is written: The Messiah will suffer and rise from the dead on the third day, and repentance for the forgiveness of sins will be preached in his name to all nations, beginning at Jerusalem. You are witnesses of these things. I am going to send you what my Father has promised; but stay in the city until you have been clothed with power from on high.”

It is significant that only the Lucan version deals with the fulfilment of Jewish prophecy. However, Sterling's (1992: 333) take on this issue concentrates on this passage being at odds with say Ev.Matt. wherein Jesus emphasises the need for the disciples to convert and teach. Certainly, in Ev.Luc. Jesus of Nazareth seems to be strongly inferring, that it was mandatory for everything that was prophesied about him in the LXX to be accomplished. In addition Jesus is presented to the reader as though he gave his disciples the necessary wisdom to correctly interpret the LXX (again implying that there was only one interpretation possible of a divine message prophesied in ancient times).

Sterling (1992: 333 – 335) analyses the Greek text (specifically Ev.Luc. 24: 46 – 47)²⁴⁹, viz.:

²⁴⁸ Greek text according to *NTOG*. 1882. Eds Brooke and Fenton: 185 – 186. NIV translation according to Holy Bible. 1989. NIV: *NT* 85.

²⁴⁹ Greek text according to *NTOG*. 1882. Eds Brooke and Fenton: 185 - 186. NIV translation according to Holy Bible. 1989. NIV: *NT* 85.

γέγραπται παθεῖν τὸν χριστὸν καὶ ἀναστῆναι ἐκ νεκρῶν τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, καὶ κηρυχθῆναι ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ μετάνοιαν εἰς ἅφεςιν ἁμαρτιῶν εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, ἀρξάμενοι ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλήμ·

He told them, “This is what is written: The Messiah will suffer and rise from the dead on the third day, and repentance for the forgiveness of sins will be preached in his name to all nations, beginning at Jerusalem.

Here, Sterling (1992: 333 and 333 n. 109 and 110) shows that the first two dependant clauses in the Greek, encapsulate the antecedent narrative and are clearly intended to facilitate both the disciples’ as well as Theophilus’ (as the intended reader of the text) comprehension of the gravity of what has transpired. The concluding dependent clause is Luke’s version of Jesus’ directive to his disciples. Sterling correctly points out that if one considers the prophetic themes mentioned in Ev.Luc. 24: 44 – 49 (i.e. The Messiah suffering and rising from the dead as well as preaching to the nations etc.) they cannot be precisely identified in the LXX. It is possible to recognise individual elements but not in any clear-cut manner. Sterling emphasises that because there are no exact counterparts to be found in the LXX, the prophetic themes must be decoded from a Christological perspective – one that can only function within the context of the *NT*. Most importantly, because there exists no known Jewish scriptural parallels, neither canonical nor pseudepigraphical nor any examples supplied by other Christian sources, we must assume that the composition is wholly Lucan in nature.

Again, with reference to Ev.Luc. 24: 46 – 49²⁵⁰, viz.:

καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὅτι οὕτως γέγραπται παθεῖν τὸν χριστὸν καὶ ἀναστῆναι ἐκ νεκρῶν τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, καὶ κηρυχθῆναι ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ μετάνοιαν εἰς ἅφεςιν ἁμαρτιῶν εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, ἀρξάμενοι ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλήμ· ὑμεῖς μάρτυρες τούτων. καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἐξαποστέλλω τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πατρός μου ἐφ’ ὑμᾶς· ὑμεῖς δὲ καθίσατε ἐν τῇ πόλει ἕως οὗ ἐνδύσησθε ἐξ ὕψους δύναμιν.

He told them, “This is what is written: The Messiah will suffer and rise from the dead on the third day, and repentance for the forgiveness of sins will be preached in his name to all nations, beginning at Jerusalem. You are witnesses of these things. I am going to send you what my Father has promised; but stay in the city until you have been clothed with power from on high.”

²⁵⁰ Greek text according to *NTOG*. 1882. Eds Brooke and Fenton: 186. NIV translation according to Holy Bible. 1989. NIV: *NT* 85.

Sterling (1992: 335) argues that in this specific passage, the Lucan author clearly wanted to create a sense of continuation for the fulfilment of prophecy theme that serves as an “entrée” into Act.Ap. Furthermore, the import of this passage is repeated in the early parts of Act.Ap. Thus, according to Sterling, Act.Ap. cannot possibly be viewed as a mere afterthought to Ev.Luc. It was clearly planned from the very beginning of the writing process, as being part and parcel of those things which were prophesied and now needed to be fulfilled in the disciples’ own time. Thus, Ev.Luc. was definitely a premeditated antecedent for what is contained in Act.Ap.

Further proofs of this interpretation are also evident. For example, as commented on by Mason already, Sterling (1992: 335) picks up on the fact that certain events that could have been mentioned in Ev.Luc. seem to have been held back deliberately and then employed more effectively at a later stage in Act.Ap. He gives a pertinent example in Act.Ap. 6: 14²⁵¹ which for greater clarity is reproduced below. For purposes of comparison, this verse is followed by excerpts from both Ev.Marc. and Ev.Matt.:

ἀκηκόαμεν γὰρ αὐτοῦ λέγοντος ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ὁ Ναζωραῖος οὗτος καταλύσει τὸν τόπον τοῦτον καὶ ἀλλάξει τὰ ἔθη ἃ παρέδωκεν ἡμῖν Μωσῆς.

For we have heard him say that this Jesus of Nazareth will destroy this place and change the customs Moses handed down to us.

In Ev.Marc. 14: 58²⁵² we are told that the false witnesses in the Sanhedrin declared:

ὅτι Ἡμεῖς ἠκούσαμεν αὐτοῦ λέγοντος ὅτι Ἐγὼ καταλύσω τὸν ναὸν τοῦτον τὸν χειροποίητον καὶ διὰ τριῶν ἡμερῶν ἄλλον ἀχειροποίητον οἰκοδομήσω·

We heard him say, “I will destroy **this temple made with human hands** and in three days will build another, not made with hands.” [My emphasis for clarity NPLA].

²⁵¹ Greek text according to *NTOG*. 1882. Eds Brooke and Fenton: 258. NIV translation according to Holy Bible. 1989. NIV: *NT* 116.

²⁵² Greek text according to *NTOG*. 1882. Eds Brooke and Fenton: 109. NIV translation according to Holy Bible. 1989. NIV: *NT* 50.

Again, in Ev.Matt. 26: 61²⁵³ two false witnesses inform the Sanhedrin:

Οὗτος ἔφη Δύναμαι καταλῦσαι τὸν ναὸν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ διὰ τριῶν ἡμερῶν οἰκοδομῆσαι.

This fellow said, “I am able to destroy **the temple of God** and rebuild it in three days.” [My emphasis for clarity NPLA].

Here, Sterling remarks that the Lucan author has neglected to include this well-known charge against Jesus of Nazareth in Ev.Luc. However, he has the self-same allegation used in Act.Ap. as evidence against Stephen the martyr.

In addition, it will be noted that Ev.Matt. possibly redacts the Ev.Marc. reference to a temple made by human hands. Unlike Mark, Matthew would have a reference to God’s temple. This was because, in the light of then evolving Christology, the supposedly older pre-Marcian tradition needed to be redacted to imply that in the future Jesus (as Son of God) would be God’s Temple – something that Ev.Jo. states explicitly. This then created an obvious link between the resurrection of Jesus on the third day and the allusion to this concept in the pericope that speaks of the three-days needed to rebuild the Holy Temple.

Sterling theorises that the Lucan author possibly avoided mention of this specific accusation in his trial scene because it interfered with the particular tone of message that he sought. He then chose to employ it more beneficially in Act.Ap. for his account of Stephen the martyr.

Sterling also considers that perhaps this saying was left out of Ev.Luc because of the potential embarrassment it might cause the evangelist who wanted to embrace a more evolved Christology. He then counters this possibility with the fact that the other post-Marcian gospel writers found a way to include the saying by simply amending the text. The fact that Luke did not do this suggests that he deliberately held back this account for later inclusion in his Act.Ap. On this very issue, Sterling (1992: 336) explains:

Why then did he [Luke] incorporate it in Acts 6 – 7? It is here that our

²⁵³ Greek text according to *NTOG*. 1882. Eds Brooke and Fenton: 65. NIV translation according to Holy Bible. 1989. NIV: *NT* 29.

evangelist has his anti-temple polemic. He therefor placed the saying where it was appropriate for his narrative rather than where it had served his predecessor [i.e. Matthew]. [My insertions for greater clarity NPLA].

As has been hinted at here, one of the key areas where unity is not present in Luke-Acts concerns Luke's apparently variable Christology. Verheyden (2012: 36), confirms that:

It seems to be impossible to discover a more or less coherent or systematic Christology in Luke's work. With some good reason he has been called a "collector" of Christological traditions which he has integrated in his work without much concern for systematization or the fact that there may be some lack of clarity or even tensions in his overall picture ... Consequently it remains a very difficult task to find the unity of Luke and Acts in its Christology.

Walters (2009: 31) argues against unity in Luke-Acts. Her approach to the question is to investigate "authorial unity," With reference to Clark (1933: 293ff) and Argyle (1974: 441 – 445) she looks for divergences of style and rhythm between Ev.Luc. and Act.Ap. Walters (2009: 76) questions the alternative view that explains stylistic differences as being due to the function of the text. For example, it is sometimes assumed that simply because Luke wanted to write a new book (Act.Ap.) he consciously sought to write it in a different way. Walters disagrees with this explanation since when Luke was in the process of writing Act.Ap. he would have still been relying heavily on Ev.Luc.

Walters' methodology is to compare selected pericopes from Ev.Luc. and Act.Ap. and identify specific characteristics such as prolonged successions of long syllables, hiatuses, post-positive particles and the use of the paratactic "and" etc.

As a result, Walters (2009: 160 and 189) has demonstrated that Ev.Luc. displays statistically significantly more examples than Act.Ap. and has determined that separate authors are possibly indicated.

5.6 Luke-Acts as Hellenistic History Writing

5.6.1 Burke et al

A popular argument, first posited by Krenkel in 1894, is repeated by Burkitt (2011: 105 – 110):

Luke and Josephus were contemporaries, they would have had access to the same sources, thus the appearance of the same characters should not be a surprise. Therefore Carrier is probably right that any similarities are not a coincidence. But the very different way the two authors treat these characters suggests that they were probably not familiar with each other's work.

Burke (2012) concurs with this sentiment and also points to other similar exposes, including the work of Pervo (2006). Here, Burke (2012) claims that, despite the fact that Pervo's argument has failed to persuade the majority of researchers, he finds it wholly convincing. On the other hand he finds Mason's thesis to be flawed and states that it is "rarely referred to in the relevant scholarly literature".

Central to this argument is that the two authors were contemporary and also shared a similar Hellenistic literary tradition. Therefore it is obvious that they would mention the same things in the same way. In addition, those scholars who feel that Luke may have had stronger Jewish roots or connections see this as an additional point of contact with Josephus.

5.6.2 Sterling

One of the key advocates for Luke being part of the then prevailing tradition is Sterling. His arguments for identifying Luke-Acts as a typical Hellenistic product are worth reviewing in more detail.

In his attempts to place these two books into some acceptable historical as well as stylistic context Sterling reviews various prevailing opinions. One that he touches on also links Luke-Acts with Josephus as well as stressing the Jewishness of the former.

For example, Sterling (1992: 318) cites Berger (1984a: 1275 and 1281; 1984b: 359 – 360) who posits that Act.Ap. is a "special type of historic monograph" or apologetic

history. He also compares Act.Ap. to 1 – 3 Ma., Hellenistic-Jewish historians and of course Josephus.

In addition, Sterling (1992: 318 – 319) goes on to cite Drury (1976: 3 – 8) and Schmidt (1985: 417 – 427) who see Luke-Acts as being distinctly Jewish (rather than Hellenistic) in nature. Sterling (1992: 319 and 319 n. 42) also cites Aune (1987: 77 and 88 – 89) (who is incidentally supported by Balch, [1989: 343 – 361]) who classifies Luke-Acts as a “general history” whilst eschewing any claims to it being either a monograph or antiquarian history. Thus, Sterling demonstrates that the prevailing theory (c. 1992) is that Luke-Acts was an historiographical work. However, he also cautions that other strong theories need to be taken into consideration.

In this regard Sterling (1992: 319) reviews briefly the important work of Talbert (1974a: 125 – 133; 1982: 2 – 6) as well as that of Barr and Wentling (1984: 63 – 88) who variously see Luke-Acts as being based on the content, form and function of the lives (*Diog. Vit.*) as described by *Diogenes Laërtius*²⁵⁴, viz.:

1. a “biographical” account of a religious/philosophical founder;
2. a narrative about his followers and the religious/philosophical community that they created; and
3. a summary of the resultant doctrine.

Sterling (1992: 319) points out that although useful; Talbert’s theory does not adequately explain the fact that Luke-Acts is a unified, cohesive narrative whereas *Diogenes* merely presents a series of biographies apropos various philosophers and their consequent schools and doctrines. In addition, Sterling (1992: 320) explains that *Diogenes* was primarily interested in giving an account of the various individuals who were linked to certain philosophical schools whereas Luke-Acts is predominantly concerned with defending a particular religion/philosophy (i.e. Christianity) as being wholly legitimate.

Lastly, Sterling (1992: 320) refers to the work of Schierling and Schierling (1978: 81 – 88), Holzberg (1986: 28 – 29), Praeder (1981: 269 – 292) as well as Pervo (1987: 12 – 85, 122 and 135) who analogously see Luke-Acts as a romance and/or an

²⁵⁴ Cf. *Diogenes Laërtius: Diog. Vit.* (c. 200 – 250 C.E.)

historical novel. According to Sterling, the primary weakness of this theory is highlighted by, inter alia, the following concerns:

1. Act.Ap. lacks sufficient dramatic elements to be classified as a novel; and
2. Ev.Luc. is separate to Act.Ap.as regards its specific dependency on Q. and Ev.Marc.

Thus, Sterling (1992: 320 – 321) concludes that we should rather view Act.Ap. as being historiographic in nature wherein the speeches and chosen methodology are in accord with Hellenistic history writing.

Sterling (1992: 369 – 370) claims that the literary preface to Ev.Luc. should be seen as being in total accord with Hellenistic historiography. Sterling also sees this historiographic process, although primarily focused on presenting a plausible Christology, continues throughout the entire gospel narrative. He also comments that in his infancy narrative, Luke depicts Jesus of Nazareth as a *wunderkind*, which is somewhat similar to how Josephus portrays himself.

Sterling (1992: 370 – 371) comments at some length about Luke's specific employment of four banquet scenes in Ev.Luc. viz.:

1. Ev.Luc. 5: 29 – 39;
2. Ev.Luc. 7: 36 – 50;
3. Ev.Luc. 11: 37 – 54; and
4. Ev.Luc. 14: 1 - 24.

Sterling sees these as reminiscent of Greek symposia, wherein, inter alia, a well to do and learned host invites a number of guests, chief amongst them being an individual equally renowned for his wisdom. In Ev.Luc. Sterling sees a similar structure to each banquet narrative wherein Jesus of Nazareth and his adversaries are allowed to debate and respond to certain issues. Sterling believes that Luke based this set pattern involving an antagonist and a protagonist within a symposium-setting based on known Hellenistic models.

Sterling sees even more Hellenistic influence in Act.Ap. and for his evidence, he refers to Paul's reference to the Greek poet Aratos and also similarities in

phraseology which become evident when comparing Plato's *Apologia Socratis* 29D with Act.Ap. 5: 29 respectively:

Apologia Socratis 29D²⁵⁵:

ἀλῶς ἔτι τοῦτο πράττων, ἀποθανῆ' - εἰ οὖν με, ὅπερ εἶπον, ἐπὶ τούτοις ἀφίοιτε, εἵποιμ' ἂν ὑμῖν ὅτι ἐγὼ ὑμᾶς, ὧ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, ἀσπάζομαι μὲν καὶ φιλῶ, **πεῖσομαι δὲ μᾶλλον τῷ θεῷ ἢ ὑμῖν**, καὶ ἕωσπερ ἂν ἐμπνέω καὶ οἴός τε ὧ, οὐ μὴ παύσωμαι φιλοσοφῶν καὶ ὑμῖν παρακελευόμενός τε καὶ ἐνδεικνύμενος ὅτῳ ἂν ἀεὶ ἐντυγχάνω ὑμῶν, λέγων οἵάπερ εἶωθα, ὅτι ὧ ἄριστε ἀνδρῶν, Ἀθηναῖος ὢν, πόλεως τῆς μεγίστης καὶ εὐδοκιμοτάτης εἰς σοφίαν καὶ ἰσχύν, χρημάτων μὲν οὐκ αἰσχύνῃ ἐπιμελούμενος ὅπως σοὶ ἔσται ὡς πλεῖστα, ”

if you should let me go on this condition which I have mentioned, I should say to you, “Men of Athens, I respect and love you, but **I shall obey the god rather than you**, and while I live and am able to continue, I shall never give up philosophy or stop exhorting you and pointing out the truth to any one of you whom I may meet, saying in my accustomed way: “Most excellent man, are you who are a citizen of Athens, the greatest of cities and the most famous for wisdom and power, not ashamed to care for the acquisition of wealth [My emphasis for clarity NPLA].

