

55). I think that it would be impossible to state the priority of grace any more clearly than did these ancient Jewish theologians.

As David Daube has pointed out, 'the abstract or general goes on unremarked for very long where the concrete or specific monopolizes attention . . .'⁵⁷ The generalizing terms 'prevenient grace', 'the priority of gift to demand', and 'the indicative precedes the imperative' reveal theological abstraction based on concrete points. The story that God redeemed Israel from Egypt before requiring obedience to the law is in Exodus, but Exodus does not use these or similar phrases. Even Paul did not coin the generalization 'grace precedes demand'. But that idea is as clear in non-Christian Jewish literature as it is in the letters of Paul. Rabbis urged that the Jews in Egypt merited extinction, but that God saved them instead.⁵⁸ Why did God wait until Ex. 20 before giving the Ten Commandments? Because he chose to redeem his people first, and only then to require them to obey his law.⁵⁹ Why do Jews bring first fruits and say the avowal? In thanks to God for delivering his people and giving them a land to farm. What do Jews pray in the temple? They offer thanks to God for his mercies. Why do Jews post mezuzot and wear tefillin? To display the loving care with which God surrounds them (all from Josephus).

Thus far we have seen that, in the common Jewish view, God graciously chose Israel and gave them his law; that they were to obey it; that transgression was punished and obedience rewarded; that God's grace modified punishment in several ways, since God wished not to condemn and destroy; that he displayed mercy so as to lead people to repentance; that they could repent and atone; that God could also effect atonement by punishing those who were basically loyal to him; that obedience and atonement kept people in the covenant of grace.

We have thus far, however, said little about the ultimate outcome of human life. What did the future hold?

Hopes for the Future

Judaism was not primarily a religion of individual salvation. An abiding concern was that God should maintain his covenant with the Jewish *people* and that the *nation* be preserved. One of Josephus' strongest and most convincing claims was that Jews had remained true to the election and the law through thick and thin. No other nation showed such commitment to its constitution (e.g. *Apion* 2.234). National survival looms much larger than does individual life after death, and so we shall begin with hopes for the nation's future.

The future of Israel

Most Jews in Palestine in the Roman period longed for 'freedom'. It is doubtful that even the chief priests and the 'powerful', the principal beneficiaries of direct Roman rule in Judaea, truly liked having to answer to Rome. Herod enjoyed autonomy in internal affairs, but he must at times have wished that Rome did not look over his shoulder. Herod's descendants were prevented from warring on each other because they were all answerable to Rome, and this was doubtless of benefit to them; but some of them would have liked to have been independent kings. 'Freedom', as long as it remained undefined, was something Jews could agree on, rich and poor alike, though they may have hesitated to use the word. The Romans knew perfectly well one of the things it meant.

There agreement stopped: it did not run very far. One person's freedom was another's bondage. The Hasmoneans, descendants of the family that liberated Israel from the Seleucid yoke, were seen by many as imposing a worse one. Direct rule by Rome would be better. Open the gates to Pompey! (*War* 1.142f.). Later, some wanted the gates to be opened to Herod rather than to be ruled by Antigonus (*Antiq.* 15.3). There were periods when the only ones at peace were those who so defined their desire for freedom that it

did not conflict with others' desire for domination. The Pharisees, it seems, finally mastered this art (ch. 18). They caused the aristocrats to flee Jerusalem during their tenure of power under Salome Alexandra (76–67); but when Aritobulus II, the supporter of the aristocrats, seized the throne and the high priesthood after his mother's death (*War* 1.117–21), the Pharisees obviously laid low. We do not hear of wholesale executions. Decades later (c. 20 BCE) they refused Herod's loyalty oath, fifteen years later two of their teachers urged young men to take down Herod's golden eagle from the temple (5–4 BCE), and after one more decade some supported Judas the Galilean (CE 6); but mostly they kept their discontent to themselves. We may suppose that they were free to do what they thought most important: worship God and live by the law. But we may be sure that they continued to hope for something other than the alliance between the Roman administrators and the chief priests.

