

# JOSEPHUS' *CONTRA APIONEM*

*Studies in its Character and Context with a Latin Concordance  
to the Portion Missing in Greek*

EDITED BY

LOUIS H. FELDMAN

AND

JOHN R. LEVISON



E.J. BRILL  
LEIDEN · NEW YORK · KÖLN  
1996

THE DEPICTION OF THE JEWS AS TYPHONIANS  
AND JOSEPHUS' STRATEGY OF REFUTATION  
IN *CONTRA APIONEM*

JAN WILLEM VAN HENTEN AND RA'ANAN ABUSCH  
University of Amsterdam

1. *Introduction*

Chapter 39 of the book of Genesis describes an episode in the life of one of the first Israelites to visit Egypt. The narrative is often read as a story of seduction of a pious and chaste youth by the brutal wife of his new master. A young Israelite slave makes a very quick career for himself at the household of a rich Egyptian man, but is ruined by the advances of the wife of his master, or should we say his love affair with her? However, the story also has an ethnic dimension; there are no less than four explicit references to Egypt in Gen. 39:1–5 (39:1–2, 5) and two references to Joseph being a Hebrew in the repeated accusation of Potiphar's wife in 39:14, 17: "See, my husband has brought among us a Hebrew (אִישׁ עִבְרִי) to insult us . . . The Hebrew servant whom you have brought among us, came in to insult me". The Hebrew verb צָחַק with the preposition כִּי translated by "insult" in *NRSV* can mean "to make love with someone", but also "joke about something or someone", that is "joke about us Egyptians".<sup>1</sup> The tension described in this Biblical passage and embedded in Israelite consciousness of their prehistory provides apt background for the complicated and often hostile relationship between the Jewish people and the Egyptians. The Hellenistic period increasingly saw the heightening of this tension as both parties drew from their common prehistory ideological positions with respect to one another. Accusations against Jews repeated time and again seemed to have affected the life of the Jews in that country dramatically.

<sup>1</sup> For example, see J. de Fraine, *Genesis uit de grondtekst vertaald en uitgelegd* (De Boeken van het Oude Testament I:1; Roermond-Maaseik: 1963) 277. The equivalent ἐμπαίζω in LXX can also have a sexual connotation, see M. Harl, *La Genèse*, (La Bible d'Alexandrie; Paris: 1986) 269. In Jud. 19:25 ἐμπαίζω is a euphemism for rape, see *LSJ* 543 s.v. I.2. We would like to thank Prof. J. M. Bremer and Prof. P. W. van der Horst for their helpful comments. If not otherwise specified, the translation of H. St. J. Thackeray (Loeb Classical Library) is used.

In *Contra Apionem* Josephus has collected a great number of these accusations and attempted to counter all of them. In our discussion of these accusations, we shall focus upon two important aspects: 1) some of the accusations seem to incorporate well-known mythological traditions which were highly evocative because of the powerful and pervasive negative associations they called forth. How can we isolate such traditions and determine what their impact may have been on the image of the Jews? 2) What can be said about Josephus' way of refuting the accusations in this respect? Does he offer rather superficial *ad hoc* refutations or does he use a specific strategy? Does he counter specific mythological traditions contained in the accusations? Can his refutations be considered successful?

It is impossible to discuss all the accusations transmitted in *Contra Apionem* in detail here. Instead this article will concentrate on a number of accusations which share a common content in order to come to some conclusions about the transmission of non-Jewish mythological traditions in *Contra Apionem*. Several criteria for distinguishing and isolating such traditions will be suggested in § 2. We shall argue in that section that both the accusations concerning the Egyptian origin of the Jewish people and the veneration of the ass by the Jews are linked to a mythic theme of a battle of the (Graeco-)Egyptian royal god Horus against the evil god Seth-Typhon.<sup>2</sup> This conflict myth was often used in Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt in propagandistic texts to characterize the nature of military, political and ethnic conflicts in Egypt. One application of these mythological traditions concerns the wars of the Ptolemaic kings against indigenous Egyptian rebels.<sup>3</sup> The myth must have been so powerful that both the Ptolemies as well as their indigenous opponents associated their own role with that of Horus, the god who overcomes Seth-Typhon and restores order. The popularity of the myth can to a large extent be explained because of Seth-Typhon's associations with foreigners. Seth-Typhon could represent any evil foreign people which threatened Egypt:<sup>4</sup> Asians, Persians, Greeks, and probably also Jews. This is, for ex-

<sup>2</sup> See J. W. van Henten, "Typhon", *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible (DDD)* (eds. K. van der Toorn; B. Becking; P. W. van der Horst; Leiden: 1995) col. 1657-1662.

<sup>3</sup> For references, see J. W. van Henten, "Antiochus IV as a Typhonic Figure in Daniel 7," *The Book of Daniel in the Light of New Findings* (ed. A. S. van der Woude; BETL 106; Leuven: 1993), 223-243, esp. 238-243.

<sup>4</sup> For an overview, see H. te Velde, *Seth, God of Confusion: A Study of his Role in Egyptian Mythology and Religion* (Probleme der Ägyptologie 6; Leiden: 1977), 109-151.

ample, apparent from the famous *Oracle of the Potter*, which originated in indigenous Egyptian circles and has a clearly anti-Greek tenor. It contains allusions to the divine conflict of Horus and Seth-Typhon in an apocalyptic setting and characterizes the Greeks consistently as Typhonians, i.e. people to be associated with Seth-Typhon, the god who creates chaos. We shall discuss several passages in *Contra Apionem* and try to demonstrate that mythological traditions connected with Seth-Typhon form the principal propagandistic background of some of the accusations against the Jews. In § 3 we shall investigate Josephus' rebuttal of the libels connected with Seth-Typhon and, in so doing, attempt to characterize the nature of Josephus' refutations more generally, a task largely neglected by previous scholarship. This analysis of Josephus' strategies of refutation and his specific refutation of the libels connected with Seth-Typhon will ultimately address the question of Josephus' familiarity with this mythological background. The limitations of his rhetorical strategies in countering attacks against Jews and Judaism are particularly poignant at the time Josephus composed this work, the midway point between the destruction of the Jerusalem temple and the Jewish revolt of 116–117. Finally, conclusions will be offered (§ 4).

## 2. *Traditions about Seth-Typhon and their associations with the Jews in Contra Apionem*

It is an undisputed fact that *Contra Apionem* contains extensive passages which were not composed by Josephus himself. Yet, whether Josephus borrowed the material attributed to the Egyptian priest Manetho, the Alexandrian grammarian Apion and others from an intermediary source or whether he has transmitted the texts of these authors himself remains highly debated.<sup>5</sup> The related question of the extent to which Josephus may have adapted his source material likewise presents an important methodological question with direct bearing on Josephus' strategies of refutation. For example, Josephus may

<sup>5</sup> See among others S. Belkin, "The Alexandrian Source for *Contra Apionem* II," *JQR* 27 (1936–1937) 1–32; L. Troiani, "Sui frammenti di Manetone nel primo libro del *Contra Apionem* di Flavio Giuseppe," *Studi Classici e Orientali* 24 (1975) 97–126, and for further references L. H. Feldman, *Josephus and Modern Scholarship* (Berlin-New York: 1984) 384–387; *Idem*, *Josephus: a Supplementary Bibliography* (Garland Reference Library of the Humanities 645; New York etc.: 1986) 857–858.

have made his task of refutation easier by manipulating his sources. These questions constitute a different, although potentially fruitful, line of investigation from the one presented here.<sup>6</sup> We shall instead concentrate on the gentile traditions as transmitted to us in the received text in the hopes of using these as accurate reflections of gentile views about the Jews and as windows into the mechanics of Josephus' rebuttal of the reproaches they contain.

2.1. The question of how to determine with a high degree of probability that a specific tradition has been incorporated in one or more of the libel passages requires the development of basic methodological tools. This is particularly tricky when one is trying to isolate a complex of images or associations which pervaded both general modes of presentation (e.g. conflict myth) as well as specific traditions (e.g. Jewish origins). The cultural valence of these mythic representations must have been recognizable and pervasive in their day. To demonstrate the presence of such associations with gentile mythological traditions several complementary types of criteria can be used:

- 1) a remarkable detail which can only be understood against the background of a specific tradition;
- 2) a specific narrative sequence which is repeated in several independent passages and therefore also points to a specific traditional origin;
- 3) a detail which remains unclear in the present context when interpreted on its own, but which becomes illuminating when associated with a specific tradition;
- 4) a cluster of motifs which may appear in several texts but which is at least once explicitly associated with the central figure of a specific tradition.

The probability that a certain non-Jewish tradition can be isolated in Josephus' treatise increases as more than one criterion is matched. In addition, these criteria allow us to unravel the different strands of a given set of traditional associations. We intend to illustrate the usefulness of these criteria in the following discussion of the usage of typhonic traditions in *Contra Apionem*.

---

<sup>6</sup> One problem with this line of argumentation is that Josephus is our sole source for many of these texts.

2.2. The accusation that the Jewish people is of Egyptian origin is reiterated by several of the gentile sources in *Contra Apionem*. This charge is linked to traditions about Horus's enemy Seth-Typhon through one specific phrase, the geographical designation of the city of Avaris, a city explicitly connected with Seth-Typhon in the text.<sup>7</sup> This detail can be found in two fragments of Manetho's<sup>8</sup> *History of Egypt*, which was written in the third century BCE (*Aegyptiaca*) and transmitted by Josephus (Fragments 42 and 54 = *CA* 1.73–91 and 1.228–251).<sup>9</sup> These two passages contain several inconsistencies, which are pointed out in part by Josephus himself, but their basic content is clear. The Jewish people came from Egypt, left this country after a rebellion and went to Judaea where they founded the city of Jerusalem (cf. Josephus' summary of Manetho's accusation in *CA* 1.228–229). In order to understand the reference to Seth-Typhon and its implication for the image of the Jews better, it is necessary to summarize the content of both fragments.

Manetho's two fragments deal with Israel's history previous to the exodus from Egypt. They contain references to the terrible deeds of the ancestors of the Jewish people and characterize the Jews as outcasts. In the first fragment Manetho identifies the Hyksos as the ancestors of the Jews.<sup>10</sup> He describes the Hyksos as a people who invaded Egypt from the east, defeated the indigenous rulers, treated

<sup>7</sup> *CA* 1.78, 86, 237.

<sup>8</sup> Manetho was an Egyptian priest who served at Heliopolis, see R. Laqueur, "Manetho (1)," *PW* 27, 1060–1101; H. J. Thissen, "Manetho," *Lexikon der Ägyptologie* 3, 1180–1181; G. E. Sterling, *Historiography and Self-Definition. Josephos, Luke-Acts and Apologetic Historiography* (NovTSup 64; Leiden: 1992) 117–136. For a survey of these and related texts, see C. Aziza, "L'utilisation polémique du récit de l'Exode chez les écrivains alexandrins (IV<sup>ème</sup> siècle av. J.-C.-I<sup>er</sup> siècle ap. J.-C.)," *ANRW* II 20:1, 41–65.

<sup>9</sup> For recent discussions of Josephus' knowledge of Manetho and the authenticity of the fragments in *CA*, see Sterling, *Historiography*, 119–123 and 261–262; M. Pucci Ben Zeev, "The Reliability of Josephus Flavius: The Case of Hecataeus' and Manetho's Accounts of Jews and Judaism: Fifteen Years of Contemporary Research (1974–1990)," *JStJ* 24 (1993) 215–234, esp. 224–234. See also M. Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism* (2 vols.; Jerusalem: 1976–1980) I, 64; J. G. Gager, *Moses in Greco-Roman Paganism* (SBLMS 16; Nashville/New York: 1972) 117–118, assumes that the discrepancy between the renderings of the name Osarsiph in *CA* 1.238 (with Greek ending) and 1.250 (without Greek ending) and the introduction of the passage in 1.250 by "it is said that" are evidence of an interpolation by an anonymous Alexandrian writer (Ps-Manetho) which originated about 40 CE.

<sup>10</sup> Stern, *Authors* I, 63: "The fact that he makes the Hyksos emigrate to Judaea, which in Manetho's time was not identical with the whole of Palestine, and ascribes to them the founding of Jerusalem, can be explained only on the assumption of an identification of the Hyksos with the ancestors of the Jewish nation."

the Egyptian population very cruelly, set the Egyptian cities on fire and razed the temples to the ground (*CA* 1.75–76). The name Hyksos may derive from an old Egyptian phrase meaning “Rulers of the foreign countries”.<sup>11</sup> Josephus records that Manetho named them, based on the etymology of their name, the “king-shepherds” (*CA* 1.82; cf. 91), and associated them with “captives” as well (αἰχμάλωτοι).<sup>12</sup> Modern scholars attempting to reconstruct the role of the Hyksos in Egypt imagine that they were a foreign group of Semitic or Hurritic origin which ruled Egypt from about 1650–1542 BCE.<sup>13</sup> It is important for our discussion that Manetho refers to the foundation of a city in Egypt by the Hyksos called Avaris (*CA* 1.78; cf. 86).<sup>14</sup> This city was known as the city of Seth-Typhon, according to Manetho’s second fragment. Manetho thus narrates a coherent history in which, after the siege of Avaris by king Thoummosis, the Hyksos leave Egypt again, move to Judaea and found the city of Jerusalem (*CA* 1.88–90). In his second fragment, Manetho mentions the Hyksos again, because of their alliance with the defiled Egyptians, who are also associated with the Jews by Manetho.

<sup>11</sup> W. Helck, “Hyksos,” *KP* 2, 1264. On the dependability of Manetho’s report on the Hyksos, various opinions have been expressed, see A. H. Gardiner, *Egypt of the Pharaohs. An Introduction* (Oxford: 1961) 155–170; E. Hornung, *Untersuchungen zur Chronologie und Geschichte des Neuen Reiches* (Ägyptologische Abhandlungen 11; Wiesbaden: 1964) 30–41; J. van Seters, *The Hyksos: A New Investigation* (New Haven/London: 1966) 121–126.