Act.Ap. 5: 29²⁵⁶:

ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ Πέτρος καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι εἶπαν **Πειθαρχεῖν δεῖ θεῷ μᾶλλον ἢ ἀνθρώποις**.

Peter and the other apostles replied: "**We must obey God rather than human beings!** [My emphasis for clarity NPLA].

Sterling (1992: 372 – 373) also sees Luke's employment of 24 speeches in Act.Ap. as distinctly Hellenistic in nature.

²⁵⁵Greek text and English translation according to Fowler (Tr.) 1966. *Plato in Twelve Volumes*, Vol. 1 translated by Harold North Fowler; Introduction by W.R.M. Lamb. Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press; London, William Heinemann Ltd. 1966. Perseus Digital Library <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=plat.+apol.+29d>

²⁵⁶ Greek text according to *NTOG*. 1882. Eds Brooke and Fenton: 256. NIV translation according to Holy Bible. 1989. NIV: *NT* 116.

5.6.3 Marguerat

Marguerat (2004: 25) is confident that Luke benefits from an overlap of both Hellenistic as well as Jewish historiography. He also sees Luke as a typical Græco-Roman historian who employs narrative devices which are firmly grounded in what were at the time, the highest literary standards.

However, unlike Mason, Marguerat sees Luke's writing as running counter to the notion of objectivity that informs so much of Herodian and Thucydidean historiography. For Marguerat, Luke "recounts a confessional history".

Luke does not set out the destiny of a religious movement moving toward Rome from its origin in the Near East, but the expansion of a mission that he intends from the very start to make known as "a history of salvation".

Here, Marguerat argues that like other Græco-Roman authors, Luke searches for causality. However, in this context, Luke is only interested in explanations that are theological in nature. Like other examples of Judæo-Christian historiography, Luke's primary agenda is to reveal the divine intention that lies just beneath the surface of reality. In short, Luke, like Josephus, is concerned with revealing God's unfolding plan by means of the historical events he recounts.

As an aside, a comment made by Marguerat (2004: 1) – almost in passing – is worth focusing upon in this debate. Not only is it possible to consider Luke as the first Christian historian but more importantly, he was the very first author to produce a biography for Jesus of Nazareth. This issue will be returned to in more detail at a later point.

Marguerat (2004: xi) informs us that he approaches his subject by combining two investigative methods, viz.: historical criticism as well as narrative criticism. In this regard, he maintains that in order to better understand the significance of a biblical text one first needs to be fully conversant with the historical context that informed its initial creation. Marguerat refers to this as the "the epistemological credo of the historical-critical method".

Although admirable - and it is indeed a noble ideal – one that all historians should emulate. However, in reality, how does anyone (replete with their own worldview)

manage to truly assume the identity of another individual or community – let alone one that has been extinct for nearly two thousand years? If one accepts a linguistic paradigm, how can anyone ever return to the origin of anything? Everything is mediated solely through language. One cannot regain anything outside of the medium of communication and interpretation. Nonetheless, Marguerat believes that in order for his research to be successful he must first study the culture and codes of communication of the ancient Mediterranean world to which Luke and his readers once belonged.

Marguerat (2004: 4 and 4 n. 7), maintains that Luke's work is spiritually significant scripture. Given the context of the time and social setting Luke wrote in, Marguerat is also quite happy to consider Luke as a distinguished historian. Accordingly, he takes issue with scholars like Overbeck (1919: 78) who once commented about Luke:

Es ist das eine Taktlosigkeit von welthistorischen Dimensionen, der grösste Excess der falschen Stellung, die sich Lukas zum Gegenstand gibt

It is the sole tactlessness of world-historical dimensions, the greatest excess of the false position, which Luke assigns to the object²⁵⁷

Marguerat (2004: 4) goes on to counter Overbeck's "misguided" attitude as follows:

According to Overbeck, Luke's sin was to have confused history and fiction, that is, to "treat historiographically that which was not history and was not transmitted as such". In brief, the author of Acts blended history and legend, historical and supernatural fact, in a concoction from which the modern historian recoils in distaste... The denunciation of Luke as a falsifier of history, at best naive, is forceful and scathing. Very generally speaking, the opinions of scholars are fixed along party lines: on one side the extreme scepticism of German exegesis concerning the historical work of Luke (Vielhauer, Conzelmann, Haenchen, Lüdemann, Roloff, with the exception of Hengel), and on the other side the determination of Anglo-American research to rehabilitate the documentary reliability of Luke–Acts (Gasque, Bruce, Marshall, Hemer, Bauckham).

Accordingly, Marguerat sets out to portray Luke as the very epitome of late Hellenistic historical competence. To support his view he considers what the ethics of a typical Graeco-Roman historian would have looked like.

²⁵⁷ Author's translation.

To do this, Marguerat (2004: 13 – 14) bases his supposition on the *Hist.Conscr.*²⁵⁸ written by Lucian of Samosata²⁵⁹.

As is well known, this essay, written after the mid-second century of the Common Era, purports to advise historians as regards the correct approach to history writing. Holding (2008: 70) corroborates that we must accept Lucian's credibility because he wrote this treatise in which he expressed the ideal that history abhors falsehood and that the historian's task is to tell the truth. Holding confirms that "Lucian ... clearly held historical accuracy in high esteem".

Ignoring for the moment that Lucian was primarily a satirist who is better known for writing the most fantastical of tales, Marguerat (2004: 13) quotes (in one case incorrectly) key passages from *Hist.Conscr.* to emphasise Lucian's preferred approach to history writing. These references have been reproduced below in their entirety in order to obtain a sense of their broader context than that solely supplied by Marguerat. The actual content employed by Marguerat, which he employs to prove how objective Græco-Roman historians were, is emboldened for clarity:

Hist.Conscr. 9²⁶⁰:

9: I would not be understood to exclude eulogy from history altogether; it is to be kept to its place and used with moderation, is not to tax the reader's patience; I shall presently show, indeed, that in all such matters an eye is to be had to posterity. It is true, there is a school which makes a pretty division of history into the agreeable and the useful, and defends the introduction of panegyric on the ground that it is agreeable, and pleases the general reader. But nothing could be further from the truth. In the first place the division is quite a false one; **history has only one concern and aim, and that is the useful; which again has one single source, and that is truth.** The agreeable is no doubt an addition, if it is present; so is beauty to an athlete; but a Nicostratus, who is a fine fellow and proves himself a better man than either of his opponents, gets his recognition as a Heracles, however ugly his face may be; and if one opponent is the handsome Alcaeus himself--handsome enough to make Nicostratus in love with him, says the story -, that does not affect the issue. History too, if it can deal incidentally in the agreeable, will attract a multitude of lovers; but so long as it does its proper business efficiently - and that is the establishment of truth -, it may be indifferent to beauty.

²⁵⁸ *The Way to Write History, an Essay in Literary Criticism.* (c. 166 - 168 C.E.). According to Fowler (1905: xv) this was one of Lucian's more mature writings, written in middle age and executed whilst he was living in Athens.

²⁵⁹ *Lucianus Samosatensis* (c. 125 – after 180 C.E.).

²⁶⁰ English translation according to Fowler and Fowler, (Trs) 1905. *The Works of Lucian of Samosata*: 113 - 114.

End of 38: **The historian's one task is to tell the thing as it happened.**

39: This he cannot do, if he is Artaxerxes' physician trembling before him, or hoping to get a purple cloak, a golden chain, a horse of the Nisaeon breed, in payment for his laudations. A fair historian, a Xenophon, a Thucydides, will not accept that position. He may nurse some private dislikes, but he will attach far more importance to the public good, and set the truth high above his hate; he may have his favourites, but he will not spare their errors. **For history, I say again, has this and this only for its own; if a man will start upon it, he must sacrifice to no God but Truth; he must neglect all else;** his sole rule and unerring guide is this - to think not of those who are listening to him now, but of the yet unborn who shall seek his converse.

Marguerat (2004: 13 – 14 and 14 n. 39) also makes reference to Van Unnik (1979: 37 – 60) who similarly employed Lucian's *Hist. Conscr.* as well as Dionysius of Halicarnassus' Letter to Pompey²⁶² in order to formulate what he considers to be the ethical code of the typical Græco-Roman historian in ten rules. These rules may be compared favourably with the list of Josephus' intentions as contained in his *πρόλογοι* for both his *War* and *Antiquities*:

1. the choice of a noble subject;
2. the usefulness of the subject for its addressees;
3. independence of mind and absence of partiality, that is, the author's *παρρησία*;
4. good construction of the narrative, especially the beginning and the end;
5. an adequate collection of preparatory material;
6. selection and variety in the treatment of the information;
7. correct disposition and ordering of the account;
8. liveliness (*εὐνεργεία*) in the narration;
9. moderation in the topographical details; and
10. composition of speeches adapted to the orator and the rhetorical situation.

These ten rules, as originally formulated by Van Unnik are believed by Marguerat (2004: 14) to accurately inform Luke's own approach to Luke-Acts. To this end Marguerat (2004: 13 - 25) attempts to show how Luke manages to address nearly all of these rules by reference to relevant passages within Luke-Acts. He also mentions

²⁶¹ English translation according to Fowler and Fowler, (Trs) 1905. *The Works of Lucian of Samosata*: 128 - 129.

²⁶² Gnaeus Pompeius Magnus (106 - 48 B.C.E.).

that the majority of Hellenistic Jewish historians (Josephus being principal among them) followed these self-same rules but strangely makes no direct connection between Luke and Josephus himself.

Here, we need to consider this point quite circumspectly, since we as modern readers, supposedly replete with tried and tested conventions to ensure objectivity may carelessly dismiss Luke's writings before considering the realities of the time he lived in and the avowed purpose of his works at the time of writing. This latter point certainly drives Marguerat's vigorously apologetic stance when he discusses Luke-Acts (Cf. Marguerat, 2004: 1 – 61).

5.6.4 Lüdemann

In short, assuming that Luke knew that he was inventing history, was this justifiable in his day? Lüdemann (2013: 253 - 272) who has critically reviewed Act.Ap. 28: 11 – 31, asks how we can objectively adduce Luke's honesty – an important issue since it may supply us with valuable insights that will shed light on the possible charge of plagiarism.

Lüdemann (2013: 261 - 262) should also be commended for taking a firm stance on objectivity in his approach. Unlike all fundamentalists and most conservative scholars who unavoidably wear their subjective faith on their sleeves, Lüdemann clearly understands the problems of attempting to undertake a scientific investigation when personal religious world-views are involved:

One's belief in God or god should play no role in the historical investigation. The Acts of the Apostles must be investigated as all other religious or nonreligious texts are examined. The rules that apply for historical science should also apply for theological study when it comes to the investigation of the historical records of Christianity. The assumption that the history of this or any other religion has to be reconstructed as if God does not exist should find common agreement among twenty-first century scholars.

Lüdemann would surely support the view that in the final analysis, truth (or what approximates this ideal) is largely dictated by a person's worldview and is accordingly constructed rather than discovered. This has especially negative connotations for persons who are totally reliant on what they perceive to be revealed knowledge and/or who are unable to deal with their religious beliefs in a non-literalist and non-

fundamentalist way. Indeed, such individuals are really not well suited for meaningful scientific investigation. On this issue Lüdemann (2013: 262) correctly opines:

Yet, for whatever reason, Christian scholars are sometimes chary about heeding the strictures of this protocol. Instead, they resort to philosophical reflections calculated to protect the believer against history.

One good example that illustrates Lüdemann's point concerns Swanson (2004: 124) who even praises the overall import of the Mason thesis. However, due to his religious bias, he cannot help himself but warn his reader of the following:

The major flaw in the work from an epistemological viewpoint is that the author regards the works of Josephus to be of an equal historical value and reliability as the Scriptures, and often seems to regard Josephus as perhaps more reliable. This, of course, will be a distraction to those committed to an inspired and inerrant Scripture; however, that should not dissuade a serious student of the NT from acquiring and using this excellent introduction to great profit.

It is difficult to understand how in the twenty-first century individuals still view Judeo-Christian scripture to be somehow automatically superior to all other ancient texts.

Lüdemann (2013: 255) claims that a useful way to evaluate Act.Ap. is to comprehend the nature of the conceptual framework that Luke has conceived within which he places his various "historical" episodes. Here, Lüdemann correctly feels that irrespective of how true or false a recorded event may be, its significance is delimited by its historical context. Lüdemann (2013: 255) gives the example of Paul's inferred date for the Apostolic Council which is at odds with what is recorded in Act.Ap.15. Lüdemann (2013: 256) also confirms that Act.Ap. is fairly linear in terms of its recording of subsequent events. However, it also generalises to such an extent that it is quite unreliable as an accurate history of the nascent Christian church in the first-century of the Common Era.

Lüdemann (2013: 256) explicates:

[T]he story contains many loose ends that Luke did not bother to hide and poses obvious questions he ignored. Yet more troubling is the appearance of puzzling characters like Apollos, who knew only John's baptism (Acts 18: 24 - 28) and the Ephesian disciples who had never heard of the Holy Spirit (Acts 19: 1 - 7). And strangest of all, we learn nothing about Christianity's arrival in Rome! How can these oddities be explained?

Lüdemann (2013: 256) offers his take on the situation by explaining that Luke employed judiciously-chosen characters, constructs and events in his narratives to prove that Christianity was indeed divinely sanctioned and always proves to be victorious in the end. As has been discussed already and which is also fully supported by Marguerat (2004:1 - 61) Luke is primarily concerned with revealing what he purports to be Almighty God's unfolding plan by means of the historical events he recounts.

Lüdemann confirms that Luke's literary characters (albeit stereotyped) include the following:

1. Obvious "good guys" (e.g. disciples, apostles, Jesus etc.);
2. Christian teachers, and martyrs;
3. Obvious bad individuals (e.g. heretics and Jews); and
4. A clearly defined and uncomplicated "road" to salvation.

By this strategy, Luke manages to create a *fabula* which is easy to remember and disseminate. The corollary to this simplification is that there can be no place for subtlety or nuance – accordingly historical accuracy must take a back seat.

Lüdemann (2013: 256) elaborates as follows:

[B]y avoiding the nuances and complexities that are part of human history, such simplistic dramatization necessarily distorts the truth. Studying the abundant evidence of Christianity's early diversity places Acts in a very different perspective and shows how much Luke has left out. Above all, we may find ourselves reluctant to accept his biases concerning Jews and other troublemakers who hinder what he sees as the monolithic and inevitable progress of Christianity. Today, the good/bad, orthodox/heretic distinctions are at last coming to be seen as judgments made after the fact by those who wish to promote the winners among whom they see themselves.

Thus, even for Luke's time, he was knowingly sacrificing historical accuracy for the sake of a powerful message that would appeal to the less critically minded and which would not lose too much in translation - even if repeated by those less educated. Indeed, even if the newly converted Christian was to further undermine the historical nuances in the process of re-telling the *fabula*, the primary spiritual message would still survive. In short, here is good evidence of a premeditated strategy that underpins the entirety of Luke-Acts. If this finding is correct it would explain why Luke was far less concerned with historical accuracy than he was with identifying and recording

memorable narratives to accentuate his important spiritual message. Therefore, he might well have borrowed from other sources – especially if the passage he was lifting would assist him in his task. As Josephus was himself already entrenched in his own apologetic agenda and was employing similar propagandistic tactics, Luke became the unwitting beneficiary.

Lüdemann (2013: 256) lists some of Luke's theologically-based conjectures which by necessity undermine any historical value they may once have possessed:

1. The Holy Spirit is instrumental in salvation history;
2. All things are predetermined by the will of God;
3. The spread of the fundamental Christian mission is inevitable and unremitting;
4. Roman power is completely benevolent to Christianity; and
5. The incredulous Jews will do anything in their power to frustrate Christian objectives and intentions.

With reference to the last observation Lüdemann (2013: 256 - 257) verifies that the following conclusions present themselves. Viz.:

1. Luke misrepresented Paul's association with the Jerusalem community;
2. Luke has altered Paul's theology;
3. Luke's description of Paul's actions (albeit incomplete) is both miraculous and fallacious;
4. Luke makes Peter appear Pauline and Paul appear Petrine;
5. Luke places Paul's major mission immediately after the Jerusalem conference (Acts 15). In reality it had started at least a decade earlier.
6. Since the inner and outer growth of the communities is divinely assured, Luke presumes that strong affirmations of extraordinary growth do not demand sources.
7. Luke's narrative concerning the various mission sites is unbalanced. He omits to say anything about the real beginnings of Christianity in Galilee, northern Galatia, Rome or Egypt. Instead he spends 60 verses - most of them the purest fiction - on the sea-voyage to Rome.