Hope for the future ran the full gamut from plotting revolt and storing arms to praying quietly that God would do something to change things. In theory, we might distinguish the goal – a longed-for better time – from the means – prayer, bearing arms and the like. Some people had very modest hopes, such as a better high priest or greater prosperity, while others had grandiose dreams, such as the subjugation or conversion of the Gentiles. Some were willing, some unwilling to countenance or participate in violence in order to accomplish what they wanted. Our information, however, is sketchy, and we cannot always describe both means and ends. There is more evidence about what people were willing to do to hasten a better day than there is about what it would be like, but in both cases we can discern a wide variety. It is this range that I wish to exemplify here. It may be that the Sadducean aristocrats did not hope for much in the future. The best hoped that nothing would go wrong, that the Roman administrators would be fair and decent, that the crops would not fail and that the people would not revolt. The worst wanted to get richer. Yet some, I shall show, would have liked change, as did most people.

War and resistance

Hope for the future often expresses itself in negative ways: complaints, protests, insurrections. We shall consider these means first.

1. There were those who were ready, given any reasonable opportunity, to take up arms. Josephus attributes this view to the 'fourth philosophy', founded by Judas the Galilean and Saddok the Pharisee in 6 CE (*Antiq.* 18.3–10., 23–5; *War* 2.117f.). In that year Archelaus was deposed, Rome sent its first prefect to govern directly, and there was a census for tax purposes.

The Jews had been accustomed to pay taxes indirectly to Rome, since Rome levied tribute on Herod and his descendants. Judas the Galilean and his followers chose to fight to resist the significant further imposition of foreign rule that direct taxation represented (this is the motive assigned them in *Antiq.* 18.4).

In the *War* Josephus wrote that Judas' party had nothing in common with the others, while in the *Antiquities* he said that it was in full agreement with the Pharisees, except that its members loved freedom more than life. These are two different attempts to deny that Jews in general wanted political freedom and were prepared to fight for it and if need be to die. In fact, as we saw in ch. 4, the uprising led by Judas the Galilean was preceded by similar incidents, as it was followed by them; the fourth philosophy was not entirely new. In ch. 18 we shall explore more fully the relationship between the fourth philosophy and the Pharisees; here we note only the alliance.

A long-standing scholarly convention has been to identify the 'fourth philosophy' as a party or sect, to call its members 'the Zealots', and to think that the Zealot party was the freedom movement that eventually took Israel into war against Rome. On this view, a single party endured from 6 CE until the fall of Matsada, championing revolution throughout the entire period. The Zealot party had a radical wing, called 'the Sicarii', 'assassins'.

There are two faults with this view. Terminologically, the title 'the Zealots' (with a capital Z) is best used as Josephus used it: the name of a group that emerged part of the way through the great revolt, attacked and defeated the aristocratic leaders, executed some of the remaining aristocrats, and defended Jerusalem to the bitter end (*War* 2.651; 4.160–6.148; 7.268). The Sicarii were not a branch of this group; they arose earlier and had a separate history. It is, I realize, convenient to have a blanket name for insurgents, and 'Zealots' seems like a good one, since the ideal of zeal for the law was well established. Nevertheless, it would be better if we did not use a single name, and especially if we did not call all insurgents 'Zealots'. (1) That name refers to a specific group at a specific period. (2) The use of one party label to cover diverse movements over a long period incorrectly implies that the motive and rationale for uprisings remained constant.¹ There was, of course, the general issue of freedom: freedom to live according to the law as we see it; freedom from the Hasmoneans, from Rome, from Herod – and so on. It is, however, misleading to think that there was a single overarching concern that triggered every insurgency.