<sup>12</sup> This name may be connected with Seth-Typhon, as is apparent from an Egyptian ritual text of the fourth century BCE and the Raphia-decree which refer to typhonic figures as captives, see Van Henten, “Antiochus IV,” 239–240.

<sup>13</sup> P. Montet, *Le drame d’Avaris. Essai sur la pénétration des Sémites en Égypte* (Paris: 1941); W. Helck, *Die Beziehungen Ägyptens zu Vorderasien im 3. und 2. Jahrtausend v. Chr.* (Wiesbaden: 1962); Van Seters, *Hyksos*. For further references and summaries of the discussion, see Stern, *Authors* I, 70; M. Bietak, “Hyksos,” *Lexikon der Ägyptologie* III, 93–103.

<sup>14</sup> Avaris is located by Josephus according to codex Laurentianus and the Latin version in the Saite nome (ἐν νομῷ τῷ Σαίτη), but this is changed in several editions into the Sethroite nome on the basis of other witnesses of Manetho’s text; see P. Collomp, “Manéthon et le nom du nome où fut Avaris,” *REA* 42 (1940) 74–85. Part of the problem is whether Avaris can be identified with the city of Tanis (the biblical Zoan, Num. 13:22), the capital of the Tanite nome, or not. Stern, *Authors* I, 71, states that this identification is commonly accepted now, but recent excavations confirm that there were two separate cities, both located in the most eastern part of the delta of the Nile. Avaris is located at present-day Tell ed-Dab’a and Tanis at Sa el-Hagar, in the opinion of Bietak, “Hyksos,” 98; M. Römer, “Tanis,” *Lexikon der Ägyptologie* VI, 194–209, esp. 195; D. Arnold, *Die Tempel Ägyptens. Götterwohnungen, Kultstätten, Baudenkmäler* (Zürich: 1992) 210–214 with references. R. Stadelmann, “Auaris,” *Lexikon der Ägyptologie* I, 522–524, assumes, however, on the basis of Josephus that Avaris was located “im sethroitischen Gau, östlich vom bubastischen Nilarm,” i.e. east of Qantir; cf. Van Seters, *Hyksos*, 127–151.

In the second fragment, it is recorded that a certain pharaoh with the name Amenophis decided that he wanted to see the Egyptian gods.<sup>15</sup> Everyone who is acquainted with Egyptian religion will become suspicious while reading this passage, for there were hardly gods who seemed to have been more visible than the Egyptian deities. Josephus does not fail to indicate this by referring to the Egyptian veneration of animals as manifestations of the gods.<sup>16</sup> A sage who could foretell the future and who had the same name as the king (*CA* 1.232)<sup>17</sup> suggested to the king to purge the Egyptian people: "(he) replied that he (the king) would be able to see the gods if he purged the entire country of lepers and other polluted persons" (*CA* 1.233).<sup>18</sup> The pharaoh followed this advice and brought together all the Egyptians whose bodies were affected by disease and set them to work in quarries east of the Nile, apart from the other Egyptians.<sup>19</sup> The pharaoh allowed the defiled Egyptians to live in the city of Avaris in the eastern part of the Nile delta, an area which belonged to the Hyksos in an earlier period. In this way, the Hyksos as well as the Egyptian lepers are linked to Avaris.<sup>20</sup>

In this passage, Manetho informs the reader of a detail concerning Avaris which must have carried tremendous significance for his

<sup>15</sup> *CA* 1.232: ἐπιθυμῆσαι θεῶν γενέσθαι θεατήν. Cf. 233: θεοὺς ἰδεῖν.

<sup>16</sup> *CA* 1.254. There is a possibility that Josephus adapted his source here to refute it more easily, maybe inspired by passages from the Hebrew Bible like Exod. 7:1. In another passage with a similar story attributed to Chaeremon the anger of the goddess Isis is the reason for Amenophis' decision to purge Egypt (*CA* 1.289). Cf. also *CPJ* 520.

<sup>17</sup> This Amenophis, son of Paapis, is known from other sources; see Stern, *Authors* I, 84.

<sup>18</sup> ὅτι δυνήσεται θεοὺς ἰδεῖν, εἰ καθάρῃ ἀπὸ τε λεπρῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων μιαρῶν ἀνθρώπων τὴν χώραν ἅπασαν ποιήσειεν. Cf. *CA* 1.257 καθάραι τὴν χώραν; 1.260 ὃν καθαρεῦσαι τὴν Αἴγυπτον. A purge from lepers is also mentioned by Diodorus 34–35.1.2; Lysimachus (*CA* 1.304–311); Chaeremon (*CA* 1.288); Tacitus, *Hist.* 5.3 and Pompeius Trogus in Justinus 36.2.12. Hecataeus of Abdera refers in this connection to foreigners (*FGH* 264 F6); see Stern, *Authors* I, 85.

<sup>19</sup> Corresponding passages record the expulsion of the lepers from Egypt; see Stern, *Authors* I, 85; L. H. Feldman, *Jew and Gentile in the Ancient World: Attitudes and Interactions from Alexander to Justinian* (Princeton: 1993) 192–194; 240–241; 250–251. After writing down his prophecy that these defiled Egyptians would conquer Egypt with their allies and would rule thirteen years over Egypt and that an indigenous king would oust the enemy and establish the final period of salvation Amenophis commits suicide. The prediction of calamities because of foreign oppression followed by the redeeming restoration of indigenous rule corresponds with the content of other Egyptian prophecies, like the *Oracle of the Lamb of Bocchoris* and the *Potter's Oracle*; cf. J. Yoyotte, "L'Égypte ancienne et les origines de l'antijudaïsme," *RHR* 163 (1963) 138.

<sup>20</sup> Manetho calls Avaris the ancestral city of the Hyksos according to *CA* 1.242 (εἰς Αὔαριν τὴν προγονικὴν αὐτῶν πατρίδα; cf. *CA* 1.262).



contemporary Alexandrian and Egyptian readers: "According to religious tradition this city was from earliest times dedicated to Typhon" (ἔστι δ' ἡ πόλις κατὰ τὴν θεολογίαν ἄνωθεν Τυφόνιος, *CA* 1.237). Typhon is originally the name of a giant who attacked the Greek supreme god Zeus.<sup>21</sup> He was identified with the Egyptian god Seth, who was at first a respectable royal god, but developed during the first millennium BCE into an anti-god, the prototype of evil and the enemy of the other gods, especially the royal god Horus.<sup>22</sup> Other sources confirm that Avaris was a centre of the cult of Seth, who is called "Lord of Avaris" on monuments, and that the Hyksos were viewed by the Egyptians as worshippers of Seth.<sup>23</sup>

Against this background, it is no longer surprising that Manetho states that the impure Egyptians immediately started a rebellion with the priest Osarsiph-Moses as their commander (*CA* 1.238).<sup>24</sup> Manetho presents Moses' laws as antithetical to Egyptian practices, and he tells of Moses' appeal to the Hyksos in Jerusalem to join them in the war against the Egyptians. The Hyksos gladly accepted this invitation to conquer Egypt and arrived with 200,000 soldiers in their former city Avaris. The pharaoh is forced to flee to Ethiopia with the holy Apis bull and the other sacred animals. The prophecy of the sage Amenophis comes true in this way and the Hyksos and lepers terrorize Egypt for thirteen years: "Meanwhile, the Solymites (Σολυμίται) made a descent along with the polluted Egyptians, and treated the people so impiously and savagely that the domination of the Shepherds<sup>25</sup> seemed like a golden age to those who witnessed the present enormities. For not only did they set towns and villages on fire, pillaging the temples and mutilating images of the gods without restraint, but they also made a practice of using the sanctuaries as

<sup>21</sup> See J. W. van Henten, "Typhon."

<sup>22</sup> H. Kees, *Horus und Seth als Götterpaar* (2 vols.; Leipzig: 1923/24); A. H. Gardiner, *The Library of A. Chester Beatty: Description of a Hieratic Papyrus with a Mythological Story, Love-Songs, and other Miscellaneous Texts* (The Chester Beatty Papyri, No. I; Oxford: 1931) 8-26; J. Spiegel, *Die Erzählung vom Streite des Horus und Seth in Pap. Beatty I als Literaturwerk* (Glückstadt-Hamburg-New York: 1937); J. G. Griffiths, *The Conflict of Horus and Seth from Egyptian and Classic Sources* (Liverpool: 1960); Te Velde, *Seth*; Te Velde, "Seth," *Lexikon der Ägyptologie* V, 911.

<sup>23</sup> P. Montet, *Le drame*; Van Seters, *Hyksos*, 171-180; Te Velde, *Seth*, 118, 121, 127-128 and 142; Stern, *Authors* I, 70; R. Stadelmann, "Vierhundertjahrstele," *Lexikon der Ägyptologie* VI, 1039-1043.

<sup>24</sup> On Moses' leadership in these anti-Jewish accounts of the exodus, see Gager, *Moses*, 113-133.

<sup>25</sup> Of course, the earlier rule of the Hyksos is meant here, *CA* 1.75-90.

kitchens to roast the sacred animals<sup>26</sup> which the people worshipped; and they would compel the priests and prophets to sacrifice and butcher the beasts, afterwards casting the men forth naked." (CA 1.248–249). At the end of this fragment, Manetho emphasizes that Moses was responsible for the way of life (πολιτεία) and laws of these people, that he was a priest from Heliopolis, and finally, that his original name was Osarsiph (CA 1.250, 261, 279, 286).<sup>27</sup> The Hyksos and lepers were finally driven out of Egypt and were pursued by pharaoh Amenophis and his son Rampses to the border of Syria (1.251).

Manetho's fragment about the impure Egyptians can easily be read as a vicious prehistory of the Jewish people, notwithstanding Josephus' denial. This is apparent both from the framework used by Manetho as well as from several details, among which the references to Jerusalem and Moses are only the most obvious. It is also clear that Manetho's point in the second fragment is—again denied by Josephus—that the Jews originated from Egypt, a fact already suggested by his remark that Moses was in fact an Egyptian priest from Heliopolis (cf. CA 2.10). Moreover, both fragments characterize the Jewish people by repeatedly emphasizing their association with the city of Avaris, the same city which was home to the Hyksos as well as the base of operation of the impure Egyptians (CA 1.78, 86, 237, 242, 243, 260, 261, 262, 296). Hyksos, lepers and Jews are associated with Seth-Typhon, the evil enemy of the gods, a fact which matches perfectly the brutal and sacrilegious acts committed against the Egyptians according to Manetho's account.

2.3. The content and sequence of events of Manetho's second legend about the origins of the Jewish people (Fragm. 54) corresponds to a

<sup>26</sup> The Greek seems ambiguous here. It can be interpreted as a reference to the roasting of the sacred animals, but also as a reference to the use of the sanctuaries of the sacred animals as kitchens by the Hyksos and lepers. In any case, the sacrilege by the Hyksos and lepers is obvious.

<sup>27</sup> Manetho (rightly) states that Osarsiph derives from the name of the god Osiris, but that explains only the first part of the name. The second part (-siph) may derive from the name Sepa, a deity in the shape of a centipede worshipped in and near Heliopolis, see H. Bonnet, *Reallexikon*, 698–699; G. Mussies, "Some Notes on the Name of Sarapis," *Hommages à Maarten J. Vermaseren* (EPRO 68; Leiden: 1978) 821–832; *Idem*, "The interpretatio judaica of Sarapis," *Studies in Hellenistic Religions* (ed. M. J. Vermaseren; EPRO 78; Leiden: 1979) 209–212; P. W. Van der Horst, *Chaeremon: Egyptian Priest and Stoic Philosopher. The Fragments Collected and Translated with Explanatory Notes* (EPRO 101; Leiden: 1984; 1987<sup>2</sup>) 50. The name Osiris-Sepa is found in ch. 142

considerable extent to the data in two other anti-Jewish libels. First, there is a shorter passage attributed to Chaeremon (*CA* 1.288–292),<sup>28</sup> an Egyptian priest and Stoic philosopher of the first century CE,<sup>29</sup> which is much shorter than Manetho's legend. Although Josephus emphasizes that this text differs in several details from Manetho's,<sup>30</sup> their basic messages are nonetheless very similar, especially the narrative thread of the legends. Chaeremon's version corresponds to a portion of Manetho's found at *CA* 2.228–251 and the correspondence of detail and narrative indicates that a common tradition served as a basis of both legends.

In comparison with Manetho's version, Chaeremon's story looks like a historicization of the famous Osiris-myth. This myth contains the following important elements: the killing of Osiris by Seth-Typhon, the flight of Isis while pregnant with Horus, or the flight of Isis and her child before Seth-Typhon, and the battle between Seth-Typhon and the grown-up Horus who avenges his father's death.<sup>31</sup> According to Chaeremon's fragment, the Jews originated from defiled Egyptians. These impure Egyptians, who are also called Jews (cf. *CA* 1.292: ἐκδιῶξαι τοὺς Ἰουδαίους), associated themselves with 380,000 persons who were left at Pelusium by pharaoh Amenophis and were not allowed to enter Egypt.<sup>32</sup> Although a reference to Seth-Typhon is

---

of the *Book of Dead*; see, e.g., E. Hornung, *Das Totenbuch der Ägypter* (Zürich-München: 1979) 274. We owe this reference to Dr. H. Milde, Amsterdam.

<sup>28</sup> Stern, *Authors* I, 417–421. Josephus mentions the supposed origin from Egypt briefly in his refutation of Apion in 2.122.

<sup>29</sup> P. W. van der Horst, "Chaeremon. Egyptisch priester en antisemitisch Stoïcijn uit de tijd van het Nieuwe Testament," *NedTTs* 35 (1981) 265–272. *Idem*, *Chaeremon*, with extensive references to earlier publications. On *CA* 1.288–292 (Fragm. 1 of Chaeremon), see especially pp. 49–51, 84.