Lüdemann (2013: 257) believes that Luke is only accurate on two counts, viz.:

1. The Jerusalem community played a primary role in the nascent Christian church; and
2. Paul was a key figure in the proclamation, expansion, and shaping of nascent Christianity.

Accordingly Lüdemann feels that Luke is justified in allotting more than 50% of Act.Ap. to his mission. However, due to the historical errors, the more critical reader needs to also read the Pauline epistles to obtain a more accurate picture of events.

5.6.5 Brighton

Brighton (2011: 558), who conducted an investigation into the use of the term “*Sicarii*” in both Josephus’ writings and Act.Ap. ignores this kind of evidence. He firmly believes that one first needs to have a thorough grasp of Josephus before claiming to understand but a mere segment of Act.Ap.:

A superficial reading of Josephus will lead to misunderstanding and inappropriate conclusions. This is true not only in regard to the Sicarii, but also the Pharisees, priests, Roman administration - in short, anything at all that Josephus would tell us about late Second [T]emple Judaism. Josephus simply cannot be used as a proof text for the NT world...but must first be read as an author crafting his works in defense of his own people at Rome. Only when we understand the whole will we be able to understand the parts (*sic*) [My correction (insert)].

Consequently, Brighton (2011: 558) does not support Mason’s thesis in its entirety and concludes that the works of Josephus have been possibly misused in order to accuse Luke of historical error. Ultimately, Brighton (2003: 558) feels that at best, Act.Ap. “provides independent confirmation of Josephus’ portrayal of the Sicarii”. Unfortunately, due no doubt to Brighton’s worldview²⁶³ his views are clearly tainted. The fact that it is quite evident from the evidence presented thus far that Luke is anything but historical whilst Brighton sees the Mason thesis as merely a ploy to undermine Luke’s credibility as an historian is certainly worth noting.

²⁶³ Dr Mark Brighton lectures in Biblical Languages at the Concordia University Irvine's Christ College which informs its student body that “you will study with exceptional theologians who are faithful to Scripture, dedicated to academic excellence, and engaged in Christian ministry”. <http://www.cui.edu/academicprograms/undergraduate/majors/biblical-languages/faculty>

5.6.6 Levels of Style-Criticism in Hellenistic Times

Regardless, one of Lüdemann's most important contributions to this debate concerns how well-equipped individuals who lived in Græco-Roman times were when it came to determining the validity of what they were reading.

Although the following narrative is more anecdotal than scientific, Lüdemann (2013: 259) relates the famous opening account given by the Greek Physician Galen²⁶⁴ in *My Own Books*²⁶⁵:

The validity of your advice regarding the cataloguing of my extant books, Bassus, has been proved by events. I was recently in the Sandalarium, the area of Rome with the largest concentration of booksellers, where I witnessed a dispute as to whether a certain book for sale was by me or someone else. The book bore the title: Galen the doctor. **Someone had bought the book under the impression that it was one of mine; someone else - a man of letters - struck by the odd form of the title, desired to know the book's subject.** On reading the first two lines he immediately tore up the inscription, saying simply: "This is not Galen's language - the title is false." **Now, the man in question had been schooled in the fundamental early education which Greek children always used to be given by teachers of grammar and rhetoric.** Many of those who embark on a career in medicine or philosophy these days cannot even read properly, yet they frequent lectures on the greatest and most beautiful field of human endeavour, that is, the knowledge provided by philosophy and medicine.

This kind of laziness existed many years ago too, when I was a young man, but it had not yet reached the extreme state it has now. For this reason - and also because my books have been subject to all sorts of mutilations, whereby people in different countries publish different texts under their own names, with all sorts of cuts, additions, and alterations - I decided it would be best, first to explain the cause of these mutilations, and secondly to give an account of the content of each of my genuine works. Well, as for the fact of my books being published by many people under their own names, my dearest Bassus, you know the reason yourself: it is that they were given without inscription to friends or pupils, having been written with no thought for publication, but simply at the request of those individuals, who had desired a written record of lectures they had attended. When in the course of time some of these individuals died, their successors came into possession of the writings, liked them, and began to pass them off as their own. [...] Taking them from their owners, they returned to their own countries, and after a short space of time began to perform the demonstrations in them, each in some different way. All these were eventually caught, and many of those who then recovered the works

²⁶⁴ Galen of Pergamon (Κλαύδιος Γαληνός) (129 – c. 200 or c.216 C.E.).

²⁶⁵ Pearce, Roger. 2007. The Pain of Being Galen; Plagiarism in the Ancient World in *Roger Pearce.org* [Online]. Available: <http://www.roger-pearce.com/weblog/2009/02/27/the-pain-of-being-galen-plagiarism-in-the-ancient-world/> [15 January 2015].

affixed my name to them. They then discovered discrepancies between these and copies in the possession of other individuals, and so sent them to me with the request that I correct them.

Since, then, as I have stated above, they were written not for publication but to fit the particular attainments and needs of those who had requested them, it follows naturally that some of them are rather extended, while others are compressed; and their styles, and indeed the actual theoretical content, vary in their completeness. Those works which were written for the parties mentioned above would obviously be neither complete nor perfectly accurate in their teaching. That was not their requirement - nor would such individuals have been able to learn the whole subject-matter accurately until they had first reached a certain basic level. Some of my predecessors gave such works the title of Outlines, others Sketches, or Introductions, Synopses, or Guides. I simply gave them to my pupils without any such inscription, and it is for that reason that when they later fell into other hands, they were given a number of different titles by different persons.

Lüdemann (2013: 259 - 260) argues, that based on Galen's comments, three findings relevant to Græco-Roman times, are evident:

1. Even individuals with limited education were able to employ basic "style-criticism" to discriminate between legitimate and bogus texts;
2. Plagiarism (i.e. publishing someone else's ideas as one's own) was *not* tolerated; and
3. Pseudepigraphy (i.e. publishing one's own ideas under someone else's name) was considered inappropriate behaviour.

Lüdemann (2013: 260) supports these findings concerning the probable late Hellenistic view of plagiarism and the like by reference to two episodes from *The Lives of Eminent Philosophers* by the Greek writer *Diogenes Laërtius*²⁶⁶. Accordingly, in *Diog. Vit.* 5.92 – 93, we read:

Aristoxenus the musician asserts that Heraclides also composed tragedies, inscribing upon them the name of Thespis. Chamaeleon complains that Heraclides' treatise on the work of Homer and Hesiod was plagiarized from his own. Furthermore, Autodorus the Epicurean criticizes him in a polemic against his tract *Of Justice*. Again, Dionysius the Renegade, or, as some people call him, the "Spark," when he wrote the *Parthenopaeus*, entitled it a play of Sophocles; and Heraclides, such was his credulity, in one of his own works drew upon this forged play as Sophoclean evidence. Dionysius, on perceiving this, confessed what he had done; and . . . the other denied the fact and would not believe him.

²⁶⁶ Cf. *Diogenes Laërtius: Diog. Vit.* (c. 200 – 250 C.E.)

Lüdemann (2013: 260) explains that the librarians of such eminent ancient libraries as Alexandria and Pergamum were constantly establishing the authenticity of texts. In this context, *Diogenes Laërtius* gives an account of how the head librarian at Pergamum (*Athenodorus*) fraudulently altered Stoic writings. Thus in *Lives of Eminent Philosophers* 7.34 we read:

Isidore of Pergamum . . . likewise affirms that the passages disproved by the school were expunged from his works by Athenodorus the Stoic, who was in charge of the Pergamene library; and that afterwards, when Athenodorus was detected and compromised, they were replaced.

5.6.7 Possible Jewish Influences

Lüdemann (2013: 260 - 261) (albeit unwittingly) makes another very important observation that can only be fully explicated after considering the following points:

Most scholars involved in the Josephus/Luke-Acts debates are quick to identify Luke's writings as being in accord with typical Græco-Roman standards of historiography and/or history writing. However, Lüdemann correctly points out that for the most part, traditional Jewish scriptural writings are largely oblivious to issues such as plagiarism, intellectual property, pseudepigraphy, commitment to historical veracity etc.

Lüdemann (2013: 259) explains that:

[T]he literature of what later became the Old Testament was for the most part tradition-literature rather than author-literature. Even the books of the prophets were constantly reworked by their disciples and by later theological schools. And not only is the same true for the panoramic history that stretches from 1 Samuel to 2 Kings, but the Chronicler's account is ultimately a further commentary on those narratives, for he is engaged in the same task as that of his prophetic and historical predecessors: rewriting earlier proclamations or accounts to suit the needs of the present generation.

Of course, Lüdemann is quite correct. Amongst more objective scholars it is well accepted that the *Torah* (תורה), which is interpreted variously as 'teaching', 'instruction' or 'law' (JSB, 2004:1), was originally recounted as part of an oral tradition that may stretch as far back as c.1200 B.C.E.. Originally, much of the information it now contains was most likely handed down, orally, generation after generation and in

due course, with the advent of writing, it was eventually written down for posterity and ultimately edited and composed into its present unity notwithstanding the fact that it is arranged into five books.

Indeed, it can be clearly shown that the final compilation of its written form or *Torah she-khtav* (תורה שבהתו), with its often contradictory reiterations, was redacted from at least four distinctive sources, each of which is identifiable on the grounds of such aspects as literary style, theological stance and employed vocabulary (JSB, 2004:3).

Respected authorities, like Brettler (JSB, 2004:6) and Rosenberg (in *Back to the sources*, 1984:36 - 37), point out that scholarly research supports the notion that this process of amalgamation did not happen overnight; most probably occurring in several stages over an extended period of time. The definitive outcome of this redaction, which also must have witnessed the removal and loss of substantial material, is claimed to have occurred during or shortly after the time of the Babylonian exile (586 – 538 B.C.E.). Regardless, this herculean labour resulted in arguably the longest piece of literature to have ever emanated from the ancient Near East, not only in terms of its sheer volume but also in terms of its historical scope and range of incorporated literary genres.

In this regard, according to Rosenberg in *Back to the sources* (1984:34) the *Torah* is replete with, inter alia, epigrams, folk tales, poetry, prophecies, quasi-historical narratives, remnants of myths, satires, songs, and wisdom literature. However, what was considered far more important, especially from a more traditional Jewish perspective, is that the *Torah* was an embodiment of either divine or divinely inspired law

What is also a point to consider is that it is a fairly modern phenomenon for say a fundamentalist to insist on having access to what he/she idealistically believes is an “original” text. Ancient Jews for one, were fully aware of the discrepancies in their religious texts and indeed different communities might possess different versions of the same scripture. It is only in more modern times that certain religiously inclined individuals insist on re-establishing some mythical “origin” as though it were the Holy Grail of truth itself.

According to the official Dead Sea Scroll website²⁶⁷ we now know, via the evidence gleaned from the Dead Sea Scrolls discovery that several contemporaneous versions of the biblical text once existed. However, one version known as the proto-Rabbinic or proto-Masoretic enjoyed a special status by the Græco-Roman period (third century B.C.E. - first century C.E.)

Thus over several centuries a more authoritative or Masoretic version of the Hebrew Bible did evolve. However we have to wait until the tenth century of the Common Era before even the Masoretic version became the standard authoritative text of the Hebrew Bible.

If one briefly considers the relatively recent discovery of the Great Isaiah Scroll²⁶⁸ it transpires that although it generally conforms to the Masoretic version, this two thousand year old scroll is replete with alternate spellings, scribal errors, amendments, and many variant readings. Here, it has been calculated that over 2,600 textual variants exist.

With the afore-mentioned background and given Lüdemann's understanding concerning Hebrew scriptural literature it is puzzling that he has not pointed out the possibility that Luke, being possibly more Jewish in personal orientation was merely adopting a more Jewish tradition than a strictly Græco-Roman one? If even partly true, this would also go some way to explaining Luke's intentions in writing Luke-Acts (assuming these books once had one overall authorial directive). In short, like the recipients of *Torah*, perhaps Luke intended his readers to receive his text from a more traditional Jewish perspective as the embodiment of divinely inspired directives.

However, none of his many arguments seems conclusive and even he has to admit that a number of influences are possible in Luke-Acts, principal amongst them being Hellenistic historiographical trends. Sterling (1992: 375) also unwittingly lends some support to Mason's thesis when he admits that like Josephus, Luke addresses a *patronus* in his prologue. Regardless, Sterling (1992: 374) concludes as follows:

²⁶⁷ Versions and Translations of the Book of Isaiah 2014. In *The Digital Dead Sea Scrolls* [Online]. Available: <http://dss.collections.imj.org.il/isaiah> [15 January 2015].

²⁶⁸ The Great Isaiah Scroll (1QIsa^a) is one of the original seven Dead Sea Scrolls discovered in Qumran in 1947. It is also the largest, measuring some 734 cm in length. It is also the best preserved and most complete of all the biblical scrolls. It has been dated to c. 125 B.C.E. making it over 1,000 years older than the oldest extant manuscript of the Hebrew Bible. Cf. Versions and Translations of the Book of Isaiah 2014. In *The Digital Dead Sea Scrolls* [Online]. Available: <http://dss.collections.imj.org.il/isaiah> [15 January 2015].

Luke-Acts is thus a complex work which combines Christian, Jewish, and Hellenistic elements into a form of Hellenistic history.

In this context, he goes on to emphasise that the overriding tradition that effectively explicates the existence of, and interaction between, these diverse components is Hellenist historiography.

5.7 Luke-Acts as Apologetic Historiography

One of the more important contributions to this debate comes from Sterling (1992). What should be borne in mind here, is that Sterling argues from the world-view of a confirmed Christian fundamentalist²⁶⁹ and accordingly is not really “open” to any contention that might seriously undermine his belief system. Regardless, his arguments, especially where they are objective offer valuable insight into the present conundrum.

Sterling (1992)²⁷⁰ is relatively well-known for his important thesis that attempts to define writings like Luke-Acts and Josephus’ *Antiquities* as examples of a particular genre of history writing which he calls “apologetic historiography”. In this context he has identified ancient texts from the Græco-Roman world which are primarily concerned with extolling the character and significance of a particular sub-culture operating within the broader perspective of the prevailing and increasingly dominating Hellenised Roman world. These texts are produced by an individual or individuals who are themselves members of the sub-culture. The import of these texts, which are themselves Hellenised, are directed to either members of the sub-culture or to the dominant culture or both.

Sterling (1992: 17) proffers the following definition for his new term:

²⁶⁹ Sterling is both a Christian scholar and a preacher attached to the Church of Christ. This sect has a decentralised nineteenth-century primitivist tradition which endeavours to educe what it naively believes was the original disposition of the nascent Christian community. Cf. Oppenheimer, Mark 2012. New Div School Dean is a Preacher-Scholar in *Yale Alumni Magazine* [Online]. Available:

<https://www.yalealumnimagazine.com/articles/3431/new-div-school-dean-is-a-preacher-scholar>

²⁷⁰ Sterling’s seminal book is titled: *Historiography & Self-definition: Josephos, Luke-Acts & Apologetic Historiography* (1992).

Apologetic historiography is the story of a subgroup of people in an extended prose narrative written by a member of the group who follows the group's own traditions but Hellenizes them in an effort to establish the identity of the group from within the setting of the larger world. [Sterling's italics].

Here Sterling (1992: 17 and 17 n. 77) explains that by “self-definition” he means the author’s endeavour to present a defining characteristic of the sub-culture to which he claims adherence and juxtapose it with those exhibited by the larger society and its perceptions. Sterling clarifies that this does not in any way presuppose that the author in question was himself operating in a manner that was completely in accord with the precepts of his own sub-culture. Rather, the author presents an apologetic discourse which serves as its own normative point of departure.²⁷¹

Lastly, Sterling emphasises that the sub-group should not be seen as totally insular in nature. Rather it should be viewed (due in part to prevailing Hellenisation?) as a legitimate subsection of the dominant society. On this latter point, it could be claimed that Sterling is perhaps trying to generalise for the sake of establishing a useful definition for his new term. Certainly in the case of the Jews, the very tenets of mainstream Jewish culture - especially during this stressful time in their history - would not have encouraged the majority to see themselves as willing participants of Roman world domination. Indeed, in terms of their perceived covenant with God, observant Jews were surely far more likely to stress their “apartness” to what they would have perceived as an ungodly and heathen world. Where, Sterling could be exonerated for his oversimplification – especially in the case of Josephus – is that the latter author tended to see the actions of the Roman world as part of God’s divine retribution and ultimate plan. In that limited sense alone, Jewish identity may have been presented as contributing to the greater understanding of the whole.

Within this context, Sterling (1992: 313) repeats the conjecture that Ev.Luc. and Act.Ap. should not necessarily be viewed as products of the same hand or “school”. Undeniably, Sterling (1992: 313 n. 13) claims that according to his knowledge no manuscript exists that can unite Luke-Acts.