The more important issue is whether or not there was a continuing *party* with a consistent philosophy: armed revolt. By naming the fourth philosophy along with the other parties (Pharisees, Sadducees and Essenes), Josephus implies that there was. Many scholars, even some who know that Judas the

Galilean should not be called a Zealot, and who do not merge all the different protesters into one party, accept Josephus' implication and speak of Judas as founding a continuing 'sect'. The difficulty with this is that the party disappears from Josephus' account for sixty years (6–66 CE). If throughout this period a significant party championed armed revolt, why do we not hear more about it? There were lots of occasions during those sixty years that a party committed to revolution could have used to foment open revolt. Rhoads attempts to do justice to this fact, while still accepting Josephus' statement that Judas founded a 'philosophy'; he concludes that Judas founded a sect (though it was not called 'Zealot'), but that it was quiescent for a full generation, from 6 to 44 CE, and that even after 44 it was too minor to deserve separate mention.² It would be better to admit that there is no evidence of a continuing party. Judas inspired one revolutionary outburst among many. Josephus wanted to isolate rebels, and he did this in part by relegating them to a separate 'philosophy'.

The philosophy that Josephus ascribes to Judas the Galilean is 'no master but God' (to use the common paraphrase of Josephus' various phrases: *War* 2.118; *Antiq.* 18.23). The determination to be ruled by God alone is also ascribed to the Sicarii, who defended Matsada (*War* 7.323; that these rebels were Sicarii: *War* 4.516), and who killed themselves rather than submit to Rome. Other Sicarii escaped to Egypt (*War* 7.410f.), where they were eventually captured. 'Under every form of torture and laceration of body, devised for the sole object of making them acknowledge Caesar as master, not one submitted . . .' (7.418). Does 'no master but God' prove that Judas the Galilean founded a party, later called 'the Sicarii', that was comparable to the Essenes, Sadducees and Pharisees?

The fact that this slogan comes up twice does not prove that Judas founded a 'party'. I offer an analogy. Addressing the Virginia House of Burgesses, in the period leading up to the American Revolution, Patrick Henry proclaimed, 'I know not what course others may take, but as for me, give me liberty or give me death'. Today, New Hampshire puts on its automobile licence plates 'live free or die'. This does not prove that Patrick Henry founded a party, the remnants of which are now to be found in New Hampshire. In between, lots of Americans fought and died for freedom, though they did not necessarily chant the slogan. Did the soldiers from the Midwest and Northeast, whom Grant hurled against the Army of Northern Virginia, with the intention, among others, of crushing slavery, think of themselves as belonging to the party of the Virginian Patrick Henry? Were they all from New Hampshire? The answers are obvious.

Let us pose another question: just what did 'no master but God' mean? Apparently not anarchy. The holders of this philosophy seem to have applied it principally against being ruled by Rome, usually not against native rulers, and never against their own leaders.³ This observation, together with our analogy

with Patrick Henry, help us to see the 'fourth philosophy' for what it was. It was a radical religio-political ideal that could be called forth by various people to justify extreme action at what they regarded as moments of crisis, and that they could thus apply selectively. 'No master but God' goes only a step beyond the common view, 'die rather than tolerate heinous transgression'. The question is when one applies one of these principles. Once articulated, they are available to be used or exploited.

This gives us a better notion of 'the fourth philosophy' than does the idea of a party that had a constant platform in favour of revolt, but that was inactive for decades. There was, however, a connection between Judas the Galilean and the Sicarii besides the slogan: there was a family relationship. Menahem, a son of Judas, set himself up as a tyrant in the early stages of revolt. He was overthrown and killed. It was some of his followers, led now by Eleazar, a relative, who escaped to Matsada (*War* 2.433–48); these people were Sicarii, as we noted above. Thus while Judas did not found a party, he did have an heir, who was connected with the Sicarii, the group that used Judas' slogan.

The slogan may have been used by relatively few, but many Jews over the years were ready to bear arms and risk death whenever there seemed a fair opportunity to rouse the populace against the Romans. Although a party founded by Judas is not likely, a recurring spirit of readiness to fight and die is certain.