<sup>30</sup> The motive for pharaoh Amenophis' decision, for instance, is the appearance of Isis in a dream (cf. above) and not a prophecy of a sage; the name of the sage is Phritibautes instead of Amenophis. There is no link between the impure Egyptians and the Hyksos, and Joseph is mentioned besides Moses.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. retellings of the myth in Plutarch, *De Iside* 8; 12–21, and Diodorus Siculus 1.21–22, 88. The element of the pursuit of Isis by Seth occurs already in Egyptian texts from the second millennium BCE; see the *Hymn of Amen-Mose* (about 1400 BCE); Spell 148 in A. de Buck, *The Egyptian Coffin Texts* (2 vols.; The University of Chicago Oriental Institute Publications 49; Chicago: 1938) 209–226; for a translation and further references, see R. O. Faulkner, *The Ancient Egyptian Coffin Texts*, vol. I, (3 vols.; Warminster: 1973) 125–127. We owe this reference to Dr. H. Milde, Amsterdam. Later texts with the motif are Herodotus, *Hist.* 2.156, and the so-called *Metemichstele* (from 378–360 BCE). These texts are discussed in connection with the mythological background of Rev. 12 by A. Yarbro Collins, *The Combat Myth in the Book of Revelation* (Harvard Dissertations in Religion 9; Missoula (Mont.): 1975) 62–63.

<sup>32</sup> Cf. the commentary by Stern, *Authors* I, 421: "The people expelled from Egypt

missing in this passage, the similarity of the patterns of the narrative in Chaeremon's and Manetho's passages strongly suggests that CA 1.288–292 is also very much influenced by traditions concerning Seth-Typhon. This implies that the association of the Jews with Seth-Typhon is presupposed in this libel as well.

The assumption that Chaeremon's version presents a historicization of mythic traditions linked to Seth-Typhon helps us to explain rather easily both the similarities in details as well as most of the differences between Chaeremon's and Manetho's accounts. After the invasion by the defiled Egyptians and their allies, the pharaoh fled to Ethiopia. At this point in the narrative, Chaeremon adds to Manetho's story that the pharaoh's wife, who was pregnant, was left behind. She concealed herself in caverns and gave birth to a son (1.292). This corresponds to the flight of Isis and Horus before Seth-Typhon. Moreover, in Chaeremon's version it is not Amenophis but the pharaoh's son Ramesses who drove the rebels out of Egypt into Syria and brought home his father. Amenophis' role is similar to that of Osiris in the myth, and his son plays the part of the royal god Horus. One detail in Josephus' refutation of Chaeremon, which seems unimportant at a first glance, catches the eye in the light of the Seth-Typhon traditions. Josephus states in 1.300 that Ramesses, the son of Amenophis, "was born in a cave *after his father's death*, and subsequently defeated the Jews".<sup>33</sup> Thackeray's note in the Loeb edition that this is merely "a careless contradiction of Chaeremon's statement (§ 292)"<sup>34</sup> is unsatisfactory, since this detail fits in exactly with the conflict myth of Horus and Seth-Typhon. Horus is born after

---

are labelled Jews without any explanation. Were the Jews, according to Chaeremon, identical with both the defiled people and with those from the border?" The story attributed to Lysimachus concerning pharaoh Bocchoris (1.304–311) makes a similar claim. The oracle of Ammon advises to purify the Egyptian temples of lepers and people afflicted with scurvy, as well as with other diseases. People of the first two categories are put in strips of lead and sunk in the sea (which reminds one of a detail in Plutarch's famous version of the Osiris myth: after Typhon has made Osiris to enter the coffin he fastens it with molten lead and pushes it into the Nile, 14 *Mor.* 356E), the others (1.307 ἀκάθαρτοι) were driven into the wilderness. Moses brought them to Judaea, where they founded their city Hierosyla (1.310–311). Cf. 1.311: "This town was called Hierosyla (Ἱερόσυλα) because of their sacrilegious propensities". According to Josephus' refutation Lysimachus used the phrase ὁ λαὸς τῶν Ἰουδαίων, but these words are missing in his rendering of Lysimachus.

<sup>33</sup> οὗτος δὲ πεποίηκεν αὐτὸν μετὰ τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς τελευταίην ἐν σπηλαίῳ τινὶ γεγεννημένον καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα νικῶντα μάχῃ καὶ τοὺς Ἰουδαίους εἰς Συρίαν ἐξελαύνοντα . . . (CA 1.300).

<sup>34</sup> H. St. J. Thackeray, *Josephus I. The Life. Contra Apionem* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press: 1926) 284.

the death of his father at the hands of Seth-Typhon and takes up the fight against his antagonist when he has grown up (cf. *CA* 1.292 ἀνδροθέντα concerning Ramesses). Chaeremon very probably has associated the Jews with Seth-Typhon and may have adapted his own source in order to enhance its similarity with the combat myth of Seth-Typhon, although he failed to do this consistently.<sup>35</sup> Finally, two other details incidental to the narrative but crucial for unravelling the associations which fuel these texts confirm this assumption: first, reference is made to the revelation of Isis, a key figure in the myths concerning Osiris, Horus and Seth-Typhon, and, second, Joseph, who is presented as the second leader of the impure people alongside Moses, is given the Egyptian name Peteseeph (Πετεσήφ, *CA* 1.290), possibly a corruption of Peteseth meaning "The gift of Seth".<sup>36</sup> In any case, this evidence makes it clear that the impure Egyptians and Pelusians in their role as ancestors of the Jews were associated with Seth-Typhon.

An anti-Jewish Egyptian prophecy preserved on a papyrus and dated to the end of the second or the third century CE by palaeographical criteria<sup>37</sup> provides further support for understanding Manetho's and Chaeremon's libels as a (narrative) complex of legendary associations deeply rooted in Egyptian cultural history and political rhetoric. This prophecy of calamity in Egypt<sup>38</sup> shares a pattern of events with these libels about the origin of the Jews (*CPJ* 520 = *PSI* 8.982).<sup>39</sup> This affinity is not merely associative or general. The last

<sup>35</sup> Another possibility is that Josephus has adapted Chaeremon's phrasing in order to make the link with Seth-Typhon less obvious, but transmitted the more original version accidentally in his refutation.

<sup>36</sup> T. Hopfner, *Plutarch über Isis und Osiris* (2 vols.; Prague: 1941) 145; L. Troiani, *Commento storico al "Contro Apione" di Giuseppe*, Introduzione, commento storico, traduzione e indici (Biblioteca degli studi classici e orientali 9; Pisa: 1977) 134; Stern, *Authors* I, 421. Cf. Moses' Egyptian name Τισιθέν in the same passage. G. Mussies, followed by Van der Horst, *Chaeremon*, 49–50, states that Peteseeph can best be explained as deriving from the combination of Pete- ("the one given by") and Sepa; see n. 27 with references.

<sup>37</sup> See G. Vitelli, *Pubblicazioni della Società Italiana per la ricerca dei papiri greci e latini in Egitto* VIII (Florence: 1927) 199–201; M. Nagel, "Un Samaritain dans l'Arsinoïte au II<sup>e</sup> siècle après J.-C.," *Chronique d'Égypte* 49 (1974) 361; M. Stern in *CPJ* III, 119.

<sup>38</sup> Τάλενα (= τάλαινα; Ἀγροπ[τος] corresponds with similar phrases in *Sib. Or.*; see 3.648 concerning Egypt and cf. 3.732; 4.80, 105, 143; 5.336.

<sup>39</sup> The parallels between *CA* 1.288–292 and *CPJ* 520 have often been noted; see M. Stern, "An Egyptian-Greek Prophecy and the Tradition about the Expulsion of the Jews from Egypt in the History of Chaeremon," *Zion* 28 (1963) 223–228 (Hebrew); Gager, *Moses*, 121 n. 19; Stern, *Authors* I, 420; Van der Horst, *Chaeremon*, 50. See the recent discussions of this text by D. Frankfurter, "Lest Egypt's City Be

part of line 4 of this text ( ] .σταθείς· ἔπελθε οὖν Ἰου[ . . ) should probably be completed into a phrase meaning something like “attack the Jews” or “invade Judaea”.<sup>40</sup> Such a reading is highly plausible; the text continues with a reference to a group which was expelled from Egypt (ἐξ Ἐγύπτου ἐγβεβλημένοι, line 8)<sup>41</sup> because of the wrath of Isis,<sup>42</sup> an element reminiscent of the defiled Egyptians.

This specific information parallels the story of Chaeremon to a considerable degree. According to Chaeremon, the anger of Isis is provoked because of the destruction of her temple (*CA* 1.289; cf. Manetho’s reference to the destruction of the Egyptian temples by the Hyksos in *CA* 1.76 and by the lepers in *CA* 1.249, 264; cf. lines 3 and 5 in *CPJ* 520),<sup>43</sup> an act which leads to the expulsion of the contaminated Egyptians. The fragment seems to foretell that the Jews “will inhabit the land of Helios-Re”, that is the land of the Egyptian sun god Re, who was the ruler of the cosmos and connected in the royal ideology with Horus.<sup>44</sup> The correspondences between *CPJ* 520 and Chaeremon’s story render it very probable that it is the Jews who are intended as the people who were expelled from Egypt in *CPJ* 520 line 8.<sup>45</sup> This assumption is strengthened by the characterization of these persons as “girdle-wearers” (ζωνοφόροι) in an unpublished fragment of the same text.<sup>46</sup> Frankfurter draws together these

---

Deserted: Religion and Ideology in the Egyptian Response to the Jewish Revolt (116–117 CE),” *JJS* 43 (1992) 203–220; and G. Bohak, “CPJ III, 520: The Egyptian Reaction to Onias’ Temple,” *JStJ* 26 (1995) 32–41.

<sup>40</sup> Vitelli, Stern and others complete Ἰου[δαίσις; G. Manteuffel, “Zur Prophetie in P.S.I. VIII. 982,” *MIFAO* 67 (1934) 119–124, reads Ἰου[δαίων. Possible but less probable would be Ἰου[δαία.

<sup>41</sup> The verb ἐκβάλλω or the noun ἐκβολή occurs several times in the passages on the Egyptian origin of the Jews in *CA*; see 1.290, 294, 296, 306.

<sup>42</sup> Following the reconstruction of the text proposed by Manteuffel, “Prophetic,” 120, which is supported by L. Koenen in his review of *CPJ* in *Gnomon* 40 (1968) 257–258, and Bohak, “CPJ III, 520,” 33–34. Cf. the references to the wrath of the gods connected with the presence of the lepers in Egypt in *CA* 1.235, 256, 258. Cf. also 1.246.

<sup>43</sup> These lines possibly refer to the destruction of Egyptian cities and temples. In the opinion of Frankfurter, “Lest Egypt’s City,” 208, Memphis is meant by the reference to the deserted city in line 5. Cf. also the reference to lawless behaviour (παράνομοι, line 7).

<sup>44</sup> See Frankfurter, “Lest Egypt’s City,” 208–209. On the “King from the sun” in the *Potter’s Oracle* and *Sib. Or.* 3.652–656, see J. J. Collins, “The Sibyl and the Potter: Political Propaganda in Ptolemaic Egypt,” *Religious Propaganda and Missionary Competition in the New Testament World: Essays Honoring Dieter Georgi* (eds. L. Bormann; K. del Tredici; A. Standhartinger; Leiden–New York–Köln: 1994) 57–79.

<sup>45</sup> With Stern, *CPJ* III, 121; Bohak, “CPJ III, 520,” 35.

<sup>46</sup> Frankfurter, “Lest Egypt’s City,” 209 n. 32.

various strands in his discussion of this fragment: "A second fragment of the unpublished Oxyrhynchus papyrus of the anti-Jewish prophecy mentions the ζωνοφόροι, or 'girdle-wearers', an enigmatic horde who invade Egypt in the Potter's Oracle; they represent the Greeks but are identified explicitly as 'Typhonians' (P2 13-14...)." In the anti-Greek *Oracle of the Potter*, the very rare word ζωνοφόροι<sup>17</sup> referring to the Greeks appears as a designation for the same group labelled by the equally rare word τυφώνιοι (see below), a link which again draws on stereotypes derived from the myth about Seth-Typhon.<sup>18</sup> The analogous role and characterization of the Jews in *CPJ* 520 and the Greeks in the *Potter's Oracle* further confirms our hypothesis that traditions concerning Seth-Typhon form the background for the corresponding patterns of events in the passages of Manetho, Chaeremon and *CPJ* 520.

2.4. These patterns described above are attested to by several additional details which are notably present in each of these texts. One of the accusations which returns time and again in *Contra Apionem* is that the Jews were said to have been worshippers of the ass.<sup>19</sup> A

<sup>17</sup> The origin of this enigmatic phrase is not clear. Bohak, "CPJ III, 520," 38 n. 23, suggests that the phrase refers to the Jewish priests of Onias' temple in Leontopolis or Heliopolis, "who wore their priestly belts in accordance with Ex. 28.4, 39; 29.9 etc.!", but this is unconvincing, since it does not explain the use in the *Potter's Oracle*. F. Dunand, "L'oracle du potier et la formation de l'apocalyptique en Égypte," *Études de l'histoire des religions* 3 (1977) 41-67, esp. 61, assumes that the upper class of the Greek citizens of Alexandria is meant by the phrase in the *Potter's Oracle*. This may be true but does not explain the origin of the phrase. W. Clarysse, "The City of the Girdle-Wearers and a New Demotic Document," *Enchoria. Zeitschrift für Demotistik und Koptologie* 18 (1991) 177-178, proposes to read the phrase *smepwrs* in P. Lond. de. 10223 (early second century BCE) l. 4 as a Demotic transcription of ζωνοφόρος, which implies that the papyrus refers to the tomb of the girdle-wearer. Clarysse thinks that the ζωνοφόρος means that the deceased was a member of the army or the police force.