5.8 Josephus as a Possible Influence on Luke-Acts

Crowe (2012: 93) with specific reference to Bruce (1951: 43 – 44) cursorily dismisses claims that Josephus could have influenced Luke. He acknowledges the similarities between the episodes involving Theudas, Judas the Galilean and the Egyptian activist but concludes that, as intriguing as this notion may be, since Act.Ap. was most likely written *before* c. 93 C.E. the *Antiquities* could not possibly be considered to be an influence. Here again is an example of the enormous power of a researcher's world-view that so effectively undermines an individual's ability to reason. Crowe neglects to mention *War* as a possible influence (unless he feels that Act.Ap. was written even earlier than 75 C.E.?) and mechanically accepts the conservative view that Act.Ap. could only have been written well within the first century C.E. This finding is based almost solely on Luke-Acts' "historical" content. The fact that its many references to certain events are clearly inaccurate does not seem to bother Crowe at all.

Dicken (2012: 24 – 25) also addresses the notion that Luke may have copied Josephus. In this context, he reiterates that most scholars reject this thesis but also defers to Pervo (2006) (especially chapter five) who (as we have already witnessed) has managed to show that Luke-Acts owes some intertextual dependence on Josephus. Burke (2012) concurs with this sentiment and also points to the work of Pervo (2006) as well as other similar exposés. Here, Burke (2012) claims that, despite the fact that Pervo's argument has failed to persuade the majority of researchers, he finds it wholly convincing. On the other hand he finds Mason's thesis to be flawed and makes the debatable claim that it is "rarely referred to in the relevant scholarly literature".

However, in the final analysis, Dicken believes that any coincidences between content or choice of vocabulary in the respective works of Josephus and Luke are more likely due to the fact that late Hellenistic authors were drawing from the same well.

Sterling (1992: 365) also intimates cursorily that Josephus might be considered a more direct influence on Luke but does not seem to take this suggestion too seriously. However, as has already been witnessed, certain observations that he makes seem to offer (albeit unwittingly) additional support for the Mason thesis.

Sterling (1992: 365 and 365 n. 281) is careful not to dismiss outright the possibility that Josephus may have influenced Luke. However, due to the fact that a suspected association between Josephus and Luke-Acts has long been a subject for scholarly reflection and (according to him) every possible opinion has already been given, Sterling states that the “relationship is insoluble”.

Sterling (1992: 365 – 367) is only certain that the two authors shared a common tradition concerning their, then, recent history of the Jewish nation. Moreover, both Luke and Josephus make use of similar techniques and conceptual agreements. Here, Sterling (1992: 367 n. 284) supplies the following two examples as evidence, viz.:

1. Act.Ap. 10: 35 and *Against Apion* 2, 210; and
2. Act.Ap. 17: 25 and *Antiquities* 8, / 111.

Sterling (1992: 367 – 369) also believes that an area of research that has been undervalued lies in comparing the two author’s shared historiographical perspectives. Like, Mason, Sterling finds interesting parallels between the respective *πρόλογοι* of the following passages:

1. *Against Apion* 1, 10 / 53 - 55 and Ev.Luc. 1: 1 – 3; and
2. *Against Apion* 2, 1 / 1 – 2 and Act.Ap. 1: 1 – 3.

Curiously, Sterling (1992: 367) refers to the wrong book within *Against Apion* – citing *Against Apion* I instead of *Against Apion* 2! In addition he refers to Ev.Luc. 1: 1 – 4 instead of Ev.Luc. 1: 1 – 3. Accordingly, his errors have been corrected for the purpose of this review of his thinking.

These passages are set out below according to a format loosely based on that originally employed by Sterling (1992: 367 and 368):

Ap. I, 10 / 53 - 55 ²⁷²	Ev.Luc. 1: 1 – 3 ²⁷³
<p>(53): Φαῦλοι δέ τινες ἄνθρωποι διαβάλλειν μου τὴν ἱστορίαν ἐπιχειρήκασιν ὥσπερ ἐν σχολῇ μειρακίων γύμνασμα προκεῖσθαι νομίζοντες κατηγορίας παραδόξου καὶ διαβολῆς, δέον ἐκεῖνο γινώσκειν, ὅτι δεῖ τὸν ἄλλοις παράδοσιν πράξεων ἀληθινῶν ὑπισχνούμενον</p> <p>(from line 55: πλείστων δ' αὐτόπτης γενόμενος)</p> <p>(53): αὐτὸν ἐπίστασθαι ταύτας πρότερον ἀκριβῶς,</p> <p>ἢ παρηκολουθηκότα</p> <p>(54): τοῖς γεγονόσιν ἢ παρὰ τῶν εἰδότην πυνθανόμενον.</p>	<p>(1): Ἐπειδὴπερ πολλοὶ ἐπεχείρησαν ἀνατάξασθαι διήγησιν</p> <p>περὶ τῶν πεπληροφορημένων ἐν ἡμῖν πραγμάτων,</p> <p>(2): καθὼς παρέδοσαν ἡμῖν οἱ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρέται γενόμενοι τοῦ λόγου,</p> <p>(3): ἔδοξε κάμοι παρηκολουθηκότι ἄνωθεν πᾶσιν ἀκριβῶς καθεξῆς σοι γράψαι ...</p>

Figure 2

A Comparison of Commonly Employed Vocabulary apropos Luke's πρόλογος (Ev.Luc. 1: 1 – 3) and Josephus' explanation of his historiographical procedures (Ap. I, 10 / 53 – 55).

Following Sterling's example, the commonly employed vocabulary has been clearly identified for ease of comparison when demonstrating where similar words have been utilised. Figure 3 (*ut infra*) displays a comparison between the two authors' secondary prefaces. In both cases the author refers to his previous book, addresses his patron, summarises the first book and then introduces the second book.

²⁷² Original Greek and English translation according to Whiston, (Tr. and Ed.). 1895. Flavius Josephus. The Works of Flavius Josephus, in *Perseus Digital Library*, [Online]. Available: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0216%3Abook%3D1%3Awhiston+section%3D10> [12 January 2015].

²⁷³ Greek text according to *NTOG*. 1882. Eds Brooke and Fenton: 114. NIV translation according to Holy Bible. 1989. NIV: *NT* 53.

Ap. 2, 2 / 1 – 2 ²⁷⁴	Act.Ap. 1: 1 – 3 ²⁷⁵
<p>(1): Διὰ μὲν οὖν τοῦ προτέρου βιβλίου,</p> <p>τιμιώτατέ μοι Ἐπαφρόδιτε, περί τε τῆς ἀρχαιότητος ἡμῶν ἐπέδειξα,</p> <p>τοῖς Φοινίκων καὶ Χαλδαίων καὶ Αἰγυπτίων</p> <p>γράμμασι πιστωσάμενος τὴν ἀλήθειαν καὶ πολλοὺς τῶν Ἑλλήνων συγγραφεῖς παρασχόμενος μάρτυρας, τὴν τε ἀντίρρησιν ἐποιησάμην πρὸς Μανεθῶν καὶ Χαιρήμονα καὶ τινὰς ἐτέρους.</p> <p>(2): ἄρξομαι δὲ νῦν τοὺς ὑπολειπομένους τῶν γεγραφότων τι καθ' ἡμῶν ἐλέγχειν.</p>	<p>(1): Τὸν μὲν πρῶτον λόγον ἐποιησάμην περὶ πάντων, ὃ Θεόφιλε, ὧν ἤρξατο ὁ Ἰησοῦς</p> <p>ποιεῖν τε καὶ διδάσκειν,</p> <p>(2): ἄχρι ἧς ἡμέρας ἐντειλάμενος τοῖς ἀποστόλοις διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου οὐς ἐξελέξατο ἀνελήμφθη·</p> <p>(3): οἷς καὶ παρέστησεν ἑαυτὸν ζῶντα ...</p>

Figure 3

A Comparison between the Secondary πρόλογοι (Ap. 2, 2 / 1 – 2 and Act.Ap. 1: 1 – 3).

Sterling (1992: 368) warns that the employment of “common vocabulary” is not conclusive evidence in itself and preferably one should rather look for proof of shared historiographical orientation. Sterling goes on to confirm that Josephus extols two historiographical methodologies, viz.: judicious enquiry and eyewitness accounts. In this context, Luke definitely makes use of these two methodologies, but combines them by claiming that it is eyewitness accounts that guarantee focussed

²⁷⁴ Original Greek and English translation according to Whiston, (Tr. and Ed.). 1895. Flavius Josephus. The Works of Flavius Josephus, in *Perseus Digital Library*, [Online]. Available: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0216%3Abook%3D2%3Awhiston+section%3D1> [12 January 2015].

²⁷⁵ Greek text according to *NTOG*. 1882. Eds Brooke and Fenton: 245. NIV translation according to Holy Bible. 1989. NIV: *NT* 111.

investigation. Coincidentally, Sterling (1992: 368) would also seem to support Masson (albeit unwittingly) when he verifies that both Luke and Josephus make use of secondary prefaces, addresses to a patron and references to their earlier works etc.

Sterling (1992: 368) also confirms the view that both authors were giving an account which showcases their particular sub-group by means of the modification and re-presentation of that group's claimed historical texts. Here stress must be given to the fact that both authors want to emphasise the great antiquity of their particular group's religious/philosophical teaching and both exaggerate the role of biblical prophecy.

However, ultimately Sterling seems to make more of a case to emphasise the differences - rather than the similarities - between the two authors. Sterling (1992: 369) explains:

The author of Luke-Acts thus shared common historical and historiographical traditions with Josephos. This does not mean that Luke-Acts is dependent upon Josephos, but that they were cut out of the same bolt of cloth [Spelling correction (underlined) NPLA].

It is also noteworthy that although Sterling would clearly not buy into the Mason thesis he does state (1992: 369) that the alternative (i.e. Josephus copied Luke) is even more unlikely. One could surmise from this that Sterling does not completely rule out the possibility that Luke made some use of Josephus. Certainly, it would still be more plausible than imagining a reverse situation. Regardless, in the final analysis, Sterling seems to be a supporter of the more popular opinion, viz.: Luke and Josephus were equally influenced by a common source.

5.9 Chapter Five Summary

With the aforementioned background information in mind, the present situation seems to reflect the concern that scholars tend to be more involved with preserving their constructed realities than they are with dealing dispassionately with the known historical facts. In this context, commentators like Holding (2014) are simply not critical. They merely deny any evidence that challenges their world view. As a consequence their comments are not that useful. Unfortunately, the dominance of a researcher's worldview always plays a major role. This accusation can be levelled at

all camps, regardless of whether they claim to be conservative Christian scholars or even, free-thinking liberal academics.

Regardless, Sterling, who despite the fact that he believes that Ev.Luc. and Act.Ap. might not have even been written by the same person or group, does not deny the remarkable coincidences that are found in a reading of Luke-Acts and selected books by Josephus.

Unfortunately, like so many of the more critical scholars in the conservative camp, when anomalies are confirmed they are merely explained away.

Nonetheless, of special importance to this investigation are the findings of Sterling (1992: 367 and 368). Specifically his comparison of the more commonly employed vocabulary apropos Luke's πρόλογος (Ev.Luc. 1: 1 – 3) and Josephus' explanation of his historiographical procedures (Ap. I, 10 / 53 – 55) (cf. Fig. 2). This evidence, when placed together with Mason and Carrier's many findings (cf. Chapter 2 and 3) adds much weight to the argument that Luke and Josephus did not draw from some common (albeit lost) source. Indeed, apart from Q. and Ev.Matt, Luke was also heavily reliant on Josephus for both his historical content and rhetorical approach.

Of course, there is additional evidence that Luke was copying other authors as well. For example Dicken (2012: 13 – 14) who draws his readers' attention to the so-called "we sections" that seem to indicate another common source. Here we have already seen that Haenchen (1971: 85 – 87) takes this observation further and has theorised that all the "we sections" might well be based on any number of personal diaries or writers' travelogues.

Most importantly, the evidence seems to present itself that Luke was quite happy to sacrifice any historical accuracy for the sake of a simple, easily understood message – most likely directed at a community that was not too critical.

Lüdemann (2013: 256) has assisted in identifying the main themes of this message:

1. The Holy Spirit is instrumental in salvation history;
2. All things are predetermined by the will of God;
3. The spread of the fundamental Christian mission is inevitable and unremitting;
4. Roman power is completely benevolent to Christianity; and

5. The incredulous Jews will do anything in their power to frustrate Christian objectives and intentions.

Lüdemann (2013: 256 - 257) has also verified that this message was of such importance to Luke, that although he needed to exploit the context of a largely fictitious historical setting, in the final analysis, any cited historical event, real or imagined was totally subservient to the spiritual message. As a consequence, Lüdemann has shown that Luke is responsible for the following digressions from *NT* scripture:

1. Paul's association with the Jerusalem community is misrepresented;
2. Paul's theology is altered;
3. Paul's actions are both miraculous and fallacious;
4. Peter appear Pauline and Paul appear Petrine;
5. Paul's major mission is recorded as having taken place immediately after the Jerusalem conference (Act.Ap.15). Other *NT* accounts place this event a decade earlier.
6. The inner and outer growth of the nascent Christian communities is divinely assured and thus requires no hard evidence;
7. Narratives apropos the various mission sites are inequitable: The beginnings of Christianity in Galilee, northern Galatia, Rome or Egypt are largely neglected yet 60 verses (mostly fictitious) are devoted to a sea-voyage to Rome.

If one can believe Lüdemann (2013: 259 - 260), based on comments by Galen, Luke was also guilty of the following:

1. Being oblivious to the possibility that at least some of his readership might have been able to discriminate between legitimate and bogus texts; and
2. Plagiarism – despite the fact that it was not tolerated in learned circles.

If in any way accurate, these findings point to an author who either does not care about how his texts will be received or what is more likely, it points to the low critical standards of his intended readership. It may even point to a situation where the texts were intended to be read by a minister to a group of totally illiterate people.

CHAPTER SIX

Josephus' Reliability as an Historian

6.1 Introduction

This chapter attempts to consider to what degree Josephus' writings may be taken as in any way historically reliable. Here such considerations as Josephus' worldview, levels of honesty and rhetorical strategy will be reviewed.

6.2 Josephus' Status as a Reliable Historian

Mason (2009: 67) emphasises that Josephus should not to be seen as an authority in the sense of a trustworthy spokesperson for *everything* he recounts. Here Mason would still allow the reader to consider Josephus as a better choice given the alternatives but certainly not the final arbitrator of truth. Indeed, Mason (2009:58) believes that originally Josephus audience was small and parochial – limited to an elite inner circle of Roman readers. Mason (2009: 67) supports this interpretation by pointing to Josephus' well known stated purpose for writing his texts, viz.: to write a Jewish apology for a distinctly Hellenistic readership.

6.3 Josephus' Honesty

Given that he has no trouble in disguising his earnest desire to save his own skin at the expense of others on numerous occasions²⁷⁶ and despite the claims of divine protection and higher purpose which he claims underscored his questionable actions he is outstandingly honest in recounting what would surely be embarrassing moments to a modern author.

Nothing stopped him from lying or disguising his cowardice, yet he faithfully records what he experienced albeit from his own perspective. That kind of information should give the reader a certain degree of confidence when reading what else he has to say about those accounts he claims to have witnessed at first hand.

²⁷⁶ Cf. *Life* 18 /, 28 /, 29 /, 41 / and Josephus' sincere admission of his own fear of death in *Life* 58 / 304.

Josephus was proud of his noble lineage and prided himself on his strict adherence to Mosaic Law²⁷⁷. Yet he is honest enough to tell his reader that even he slipped up on occasion.

For example, Josephus makes an honest admission of guilt in *Life* 15 / 81, when he confesses to keeping spoils of the enemy. In addition, in *Life* 70 / 393, despite having repeatedly informed his reader of how he continually preaches tolerance towards one's enemies and often gives accounts illustrating his magnanimity when dealing with even the bitterest of his adversaries he is still happy to candidly admit to almost killing Justus, the son of Pistus out of pure irritation.

Lastly, he goes so far as to emasculate his claimed standing as a priest when he admits to accepting Vespasian's gift (whilst he was still in bondage) of a captive virgin in *Life* 75 / 414.

It should be understood that the taking of a captive woman as a wife by a priest was strictly forbidden by Mosaic Law. What is worse, is that Josephus also admits, that after having borne him three children, he ultimately divorces her – not because he wanted to restore his priestly status – but merely because she dissatisfied him²⁷⁸.

In *Life* 76 / 426²⁷⁹ Josephus clearly states:

καθ' ὃν δὴ καιρὸν καὶ τὴν γυναῖκα μὴ ἀρεσκόμενος αὐτῆς τοῖς ἤθεσιν ἀπεπεμψάμην τριῶν παιδῶν γενομένην μητέρα, ὧν οἱ μὲν δύο ἐτελεύτησαν, εἷς δέ, ὃν Ὑρκανὸν προσηγόρευσα, περίεστιν.

about which time **I divorced my wife also, as not pleased with her behaviour**, though not till she had been the mother of three children, two of whom are dead, and one whom I named Hyrcanus, is alive. [My emphasis for clarity and correction to spelling underlined NPLA]

²⁷⁷ Cf. references to keeping the law of Moses. Josephus normally abides slavishly to the Torah. See, for example his stance on craven images (*Life* 12 / 65) and the holding of property that belongs to an enemy (*Life* 26 / 128).