Many hard-nosed revolutionaries thought concretely and hoped for practical results.⁴ When the great revolt began, the Roman empire looked shaky. Nero had been emperor for fourteen years, and he had deteriorated as a ruler. He sought prizes as a performing artist while the business of empire languished. He would last only three more years, and when he was forced to commit suicide confusion reigned: in 69 there were four emperors. The situation in Rome was stabilized only when Vespasian left the campaign in Palestine in the hands of his son, Titus, and returned to Rome to take control. The Jewish rebels had the misfortune to face the general who turned out to be the man capable of saving the empire. They did not know this in advance. At first, they could hope that, just as internal confusion in Syria had allowed the Hasmoneans to establish an independent state, Rome's instability would give them the chance of victory. As we shall see more fully below, Rome's opening moves were clumsy and ineffectual. This induced others to join the rebel cause. They did not know that Rome was only pausing for breath and that its greatest period lay ahead.

There is not enough evidence to say how concretely the insurgents of 6 CE (Judas the Galilean) had thought. Probably they calculated their chances and decided that they might have limited but useful success. At that point, Rome had not ruled any of Palestine directly, but rather had relied on Hyrcanus II,

Antipater, Herod and Herod's sons. When Archelaus was deposed, some thought that they might get rid of the Herodians and either establish an independent state or a client state that was more to their liking.

2. Over the years many other Jews had shown themselves ready to die passively rather than to transgress the law or to have it transgressed. We cited instances above of people who, insisting that they did not intend to fight, asked to be killed rather than have an atrocity continue. One of the principal instances came early in Pilate's prefecture, after he introduced Roman standards into Jerusalem (c. 26 CE; *War* 2.169-174), another when Caligula ordered Petronius to set up his statue in the temple (c. 41; *Antiq.* 18.261-278). Josephus attributes to the latter group of protesters such statements as these: 'slay us first before you carry out these resolutions' (18.264); 'we will sooner die than violate our laws' (18.271). In the *Testament of Moses* (first century CE) there is a sentence that serves to sum up an attitude that runs unchecked from Antiochus IV to Hadrian - that is, from Mattathias and his sons to Bar Kokhba: 'Let us die rather than transgress the commandments of the Lord of lords, the God of our fathers' (*T. Moses* 9.6).

We may put into this category those who were guilty of pulling down the eagle and the teachers who inspired young men to do the deed. These men did not intend warfare; rather they carried out a single, non-military act of protest against transgression of the sanctity of the temple, especially against profaning it with a symbol that reminded people of Rome.

What such people as these hoped for, at least in the first instance, was simply for the Romans - or the Hasmoneans or Herod - to leave Jerusalem, and especially the temple, alone. If this were granted, they could tolerate more-or-less anything else.

It would seem, however, that those who wanted to be allowed to worship and live in their own way had a second hope if the first, modest hope was disappointed. According to Josephus, the men who faced Petronius, at the time of the crisis precipitated by Caligula, reasoned that, for those who were determined to take the risk, 'there is hope even of prevailing; for God will stand by us if we welcome danger for His glory' (*Antiq.* 18.267). They hoped, that is, that if reason did not prevail God would intercede, either fighting on their side (on which, see 3 below), or producing a miracle that would confound the enemies of his temple.

In the case of the teachers who inspired some of the young to take down the offending eagle, they first of all hoped that Herod was too near death to do anything. Their second hope, in case that turned out not to be true, was personal life after death: 'immortality and an eternally abiding sense of felicity' (*War* 1.650).

It does not matter whether or not the participants in these two events actually reasoned in these ways. Josephus, as a good Hellenistic historian, attributed to them sentiments appropriate to the occasion. The thoughts that God might directly intervene, or that he would give eternal life to those who served him, were current in his day and were relied on by those who risked their lives for a different future.