<sup>18</sup> The close connections between *CPJ* 520 and the *Oracle of the Potter* are commonly accepted and were already pointed out by Vitelli, *Pubblicazioni*.

<sup>19</sup> J. Halévy, "Le culte d'une tête d'âne," *RevSém* 11 (1903) 154-164; *Idem*, "La visite d'Apollon au temple juif," *RevSém* 18 (1910) 218-222; E. Bickermann, "Ritual-mord und Eselskult," *MGWJ* 71 NS 35 (1927) 171-187 and 255-264; A. Jacoby, "Der angebliche Eselskult der Juden und Christen," *ARW* 25 (1927) 265-282; L. Vischer, "Le prétendu 'culte de l'âne' dans l'Église primitive," *RHR* 70 (1951) 14-35; W. Speyer, "Zu den Vorwürfen der Heiden gegen die Christen," *JAC* 6 (1963) 129-136, esp. 130-131; Feldman, *Jew*, 127, 145-146, 499-501. B. H. Stricker, "Asinarii I," *OMRO* 46 (1965) 52-75, supposes that the accusation was based on the actual veneration of the ass by Jews (*sic!*) and argues, among other things, that references to asses in LXX are systematically omitted. Even if this would be the

similar accusation is referred to in several non-Jewish works, a fact which proves undoubtedly that Josephus did not invent it to demonstrate the stupidity of his opponents. The question arises, however, why the ass was chosen as the favorite animal to ridicule the Jews. The negative attributes associated with the ass, such as its stupidity, ugliness, obstinance and lechery, are obvious,<sup>50</sup> but they do not sufficiently account for the harsh conclusions which are drawn in some of the passages in question after the link between the Jews and the ass has been established. It is not coincidental that the accusation of the veneration of the ass by the Jews is sometimes accompanied by remarks which point to Seth-Typhon as the figure which forms the background of these traditions (see also 2.5). Read in the light of its associations with Seth-Typhon, the specific nature of this accusation becomes clear.

The accusation of Jewish worship of the ass is attributed to Apion himself (2.79–80):<sup>51</sup> “Within this sanctuary (the temple of Jerusalem) Apion has the effrontery to assert that the Jews kept an ass’s head (*asini caput collocasse*), worshipping that animal and deeming it worthy of the deepest reverence (*et eum colere ac dignum facere tanta religione*) . . .” The golden ass’s head was said to have been discovered by Antiochus Epiphanes. The reference to the veneration of the ass returns in a passage attributed to the historian Damocritus (*De Iudaeis, apud Suda s.v. Δαμόκριτος*),<sup>52</sup> where the accusation of ass veneration (ὄτι χρυσῆν ὄνου κεφαλὴν προσεκύουσι) is combined with that of the ritual slaughter of a foreigner by the Jews (cf. *CA* 2.89–96 attributed to Apion). Diodorus Siculus, who wrote in the first century BCE, offers another source with the same accusation at 34–35.1.1–5.<sup>53</sup> He links Jewish religion to the veneration of the ass in a passage which offers a legitimization of the acts of Antiochus IV against Jerusalem (34–35.1.1–5).<sup>54</sup> Antiochus’ friends advised him to wipe out the Jewish people completely (34–35.1.1).

Their arguments contain a reference to the charge that impure

---

case, it is far-fetched to consider this as an implicit confession of the Jews that they venerated the ass.

<sup>50</sup> F. Olck, “Esel,” *PW* 1. Reihe VI, 633–636; Stricker, “Asinarii I.”

<sup>51</sup> Stern, *Authors I*, 409–410.

<sup>52</sup> For text and commentary, see Stern, *Authors I*, 530–531. It is not known when Damocritus lived.

<sup>53</sup> Stern, *Authors-I*, 181–185.

<sup>54</sup> The hypothesis of Bickermann, “Ritualmord,” 260, and others that this story ultimately derived from Poseidonius because of his supposedly relatively positive



Egyptians were the ancestors of the Jewish people (Diodorus 34.1–2). As we have argued above, the familiar valence of this accusation is part and parcel of the traditions concerning Seth-Typhon. Antiochus disregarded the counsel of his friends, but decided to stop Jewish religion after his visit to the holy of holiest of the temple. In an attempt to justify Antiochus' measures, Diodorus focuses upon what Antiochus discovered after having entered the temple's innermost sanctuary: "Finding there a marble statue of a heavily bearded man seated on an ass (καθήμενον ἐπ' ὄνου), with a book in his hands, he supposed it to be an image of Moses, the founder of Jerusalem and organizer of the nation, the man, moreover, who had ordained for the Jews their misanthropic and lawless customs. And since Antiochus was shocked by such hatred directed against all mankind, he had set himself to break down their traditional practices." (34–35.1.3).<sup>55</sup> A careful reading of this passage leads to the conclusion that only the ass can have created the shock to Antiochus. A man with a heavy beard and a book may be strange but not offensive. The ass triggers the negative associations with the presumed antisocial and lawless behaviour of the Jews. Diodorus merely reports the story without even providing any details concerning the Jews' legendary veneration of the ass. This fact implies that the passage had a well-known traditional background. Diodorus did spend part of his life in Alexandria (17.52),<sup>56</sup> which may indicate that the legend does indeed have an Egyptian origin.

The oldest version of the libel about the veneration of the ass by the Jews transmitted in *Contra Apionem* is attributed to Mnaseas of Patara in Lycia, who lived in the second century BCE (CA 2.112–114).<sup>57</sup> According to this curious legend, a certain Zabidos, an Idumean from Dora (Adora, cf. below),<sup>58</sup> duped the Jews of Jerusalem by

---

attitude towards the Jews is refuted by Gager, *Moses*, 126, but considered plausible by Stern, *Authors I*, 184.

<sup>55</sup> Εὐρόν δὲ ἐν αὐτῷ λίθινον ἄγαλμα ἀνδρὸς βαθυπάργωνος καθήμενον ἐπ' ὄνου, μετὰ χειρᾶς ἔχον βιβλίον, τοῦτο μὲν ὑπέλαβε Μωυσέως εἶναι τοῦ κτίσαντος τὰ Ἱεροσόλυμα καὶ συστησαμένου τὸ ἔθνος, πρὸς δὲ τούτοις νομοθετήσαντος τὰ μισάνθρωπα καὶ παράνομα ἔθνη τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις· αὐτὸς δὲ συγγήσας τὴν μισανθρωπίαν πάντων ἐθνῶν ἐφιλοτιμήθη καταλῦσαι τὰ νόμιμα.

<sup>56</sup> E. Schwartz, "Diodoros 38," *PIW* 5.663 and 670–672.

<sup>57</sup> Cf. Josephus, *Ant.* 1.94; *CA* 1.215–216 and see Stern, *Authors I*, 97–101. Also Bickermann, "Ritualmord," 255–264.

<sup>58</sup> The name of the city is given as Δῶρα in 2.114 in most of the MSS (cf. however MS P "Ἀδωρα"), but this must be a mistake, because Dor was located at the coast near Mt. Carmel. The Idumean city Adora is probably meant in this passage. Its

promising them to deliver up to them Apollo, the god of his city, if they would leave the temple. The naive Jews let him have his way which enabled him to steal the golden head of the pack-ass (κόνθων) which stood in the temple and which may be understood to be the cult statue. This tradition is, of course, very unlikely, because the Jews would never have allowed gentiles to enter the temple (cf. e.g. 2 Macc. 3).

Regardless of its other associations, the suggestion that the Jewish people venerated the ass certainly expresses the unequivocally anti-Jewish idea that the Jewish people could be associated with the characteristics of the ass, its ugliness, its stubbornness, its unpleasant voice, and last but not least its lewdness. Bickermann rejected the hypothesis that the accusation proceeded from the association of the Lord with Seth-Typhon.<sup>59</sup> He emphasized that the oldest version of the accusation of the veneration of the ass by the Jews focuses on the golden head of the ass. The story about the stealing of the head of the ass by Zabidus would contain the oldest stratum of the tradition which would have circulated already in Idumea in the fifth and fourth century BCE.<sup>60</sup> The arguments for his hypothesis are, however, not convincing, as several scholars have pointed out.<sup>61</sup>

These vaguer associations do not reflect the whole story of this anti-Jewish libel. The prominent feature of the ass remains unexplained in Bickermann's hypothesis, while this element can be understood very well in connection with traditions about Seth-Typhon. Furthermore, most of the passages in which the accusation of the veneration of the ass appears are attributed to authors with an Egyptian background.<sup>62</sup> It seems, therefore, more probable that Mnaseas'

name is given as Ἄδωρα in Josephus, *Ant.* 13.207, 257, 396 and 14.88 and as Ἄδωραίμ in *Ant.* 8.246. Cf. Bickermann, "Ritualmord," 262.

<sup>59</sup> Bickermann, "Ritualmord," 256.

<sup>60</sup> Bickermann, "Ritualmord," 264. Cf. Halévy, Le "culte," who suggested that the legend originated in Palestine and goes back to the actual veneration of the ass at Sichem.

<sup>61</sup> Jacoby, "Eselskult," esp. pp. 281-282; L. Finkelstein, "Pre-Maccabean Documents in the Passover Haggada," *HTR* 36 (1943) 1-38, esp. pp. 24-28; Vischer, "culte de l'âne;" V. Tcherikover, *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews* (New York: 1979) 365-366; Stern, *Authors* I, 98; Van der Horst, "Chaeremon," 265-272, esp. 271; Gager, *Moses*, 116 and 132; Van der Horst, *Chaeremon*, 50 with further references; Feldman, *Jew*, 499-501. Yoyotte, "Égypte," 141-142, states that the ass goes back to Seth-Typhon and offers many parallels from Egyptian sources to elements of the legend about the impure Egyptians.

<sup>62</sup> Even the passage attributed to Mnaseas was transmitted by Apion according to *CA* 2.112, 115.

legend derives from an Idumean variant of a tradition which ultimately originated in Egypt. Stern assumes that this tradition derives from an Egyptian source and that it reflects tensions between Jews and Idumeans both of whom emigrated to Egypt in the third and second century BCE. The legend can also be understood as an expression of Idumean frustration stemming from Jewish domination of Idumea in the second century BCE. The Idumeans were forced by John Hyrcanus to circumcise themselves and observe Jewish laws, after their cities Adora and Marissa were conquered,<sup>63</sup> and at this time of crisis they may have taken over the familiar anti-Jewish libel current in Egyptian circles.<sup>64</sup>

2.5. The fourth criterion for the identification of the presence of an ancient mythological tradition in *Contra Apionem* implies that elements which may appear isolated in one of the passages with an anti-Jewish accusation belong to a cluster of motifs connected with the key figure of such a tradition. This may be apparent from one of the relevant passages in *Contra Apionem* or from a parallel text outside the work. In connection with the alleged Jewish veneration of the ass, a short but very clear passage of Plutarch indicates the existence of such a cluster of motifs in connection with Seth-Typhon. The explicit reference to Seth-Typhon implies that we can be fairly sure that the passages with the accusation that the Jews worshipped the ass ultimately derive from Graeco-Egyptian traditions about the conflict myth of the royal god Horus and his evil opponent Seth-Typhon.<sup>65</sup> In a passage belonging to his large work on the myth of Osiris Plutarch notes combined references to Seth-Typhon and to the ass. These references are clearly applied to the Jews and connected with the libel of the Egyptian origin of the Jews. The tradition recalled by Plutarch depicts how Typhon fled from Egypt on an ass for seven days and begot two sons, Jerusalem and Judah: "But those who relate that Typhon's flight from the battle [the fight with Horus] was

<sup>63</sup> Josephus, *Ant.* 13.257; *Bell.* 1.63. See E. Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 BC-AD 135)* I, A New English Version Revised (eds. G. Vermes, F. Millar; Edinburgh: 1973) 207. This would imply that the attribution of the story to Mnaseas may originate from a later period.

<sup>64</sup> There are several other sources which contain this same accusation which may likewise have adopted this tradition for their own purposes (for example, Tacitus, *Hist.* 5.2-4; Plutarch, *Questiones Conv.* 4.5.2 [= *Mor.* 670D]; Tertullian, *Apologeticum* 16.2).

<sup>65</sup> With Stern, *Authors* I, 98.

made on the back of an ass (ἐπ' ὄνου) and lasted for seven days, and that after he had made his escape, he became the father of sons, Hierosolymus and Judaeus, are manifestly, as the very names show, attempting to drag Jewish traditions into legend" (*De Iside et Osiride* 31; = *Mor.* 363C-D; transl. Babbitt; cf. Tacitus, *Hist.* 5.2).<sup>66</sup> Plutarch's commentary is clear; according to his anonymous sources, Israel's exodus and settlement in the holy land are described in terms of the historicization of a myth. This application of the conflict myth of Horus and Seth-Typhon fuses all of the elements we have discussed above.

2.6. The result of our investigation so far is that in Egypt the Jews were stereotypically depicted as worshippers of Seth-Typhon, the enemy of the gods, in sources dating anywhere from the third century BCE to the first or even second century CE. What are the consequences of this widespread anti-Jewish propaganda? The application of the conflict myth of Horus and Seth-Typhon to the Jews seems to have an obvious implication: the Jews are identified as foreigners who should be removed from Egypt in order to safeguard Egyptian or Graeco-Egyptian society. They were considered scapegoats who had to be driven away or even be eliminated so that the forces of evil were safely carried across the Egyptian border. The function of this myth can easily be demonstrated by looking at several other historicizations of the myth.