²⁷⁸ Whiston (1895, n.1) incorrectly gives the view that Josephus eventually divorced the captive virgin *primarily* because he wanted to comply to Mosaic law. Certainly, he also cites Reland as supporting this view.

²⁷⁹ Greek and English translation according to Whiston (Tr.). 1895. *The Works of Flavius Josephus*. Auburn and Buffalo: John E. Beardsley. [Online]. Available: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0150%3Awhiston+section%3D76>. [13 October 2015].

This should be seen as a most candid confession. Indeed, Josephus clearly spells out a Jewish priest's correct approach to marriage in *Antiquities* 3, 12, 2 / 276 – 277a²⁸⁰:

Τῶν δ' ἱερέων καὶ διπλασίονα τὴν ἀγνείαν ἐποίησε: τούτων τε γὰρ αὐτοὺς ὁμοίως τοῖς ἄλλοις εἶργει καὶ προσέτι γαμεῖν τὰς ἡταιρηκίας ἐκώλυσε, μήτε δούλην μήτ' αἰχμάλωτον γαμεῖν αὐτοὺς κεκώλυκε καὶ τὰς ἐκ καπηλείας καὶ τοῦ πανδοκεύειν πεπορισμένας τὸν βίον μηδὲ τὰς τῶν προτέρων ἀνδρῶν ἐφ' αἰσθητοῦν αἰτίαις ἀπηλλαγμένας. 77] τὸν ἀρχιερέα μέντοι οὐδὲ τεθνηκότος ἀνδρὸς ἤξιωσε γυναῖκα τοῦτο τοῖς ἄλλοις ἱερεῦσι συγχωρῶν, μόνην δ' αὐτῷ δέδωκε γαμεῖν παρθένον καὶ ταύτην φυλάττειν:

As for the priests, he [Moses] prescribed to them a double degree of purity for he restrained them in the instances above, and moreover forbade them to marry harlots. **He also forbade them [the priests] to marry a slave, or a captive**, and such as got their living by cheating trades, and by keeping inns; as also a woman parted from her husband, on any account whatsoever. Nay, he did not think it proper for the high priest to marry even the widow of one that was dead, though he allowed that to the priests; but he permitted him only to marry a virgin, and to **retain her**. [My insertions and emphasis for clarity NPLA].

Again, in *Against Apion* 1.7 / 34 – 35²⁸¹, Josephus confirms:

καὶ τῶν ἐπάνω προγόνων καὶ τίνες οἱ μαρτυροῦντες. πόλεμος δ' εἰ κατάσχοι, καθάπερ ἤδη γέγονεν πολλάκις Ἀντιόχου τε τοῦ Ἐπιφανοῦς εἰς τὴν χώραν ἐμβαλόντος καὶ Πομπηίου Μάγνου καὶ Κυντιλίου Οὐάρου μάλιστα δὲ καὶ ἐν τοῖς καθ' ἡμᾶς χρόνοις, οἱ περιλειπόμενοι τῶν ἱερέων καινὰ πάλιν ἐκ τῶν ἀρχαίων γραμμάτων συνίστανται καὶ δοκιμάζουσι τὰς ὑπολειφθείσας γυναῖκας. οὐ γὰρ ἐπὶ τὰς αἰχμαλώτους γενομένας προσίενται πολλάκις γεγονυῖαν

But if any war falls out, such as have fallen out a great many of them already, when Antiochus Epiphanes made an invasion upon our country, as also when Pompey the Great and Quintilius Varus did so also, and principally in the wars that have happened in our own times, those priests that survive them compose new tables of genealogy out of the old records, and examine the circumstances of the women that remain; **for still they do not admit of those that have been captives, as**

²⁸⁰ Greek and English translation according to Whiston (Tr.). 1895. *The Works of Flavius Josephus*. Auburn and Buffalo: John E. Beardsley. [Online]. Available: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0146%3Abook%3D3%3Awhiston+chapter%3D12%3Awhiston+section%3D2>. [13 October 2015].

²⁸¹ Greek and English translation according to Whiston (Tr.). 1895. *The Works of Flavius Josephus*. Auburn and Buffalo: John E. Beardsley. [Online]. Available: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0216%3Abook%3D1%3Awhiston+section%3D7>. [13 October 2015].

suspecting that they had conversation with some foreigners. [My emphasis for clarity NPLA].

6.4 Josephus' Agenda and Attitude to Sources

Mason (1991: 48) states that one "cannot deny that a few clear material inconsistencies remain in Josephus' works, but these tensions cannot overturn the overwhelming evidence of Josephus' control over his literary productions".

Allen (2016: 279) explains the following:

[A]ny assistants employed by Josephus, would surely not have been given *carte blanche* permission to exercise their own rhetorical skills or subvert his stated intentions. In short, we can be fairly certain that Josephus' own unique agenda was the primary focus of the *BJ [War]*... [My insert for clarity NPLA].

Obviously Josephus composed this work in such a way that would be most accessible to a Hellenistic readership. Thackeray (1929: 101f) himself states that *War* is: "an excellent specimen of the Atticistic Greek of the first century" although here again, we must be mindful that Thackeray also believed that Josephus was not directly responsible for all of its contents.

As has already been stated, Mason (2009:58) believes that originally Josephus audience was small, parochial and constrained for the sole benefit of a small elite of Roman readers. Mason (2009: 67) supports this interpretation by pointing to Josephus' well known stated purpose for writing his texts, viz.: to write a Jewish apology for a distinctly Hellenistic readership.

Allen (2016: 281) has explained that If Josephus was indeed a slave to employing Hellenistic rhetorical manipulation (as supported by Mason and others), and he had wanted to pointedly sell his message to a mostly Greek-speaking readership, regardless of his actual prowess with the Greek tongue as early as c. 70 C.E., if he was as dishonest and/or as arrogant as some claim, he might well have chosen to emphasise how *expert* he was in Greek and in addition how he had been schooled by Greeks and was wholly familiar with the Greek classics etc.

Instead he displays modesty and even lack of skill. Given his arrogance in places, these are both very rare qualities for someone like Josephus to admit to. What is even more telling here is that his admissions of inadequacy do not assist his stated task. Therefore, at least in these cases the reader can be assured that his pronouncements have validity.

Furthermore, when he did not have first-hand experience of a situation he relied on the voice of those that he trusted. Here I would tend to largely credit what he states in his prologue in the sense that although he may have distorted the truth as a direct result of his own personal experiences he never does so consciously. Josephus does have an agenda – but it is quite transparent and dominated by his naïve desire to be totally honest. Often he is blind to the hypocrisy of some of his statements and is even inconsistent but that does not necessarily mean that he has a hidden agenda.

This would strongly oppose Mason's claim that Josephus is in many ways a dishonest spokesperson for his age – one who deliberately distorts history for the benefit of some personal agenda. The worst that could be said of him is that he has no means with which to assess the validity of the information he repeats but his choice of historical material is used to highlight what for him were current concerns. In this latter regard they still assist the historian in understanding the issues of his own time.

Thus, he equally criticises historical figures when their actions harm the Jewish nation.

Another issue that seems to be overlooked is that if we assume that we can trust Josephus' stated agenda in the opening of both *War* and *Antiquities* respectively. In both cases Josephus gives the distinct impression that he firmly believed himself to be recounting events as honestly as he could. He even admits to the matter of subjectivity head-on.

It should also be noted that many of his negative accounts were not actually witnessed first-hand by Josephus – indeed they occurred in some instances several centuries before he wrote *War*. Therefore he must have been reliant on other written sources for his information. Here, (without being naïve to possible Josephan agenda and/or third and fourth century C.E. Christian interference) we should surely be mindful of the original itinerary of his chosen source material. Certainly, based on Josephus' promise for objectivity in his prologue, one would expect him to record the supplied information as faithfully as possible. Thus if he trusted a source enough to cite it he would hardly rewrite it – especially if the tenor of that information worked

against his supposed hidden agendas. For example, if Smith (1956)²⁸² is correct and Josephus had secretly wanted to hold up the Pharisaic party in general as a suitable example of leadership which would benefit the Romans he must have seen the damage that he was creating when he speaks badly about a particular Pharisee in history? Therefore only two possibilities are possible here:

1. Josephus faithfully recorded what he had researched as faithfully as possible; and/or
2. Josephus was extremely sloppy when it came to organising his ideas.

As an aside, depending on the contents of his source material Josephus can do one of three things:

1. Elect to select from his source(s) only those pieces of information that he agrees with; and/or
2. Embellish his source to make it accord with his own world view; and/or
3. Sacrifice his agenda when the source contradicts his agenda but still include the information because he wants to be honest.

Mason (2009: 136) retorts that recovering historical truth by reading Josephus would require a skill beyond the means of science, namely “magic or alchemy”. In addition, Mason correctly emphasises that in the case of the Josephan text, readers must constantly be aware of the pitfalls of assuming that they are simply analysing an individual’s attempt at giving an honest and straightforward account. As an example, Mason applies Ahl’s framework for pinpointing multivalence in ancient sources.

Ahl in Marcovitch and Sansone (1989:7) postulates that our models of Greek and Latin epic narrative are quite defective because they assume a clarity and directness of narrative and rationale that in no way reflects the manner in which ancient poets operated in actuality. In this regard, Ahl claims that the ancient author was quite aware of the wider fields of reference that specific terms might have and further

²⁸² Smith goes further in his assumptions: Perhaps Josephus was a loyal Sadducee before the rebellion but then, after 70 C.E., he conferred his allegiance to the Pharisees either because they were now the *de facto* most popular leadership (Smith, 1956:76) and/or because he found himself thinking along similar lines and/or he had come to realise that they were the best party to take the Jewish nation forward given the new political realities. As a result, Smith (1956:77) suggests that sometime after he had written his *War*, Josephus may well have aligned his own position with that of the Pharisaic movement.

exploited this fact in order to give their textual compositions more expressive weight. Ahl goes on to state that the ancient poet:

... had little use for the forthright expression we admire because they thought it less powerful in public speaking (Aristotle *Rhetoric* 1 382b) and less effective even with friends (Plutarch *Moralia* 66E-74E). Those ancients who do praise artless speech and criticize the techniques of "formidable speaking" - *deinotes* - are often themselves the most skilled practitioners of "formidable speaking".

In the same vein, Mason in Sievers and Lembi (2005: 71 – 100) attempts to show that Josephus' employment of say, flattery and criticism are not at all straightforward - rather they are carefully interrelated rhetorical devices. Mason puts forward brilliant arguments to show that Josephus may well have employed say flattery of Vespasian in an ironic way in order to expose the foolishness of the Roman emperor.

All of this may well be true – but it should also be noted, that Josephus is more likely to have placed his own safety above even the slightest risk of exposing himself to his many enemies, both Jewish and Roman. He states this many times in his books, so why would he risk certain death by setting down veiled insults that ran the risk of being eventually discovered by Vespasian and his extended family - his only true guarantee of even medium-term safety?

Surely Josephus can neither be expected to serve as an unbiased observer nor should he be expected to apply the rigours of contemporary historical enquiry. He was a product of his own age and employed the techniques of his own time to the best of his ability. In this context his texts (albeit with interpolations and redactions neutralised)²⁸³ should be seen as a genuine product which contains the rhetorical devices appropriate to the spirit of the age in which he lived. Certainly, it is not possible to say the same of an author like Luke and consequently one is more likely to treat Josephus (despite the occasional errors) as at least a potentially accurate

²⁸³ Cf. Allen, 2015. *Clarifying the Scope of Pre-Fifth-Century C.E. Christian Interpolation in Josephus' Ιουδαϊκή Αρχαιολογία (c. 94 C.E.)*. Nicholas Peter Legh Allen, 2017a. "Josephus, James and Jesus." *Journal of Early Christian History*, Vol .VII No. 1, Pretoria: UNISA Press; 2017b. "Josephus, Origen and John the Baptist: Exposing a Christian Apologist's Deceit." (IOSOT Conference) in *JBL* (publication pending); 2017c. "Christian Misappropriation in the *Jewish Antiquities*: Josephus Redeemed," in *Journal of Religions*, Chicago: CUP. (Pending Peer-Review process).

recorder of historical events whereas Luke consistently gets things wrong and often resorts to pure fantasy.

Josephus was a traditional, practicing Jew, living at the height of aggressive Hellenisation. He was witnessing the rapid destruction of everything that he held dear. He was attempting to make sense of the destruction and see God's purpose in a situation that countered every expectation. Despite his arrogance and delusions of self-importance, he genuinely wanted to see the survival of his religion and his nation. He wanted the non-Jew to better understand his people's plight and to acknowledge what he earnestly believed was God's divine handiwork in important historical events. He also did not want the Jewish nation to lose heart and was intent on pointing out to all Jews the perils of behaving in certain ways. Thus his *raison d'être* for writing was multifaceted. He wanted to tell the truth as best he could but in addition he wanted to educate his reader, whether Jew or Gentile.

CHAPTER SEVEN

Conclusions

7.1 Introduction

This chapter attempts to highlight the most important findings of this investigation as these address each sub problem and main problem of research.

7.2 The Problem of Research

This dissertation set out to determine to what degree the Mason thesis can withstand rigorous analytical scrutiny within the context of a substantiated and verified historical context.

7.3 The Sub-Problems of Research

Within this context a number of sub problems were identified.

7.3.1 First Sub-Problem

The dissertation attempted to determine the most credible historical context for the pertinent writings of Josephus, Ev.Luc. and Act.Ap. In this context, the following is relatable:

Firstly, Sterling (1992: 321) infers that by 130 C.E. no mention had yet been made of Ev.Luc. or even a similar document, strongly suggesting that Luke-Acts could never have been a source document for Josephus' writings.

Secondly, it is fairly safe to assume that neither Luke nor Josephus based their seemingly matching historical accounts and similar rhetorical style on some hypothetical common source. Apart from the more likely possibility of Josephus being a primary source (based solely on what is contained in Luke-Acts), it is clear that Luke also made use of Q and Ev.Matt.²⁸⁴ plus at least one other additional source(s) (i.e. the "we sections") that according to Porter (1994: 545 – 574) was a single source but according to Haenchen (1971: 85 – 87) may well have been any number of independent travelogues. There are also other obvious borrowings like Paul's

²⁸⁴ Cf. Mason, 2003: 251; and Carrier, 2000.

reference to the Greek poet Aratos and similarities in phraseology (e.g. Plato's *Apologia Socratis* 29D and Act.Ap. 5: 29).

Thirdly, much of the longest "we section" (Act.Ap. 27: 1 - 28: 16) has only limited parallels with Josephus' own accounts (*Life* 14 – 16) of his own experiences during a shipwreck on the way to Rome. Although this certainly does not rule out Luke making use of Josephus in this instance, we need to be mindful of the possibility that Luke also equally lifted content from other sources. Nonetheless, the evidence seems to point to Luke consistently employing his source material merely as a non-critical point of departure for accounts that are preoccupied solely with the delivery of his spiritual message in a dramatic and memorable way. In this latter regard, Dicken (2012: 12 – 13); Pervo (1987: 138); and Bovon (2002: 8) all seem to support the possibility that Luke utilised the "we sections" as literary devices in order to better involve and engage the reader as well as making the narrative more exciting.

Fourthly, if a reliable date for Luke-Acts was forthcoming, this would assist greatly in ruling out Josephus as a source. Here, the problem is that most scholars who are more conservative will automatically favour an early date whereas more liberal thinkers tend to proffer much later dates. Because it is acknowledged that Ev.Luc. is based in part on Ev.Marc. and the latter is commonly ascribed to c.65 – 70 C.E., most conservative scholars favour a date soon after 70 but well before 90 C.E.

Thus we have scholars such as Dicken (2012: 17 – 25) who typically attempt to establish what he believes are plausible dates for Luke-Acts based largely on a trusting acceptance of the reliability of what is written in the *NT*. Within this latter context, Dicken attempts to establish a safe *terminus a quo* and *terminus ad quem* for Luke-Acts.

Here, based on, inter alia, Jesus' reference to the destruction of Jerusalem in Ev.Luc. 19: 41 – 44, Dicken settles on a *terminus a quo* of between c. 75 and 80 C.E.

As we have seen, Dicken (2012: 24 – 25) believes that 1 Clem. was written in 96 C.E. and is possibly dependent on Act.Ap. Accordingly he is happy to accept a *terminus ad quem* for Luke-Acts of c. 85 - 90 C.E.

These dates are problematic for a number of obvious reasons but principle amongst them is the fact that Dicken merely conflates his dubious *terminus ad quem* of 85 – 90 C.E. to further justify why there would not have been sufficient time for Luke to have borrowed from Josephus' *Antiquities* (c. 94 C.E.) before his Act.Ap. was borrowed by Clement I.

In point of fact, there is absolutely no evidence to support the tradition that Clement I wrote 1 Clem. It has already been pointed out that this epistle had no specified author before c. 170 C.E. at the *earliest* possible date. In addition, Van Den Bergh Van Eysinga (1908: 52) has already shown that the text contains mature Roman Catholic theology too advanced for an author living in either the late first century or the early second century of the Common Era. Therefore it is not possible for Act.Ap to have influenced Clem 1. until at least the last two decades of the second century C.E.

At least Dicken accepts that Luke-Acts was not considered authoritative until at least the mid-second century C.E. Sterling (1992: 321) also infers that by 130 C.E. no mention had yet been made of Ev.Luc. or even a similar document. In addition, Marcion of Sinope (c. 85 - c. 160 C.E.) is known to have accepted a version of what is now called Ev.Luc. as canonical as late as c. 140 C.E.

Fifthly, Dicken like Crowe (2012: 93) and Bruce (1951: 43 – 44) neglect to mention *War* as a possible influence. As has been noted already, even if Dicken is totally correct and Luke-Acts was indeed written as early as say c. 85 C.E. it could still have been based in part on *War* (c. 74 C.E.).

We also need to consider Carrier's (2000) prudent observations: Given the slow rate of publication and dissemination, hand-written copies of Josephus' texts would surely have taken quite some time to reach the hands of those responsible for the initial creation of Ev.Luc and Act.Ap.

In the final analysis, there seems to be more reason to believe that Ev.Luc. was indeed created somewhat later than 90 C.E. Here, it would seem that Sterling (1992: 330) is proven to be more accurate when he at least will accept a date up to the mid-90s C.E. for the actual composition of Luke-Acts.

Unfortunately, this latter observation per se, does not really assist the task of clarifying the most plausible historical context for Luke-Acts. If the conservative scholars are correct and Ev.Luc was produced before say 75 C.E. there is absolutely no chance that the author could have read either *War* or *Antiquities*. In this unlikely scenario Luke could not possibly have plagiarised Josephus and in addition we would have tangible evidence for a prior common source.

However, given the long list of evidence of plagiarism that almost certainly exists, then the only option left would be to ascertain that Luke-Acts was written well after 97 C.E. Here, with the insights of Carrier (2000) we could even speculate a date as late as 110 C.E. as the earliest possible date for composition of Ev.Luc. let alone Act.Ap.

We need to consider that Luke-Acts might not have been written by one author – something that is accepted by scholars such as Verheyden (2012: 27). Here we have seen the opposing arguments of Walters (2009: 160 and 189) who, based on “authorial unity,” has identified divergences of style and rhythm in Ev.Luc. and Act.Ap.. As a consequence she would argue for separate authors.

However, one must also be mindful of the fact that the same author (or group) may well have changed his (their) approach when composing his (their) second book due to the nature of the source material and overriding agenda.

Then there is Luke’s reference to his previous book (i.e. Ev. Luc.) when writing the *πρόλογος* for Act.Ap. If two separate authors or groups were involved it is evident that they still treated Luke-Acts as a unity.

Lastly, it is almost certain that both books were redacted over time and certain modified concepts and/or theological directives of later periods inculcated into the text²⁸⁵. With this possibility in mind, stylistic differences would, over time, creep into the respective texts. If so, this would explain the cause of Walters’ predicament.

7.3.2 Second Sub-Problem

The dissertation attempted to determine to what degree either Ev.Luc. or Act.Ap. may be considered reliable historical sources.

²⁸⁵ The fact that Luke himself is attempting to undermine Paul’s more archetypal message as found in 1 Ep.Cor. is a case in point.

Again, the world-view of the various scholars plays a large role in coming to a conclusion apropos the issue of reliability. In general, conservative scholars seem to automatically assume that Luke is almost totally accurate and reliable whereas more sceptical scholars like Mason (1992) and Carrier (2000) find Luke to be totally unreliable.

However, it is interesting to note that apart from very fundamentalist commentators like Holding (2014) and Dicken (2012) who wholly accept that the information recorded in Luke-Acts is God-given, there are dissenting voices. Indeed, certain of the more conservative scholars – those whom one might assume would want to naively accept the *NT* being totally historically accurate - do not seem to state *unequivocally* that Luke is absolutely dependable.

For example Lüdemann (2013: 256 - 257) is quite objective in his approach and points out many areas where Luke gets things wrong when compared to the other *NT* gospels writers. For example, as has been already discussed Luke misrepresents Paul's association with the Jerusalem community and also altered Paul's theology etc.

However, Lüdemann (2013: 256) explains that these discrepancies are as a result of Luke employing judiciously-chosen characters, constructs and events in his narratives to prove that Christianity was indeed divinely sanctioned and always proves to be victorious in the end.

Regardless, based on the arguments given by Pervo (1987), Sterling (1992), Dicken (2012) and Lüdemann (2013) it is evident that scholars do not present Luke as a historically reliable author. Instead they justify Luke's approach as a *means* to impart a more important *spiritual* truth.

In the final analysis, based on the evidence presented it is quite clear that Luke cannot be relied upon to recover historical truth. Many of his accounts are inaccurate and in many cases quite fantastical. Only a non-critical and gullible reader would believe accounts of a census occurring throughout the entire Roman world (Ev.Luc. 2: 1 – 7), an earthquake loosing all the prisoner's chains (Act.Ap. 16: 26), Peter quoting Jl. 2: 28 – 32 verbatim (Act.Ap. 2: 17 – 21), Peter's exhortation which

resulted in the immediate conversion of 3,000 Jews (Act.Ap. 2: 14 - 36), and Paul bitten by a snake and suffering no ill effects (Act.Ap. 28: 3 – 6) etc.

Lastly, it should be seen as significant that the only references to the first person plural, in either Luke or Acts are limited to four sections. This factor alone reveals that Luke was not writing consistently as a reliable witness. Indeed, if a sole author had been involved one would have expected the first person singular to be employed uninterruptedly throughout the entire recitation.

7.3.3 Third Sub-Problem

The dissertation attempted to determine, in the context of Mason's thesis, the degree of historical reliability apropos Josephus' writings.

This is a complex problem to deal with in a research project of this limited scope. However, although it is clear that Josephus has a clear agenda (inter alia, to write a Jewish apology for a distinctly Hellenistic readership), which underpins much of his writing, he does go to great lengths to convince his reader of his honesty. Of course this could be ascribed to a clever rhetorical strategy. However, on more than one occasion he does relate incidents that do not exactly assist his cause. In addition these accounts²⁸⁶ reveal negative traits such as cowardice and unrighteous behaviour. Thus, in these contexts at least, it can safely be stated that he should be considered to be mostly reliable – certainly when one considers the alternatives. In this latter context, if Luke is the only alternative, given his proven unreliability²⁸⁷, Josephus' accounts would appear to be far more trustworthy.

7.3.4 Fourth Sub-Problem

The dissertation attempted to determine if Josephus is indeed the primary source for any of the Lucan texts or vice versa.

Certainly, based on the results of the previous three sub-problems it is highly unlikely that Luke could have ever been a source for Josephus. Therefore what is more

²⁸⁶ Cf. *War* 3, 8, 3/ 350 - 7/ 391 and *Antiquities* 3, 12, 2 / 276 – 277a.

²⁸⁷ Notably, Luke both misdates the census of Quirinius as well as misleading his reader apropos its extent. Firstly, the census of Quirinius only occurred in Syria and not the entire Roman world. Secondly, it took place in c. 6 C.E. and not c. 6-4 B.C.E. as alluded to in the text.

important to determine is was Josephus in any way a source for Luke? And, if so to what degree?

We have already seen that, of all the *NT* books, only *Ev.Luc* and *Act.Ap.* demonstrate analogous correspondences with certain of Josephus' accounts. In this regard, both Josephus and Luke are identifiable as a consequence of the following seemingly shared attributes:

1. Josephus and Luke both employ the same genre or literary type to convey their message (Hellenistic history writing);
2. Both Josephus and Luke represent a minority group within a broader Græco-Roman ethos;
3. Both writers present their minority group as having a valuable role to play within the greater system;
4. Both writers downplay any dissension (real or perceived) within their respective groupings and stress more ideal group characteristics, such as union, discipline and accord;
5. Both authors hold up the religious values and ancient traditions of their respective sub-group as eminently worthy of consideration and respect; and
6. Although they primarily write for a broader Græco-Roman audience they also cater for the specific needs of their own sub-group.

As has already been summarised, the argument that both authors existed at the same time and shared similar Hellenistic influences is not sufficient to explain all of these correspondences, viz.:

1. Agrippa I's death;
2. Felix and Drusilla;
3. Agrippa II and Bernice

Similarly, certain accounts also contain elements of incongruity (certainly from an accurate historical perspective):

1. The Census under Quirinius;
2. Judas the Galilean;
3. Theudas;

4. The Egyptian False Prophet; and
5. The *Sicarii*.

Luke is clearly operating (like Josephus) within a typical Hellenistic milieu. For example, he makes use of invented “plausible” speeches for individuals as though they were recorded verbatim and he claims to have access to eyewitness testimony.

However, unlike most other authors at the time, Luke refrains from openly condemning previous writers which could be taken as an indication that he did not want to draw his reader’s attention to the sources that he was lifting. This possibility, when considered in the light of Mason’s argument, reveals the possibility that Luke still managed to imply that previous authors were substandard (i.e. without stating it explicitly). Here, the insight of Mason (2003: 255) where Luke’s specific reference to πολλοὶ in Ev.Luc.1: 1 might be intended to indicate Luke’s disapproval needs to be evaluated. As has been seen, Mason supports the notion that as a Hellenistic writer he would still have wanted to improve on the quality of the other, then extant, gospels. Thus, according to Mason, Luke is still indirectly, implying that his gospel will be an improvement when compared to what had been recorded earlier.

However, the following facts need to be considered as a collective:

1. There is no real *hard* evidence to support Mason’s hunch of Luke’s implicit disapproval of previous authors;
2. Luke never openly states his disapproval of previous authors; and
3. Much evidence exists of unabashed borrowing from other sources.

Therefore, surely it is more likely that Luke did not want to draw his reader’s attention to his dishonesty (assuming he was even aware that he was being in any way mendacious)? Also, if he was indeed conscious of some form of deceit, to disguise this fact whilst still making a veiled suggestion that his writing was superior would have been a preferred route to follow.

The findings of this investigation (both conditional and as well as analogous) seem to be reinforced by Mason’s opinion that Luke positions nascent Christianity as a “philosophical school” within Judaism. However, Josephus names and elaborates upon these competitors whereas Luke blatantly circumvents the need to focus on

them unduly. This is especially true of the distinct absence of Essenism in his writings.

Most damning is Mason's analysis of Act.Ap. 26: 5²⁸⁸

προγινώσκοντές με ἄνωθεν, ἐὰν θέλωσι μαρτυρεῖν, ὅτι κατὰ τὴν ἀκριβεστάτην αἵρεσιν τῆς ἡμετέρας θρησκείας ἔζησα Φαρισαῖος.

They have known me for a long time and can testify, if they are willing, that I conformed to the **strictest sect** of our religion, living as a Pharisee. [My emphasis for clarity NPLA].

As has been noted earlier, Mason views Luke's use of the term αἵρεσιν as specifically emphasising the interplay between the powerful philosophical schools of the Jews and that of the Christians much the same way as Josephus distinguishes between the three branches of Judaism. If so, this seems to be more than a coincidence.

Mason also draws our attention to the fact that Luke (like Josephus) has Paul refer to the Pharisees as the "ἀκριβεστάτην αἵρεσιν". Thus Luke is coincidentally employing Josephan language (i.e. "philosophical school" and "accuracy") twice within the same sentence as well as conforming to a Josephan interpretation and simultaneously confirming that the Pharisees prided themselves as being the most accurate Jewish sect - exactly as Josephus had maintained in his own works.

It is apparent that Luke needs his accounts to appear historiographical to create the illusion of reality. Only an audience that was unschooled would be content not to question when Luke either places accurate information in the wrong context or when he ingenuously invents history. Based on the evidence there seems to be little chance that the reader would be able to take a supposedly well-known fact (e.g. the procuratorship of Festus) and then happily imagine that a quite possibly fictitious story is from the same time. Furthermore, even when Luke refers to a known historical fact (e.g. the census under Quirinius) he is capable of getting the date wrong.

²⁸⁸ Greek text according to *NTOG*. 1882. Eds Brooke and Fenton: 307. NIV translation according to Holy Bible. 1989. NIV: *NT* 138.

7.4 Conclusions

When one reviews all of the arguments under review, only those of Mason and Carrier appear to be undeniably more rational. However, it is also clear that there is no *absolute* incontrovertible evidence that Luke was *definitely* dependent on Josephus.

Regardless, the largely circumstantial evidence seems overwhelming. Based purely on the law of probability, and the fact that Luke obviously does make use of other sources (e.g. Q, Ev.Matt and at least one other undetermined source – possibly a diarist), the chances that Luke did not make some use of Josephus are quite small.

As has been shown already certain events are not easy to explicate unless one accepts some degree of Lucan dependency on Josephus. This not only includes those narratives involving Agrippa I's death, Felix and Drusilla's relationship and Agrippa II and Bernice's actions but also the following group of commonly reported events:

1. The Census under Quirinius;
2. Judas the Galilean;
3. Theudas;
4. The Egyptian False Prophet; and
5. The *Sicarii*.

As the historical discrepancies could only have occurred as a result of Luke conflating specific information presented in Josephus' writings this is seen as important *prima facie* evidence of influence.

It should also be added, that the real possibility that the book of Acts was written nearer the middle of the second century C.E. (cf. Baur and Tyson) helps to support, inter alia, the possibility of Josephan influence.

7.4.1 Further Research

It is safe to state that the Mason thesis holds water but also raises a number of important issues that need to be explored further:

Firstly, given that Luke is obviously not concerned at all about historical accuracy what does that say about the educational level of those individuals who were the recipients of his texts over several centuries? The fact that no-one seems to have noticed their levels of inaccuracy until relatively recent times should be seen as significant. The texts were clearly didactic in nature and, inter alia, must have been employed for the conversion of non-Christians. Given the fact that these texts were happily taken to be historically accurate and/or valid/realistic seems to indicate that Christian converts came almost exclusively from low-income and/or uneducated societies.

Secondly, Luke seems to have no qualms about “borrowing” the contents of other sources without acknowledgement.

This seems to seriously contradict the findings of Lüdemann (2013: 259 - 260) who argued, based on Galen’s comments in *My Own Books*, the following, pertinent to Græco-Roman times:

1. individuals with limited education were able to employ basic “style-criticism” to discriminate between legitimate and bogus texts;
2. Plagiarism was *not* tolerated; and
3. Pseudepigraphy was considered inappropriate behaviour.

What it seems to show, is that if in normal Hellenistic circles style criticism and awareness of the perils of plagiarism and pseudepigraphy were well known – even to those of limited education, then the early Christians of c. 200 – 400 C.E. must have operated well outside of societal norms.

SELECTED SOURCE LIST

ALLEN, Nicholas Peter Legh. 2015. *Clarifying the Scope of Pre-Fifth-Century C.E. Christian Interpolation in Josephus' Ἰουδαϊκὴ Ἀρχαιολογία (c. 94 C.E.)*. Unpublished *Philosophiae Doctor* Thesis, Potchefstroom: North-West University.

ALLEN, Nicholas Peter Legh. 2016. "Josephus and the Pharisees" *Construction, Coherence and Connotations: Studies on the Septuagint, Apocryphal and Cognate Literature*. Edited by Nicholas P.L. Allen and Pierre J. Jordaan, 261 - 302. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter Publishers.

ALLEN, Nicholas Peter Legh. 2017. "Josephus, James and Jesus." *Journal of Early Christian History*, Vol .VII No. 1, Pretoria: UNISA Press.

ALLEN, Nicholas Peter Legh. 2018 "Josephus, Origen and John the Baptist: Exposing a Christian Apologist's Deceit." (IOSOT Conference) in *JBL* (publication pending).

ALLEN, Nicholas Peter Legh. 2017c. "Christian Misappropriation in the *Jewish Antiquities*: Josephus Redeemed," in *Journal of Religions*, Chicago: CUP. (Pending Peer-Review process).

ALLEN, Wesley. 1997. *The Death of Herod*, SBLDS, 158; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press.

ALSTON, Richard. 1998. *Aspects of Roman History AD 14 - 117*. London: Routledge.

ARGYLE, A.W. 1974. "The Greek of Luke and Acts," in *New Testament Studies*, 20, 4, 441-445.

AUNE, David E. 1987. *The New Testament in its Literary Environment*. *Library of Early Christianity*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press.

BACON, Benjamin Wisner. 1921. "The Chronological Scheme of Acts," in *The Harvard Theological Review*, Vol. 14, No. 2 (Apr., 1921): 137 - 166. Cambridge University Press.