Typhonic characterizations were rather common in Egypt in the Persian and Greek periods. They derive from the identification of the Egyptian god Seth with the giant Typhon<sup>67</sup> from Greek mythology. Typhon-Typhoeus is the name of an anti-hero who is depicted as a monster or dragon. He fights against the Olympic gods and tries to overthrow the rule of Zeus. He is an enemy of humans as well and represents the forces of chaos. In a rationalized version of the myth Diodorus Siculus states that Zeus eliminated Typhon because of his contempt of the gods and the laws (5.71). Already in the fifth century, Herodotus identifies Typhon with the Egyptian god Seth (2.144, 156; 3.5),<sup>68</sup> who had initially been a respectable royal god. In

<sup>66</sup> See further Stern, *Authors* I, 563.

<sup>67</sup> For references, see nn. 2, 3, 4 and 22.

<sup>68</sup> Origenes, *Contra Celsum* 6.42, already refers to Pherecydes for this identification; see W. Kranz, "Vorsokratisches I," *Hermes* 69 (1934) 114-115.

Egyptian mythology the conflict between Horus and Seth is a prominent story, a dramatic battle between two royal gods which is to be repeated continuously throughout history. The influence of the Osiris myth along with foreign threats to Egypt in the first millennium BCE transformed the role of Seth into the quintessential enemy of the other deities. In this new role he attacks the deities, threatens their cults and destroys their temples. This explains why Horus not only defeats but also kills Seth in later versions of the myth, a story which is, for example, depicted on the walls of temples.<sup>69</sup> Seth develops into a completely negative figure, resembling the Typhon of Greek mythology. In Hellenized Egypt, Seth-Typhon becomes the personification of chaos in nature and society. Consequently this destructive god also came to be viewed as the god of foreigners;<sup>70</sup> it is this aspect of Seth-Typhon which is most relevant to our case.

Mythic traditions about Seth-Typhon were used to interpret political events. We can refer here to illuminating studies by Ludwig Koenen and others.<sup>71</sup> One of the groups who eagerly made use of the conflict myth of Horus and Seth-Typhon were the Ptolemaic kings. They not only took over the royal ideology from the pharaohs by presenting themselves as the incarnation of Horus,<sup>72</sup> but also identified their enemies with Horus' opponent, Seth-Typhon.<sup>73</sup> The struggle between Ptolemies and indigenous rebels like Hurgonaphor, Chaonnophris, Dionysius Petosarapis and Harsiesis was depicted in the terms of the famous conflict myth. Texts suggest that the Ptolemaic king triumphs like Horus, who revenged the death of his father Osiris<sup>74</sup>

<sup>69</sup> For instance on the walls of the temple of Horus at Edfu, see H. Fairman, *The Triumph of Horus: An Ancient Egyptian Sacred Drama* (London: 1974). Cf. representations of Horus who kills Seth depicted as a crocodile or hippopotamus, W. Barta, "Horus von Edfu," *Lexikon der Ägyptologie* III, 34-35; B. Altenmüller, "Horus, der Herr der Harpunierstätte," *Lexikon der Ägyptologie* III, 36-37. This imagery was transferred to depictions of Hadrian on coins, see A. C. Levi, "Hadrian as King of Egypt," *The Numismatic Chronicle* 6. ser. 8 (1948) 30-38.

<sup>70</sup> For references, see Te Velde, *Seth*, 109-151.

<sup>71</sup> See van Henten, "Antiochus IV" with references; *Idem*, "Dragon Myth and Imperial Ideology in Revelation 12 and 13," *Society of Biblical Literature 1994 Seminar Papers* (ed. E. Lovering; Atlanta: 1994) 496-515.

<sup>72</sup> This is argued persuasively by L. Koenen, "θεοῖσιν ἐχθρός. Ein einheimischer Gegenkönig in Ägypten (132/1)," *Chronique d'Égypte* 34 (1959) 103-119, esp. 109. *Idem*, "Die Adaptation ägyptischer Königsideologie am Ptolemäerhof," *Egypt and the Hellenistic World*, Proceedings of the International Colloquium Leuven—24-26 May 1982 (eds. E. Van't Dack, P. van Dessel & W. van Gucht; Studia Hellenistica 27; Leuven: 1983) 143-190.

<sup>73</sup> Cf. Koenen, "θεοῖσιν ἐχθρός," 108-111.

<sup>74</sup> Cf. Diodorus Siculus 1.21.

on the violent and ungodly (ἀσεβής) Seth-Typhon.<sup>75</sup> There are indications that the triumph of the gods over Seth-Typhon was celebrated ritually during the coronation ceremony of the Ptolemaic king.<sup>76</sup>

Another political application of the myth concerns the military conflicts between Ptolemies and Seleucids. The famous stele on which the battle of Raphia (217 BCE) was commemorated<sup>77</sup> depicts Ptolemy IV Philopator on horseback killing an enemy kneeling before him, perhaps to be identified with Antiochus III himself.<sup>78</sup> The text shows that Ptolemy identified himself with Horus and his foreign enemy with Seth-Typhon in accordance with the old royal ideology: "Die unter seinen Feinden, die in dieser Schlacht bis in seine Nähe vordrangen, die tötete er vor sich, wie Harsiesis [= Horus, son of Isis] vordem seine Feinde geschlachtet hat. Er setzte Antiochos in Schrecken, (er) warf Diadem und seinen Mantel weg. Man floh mit seiner Frau, indem nur wenige bei ihm blieben, in elender, verächtlicher Weise nach der Niederlage . . . (Demotic version lines 11–13; transl. Spiegelberg; cf. lines 32, 35–36 and 41).<sup>79</sup>

The multipurpose propagandistic use of the Seth-Typhon traditions appears also from indigenous sources. The same associations are found, this time, however, with a reversal of roles. The Ptolemaic king and the Greeks are associated with the evil Seth-Typhon; and the leader of the indigenous rebels is linked to the god Horus, who triumphs over evil and restores order in Egypt.<sup>80</sup> This application of the royal ideology is also present in the *Oracle of the Potter*, which probably dates from 130–116 BCE.<sup>81</sup> The Oracle predicts that the

<sup>75</sup> Rosetta stone, Greek version (OGIS 90) lines 9–10, 26–28. Koenen, "θεοῖσιν ἐχθρός," 108–111.

<sup>76</sup> Nigidius Figulus, Schol. Germ. (ed. Swoboda, 1964) 123: *Typhon interficitur in templo Aegypti Memphi, ubi mos fuit solio regio decorari reges, quae regna ineunt.*

<sup>77</sup> For an edition and a commentary, see H.-J. Thissen, *Studien zum Raphiadekret* (Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie 23; Meisenheim am Glan: 1966).

<sup>78</sup> Thissen, *Studien* 70 with illustrations 1 and 2. Cf. the description of the picture on the stele in the Demotic version, lines 35–36.

<sup>79</sup> Thissen, *Studien*, 53–56, 67–69 and 71–73.

<sup>80</sup> C. Préaux, "Esquisse d'une histoire des révolutions égyptiennes sous les Lagides," *Chronique d'Égypte* 11 (1936) 522–552; Koenen, "θεοῖσιν ἐχθρός;" F. Übel, "ΤΑΡΑΧΗ ΤΩΝ ΑΙΓΥΠΤΙΩΝ. Ein Jenaer Papyruszeugnis der nationalen Unruhen Oberägyptens in der ersten Hälfte des 2. vorchristlichen Jahrhunderts," *APF* 17 (1962) 147–162; P. W. Pestman, "Harmachis et Anchmachis, deux Rois indigènes du temps des Ptolémées," *Chronique d'Égypte* 40 (1965) 157–170; W. Peremans, "Les révolutions égyptiennes sous les Lagides," *Das ptolemäische Ägypten* (ed. H. Maehler & V. M. Strocka; Mainz: 1978) 39–50. W. Clarysse, "Hurgonaphor et Chaonnophris, les derniers pharaons indigènes," *Chronique d'Égypte* 53 (1978) 243–253.

<sup>81</sup> On the *Oracle of the Potter* and related texts, see L. Koenen, "Die Prophezeiungen

Greeks will meet with disaster and that their ungodly domination of the Egyptians with Alexandria as its malignant centre will be succeeded by the rule of an indigenous king. The Greeks are stereotypically depicted as "Typhonians" (Τυφώνιοι, P<sub>2</sub> lines 3, 14, 28, 47; P<sub>3</sub> lines 4, 9, 14–15, 50) and "Girdle-Wearers".<sup>82</sup>

The *Potter's Oracle* and the unpublished fragment of CPJ 520 show that not only rulers but also other people could be characterized as typhonic. The association of people with Seth-Typhon could be signified by the name "Typhonian" or the adjective "typhonic", by a reference to the ass, the animal of Seth-Typhon, or to the color red, the color of Seth-Typhon.<sup>83</sup> People associated with Seth-Typhon deserved to be defeated, banished and even killed. This is evident from several passages in Plutarch and Diodorus Siculus and is already implied by an Egyptian ritual text from the fourth century BCE.<sup>84</sup> This text consists mainly of curses against Seth, who is expelled to the land of the Asians. In the ritual a wooden dummy of Seth is pierced and burned. Passages in Plutarch and Diodorus indicate that certain specific people seem to have fulfilled the role of the dummy of Seth-Typhon in the ritual text. They apparently would serve as scapegoats; the evil personified by Seth-Typhon is projected on to them and eliminated along with them. Plutarch, for example, in his work on Isis and Osiris refers to the ridiculing of persons who were associated with Seth-Typhon at Coptos: "... jeering at men of ruddy complexion and throwing an ass down a precipice, as the people

des Töpfers," *ZPE* 2 (1968) 178–209. For new readings: *Idem*, "Bemerkungen zum Text des Töpferorakels und zu dem Akaziensymbol," *ZPE* 13 (1974) 313–319. Further references are also given by Stern, *Authors* I, 64; Frankfurter, "Lest Egypt's City," 209 n. 32; 212 n. 48, and 217 n. 66; Van Henten, "Antiochus IV," 238–239.

<sup>82</sup> P<sub>3</sub> 43–44 καὶ <ἦ> τῶν ζωνοφόρων πολί<ς> ἐρημωθήσεται ὡν τρόπον <ἦ> ἐμ{ἦ} κάμινο<ς> "And the city of the girdle-wearers will be deserted just as my furnace (was being emptied)", cf. P<sub>2</sub> lines 32–33 and P<sub>3</sub> lines 55–56.

<sup>83</sup> Van Henten, "Antiochus IV," 236–238.

<sup>84</sup> Hatred against foreign invaders of Egypt probably formed the impetus for this text. At its beginning, Seth is already driven away to the land of the Asians by the other gods. The end of the text reads: *Man spreche die vorangegangenen Worte über eine Figur des Seth als Kriegsgefangener, die aus rotem Wachs gemacht ist, lautend "Jener elende Seth" und man zeichne mit frischer Farbe auf ein neues Papyrusblatt oder (eine Figur aus) Akazienholz oder Hm3-Holz, auf deren Brust ebenso sein Name eingeschnitten ist (lautend:) "Esel".* This leaf or this wooden figure was spitted upon, pierced, cut into pieces and burned. The text is transmitted in P. Louvre 3129 and P. Brit. Mus. 10252. The latter text contains in notes of copiers as dates the seventeenth year of Nectanebo I (= 361 BCE) and the eleventh year of Alexander II (= 312 BCE). For the edition and a German translation (quoted above), see S. Schott, *Das Buch vom Sieg über Seth* (Urkunden des ägyptischen Altertums 6; Leipzig/Berlin: 1929) 1–59.

of Coptos do, because Typhon had a ruddy complexion and was asinine in form" (transl. J.G. Griffiths).<sup>85</sup> In a similar passage derived from Manetho Plutarch mentions that the inhabitants of Eileithyiaspolis burned alive "people who were called typhonic" (Τυφωνείους καλοῦντες) and that their ashes were scattered (*De Isid.* 73). In Diodorus Siculus, one can find a reference to an ancient practice of sacrificing people with the same color of skin as Seth-Typhon near the grave of Osiris.<sup>86</sup>

2.7. Although scholars usually do not think that the passages on the sacrifice of typhonic people in Plutarch and Diodorus Siculus reflect the actual killing of humans,<sup>87</sup> it is not far fetched to see a connection between the references to the Jews as Typhonians and the outbursts of hatred against the Jews which occasionally took place in ancient Egypt and produced many victims. David Frankfurter discusses some of the anti-Jewish texts which can be linked to Seth-Typhon and assumes that they help to explain the brutal reaction of the indigenous Egyptian population to the Jewish revolt in the Cyrenaica and Egypt in 116–117 CE.<sup>88</sup> He finds that the Jewish inhabitants of Egypt were almost completely exterminated not because of the retaliation by the Romans but because of the extreme violence of the indigenous soldiers against the Jews.<sup>89</sup> It is obvious that there was a strong anti-Jewish animosity among the Egyptians during and directly after the revolt. However, Frankfurter's thesis that the prophecy of *CPJ* 520 and the unpublished fragment in POxy are directly linked to the revolt<sup>90</sup> is not convincing. It is highly probable

<sup>85</sup> *De Isid.* 30: τῶν μὲν ἀνθρώπων τοὺς πυρροὺς [καὶ] προπηλακίζοντες, ὄνον δὲ κατακρημνίζοντες, ὡς Κοπίται, διὰ τὸ πυρρὸν γεγονέναι τὸν Τυφῶνα καὶ ὀνόδη τὴν χροάν.

<sup>86</sup> Diodorus Siculus 1.88: καὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων δὲ τοὺς ὁμοχρωμάτους τῷ Τυφῶνι τὸ παλαιὸν ὑπὸ τῶν βασιλέων φασὶ θύεσθαι πρὸς τῷ τάφῳ τῷ Ὀσίριδος.

<sup>87</sup> For example, see J. Gwyn Griffiths, *Plutarch's De Iside et Osiride* (Cambridge: 1970) 408 and 551–552. On similar traditions in Greek religion, A. Henrichs, "Human Sacrifice in Greek Religion. Three Case Studies," *Le sacrifice dans l'antiquité* (Entretiens Fondation Hardt 27; Geneva: 1981) 195–235.