BALCH, David L. 1989. "Comments on the Genre and a Political Theme of Luke-Acts: A Preliminary Comparison of Two Hellenistic Historians," in *Society of Biblical Literature 1989 Seminar Papers*, ed. David J. Lull, Atlanta: Scholars Press: 343 – 361.

BARR, David L. and Wentling, Judith L. 1984. "The Conventions of Classical Biography and the Genre of Luke-Acts: A Preliminary Study in Luke-Acts: New Perspectives," from the *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar*, ed. Charles H. Talbert. New York: Crossroad: 63 – 88.

- BARR, James. 1959. "The Meaning of 'Mythology' in Relation to the Old Testament," in *Vetus Testamentum*, Volume 9, Issue 1: 1-10.
- BAUCKHAM, Richard. J. 2006. *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses: The Gospels as Eyewitness Testimony*. Grand Rapids, MI: W.B. Eerdmans Publishers.
- BAUCKHAM, Richard. J. 2008. "Eyewitnesses and Critical History: A Response to Jens Schröter and Craig Evans," in *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 31, 2 (December 2008): 221-235.
- BELSER, J. E. 1895. "Lukas und Josephus," in *Theologische Quartalschrift* 77: 634 – 662.
- BENNER, Jeffery A. 2009. *Ancient Hebrew Dictionary: 1000 Verbs and nouns of the Hebrew Bible* College Station, TX: Virtualbookworm.com Publishing Inc.
- BEN-SASSON, Haim Hillel. 1976. *A History of the Jewish People*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- BERGER, Klaus. 1984a. *Hellenistische Gattungen im Neuen Testament in Religion (Vorkonstantinisches Christentum: Leben und Umwelt Jesu; Neues Testament, Forts [Kanoniische Schriften und Apokyphen]). Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt II 25.2*, Berlin: Walter der Gruyter: 1031 – 1432.
- BERGER, Klaus. 1984b. *Formgeschichte des Neuen Testament*, Heidelberg: Quelle and Meyer.
- BERMEJO-RUBIO, Fernando. 2016. "Are Judas the Galilean and the 'Fourth Philosophy' Mere Concoctions? The Limits of Josephus' Inventiveness," in *Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok* 81, 91 – 111.
- BILDE, Per. 1988. "Flavius Josephus Between Jerusalem and Rome: His Life, His Works and Their Importance," in *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha*, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- BLOESCH, Donald G. 1994. *Holy Scripture: Revelation, Inspiration and Interpretation*, Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press.
- BOVON, François 2002. *Luke 1, Hermeneia*, Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress.
- BRIGHTON, Mark Andrew. 2009. *The Sicarii in Josephus' Judean War: Rhetorical Analysis and Historical Observations*, Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.
- BRIGHTON, Mark Andrew. 2011. "The Sicarii in Acts: A New Perspective," in the *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*, 54.3 (September 2011): 547 - 558.

- BROWN, Raymond Edward and Meier, John P. 2004. *Antioch and Rome: New Testament Cradles of Catholic Christianity*, Mahwah: Paulist Press.
- BRUCE, Frederick Fyvie. 1951. *The Acts of the Apostles: The Greek Text with Introduction and Commentary*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans.
- BRUCE, Frederick Fyvie. 1942a. *The Speeches in the Acts of the Apostles*. London: The Tyndale Press.
- BRUCE, Frederick Fyvie. 1942b. "The Tyndale New Testament Lecture," (*Conference of Graduate and Theological Student members of the Inter-Varsity Fellowship*), Wadham College, Oxford:
- BRUCE, Frederick Fyvie. 1952. *The Acts of the Apostles: The Greek Text with Introduction and Commentary*, 2nd Ed.
- BRUCE, Frederick Fyvie. 1954. *Commentary on the Book of the Acts*. The New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company
- BRUCE, Frederick Fyvie. 1962. "Christianity Under Claudius," in *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester*, 44 (March 1962): 309 - 326.
- BRUCE, Frederick Fyvie. 1986. "Chronological Questions in the Acts of the Apostles," in *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester*, 68: 284 – 287.
- BURKITT, Francis Crawford. 1911. *The Gospel History and its Transmission*, Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.
- CADBURY, Henry. J. 1922. "Commentary on the Preface of Luke," in F.J. Foakes Jackson, and Kirsopp Lake (Eds), *The Beginnings of Christianity: Part I: The Acts of the Apostles. Vol. II. Prolegomena II Criticism*, 489 – 510, London: Macmillan and Company
- CADBURY, Henry J. 1927. *The Making of Luke-Acts*. New York: Macmillan Company. Reprint ed., London: The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. (1961).
- CARRIER, Richard. 2012a. *Proving History: Bayes' Theorem and the Quest for the Historical Jesus*. Town: Prometheus Books
- CARRIER, Richard. 2012b. "Origen, Eusebius, and the Accidental Interpolation in Josephus, Jewish Antiquities 20.200," in *The Journal of Early Christian Studies*, Vol. 20, No. 4, Winter 2012: 489 - 514.
- CARRIER, Richard. 2012c. "Thallus and the Darkness at Christ's Death," in *Journal of Greco-Roman Christianity and Judaism*, Sheffield: Phoenix Press, Vol. 8: 185 - 191.

CIZEK, Alexandru. 1975. "From the Historical Truth to the Literary Convention: The Life of Cyrus the Great Viewed by Herodotus, Ctesias and Xenophon," in *L'Antiquité Classique*, T. 44, Fasc. 2 (1975): 531 – 552.

CLARK, A.C. 1933. *The Acts of the Apostles*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

COHEN, L. and Manion, L. 1994. *Research Methods in Education*. 4th ed. London: Routledge.

COHEN, Shaye J.D. 2002. *Josephus in Galilee and Rome: His Vita and Development as a Historian*. Leiden: E.J. Brill and Co.

COHEN, Shaye J.D. and Schwartz, Joshua J. (Eds). 2007. *Studies in Josephus and the Varieties of Ancient Judaism: Louis H. Feldman Jubilee Volume*, Leiden: E.J. Brill and Co.

CONZELMANN, Hans. 1987. *Acts of the Apostles*, Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

COWLEY, Angela. 2008. *Religious Toleration and Political Power in the Roman World*. Unpublished *Magister Artium* thesis, Ontario: McMaster University Library.

CRAMER, John Antony (Ed.). 1838. *Catena in Acta SS. Apostolorum E Cod. Nov. Coll.* Oxonii: E Typographeo Academico.

CRAMER, John Antony. (Ed.). 1844. *Catena Graecorum Patrum in Novum Testamentum*, Vol. III. Oxonii: E Typographeo Academico.

CRAWLEY, Richard (Tr.). 1910. *The History of the Peloponnesian War: Thucydides*, Mineola, NY.: Dover Publications.

CROWE, Brandon D. 2012. "The Sources for Luke and Acts: Where Did Luke Get His Material (and Why Does it Matter)?" in *Issues in Luke-Acts: Selected Essays*. Edited by Sean A. Adams and Michael W. Pahl, 73-96. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press.

DERRIDA, Jacques. 1997. *Of Grammatology*, Tr. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.

DIBELIUS, Martin. 1936. *A Fresh Approach to the New Testament and Early Christian Literature*. London: Ivor Nicholson and Watson.

DICKEN, Frank. 2012. "The Author and Date of Luke-Acts: Exploring The Options," in *Issues in Luke-Acts: Selected Essays*. Edited by Sean A. Adams and Michael W. Pahl, 7-26. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press.

DIRVEN, Lucinda. 2011. "The Imperial Cult in the Cities of the Decapolis, Caesarea, Maritima and Palmyra: A Note on the Development of Imperial

- Cults in the Roman Near East.” in *Proceedings of the ARAM Twenty Fifth International Conference 2008: The Decapolis* (Oxford University) ARAM, 23 (2011): 141-156.
- DRURY, John. 1976. *Tradition and Design in Luke's Gospel: A Study in Early Christian Historiography*. London: Darton, Longman and Todd.
- EHRMAN, Bart D. (Ed. and Tr.) 2003. *The Apostolic Fathers I*, Loeb Classic Library. Vol. 24. London: Harvard University Press.
- EHRMAN, Bart D. 1993. *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture: The Effect of Early Christological Controversies on the Text of the New Testament*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- EHRMAN, Bart D. 2005. *Misquoting Jesus: The Story Behind Who Changed the Bible and Why*, New York: Harper One.
- EHRMAN, Bart D. 2009. *Jesus Interrupted: Revealing the Hidden Contradictions in the Bible (and Why We Don't Know About Them)*, New York: HarperCollins.
- EINHORN, Lena. 2012. “Jesus and the ‘Egyptian Prophet’” presentation made to the Society of Biblical Literature Annual Meeting, Chicago, Nov.17-20, 2012, 1-40.
- EISENMAN, Robert H.1983. “Maccabees, Zadokites, Christians and Qumran: A New Hypothesis of Qumran Origins,” in *Studia Post Biblica* 34, Leiden: E.J. Brill and Co.
- ELLIOTT, J. K. 2005. *The Apocryphal New Testament: A Collection of Apocryphal Christian Literature* in an English Translation Based on M. R. James. Oxford: Clarendon.
- ENCYCLOPAEDIA JUDAICA. 1982. Ed. Fern Seckbach. 17 Volumes. Jerusalem: Keterpress.
- EVANS, Craig Alan. 2001, *Jesus and His Contemporaries: Comparative Studies*, Leiden: E.J. Brill and Co.
- EVANS, Craig. 1990. Luke. *New International Biblical Commentary on the New Testament*. Peabody, MA.: Hendrickson.
- EVANS, Ernest (Ed.). 1972. *Tertullian: Adversus Marcionem*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- FELDMAN, Louis H. 1987. *Josephus, Judaism, and Christianity*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press.
- FELDMAN, Louis H. 1992. “Josephus,” in *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, Vol. 3: 981 – 998. Ed. D.N. Freedman, New York: Doubleday.

- FELDMAN, Louis. 1984. "Flavius Josephus Revisited," in *Aufstieg Und Niedergang Der Roemischen Welt*, Part 2, Eds Hildegard Temporini and Wolfgang Haase,
- FERGUSSON, Francis (Ed.) 1961. *Aristotle's Poetics*. New York: Hill and Wang.
- FITZMYER, Joseph A. 1981. The Gospel According to Luke I – IX. *Anchor Bible*, Vol. 28: Garden City: Doubleday.
- FITZMYER, Joseph A. 1985. The Gospel According to Luke X - XXIV. *Anchor Bible*, Vol. 28a. Garden City: Doubleday.
- FITZMYER, Joseph A. 1998. *The Acts of the Apostles: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 31, New York: Doubleday.
- FLENDER, Helmut. 1967. *St. Luke, Theologian of Redemptive History*, tr. Reginald H. Fuller and Ilse Fuller. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
- FOSTER, Herbert Baldwin (Ed.). 1905. *Dio's Rome: An Historical Narrative Originally Composed in Greek During The Reigns Of Septimius Severus, Geta and Caracalla, Macrinus, Elagabalus and Now Presented In English Form*. Vol. IV, New York: Pafraets Book Company.
- FOUCAULT, Michael. 1983. "Discourse and Truth: the Problematization of Parrhesia," in *Six lectures given by Michel Foucault at the University of California at Berkeley, Oct-Nov. 1983*.
- FOWLER, Harold North (Tr.) 1966. *Plato in Twelve Volumes*, Vol. 1. Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press.
- FOX, Matthew. 2001. "Dionysius, Lucian, and the Prejudice against Rhetoric," in History, in *The Journal of Roman Studies*, Vol. 91 (2001): 76 – 93.
- GNUSE, Robert. 2002. "*Vita Apologetica*: The Lives of Josephus and Paul in Apologetic Historiography," in *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 13.2, 151 – 169.
- GOLDBERG, Gary J. 1995. "The Coincidences of the Emmaus Narrative of Luke and the Testimonium of Josephus," in *The Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 13: 59 -77.
- GRANT, Michael. 1995. *Greek and Roman Historians: Information and Misinformation*, New York: Routledge.
- GRANT, Robert. 1963. *A Historical Introduction to the New Testament*, New York: Harper and Row.

GRANT, Robert, 1988. *Greek Apologists of the Second Century*, Philadelphia: Westminster Press.

GREEN, Bernard. 2010. *Christianity in Ancient Rome: The First Three Centuries*, London: T. & T. Clark.

GREEN, Joel B. 1995. *The Theology of the Gospel of Luke*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

GREEN, Joel B. 1997. *The Gospel of Luke*, Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans.

GUMMERE, Richard M. 1917 – 1925. *Lucius Annaeus Seneca: Moral Epistles* Vol. I. The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

GUTIERREZ, M. L. 2009. *The Bible Dilemma: Historical Contradictions, Misquoted Statements, Failed Prophecies and Oddities in the Bible*, Indianapolis: Dog Ear Publishing.

HAENCHEN, Ernst. 1971. *The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

HALLIWELL, Stephen (Ed. and Tr.). 1995. *Aristotle: Poetics*. Loeb Classical Library. Harvard: Harvard University Press.

HARNACK, Adolf. 1909. *Luke the Physician: The Author of the Third Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles*. Tr. J.R. Wilkinson. 2nd ed. Crown Theological Library. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons.

HARVEY, Van A. 1996. *The Historian and the Believer: The Morality of Historical Knowledge*, Illinois: University of Illinois Press.

HEATH, Malcom (Tr.). 1996. *Aristotle: Poetics*. London: Penguin.

HOLMES, Peter (Tr.) 1868. *The Five Books of Quintus Sept. Flor. Tertullianus Against Marcion*, Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

HOLTZ, Barry W. (Ed.). 1984. *Back to the Sources*. New York: Touchstone Books.

HOLY BIBLE. 1989. *New International Version with Concordance*. Cape Town: Bible Society of South Africa.

HOLZBERG, Niklas. 1986. *Der antike Roman: Eine Einführung*. München: Artemis.

In Master's Seminary Journal, 15.1 (Spring 2004): 124.

in Vetus Testamentum, Vol. 9. Fasc. 1 (Jan., 1959): 1 – 10. Brill.

- HOWELL, Justin R. 2016. *The Pharisees and Figured Speech in Luke-Acts* Unpublished Philosophiae Doctor Thesis. University of Chicago. Chicago, Illinois.
- INWOOD, Brad. (Tr.) 2007. *Seneca: Selected Philosophical Letters*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- JEWETT, R. 1979. *A Chronology of Paul's Life*, Philadelphia. Fortress Press.
- JOHNSON, Luke Timothy. 1991. *The Gospel of Luke*, Sacra Pagina Series Vol.3: Edited by Daniel J. Harrington. Collegeville, Minn: The Liturgical Press
- JONES, Henry Stuart and Powell, Johannes Enoch (Eds.). 1942. *Thucydidis Historiae* in two volumes. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- JONES, Timothy Paul. 2007. *Misquoting Truth: A Guide to the Fallacies of Bart Ehrman's "Misquoting Jesus"*, Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
- KNIGHT, Jonathan. 1998. *Luke's Gospel (New Testament Readings)* London: Routledge.
- KOKKINOS, Nikos. 2010. *The Herodian Dynasty: Origins, Role in Society and Eclipse*, London: Spink.
- KOLTKO-RIVERA, Mark E. 2000. *The Worldview Assessment Instrument (WAI): The development and preliminary validation of an instrument to assess world view components relevant to counseling and psychotherapy*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, New York University.
- KOLTKO-RIVERA, Mark E. 2004. "The Psychology of Worldviews," in *Review of General Psychology, Educational Publishing Foundation*, 2004, Vol. 8, No. 1: 3 – 58.
- KÖSTENBERGER, Andreas J., Kellum, L. Scott and Quarles, Charles L. 2009. *The Cradle, the Cross, and the Crown: An Introduction to the New Testament*, Nashville: BandH Publishing Group.
- KRENKEL, Peter Maximilian. 1894. *Josephus und Lukas*. Leipzig: Haessel.
- KRENKEL, Peter Maximilian. 1894. *Josephus und Lucas: Der Schriftstellerische Einfluss des jüdischen Geschichtsschreibers auf den Christlichen nachgewiesen*. Leipzig: Haessel.
- LANE, William L. 1998. *Social Perspectives on Roman Christianity During the Formative Years from Nero to Nerva: Romans, Hebrews, 1 Clem. in Judaism and Christianity in First-Century Rome*. Eds Karl Paul Donfried and Peter Richardson, Grand Rapids, MI: W.B. Eerdmans Publishers.