<sup>88</sup> Frankfurter, "Lest Egypt's Cities."

<sup>89</sup> Frankfurter, "Lest Egypt's Cities," 203–204. Cf. E. M. Smallwood, *The Jews under Roman Rule* (Leiden: 1976) 405–409.

<sup>90</sup> Frankfurter, "Lest Egypt's Cities," 208: "... *CPJ* 520 was almost certainly composed as propaganda for opposing the Jewish revolt." Already Manteuffel, "Prophetic," 123–124, linked *CPJ* 520 to the diaspora revolt of 116–117 CE. Frankfurter also discusses the reference to an annual celebration of the triumph over the Jews in *CPJ* 450 (late second century CE). In his view the drama of this celebration "portrayed the Jews as Typhonians" (pp. 213–215, esp. p. 215).



that social and ethnic tensions already existed before the open conflict between Jews and other ethnic groups in Egypt,<sup>91</sup> and that the typhonic rhetoric was a slow but continuous poison which did not cause the outbursts of violence against the Jews themselves but contributed to their vehemence. Anti-Jewish utterances had already been articulated well before the revolt of 116–117. The anti-Jewish ideology of *CPJ* 520 might have been connected with the revolt of 116–117 but just as easily with earlier conflicts with the Jews.<sup>92</sup> Manetho wrote his anti-Jewish propaganda as early as the third century BCE. As John Collins rightly remarks, apocalyptic texts with a radical political message like the *Oracle of the Potter* could easily be adapted to a new situation through a few changes of the text. The present version of the *Potter's Oracle* dates probably from the third century CE, but the text itself is much earlier. Discrepancies between the indications of periods of government in the two versions of this oracle form the point of departure of Koenen's date of the oldest version of the Oracle shortly after the rebellion of Harsiesis (130–129 BCE),<sup>93</sup> but these changes prove unequivocally that such texts were read during a longer period and adapted to later circumstances.<sup>94</sup> For similar reasons, Gideon Bohak's interpretation of the prophecy of *CPJ* 520 as a response of the Egyptian population of Heliopolis to the founding of Onias' temple can be considered no more than a good guess. It is possible that the prophecy originated in Heliopolis after the erection of this temple, but the correspondences with Manetho and Chae-remion's passages and the fluidity of these traditions imply that another origin cannot be excluded.

What is certain is that the reasons which Manetho provides for the transfer of the impure Egyptians to the quarries east of the Nile strike at the heart of the myth. He tells the reader that Amenophis made this decision in order to purify Egypt<sup>95</sup> and to make the gods

<sup>91</sup> S. Davis, *Race-Relations in Ancient Egypt: Greek, Egyptian, Hebrew, Roman* (London: 1951); K. Goudriaan, *Ethnicity in Ptolemaic Egypt* (Dutch Monographs in History and Archaeology 5; Amsterdam: 1988).

<sup>92</sup> With Stern in *CPJ* III, 120; cf. Yoyotte, "Égypte," 134. See also E. Van't Dak, W. Clarysse, G. Cohen, J. Quaegebeur & J. K. Winnicki, *The Judean-Syrian-Egyptian Conflict of 103-101 BC: A Multilingual Dossier Concerning a "War of Sceptres"* (Brussels: 1989).

<sup>93</sup> Koenen, "Töpferorakel," 186–193; *Idem*, "A Supplementary Note on the Date of the Oracle of the Potter," *ZPE* 54 (1984) 9–13.

<sup>94</sup> Cf. Collins, "Sibyl," 63: "The *Potter's Oracle*, then, was a fluid tradition, which was updated repeatedly in light of historical events."

<sup>95</sup> Manetho mentions Seth-Typhon more often; see Frag. 78–79, 86 (= Plutarch,

visible again. The second reason refers to yet another element of the Seth-Typhon myth: the tradition that the gods were hiding themselves from Seth-Typhon.<sup>96</sup> A passage in *CA* 2.128 contains a brief reference to the flight of the gods to Egypt and their metamorphosis, although Seth-Typhon is not mentioned explicitly: "... the gods, according to their [the Egyptians'] account, took refuge in their country and saved themselves by assuming the form of wild animals. . . ."<sup>97</sup> The tradition of the flight of the gods before Seth-Typhon<sup>98</sup> was well-known in the first century CE both in the east and in Rome.<sup>99</sup> As long as Seth-Typhon in the person of the impure Typhonians was present in Egypt, the deities would conceal themselves. Thus the negative association of the Jews with Seth-Typhon enabled the Alexandrians and other Greeks living in Egypt as well as the indigenous Egyptians to construct the Jews as scapegoats who had to be driven out or even killed during periods of distress, like Seth-Typhon according to the conflict myth.

### 3. Josephus' strategies of refutation

A detailed and systematic analysis of Josephus' method of refutation employed in *Contra Apionem* is still a *desideratum*.<sup>100</sup> At least two aspects

---

*De Iside* 49, 62, 73). In the last passage Typhon is mentioned in connection with scapegoat rituals. The function of scapegoats clearly appears from a passage attributed to Hecataeus of Abdera and transmitted by Diodorus Siculus (40.3), see Stern, *Authors* I, 25–26. The native Egyptians decide to get rid of a pestilence by driving away all foreigners out of Egypt. A few lines further is noted: "But the greater number were driven into what is now called Judaea, which is not far distant from Egypt and was at that time utterly uninhabited" (40.3.1–2; transl. F. R. Walton).

<sup>96</sup> On the flight of the gods for Seth-Typhon, see the references in Van Henten, "Antiochus IV," 230–232.

<sup>97</sup> Αἰγύπτιοι δ' ἄρα μόνοι διὰ τὸ καταφυγεῖν, ὡς φασιν, εἰς τὴν χώραν αὐτῶν τοὺς θεοὺς καὶ σωθῆναι μεταβαλόντας εἰς μορφὰς θηρίων ἐξάιρετον γέρας εὗροντο . . .

<sup>98</sup> J. G. Griffiths, "The Flight of the Gods before Typhon: an Unrecognized Myth?," *Hermes* 88 (1960) 374–376. For further references, see Van Henten, "Antiochus IV," 230–232.

<sup>99</sup> E.g. Antoninus Liberalis 28.1–4; Ovidius, *Metam.* 5.346–358; Apollonius Rhodius 2.1214–1215.

<sup>100</sup> Some scholars, however, discuss Josephus' method of refutation in *CA* in general. D. M. Hay, "What is Proof?—Rhetorical Verification in Philo, Josephus and Quintilian," *Society of Biblical Literature 1979 Seminar Papers*, vol. II, ed. P. J. Achtemeier; Missoula (Montana 1979), 87–100, argues convincingly that Josephus in *CA* as well as Philo in *Flacc.* use paradigms of contemporary gentile rhetorics. He offers a summary of the kinds of argument used by Josephus (pp. 93–97). Valuable observations

of Josephus' refutations deserve serious attention and detailed research. First, although it is difficult to pin down blatant imitation and explicit use on the part of Josephus of non-Jewish rhetoric, theoretical works concerning rhetorical strategies for the refutation of accusations should be used as comparative material. In particular, those passages found in such sources which reflect on the nature of accusations and refutations can both provide a framework for approaching Josephus' own rhetorical structure and illuminate certain specific strategies common to rhetorical theory and Josephan practice. On the basis of this initial work, we can proceed with the second task, that of analyzing in detail the content and method of Josephus' refutations within the work itself. This will not only allow us to evaluate Josephus' rhetorical strategies, but will offer insight into Josephus' own use and understanding of his sources. To this end, we shall look most carefully at Josephus' rhetorical treatment of the accusations of Jewish origins, of Jewish ass worship, and finally of the mythological background we have shown underlies these accusations.

3.1. Josephus' *Contra Apionem* has often been considered an apology, a genre designation based on the characteristics of a number of early Christian sources. These texts dating from the second century onwards combine aspects of the rhetorical categories of forensic and epideictic speech.<sup>101</sup> Recently, some scholars have rightly emphasized the correspondences between *Contra Apionem* and Aristotle's third category of speeches, the *genos epideiktikon* (*Rhet.* 1.3.1–3),<sup>102</sup> for, in this work, Josephus does not merely deal with the anti-Jewish slanders of Apion and others, but also provides an extensive laudatory description of Judaism (*CA* 2.145–286).<sup>103</sup> Even in the earlier section on the Jews in Alexandria in 2.33–78, the balance between refutation and praise already shifts towards the latter. The refutation of the accusation

---

can also be found in S. J. D. Cohen, "History and Historiography in the *Contra Apionem* of Josephus," *History and Theory. Studies in the Philosophy of History* 27 (1988) 1–11.

<sup>101</sup> See, for example, K. Wegenast, "Apologeten," *KPI* I, 455; H. Koester, *Introduction to the New Testament* II, History and Literature of Early Christianity (Philadelphia-Berlin-New York: 1982) 338–345; A. Dihle, *Die griechische und lateinische Literatur der Kaiserzeit* (München: 1989) 366–368.

<sup>102</sup> See S. Mason's contribution to this volume.

<sup>103</sup> D. L. Balch, "Two Apologetic Encomia: Dionysius on Rome and Josephus on the Jews," *JST* 13 (1982) 102–122. Hay, "Proof," 89, notes that the switch in Josephus' defense from refutation to a positive statement corresponds to a remark by Quintilian implying that, as a defendant, one must first refute the accusation and subsequently present one's own case (*Inst.* 5.13.53).

of the ritual killing of a Greek is seized by Josephus as an opportunity to give a detailed report on the temple (2:89–111).

This shift is likewise reflected in the observation that technical forensic terminology drops off once Josephus has begun the eulogy on the Jewish people. For example, the term πίστις in the sense of “proof” or “evidence” serves an explicitly rhetorical purpose in the first book and half of the second where it is used in the plural as reference to dependable textual sources (*CA* 1.72; 2.18).<sup>104</sup> In the encomium, on the other hand, it serves merely the narrative and descriptive purpose of characterizing the unique relationship between the Jewish people and God (cf. 2.169, 218).<sup>105</sup> Josephus’ frequent use of technical forensic terms like κατηγορία,<sup>106</sup> κατηγορέω, (ἐχ)ελέγχω (with the meaning “refute”),<sup>107</sup> and, most importantly, μάρτυς and words related to it<sup>108</sup> also imply that *Contra Apionem* is a work in which a section of epideictic discourse is embedded in a largely forensic argument.

The relationship between these rhetorical modes holds a key to understanding the work as a whole. Those sections which assume the form of a eulogy (ἔπαινος λόγος<sup>109</sup> or ἐγκώμιον, cf. *CA* 2.147) and exhibit its characteristics of epideictic speech support the assumption that the work as a whole was first and foremost intended for a gentile audience.<sup>110</sup> The fact that Josephus does not appeal to explicit passages of the Hebrew Bible or to divine revelation<sup>111</sup> further confirms this conclusion.<sup>112</sup> Yet, while we accept the possibility voiced by Mason

<sup>104</sup> It should be noted that Josephus uses πίστις in the more general sense of “specific evidence” and not in the Aristotelian sense of “types of proof” or “manners of presenting proof.” See below in 3.2.

<sup>105</sup> Cf. *CA* 2.239, where the verb πιστεύω is ironically used to describe the Greek legislators who, although being “most trusted,” are censured by Greek sages for “sowing in the minds of the masses the first seeds of such (faulty) notions about the gods.”

<sup>106</sup> Cf. *CA* 1.53; 2.4, 7, 33, 117, 132, 137, 142, 147–148, 238, 258, 285, 288; cf. 2.264 concerning Socrates and 2.267 about Ninus the priestess. Josephus summarizes the accusations in 2.1–7 and 2.288–289. Cf. also ἀπολογία (2.147; cf. the non-technical use in 2.275) and ἀναπολόγητα (2.137).

<sup>107</sup> *CA* 1.105, 303; 2.2, 138. Cf. διελέγχω (2.149).

<sup>108</sup> See besides μάρτυς, μαρτυρία and μαρτυρέω: *CA* 1.4, 50, 52, 59, 69, 70, 74, 93, 104, 106, 112, 115, 127, 129, 160, 200, 205, 217, 219, 227; 2.1, 136, 155, 168, 279, 288, 290.

<sup>109</sup> Aristotle, *Rhet.* 1.3.3.

<sup>110</sup> See further S. Mason’s contribution to this volume.

<sup>111</sup> Cohen, “History,” 6–7.

<sup>112</sup> Mason, with further references. Hay, “Proof,” 97, argues that *CA* was primarily intended for gentile readers and meant as appeal to conversion.

and others that a proselytizing impulse is present, or perhaps even dominant, in *Contra Apionem*, we believe that this interpretation should be integrated with an evaluation of the pervasive use of forensic rhetoric. In other words, the clear shift in perspective at 2.145 from refutation arguments to speech of praise and the concomitant shifts in rhetorical style need to be explained in terms of the purpose and structure of the work as a whole.

3.2 Josephus' systematic refutation is apparent from his use of a set of technical terms which originate in dicanic speech. Several times Josephus draws an analogy between his discussion of accusations and the procedure during a lawsuit.<sup>113</sup> This connection between *Contra Apionem* and forensic speech calls for broader research into the correspondences between the theory and the practice of forensic speech. We will here concentrate upon the connection between Josephus' modes of refutation and remarks on argumentation found in the most influential ancient treatment of rhetoric, Aristotle's *The Art of Rhetoric*. First, we shall briefly refer to some basic distinctions between types of proof and types of argumentation. Secondly, we shall discuss Josephus' way of dealing with the accusations and slander of his opponents in detail.

Aristotle describes three kinds of speeches, deliberative, forensic and epideictic (see e.g. 1.3.3).<sup>114</sup> While these categories do not strictly account for the complex nature of Josephus' work, they allow the student of rhetoric to make distinctions between one mode and another. In addition to these general categories, Aristotle defines two kinds of proof, inartificial proofs which simply exist or can be taken into use (ἄτεχνοι πίστεις, *Rhet.* 1.2.2; 1.15.1–33), and artificial proofs, which have to be invented by the orator (ἔντεχνοι πίστεις, 1.2.2). In his extended discussion of the various kinds of πίστεις,<sup>115</sup> Aristotle

<sup>113</sup> At the beginning of Josephus' refutation of Apion (CA 2.5), Josephus comments that he ought not skip over Apion "who has written an indictment (κατηγορία) of us formal enough for a court of law (ὡς ἐν δίκη)." At the end of this refutation, just before he is to begin his panegyric, Josephus concludes that Apion's gruesome death is appropriate punishment (δοῦναι δίκην τὴν πρέπουσαν) for his wrongful accusations of the Jews and his maligning his own country's laws (2.143–144).

<sup>114</sup> For introductory information and references, see W. Eisenhut, *Einführung in die antike Rhetorik und ihre Geschichte* (Darmstadt: 1982); G. A. Kennedy, *Aristotle On Rhetoric: A Theory of Civic Discourse, Newly Translated with Introduction, Notes, and Appendixes* (New York-Oxford: 1991); D. J. Furley & A. Nehamas (eds.), *Aristotle's Rhetoric: Philosophical Essays* (Princeton: 1994).

<sup>115</sup> *Rhet.*, 1.15.3–33; 2.20.1–26.5; 3.17.1.

distinguishes five kinds of proof which are inartificial and which are specifically suited for use in forensic speech: laws (νόμοι), witnesses (μάρτυρες), contracts (συνθήκαι), torture (βάσανοι) and oaths (ὄρκοι).<sup>116</sup> These types of proof are contrasted with probabilities which can be employed in the case that no witnesses can be produced (ὅτι ἐκ τῶν εἰκότων δεῖ κρίνειν, 1.15.17). As we shall argue below, Josephus appeals to several of these Aristotelian kinds of inartificial proof: laws, witnesses and probabilities. Other passages of Aristotle's famous work, however, also serve to clarify Josephan practice, for Josephus draws freely on various kinds of proof and argumentation and combines them for his own purposes, although not in a systematic way.

Aristotle also defines two general modes of argumentation, the example (παράδειγμα) and the enthymeme (ἐνθύμημα, 1.2.8; 2.20.1-2; 3.17.5 and elsewhere). These in turn are correlated to the general categories of speech. On the one hand, παράδειγμα is inductive and is especially used in epideictic speech because it offers a future-oriented perspective and, on the other, ἐνθύμημα is deductive, based upon real or apparent syllogisms and the basic type of argumentation in forensic speech. Most enthymemes are not necessarily true, but drawn from probable premises. Probabilities and/or indications provide the raw material from which enthymemes are derived (λέγεται γὰρ ἐνθυμήματα ἐξ εἰκότων καὶ σημείων, 1.2.14). In book two, Aristotle defines the enthymeme in general and describes its specific topics, like a conclusion *a minore ad majus*, kinds of analogy, the inextricable connection of cause and effect (no cause without an effect) or the meaning of a name (*Rhet.* 2.22-23).<sup>117</sup> A detailed discussion of these *topoi* would lead us too far afield; we can only point out here that some of these strategies were adopted by Josephus: "turning upon the opponent what has been said against ourselves" (. . . ἐκ τῶν εἰρημένων καθ' αὐτοὺς πρὸς τὸν εἰπόντα, 2.23.7; transl. J. H. Freese) and the examination of contradictions: "Another topic, appropriate to refutation, consists in examining contradictions, whether in dates, actions, or words . . ." <sup>118</sup> In addition to κατηγορία and κατηγορέω, Josephus uses the terms διαβολή ("slander", "slandorous attack") and διαβάλλω ("malign", "attack" or "accuse") in several key passages to

<sup>116</sup> *Rhet.*, 1.15.2.

<sup>117</sup> See further Eisenhut, *Einführung*, 33-34; M. F. Burnyeat, "Enthymeme: Aristotle on the Logic of Persuasion," in Furley & Nehamas, *Aristotle's Rhetoric*, 3-55.

<sup>118</sup> "Ἄλλος ἐλεγκτικός, τὸ τὰ ἀνομολογούμενα σκοπεῖν, εἴ τι ἀνομολογούμενον ἐκ πάντων καὶ χρόνων καὶ πράξεων καὶ λόγων (*Rhet.* 2.23.23).

characterize the accusations of his opponents (1.53, 219; 2.145; cf. 1.70). This use of rhetorical terminology is no accidental turn of phrase, but calls upon specific rhetorical vocabulary familiar to us from among others Aristotle's treatment of cases of prejudice and slanderous attack (διαβολή, *Rhet.* 3.15).<sup>119</sup> In this passage, he describes several ways of removing prejudicial attacks, like contesting the disputed points (τὰ ἀμφισβητούμενα ἀπαντᾶν) by denial or qualifications (3.15.2) or indicating that others and, if possible, the accuser himself are implicated in similar charges.<sup>120</sup> This strategy has been clearly applied by Josephus, as we shall see in the next section: "Another method consists in counter-attacking the accuser (ἀντιδιαβάλλειν τὸν διαβάλλοντα); for it would be absurd to believe the words of one who is himself unworthy of belief" (3.15.7).<sup>121</sup> This brief and selective discussion of Aristotelian categories and strategies of oratory argumentation helps us to distinguish various Josephan strategies of refutation and enables us to note possible correspondences between Josephus' text and Aristotle's forensics.

3.3 Josephus' strategies of refutation can hardly be considered specifically Jewish, nor do they specifically appeal to Jewish readers. Citations of the Bible are rare and, except for a few notable exceptions, specific treatment of Jewish law is all but absent. Yet, the question remains to be answered: does Josephus make more specific use of Greek rhetorical strategies and traditions? Although it is necessary to proceed here with some caution, an analysis of specific passages in *Contra Apionem* leads to the observation that Josephus did follow specific strategies of refutation. He seems to have made use of a set of arguments, which he applies repeatedly and in various combinations.

Josephus informs the reader explicitly that he will try to refute two categories of accusations. First, he responds to the false accusation and prejudice (κατηγορίας παραδόξου καὶ διαβολῆς) concerning his "history", i.e. the *Jewish Antiquities* (1.53). Secondly, he attempts to refute a large number of false accusations concerning the Jewish people (1.219). Josephus makes both his aims and his basic strategy explicit:

<sup>119</sup> Cf. *Rhet.* 2.23.24 and 3.14.7.

<sup>120</sup> More extensive strategies concerning διαβολή can be found in Pseudo-Aristotle, *Rhetoric to Alexander*, a work dating from the fourth century BCE and often attributed to Anaximenes of Lampsakos (see chs. 29 and 36, 1436b–1438a and 1441b–1442b).

<sup>121</sup> Kennedy, *Aristotle*, notes that this chapter discusses prejudicial attack. The key phrases διαβολή and διαβάλλω in this chapter mean "slander" (3.15.4) or "prejudice" and "attack" respectively; see 262 n. 192 and 267 n. 210.

“I have still to deal with one of the topics proposed at the beginning of this work, namely, to expose the fictitious nature of the accusations and aspersions cast by certain persons upon our nation (τὸ γένος ἡμῶν), and to convict the authors of them out of their own mouths (. . . τὰς διαβολὰς καὶ τὰς λοιδορίας, αἷς κέχρηνται τινες κατὰ τοῦ γένους ἡμῶν, ἀποδείξαι ψευδεῖς, καὶ τοῖς γεγραφόσι ταύτας καθ’ ἑαυτῶν χρῆσασθαι μάρτυσιν, 1.219)”. It is important to note that Josephus uses the notion of διαβολή in order to formulate a task of refuting a double layer of prejudice, prejudicial attacks and slanders against Josephus himself and his previous work and accusations against the Jewish people as a whole (cf. also the summaries of the accusations in *CA* 2.7, 288–289). His own self-defence is closely connected with his counter-attacks against the critics of the Jews. The dicanic vocabulary consisting of κατηγορία, μάρτυς and related phrases (see 3.2) gives specific shape to his stated aims.

The specific methods of refutation similarly reflect this rhetorical artifice employed by Josephus. Josephus sets about his task with the belief that “fools must be refuted not by arguments, but by facts”,<sup>122</sup> an appeal to inartificial proof. He not only promises “to expose the fictitious nature of the accusations,” but he more specifically claims that he will “convict the authors of them (the accusations) out of their own mouths”, which echoes Aristotelian enthymemes belonging to artificial proof. *Contra Apionem* does indeed employ two kinds of enthymemes presented in Aristotle: 1) turning upon the opponent what has been said against oneself (*Rhet.* 2.23.7), and 2) pointing out of contradictions (ἀνομολογούμενα, *Rhet.* 2.23.23, see above). Within this latter strategy of argumentation, several kinds of contradictions can be discerned in *Contra Apionem*: 1) internal contradictions like chronological inconsistencies within a source (*CA* 1.254–287, 293–303, 312–320; 2.15–32, 33–78), and 2) contradictions between sources, for example the demonstration of contradictions between the passage discussed and other sources with a similar accusation or related data (1.293–303, 312–320; 2.15–32, 33–78, 79–144). Both kinds of contradictions are indicated in a passage about the accusers: “. . . they did not hesitate to contradict their ancient chronicles, nay, in the blindness of their passion, they failed to perceive that in what they wrote they actually contradicted themselves” (1.226).<sup>123</sup>

Josephus draws on three of Aristotle’s five inartificial πίστεις of

<sup>122</sup> *CA* 2.102.

<sup>123</sup> Οὐδὲ ταῖς ἀρχαίαις αὐτῶν ἀναγραφαῖς ὄκνησαν ἐναντία λέγειν, ἀλλὰ καὶ σφίσι



forensic speech mentioned above. Μάρτυρες constitute the single most important type of evidence brought by Josephus. The frequency of this word establishes it as a trope within the text, by which is meant, a consistent mode of presentation which characterizes the tone and setting for the imagined argumentation. Aristotle specifically distinguishes between ancient and recent witnesses and clearly prefers the ancient witness of poets “and men of repute whose judgements are known to all” (1.15.13; cf. 1.15.17; transl. J. H. Freese). It is precisely this preference for ancient and reputable sources which fuels so much of Josephus’ argument. Josephus also depends heavily on the argument of the improbability of accusations (1.254–287; 2.15–32, 79–144), a device propagated by Aristotle in cases where witnesses are missing (*Rhet.* 1.15.17).<sup>124</sup> Josephus calls upon Jewish law or custom (νόμοι) several times to support his argumentation. His references to the legislation of Moses concerning lepers (1.254–287) as well as his description of the temple and its laws concerning foreigners (2.102–111) are used to refute the association of the Jews with lepers and the accusation of the annual sacrifice of a Greek respectively. Finally, he refers to Jewish norms concerning the place and function of the ass within Jewish practice and custom in his refutation of the ass libel (2.86–88). Βάσανοι, torture, is in Aristotle’s view the weakest of the five categories of inartificial proof. He is sceptical about the trustworthiness of proof derived from torture for the obvious reason that the victim will give whatever evidence satisfies his torturer (1.15.26). Josephus, however, finds a variant on this category which he believes strengthens his argument greatly. In 2.232–235, he uses the almost proverbial tradition of martyrdom on the part of Jews for their laws as proof of the excellence of those laws and the nation that observes them.<sup>125</sup> He compares Jewish law with Plato’s laws and Jewish obedience to the law with Lacedaemonian observance of their laws (2.223–231), concluding that Jewish laws are not only the most noble but also most faithfully adhered to.

αὐτοῖς ἐναντία γράφοντες ὑπὸ τυφλότητος τοῦ πάθους ἠγνόησαν. Cf. 1.253 and 1.303. See also Cohen, “History,” 3–4.

<sup>124</sup> See above (3.2) and cf. *Rhet.* 1.2.15; 2.25.8–11.

<sup>125</sup> “I do not refer to that easiest of deaths, on the battlefield, but death accompanied by physical torture (μετὰ λύμης τῶν σωμάτων), which is thought to be the hardest of all. To such a death we are, in my belief, exposed by some of our conquerors, not from hatred of those at their mercy, but from a curiosity to witness the astonishing spectacle of men who believe that the only evil which can befall them is to be compelled to do any act or utter any word contrary to their laws” (*CA* 2.232–233).

In this final mode of argumentation, an interesting development can be observed. Josephus' semi-legal refutation of his accusers in large measure depends upon a comparison between the character of the Jewish people and that of the Greeks. The epideictic section beginning at *CA* 2.145–286 can be described as a panegyric, even though Josephus himself claims that his “object is not to compose a panegyric (ἐγκώμιον) upon our nation” (cf. 2.146–147). Yet, to this denial he adds: “but I consider that, in reply to the numerous false accusations which are brought against us, the fairest defence which we can offer is to be found in the laws which govern our daily life” (2.147). It is thus apparent that Josephus recognizes the rhetorical shift in tone and style that he makes at this point in his refutation. The distinctions in mode of speech proposed by Aristotle are not lost on him. Yet, it is more complicated than that, since Aristotle does not account for the relationship between these various modes. By contrast, the panegyric section presented by Josephus must unequivocally be considered part of Josephus' strategy of refutation. Josephus himself links these two distinct modalities by explicitly employing his praise sections as support for the dependability and authenticity of his Jewish textual witness, while his character assassination of Greek historiography is used to undermine the prosecutor's witnesses. The ignorance and ill-will of Apollonius Molon, Lysimachus and others forces Josephus into a presentation of the facts which takes the form of descriptive passages concerning the Jewish people. It is fair to say that this encomium constitutes one of the main and certainly the single most extended method of refutation in his arsenal. More needs to be done on this overlapping of category and the relationship between panegyric and refutation since this question lies at the heart of debates surrounding the purpose of the book, its intended audience, and its relationship to classical rhetorical theory. It is clear at least that these elements cannot be simply distilled from each other along Aristotelian lines of reasoning. Josephus' refutations are not just dressing or an excuse for missionary literature. If anything, the text itself presents precisely the opposite picture. His encomium serves a clear function within his forensic mode.