- LIGHTFOOT, Joseph Barber. (Ed. and Tr.) 1869. *S. Clement of Rome: The Two Epistles to the Corinthians*. Vol. I. London: Macmillan and Co.
- LIGHTFOOT, Joseph Barber. (Ed. and Tr.) 1889. *The Apostolic Fathers: The Epistle of S. Clement to the Corinthians*. Part I, Vol. II. London: Macmillan and Co.
- LO CASCIO, Elio. 1994. "The Size of the Roman Population: Beloch and the Meaning of the Augustan Census Figures," in *The Journal of Roman Studies. Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies*: 23 - 40
- LÜDEMANN, Gerd. 2013. "Historical Issues in Acts 28:11 – 31," in *Forum*, Third Series 2,2, Fall, 2013: 253 – 272.
- MACDONALD, Dennis R. 2003. *Does the New Testament Imitate Homer? Four Cases from the Acts of the Apostles*, New Haven: Yale University Press.
- MAGYAR, Zsolt S. 2009. "Imperial Cult and Christianity: How and to What Extent Were the Imperial Cult and Emperor Worship Thought to Preserve Stability in the Roman World?" in *Acta Archaeologica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 60, Budapest: 2009: 385 - 394.
- MARGUERAT, Daniel. 2004. *The First Christian Historian: Writing The 'Acts Of The Apostles'*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- MARSHALL, Ian Howard. 1978. *The Gospel of Luke. The New International Greek Testament Commentary*, Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- MASON, Steve. 1993. *Josephus and the New Testament*, 1st Ed. Peabody, Ma.: Hendrickson Publishers, Inc.
- MASON, Steve. 2003. *Josephus and the New Testament*, 2nd Ed. Peabody, Ma.: Hendrickson Publishers, Inc.
- MASON, Steve (Tr.). 2008. *Flavius Josephus: Translation and Commentary Vol. 1b: Judean War 2*. Leiden: Brill.
- MEAGER, John C. 1983. *Five Gospels: An Account of How the Good News Came to be*. Minneapolis: Winston Press.
- MERCED-OWNBEY, D. Jasmine. 2008. Roman Isis and the Pendulum of Tolerance in the Empire in *Inquiry*, Vol. 9: 1 - 34.
- MERCER DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE. 2001. Eds. Watson E. Mills, Edgar V. McKnight and Roger A. Bullard, Mercer University Press.
- MERTENS, D.M. 2005. *Research Methods in Education and Psychology: Integrating Diversity with Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches*. 2nd Ed. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

- MONTEFIORE H. W. 1960. *Josephus and the New Testament in Novum Testamentum* Vol, IV. Fasc. 2. Dec. 1960. Leiden: E.J. Brill: 139 – 160.
- NEYREY, Jerome. H. (Ed.). 1991. *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation*, Peabody, MA: Hendrickson.
- NOLLAND, John. 1989. Luke 1:1 - 9: 20. *Word Biblical Commentary*, Vol. 35a; Waco, TX.:
- OVERBECK, Franz Camille. 1919. *Christentum und Kultur*, Basel: Schwabe.
- PAGE, T.E., Capps, E., Rouse, W.H.D., Post, L.A. and Warmington, E.H. (Eds).1961. *Lucian* Vol. IV. 2nd Ed. The Loeb Classical Library, Tr. A.M. Harmon. London: William Heinemann Ltd.
- PAGET, James Carleton. 2001. "Some Observations on Josephus and Christianity," in *Journal of Theological Studies*, 52.2. 2001: 539 - 624.
- PAINTER, John. 2005. *Just James: The Brother of Jesus in History and Tradition*. London: Bloomsbury.
- PATSAVOS, Christos C. 1970. "Thucydides and Xenophon as Historians," in *Social Science* Vol. 45, No. 4 (October 1970): 208 – 211.
- PERVO, Richard I. 1987. *Profit with Delight: The Literary Genre of the Acts of the Apostles*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
- PERVO, Richard I. 2006. *Dating Acts: Between the Evangelists and the Apologists*, Santa Rosa, Calif.: Polebridge.
- PERVO, Richard I. 2008 *Acts: A Commentary in Hermeneia: a Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible*. Ed. Harold W. Attridge, Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press.
- PETERSON, David G. 2009. *The Acts of the Apostles*, Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans.
- PORTER, Stanley 1994. *The "We" Passages, pages 545 – 574 in The Book of Acts in Its Graeco-Roman Setting*. Eds David W. J. Gill and Conrad Gempf. Vol. 2 of The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- PRAEDER, Susan Marie. 1981. "Luke-Acts and the Ancient Novel," in *Society of Biblical Literature 1981 Seminar Papers*, ed. Kent Richards, Chico: Scholars Press: 269 – 292.
- RAJAK, Tessa. 1983. *Josephus. The Historian and His Society*, London: Duckworth Press.

RASKIN, Jay. 2006. *The Evolution of Christs and Christianities*, Bloomington: Xlibris, Corp.

ROBERTS, Alexander and Donaldson, James. (Eds) 1868. Ante-Nicene Christian Library: *Translations of the Writings of the Fathers Down to A.D. 325. Vol. VII. Tertullianus Against Marcion*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

ROBINSON, John A.T. 1976. *Redating the New Testament*, Philadelphia: Westminster Press.

RODKINSON, Michael L. (Tr.). 1918. *The Babylonian Talmud*, Volumes 1-10. Boston: Boston New Talmud Publishing Company.

RUTGERS, Leonard Victor. 1994. "Roman Policy Towards the Jews: Expulsions from the City of Rome During the First Century C.E.," in *Classical Antiquity*, Vol. 13, No. 1 (Apr. 1994): 56 – 74.

SCHAFF, Philip. 1892. *History of the Christian Church, Volume VII. Modern Christianity. The German Reformation*, 2nd Edition. Grand Rapids, MI: Christian Classics Ethereal Library.

SCHECHTER, Solomon. 1945. *Abot de-Rabbi Natan*. New York: Shulsinger.

SCHIERLING, Stephen P. and Schierling, Maria J. 1978. "The Influence of the Ancient Romances on Acts of the Apostles," in *The Classical Bulletin* 54: 81 – 88.

SCHMIDT, Daryl. 1985. "The Historiography of Acts: Deuteronomistic or Hellenistic?" in *Society of Biblical Literature 1985 Seminar Papers*, ed. Kent Harold Richards, Atlanta: Scholars Press: 417 - 427.

SCHÜRER, Emil. 2014. *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ*, Vol. I. Eds Geza Vermes, Fergus Millar and Matthew Black. London: Bloomsbury T & T Clark.

SCHWARTZ, Daniel, R. 1992. "Studies in the Background of Christianity," in *Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament*, 60. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

SCULLARD, H.H. 1982. *From the Gracchi to Nero*. London: Routledge.

SEGAL, Robert A. 1980. "The Myth-Ritualist Theory of Religion," in *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, Vol. 19, No. 2 (Jun., 1980): 173 – 185

SHELLARD, Barbara 2002. "New Light on Luke," in *Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement* 215. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

SMALLWOOD, E. Mary. 1976. *The Jews Under Roman Rule: From Pompey to Diocletian: A Study in Political Relations*. Leiden: E.J. Brill and Co.

SMITH, Daniel Lynwood and Zachary Lundin Kostopoulos. 2017. Biography, "History and the Genre of Luke-Acts," in *New Testament Studies*, 63,3, 390 – 410.

SMITH, Dennis E. and Tyson, Joseph B. 2013. *Acts and Christian Beginnings: The Acts Seminar Report*. Westar Institute, Willamette University, Salem: Polebridge Press.

SPADE, Paul Vincent (Tr.) 1995. A Translation from the Greek text in Van Winden, J. C. M. 1971. *An Early Christian Philosopher: Justin Martyr's Dialogue with Trypho, Chapters One to Nine*, ("Philosophia patrum," Vol. I), Leiden: E. J. Brill.

STERLING, Gregory E. 1992. *Historiography & Self-definition: Josephos, Luke-Acts & Apologetic Historiography*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.

SWANSON, Dennis. 2004. *Josephus and the New Testament*. 2nd Ed. T. & T. Clark.

TALBERT, Charles H. 1974a. *Ancient Sea Voyages, in Perspectives on Luke-Acts, and Christian Belief*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

TALBERT, Charles H. 1974b. "Literary Patterns, Theological Themes and the Genre of Luke-Acts," in *Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series 20*. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press:

TALBERT, Charles H. 1978. "Perspectives on Luke-Acts," in *Perspectives in Religious Studies, Special Studies Series*, No. 5. Macon, Ga: Mercer Univ. Press: 215 - 242.

TALBERT, Charles H. 1982. *Reading Luke: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Third Gospel*. New York: Crossroad.

TANNEHILL, Robert C. 1986. *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation, Vol. I. The Gospel of Luke*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

TANNEHILL, Robert C. 1990. *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation, Vol. II. The Acts of the Apostles*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

THACKERAY, Henry, St. John. 1961. *Josephus: With an English Translation in Nine Volumes*, Vol. IX. Jewish Antiquities Books: I – IV. Eds: T.E. Page et al. The Loeb Classical Library. London: William Heinemann.

THE JEWISH STUDY BIBLE. 2004. Eds. Adele Berlin and Marc Zvi Brettler, New York: Oxford University Press.

THE NEW TESTAMENT IN THE ORIGINAL GREEK. 1881. Eds Brooke Foss Westcott and Fenton John Anthony Hort, New York: Harper and Brothers, Franklin Square.

- TYSON, Joseph B. 2006. *Marcion and Luke-Acts: A Defining Struggle*, Columbia: University of South Carolina Press.
- TYSON, Joseph B. 2009. "Wrestling With and For Paul: Efforts to Obtain Pauline Support by Marcion and the Author of Acts" *Contemporary Studies in Acts*, Edited by Thomas E. Phillips, 13-28. Mercer University Press.
- TURCAN, Robert. 1996. *The Cults of the Roman Empire*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- TURCAN, Robert. 2000. *The Gods of Ancient Rome*. New York: Routledge.
- ULLMAN, B.L. 1942. "History and Tragedy," in the *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, Vol. 73 (1942): 25 – 53 The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- VERHEYDEN, Joseph. 2012. "The Unity of Luke-Acts: One Work, One Author, One Purpose?" in *Issues in Luke-Acts: Selected Essays*. Edited by Sean A. Adams and Michael W. Pahl, 27-50. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press.
- VAN DEN BERGH VAN EYSINGA, Gustaaf Adolf. 1908. *Onderzoek Naar De Echtheid Van Clemens' Eersten Brief Aan De Corinthiers*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- WALTERS, Patricia. 2009. "The Assumed Authorial Unity of Luke and Acts: A Reassessment of the Evidence," in *Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series* 145. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- WARDMAN, Alan. 1982. *Religion and Statecraft Among the Romans*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.
- WEISS, Meir. 1984. *The Bible From Within: A Method of Total Interpretation*. Jerusalem: The Magnus Press.
- WELLS, George Albert. 1971. *The Jesus of the Early Christians: A Study of Christian Origins*, Pemberton Books.
- WELLS, George Albert. 2004. *Can We Trust the New Testament? Thoughts on the Reliability of Early Christian Testimony*, Peru: Open Court.
- WHEALEY, Alice. 2003. *Josephus on Jesus. The Testimonium Flavianum Controversy From Late Antiquity to Modern Times*. Studies in Biblical Literature 36. New York: Peter Lang.
- WHISTON, William (Tr). 1999. *Josephus: The New Complete Works of Josephus*, Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel Academic and Professional.
- WILLIAMSON, G.A. 1981. *Josephus: The Jewish War*, Introduction by E. Mary Smallwood, Ed. E.V. Rieu. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

WILLIAMSON, G.A. 1964. *The World of Josephus*, London: Secker and Warburg. Word Books.

Internet Publications

BRAUNER, Reuven. 2010. The Soncino Babylonian Talmud: Machshirin in *Free Primary Jewish Sources and Resources on The Internet*. [Online]. Available:
<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1ZfHfZsLh2qYBM6Q6Qp18csQvYQMUBUOvjfwPCRN9iyJk/mobilebasic#id.4a617aadb53a> [25 January 2015].

BRUCE, Frederick Fyvie. 1959. *The New Testament Documents: Are They Reliable?* 5th Ed. [Online]. Available:
<http://www.ncbible.info/MoodRes/Transmission/NTDocuments-Reliable-Bruce.pdf>. [6 June 2014].

BURKE Jon. 2012. "Did Luke use Josephus when writing Acts?" in *Berea Portal.com*. [Online]. Available: <http://berea-portal.com/category/bible/canon/> [20 October 2014].

BURSTEIN, Stanley M. 1997. "The Hellenistic Period in World History," in *American Historical Association* [Online]. Available:
<http://southwestern.edu/departments/classics/text-restr/> [2 December 2014].

CARRIER, Richard. 2000. "Luke and Josephus," in *The Secular Web* [Online]. Available:
http://infidels.org/library/modern/richard_carrier/lukeandjosephus.html [10 October 2014].

CARY, Earnest, Foster, Herbert Baldwin and Heinemann, William (Eds). 1914. *Dio's Roman History*. Cassius Dio Cocceianus, London: Harvard University Press, in *Perseus Digital Library* [Online]. Available:
<http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A2008.01.0593%3Abook%3D60%3Achapter%3D6%3Asection%3D6> [1 September 2014].

FYFE, W.H. (Tr.) 1932. Aristotle in 23 Volumes, Vol. 23, Cambridge, M.A.: Harvard University Press in Perseus Digital Library [Online]. Available:
<http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0056%3Asection%3D1447a> [2 December 2014].

GOLDBERG, Gary. J. 2012. "New Testament Parallels to the Works of Josephus," in *The Flavius Josephus Home Page*. [Online]. Available:
<http://www.josephus.org/ntparallels.htm> [20 October 2014].

HOLDING, James Patrick. 2014. "Luke and Josephus," in *Tekton Apologetics* [Online]. Available: <http://www.tektonics.org/lp/lukeandjoe.php> [10 October 2014].

JOWETT, Benjamin. 1900. *Thucydides*, Second edition. Oxford, Clarendon Press in *Classic Persuasion* [Online]. Available: <http://www.classicpersuasion.org/pw/thucydides/jthucbk1rv2.htm> [2 February 2015].

MACKENZIE, Noella and Knipe, Sally. 2006. "Research Dilemmas: Paradigms, Methods and Methodology," in *Issues in Educational Research*, Vol. 16 (2): 193 - 205. [Online]. Available: <http://www.iier.org.au/iier16/mackenzie.html> (2 June 2014).

MANUSCRIPTS OF JOSEPHUS. 2003. CCAT (Center for Computer Analysis of Texts) at University of Pennsylvania. [Online]. Available: <http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/gopher/other/journals/kraftpub/josephusMSS.html> [28 July 2014].

OLDFATHER, William Abbott. (Tr.) 1956. *Epictetus: The Discourses as Reported by Arrian, The Manual, and Fragments*. Two Volumes. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univtirsity Press. [Online]. Available: http://archive.org/stream/epictetusdiscour01epicuoft/epictetusdiscour01epicuoft_djvu.txt [2 February 2015].

PALMER, David Robert (Tr.) 2010. *The Epistle of Polycarp to the Philippians*. [Online]. Available at <http://www.bibletranslation.ws/> [2 February 2015].

REITH, George (Tr.). 1867. "Dialogue with Trypho by Justin Martyr," in Volume 2 of the *Ante-Nicene Christian Library*, presented as Dialogue of Justin, Philosopher and Martyr, with Trypho, a Jew in Ante-Nicene Christian Library [Online]. Available: http://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Ante-Nicene_Christian_Library/Dialogue_with_Trypho#Chapter_80 [26 January 2015].

ROBERTS, Alexander, Donaldson, James and Coxe, A. Cleveland (Eds and Trs). 1885. *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. 1. Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co. Revised and edited for New Advent by Kevin Knight [Online]. Available: <http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/0109.htm> [2 February 2015].

SCHEIDEL, Walter. 2007. "Roman Population Size: The Logic of the Debate," in *Princeton/Stanford Working Papers in Classics*, Version 2.0, July 2007, Stanford University. [Online]. Available: <https://www.princeton.edu/~pswpc/pdfs/scheidel/070706.pdf> [7 September 2014].

THE JEWISH ENCYCLOPEDIA. 1906. The Unedited Full-text of the 1906 Jewish Encyclopedia in *Jewish Encyclopaedia.org*, [Online]. Available: <http://www.jewishencyclopedia.com/> [1 September 2014].

WHISTON, William. (Tr.) s.a. Flavius Josephus: Complete Works in *Project on Ancient Cultural Engagement* [Online]. Available: <http://pace-ancient.mcmaster.ca/york/york/texts.htm>. [5 September 2014].

WHISTON, William. (Tr.) s.a. Flavius Josephus: The Judean War in *Project on Ancient Cultural Engagement* [Online]. Available: <http://pace-ancient.mcmaster.ca/york/york/showText?book=2&chapter=8&textChunk=whistonSection&chunkId=2&text=wars&version=whiston&direction=&tab=&layout=split&go.x=14&go.y=6> [24 June 2014].

WHISTON, William (Tr.) 1895. Flavius Josephus. The Works of Flavius Josephus. Auburn and Buffalo, NY: John E. Beardsley in *Perseus Digital Library* [Online]. Available: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/searchresults?q=josephus> [5 February 2015].