3.4. While Josephus may have been aware that he was blurring distinct rhetorical categories and, at the same time, did certainly rely on some of the conventional types of evidence and argumentation, the traditional Greek rhetorical system addresses only some of the

formal aspects of Josephus' strategies. A careful analysis of the text itself is indispensable. The relevant passages which contain Josephus' refutations of accusations concerning the Jewish people are: 1.254–287 (Manetho); 1.293–303 (Chaeremon); 1.312–320 (Lysimachus); 2.15–32 (Apion); 2.33–78 (Apion); 2.79–144 (Apion); and 2.145–286 (Apollonius Molon and Lysimachus). Our task will be to use our conclusions about Josephus' strategy of refutation to paint a descriptive picture of Josephus' actual arguments. In turn, this picture will enable us to evaluate Josephus' response to the charges of the veneration of the ass, the legends concerning the Jewish origin from Egypt, and the association of the Jews with Seth-Typhon which we have argued underlies the most serious accusations presented in Josephus' sources.

Josephus deals with the veneration of the ass rather summarily. Apion's accusation appears improbable in Josephus' mind (2.82) and corresponds neither with the information of other sources (2.84) nor with the use of the ass as a pack animal by the Jews (2.86–88). Josephus combines here three ways of argumentation which he often uses elsewhere: improbabilities, contradictions between sources and the evidence of more dependable witnesses. In the case of the story attributed to Mnaseas of Patara about Zabidos, Josephus turns to a list of improbabilities for his refutation: 1) there was no city with the name Dora in Idumea (2.116);<sup>126</sup> 2) the story implies that the Jews had never seen a lamp before (2.118); 3) it was highly improbable that the city walls were unguarded in wartime (2.118); 4) the gates of the temple were far too heavy to be opened by Zabidos alone (2.119–120), and 5) Antiochus IV could not have found the head of an ass in the temple if Zabidos had stolen it before (2.120).

Josephus pays much fuller attention to Manetho's suggestion that the Jews originated from the lepers who were gathered by pharaoh Amenophis to work in the quarries near Avaris and that these lepers affiliated themselves with the Hyksos. According to Josephus, Manetho drew his evidence from anonymous fictitious stories and rumours (1.228–229) instead of from ancient and sacred Egyptian records, as in the case of the Hyksos (1.73; 104).<sup>127</sup> Josephus explains that "under the pretext of recording fables (*τὰ μυθεύόμενα*) and current re-

<sup>126</sup> Concerning the name Dora, see p. 286. Josephus may have been well aware of the fact that the Idumean city Adora must have been meant.

<sup>127</sup> Cf. 1.228, 287.

ports (καὶ λεγόμενα) about the Jews, he (Manetho) took the liberty of introducing some incredible tales (λόγους ἀπιθάνους; cf. 1.267, 286, 304), wishing to represent us as mixed up with a crowd of Egyptian lepers and others, who for various maladies were condemned, as he asserts, to banishment from the country." (1.229).<sup>128</sup> Here again he refutes Manetho's claims by demonstrating the many improbabilities of the story, such as the impossibility of the task of gathering together 80,000 lepers and invalids in one day (1.257); the unlikeliness that the lepers started a war against their own relatives and rejected their own national law (1.268–269); the fact that the period of government of pharaoh Amenophis is not specified (*CA* 1.230); the visibility of the Egyptian gods (1.254–255); the fact that Amenophis' aim is not realized (1.256); the fact that the Egyptian gods were not angry because of the bodily disorders of the lepers but because of their godlessness (1.256); the strangeness of the suicide of the sage Amenophis (1.257–258); the strange attitude of the lepers to the pharaoh, because they are given a city of their own (1.267); the improbability of the cooperation of lepers and Hyksos, because the Hyksos were enemies of Egypt (1.271–272), who lived in a very rich country and had no reason to invade Egypt (1.273); the improbability that the lepers survived so long that they could attack Egypt successfully (1.278); and finally the improbability of the name Osarsiph as an Egyptian equivalent of Moses' name (1.286).<sup>129</sup> To support this litany of improbable details, Josephus points to the contradictions within Manetho's text, in particular several chronological discrepancies: the Hyksos acted in Egypt 518 years earlier than the lepers (1.230–231, 279); for the same reason Moses could not have been a leprous priest,<sup>130</sup> for he lived 518 years earlier and led the Hyksos to Judaea where they became the ancestors of the Jews (1.279–286; cf. 1.253). The alliance of Hyksos and lepers is simply denied by Josephus on the authority of Manetho himself: "We have therefore Manetho's

<sup>128</sup> Cf. *CA* 1.105 and 1.287 ἀδεσπότης μύθους "anonymous stories."

<sup>129</sup> The *Oracle of the Potter* was also presented to a pharaoh who is specified only by the name Amenophis. Cf. Stern, *Authors* I, 84.

<sup>130</sup> This is contradicted by his own legislation concerning lepers, as Josephus states in *CA* 1.281–285. Cf. Lev. 13–14; Num. 12:10–15, and see for a similar reasoning *Ant.* 3.265–268. Sterling, *Historiography*, 262, thinks that Josephus had the second story of Manetho transmitted in *CA* in his mind while writing *Ant.* 2.177 and 3.265–268. This is possible, but unprovable, because Manetho's name is not given in these passages in *Ant.* and other authors ventured similar accusations.

authority for saying both that our race was not of Egyptian origin, and that there was no mixture of the races" (1.278).<sup>131</sup>

Josephus' refutation of Chaeremon in 1.293–303 follows similar lines. Josephus once again enumerates the many improbabilities: 1) the origin of the 380,000 people gathered at Pelusium is not accounted for and 2) the reason that they are not allowed to enter Egypt goes unspecified (1.298); 3) the fate of the 430,000 people who are not driven to Syria is not reported (1.301); 4) it is unclear with which group the Jews are to be identified (1.302). He also points out a chronological contradiction (Joseph lived four generations earlier than Moses, 1.299) and elaborates contradictions between Chaeremon and Manetho or Apion (like the different names for the pharaoh, 1.295, the different reasons for the expulsion of the afflicted Egyptians, 1.294, different numbers, 1.295, and a different alliance, 1.296–297). Apion's story about the Egyptian origin of the Jews is refuted not only by a similar mode of argumentation but by specific arguments used in the earlier refutation of this accusation. It is interesting to note that this refutation begins with a descriptive passage concerning the tabernacle (2.12), which resembles the later panegyric in its reliance on Jewish traditions concerning Moses and the nature of the Jewish theocracy. The other problems with Apion's version of Jewish history have a familiar ring. He sets out to discredit his accuser by claiming that Moses' supposed origin from Heliopolis is a lie based upon the story of old people (2.13–14). Once again chronological discrepancies with other sources (2.15–19), improbabilities (e.g. how could 110,000 people reach Judaea in six days while they were afflicted with tumours in the groin and other diseases? 2.20–27) and a reversal of the accusation (Apion would betray his own people, 2.28–32) all serve to hammer home his point.

The last passage demonstrates that Josephus also employs the Aristotelian strategy of "charging the accuser with the same charge he has used against you". Josephus uses this strategy especially in the case of Apion:

Was, then, Apion's mind blinded when, in the interest of the Egyptians, he undertook to revile us and actually condemned them (ἐκείνων δὲ κατηγορῶν)? For not only do they practice the customs with which he abuses, but, as Herodotus has informed us, they have taught others

<sup>131</sup> Κατὰ μὲν οὖν τὸν Μανέθων οὔτε ἐκ τῆς Αἰγύπτου τὸ γένος ἡμῶν ἐστὶν οὔτε τῶν ἐκείθεν τινες ἀνείχθησαν.

to adopt circumcision. An ulcer on his person rendered circumcision essential; the operation brought no relief, gangrene set in, and he died in terrible tortures. . . . Apion was a defaulter to his country's laws and told lies about ours. Such was his end, and here let me bring my remarks [upon him] to a close. (2.142-144)

This court-room strategy calls to mind Aristotle's remarks about counter-accusation and accusing the accuser of similar charges (*Rhet.* 3.15.4-5, 7). Another passage in *Contra Apionem* which likewise exhibits this way of refutation is 2.81. Here Josephus innocently remarks with regard to Apion's stories that the ass was no worse than the other animals venerated by the Egyptians (2.81). But he cannot refrain from comparing Apion with the ass twice: "There is the evidence which Apion should have considered, had he not himself been gifted with the mind of an ass and the impudence of the dog (*nisi cor asini ipse potius habuisset et impudentiam canis*), which his countrymen are wont to worship." (2.85). A similar comment is to be found at 2.115: "May we not, on our side, suggest that Apion is overloading the pack-ass (*τὸν κόνθωνα*), that is to say himself, with a crushing pack of nonsense and lies?" This comment might constitute an attempt by Josephus to address the charge of Jewish ass veneration with the underlying association with Seth-Typhon head on.<sup>132</sup>

A final question remains: what are the implications of our comments on Josephus' strategies of argumentation for the assessment of his refutation of the charges which related the Jews to Seth-Typhon? The abundance of argumentation and proof in *Contra Apionem* is quite impressive, as will be apparent from our survey above. But can Josephus' defense of the two powerful accusations against the Jews concerning the Egyptian lepers as their ancestors and the veneration of the ass be considered effective? Josephus returns the charge of ass worship in equal measure. Yet, his comments concerning both accusations are at best oblique. His refutations leave several gaps unfilled.

<sup>132</sup> Cf. also Josephus' reference to Apion's ridiculing of the name of the Jewish general Onias of Ptolemy VI Philometor and his wife Cleopatra (*CA* 2.49). Josephus mentions the ridiculing of both generals, Onias and Dositheus, and does not give details. The association of the name Onias (*Ὀνιάς*) with the ass (*ὄνος*) is obvious in Greek; see Feldman, *Jew*, 500. The mockery of Onias can be considered analogous to that of the last Persian king in Egypt, Artaxerxes III (358-338 BCE), whose surname Ochus was also associated with *ὄνος*; see Plutarch, *De Iside* 31; Aelianus, *Var. hist.* 4.8; 6.8. Antiochus IV may also have been associated with the ass in Dio Chrysostom, *Or.* 32.101; see N. Lewis, "Dio Chrysostom's 'Tyrant of Syria,'" *CPh* 44 (1949) 32-33; E. Wilmes, *Beiträge zur Alexandrinerrede (or. 32) des Dion Chrysostomos* (Bonn: 1970) 118-121; Van Henten, "Antiochus IV," 241-242.

The implication of Josephus' reasoning is that the ancestors of the Jews could be identified with the Hyksos. This confirms Josephus' basic point that the Jewish people did not originate from Egypt (cf. *CA* 1.75, 252–253, 270, 278) and demonstrates nicely that the Jews left Egypt about a thousand years before the Trojan War (*CA* 1.104). On the other hand, Manetho's information about the Hyksos' rule in Egypt is hardly favorable (see above). The crux of the attack against the Jews, their lowly beginnings and their fundamentally evil and troublesome nature, in fact receives confirmation by his arguments. Even more astonishing, the association of the Hyksos as ancestors of the Jews with Seth-Typhon is left unchallenged by Josephus! Josephus leaves the sting of the accusations unanswered. Nowhere in his refutation of the accusations concerning the ass and the Egyptian origin of the Jews does he refer to the mythological background of the accusations. Let us speculate about the reason for this silence for a moment. Josephus may simply not have been familiar with the Seth-Typhon traditions or with the application of them to the Jews. On the other hand, he may have known this myth and its highly suggestive potential and decided to remain silent about it. The former option may be the more probable one, which implies that Josephus could not successfully counter-attack the highly dangerous purport of the association of the Jews with Seth-Typhon which lies at the center of the case against the Jews.

#### 4. *Conclusion*

In § 2 we discussed the incorporation of traditions about Seth-Typhon in several of the anti-Jewish accusations in *Contra Apionem* concerning the origin of the Jewish people and Jewish ass veneration. We tried to identify elements of these traditions by the use of four criteria presented at the beginning of this paragraph. The cumulative evidence which can be pointed out with the help of these criteria makes it highly probable that the negative mythological stereotype of Seth-Typhon forms the background of the accusations concerned (2.1–2.4). The associations of the Jews with Seth-Typhon as embodiment of evil and foreigners helps us to understand the outrageously negative statements about the Jews, as well as the devastating implications of the accusations (2.5–2.6). Our tentative comparison of Josephus' ways of refuting the accusations against his earlier work on the Jewish

antiquities and those against the Jewish people with Aristotle's discussion of proofs in discourses can be considered a plea for a comprehensive investigation of Josephus' rhetorical strategies against the background of Graeco-Roman rhetorics (3.1-3). On the surface level, Josephus' refutations seem impressive and quite convincing. He has clearly used specific strategies of argumentation (3.4) which correspond in certain formal ways to modes of speech and echo strategies of refutation discussed by Aristotle. Yet, a careful reading implies that Josephus' refutations leave certain key charges unanswered. The unflattering association between the Jews and the Hyksos contains a poisonous kernel. Josephus was probably not aware of associations between the archetypal Egyptian myth of Seth-Typhon in the libels transmitted by him and its devastating impact on their readers, especially those familiar with Egyptian culture. This perception of the Jewish people as a foreign force which introduces chaos into the cosmic and human order must in part be seen as the cultural background for the events which were to follow in Egypt only half a generation after the publication of Josephus' refutation.