3. Intermediate between these two types were those who looked forward to a great war, one in which God, either directly or by proxy, would play the crucial role, but in which they too would bear arms. Some of these wrote up their visions of the future. The principal two documents are *Ps. Sol.* 17 and the *War Rule* from Qumran. According to the former the Davidic Messiah will enter Jerusalem, banish the Gentiles and also Jewish sinners (especially the Hasmonean priests), and establish the new Israel, with the tribes reassembled, as an ideal kingdom. Though the son of David will not trust in arms and numbers, but in God alone, one supposes that the author of the psalm thought that he would spill some blood. According to the *War Rule* the sectarians - who will have become a full true Israel, with all twelve tribes represented - will first destroy the sinful Israelites and then the Gentiles, with God himself striking the decisive blows.⁵

The pious of the *Psalms of Solomon* and the Qumran sectarians were not the only ones who harboured the hope that God would fight on their side. When Felix was procurator (52-59 CE), a man known only as 'the Egyptian' gathered a multitude and marched on Jerusalem. (The multitude was put by Josephus, *War* 2.261, at 30,000; by Acts 21.38 at 4,000.) According to one of Josephus' accounts, the Egyptian marched from the desert to the Mount of Olives. He intended to 'force an entrance into Jerusalem and, after overpowering the Roman garrison, to set himself up as tyrant of the people' (*War* 2.261-263). According to the other, the Egyptian rallied 'the masses of the common people' to join him on the Mount of Olives. He claimed that 'at his command Jerusalem's walls would fall down' (*Antiq.* 20.169-172). In either case heavily armed Roman troops put an end to his hopes, killing many of his followers, though he himself escaped.

That the Egyptian seriously thought that his rabble could conquer Jerusalem by conventional means must be doubted. The statement in the *Antiquities*, that he and his followers expected the walls to fall down, probably points in the right direction, at least in part. His followers had not counted swords, spears and armour, and concluded that they could outman and outfight the Romans; they thought, rather, that if they would take the first step, if putting their lives at risk they would strike the first blow, God himself would see to the rest.

Earlier, when Fadus was procurator (44-46), an apparently even less

militaristic prophet, Theudas, had assembled 'the majority of the masses' in the desert (400 according to Acts 5.36), persuaded them to bring along their possessions, and promised that when they reached the Jordan the river would part. Fadus sent cavalry, and many were killed, including Theudas, whose head was brought to Jerusalem (*Antiq.* 20.97-98).

In summaries Josephus points towards other such instances. In the time of Felix various 'deceivers' persuaded crowds to follow them to the desert 'under the belief that God would there give them tokens of deliverance' (*War* 2.258-260; *Antiq.* 20.167-168).

It seems that, apart from the mob led by the Egyptian, none of these groups intended to fight, or at least not much. The people who followed other prophets in the wilderness expected God to give 'tokens of deliverance', such as those that had accompanied the Exodus and the conquest of Canaan (parting of the water, collapse of the walls). They probably thought that, by stepping boldly forth and risking their lives, they would hasten the day of their deliverance, but they looked to God as the commander-in-chief who would strike the decisive blow. Their vision of the future probably differed from that of the readers of the *War Rule* only in degree. They would have to fight less hard than the Qumran sectarians thought. In all these instances redemption was basically up to God.

This hope never entirely vanished. When the Roman troops set fire to the last temple portico, 'poor women and children of the populace and a mixed multitude' - the same sort of people who followed earlier prophets of salvation - were burned alive, having followed a prophet who said that God commanded them to go to the temple, there to receive 'the tokens of their deliverance'. Josephus adds that this prophet was not alone and that others had bidden people to 'await help from God' (*War* 6.283-7; cf. 1.347).

It should be emphasized that most ancients expected God (or one of the gods) to take a direct hand in human affairs; and, in fact, they saw him as having done so no matter what the outcome. If failure and death were the result, it was because God willed it. As we saw in ch. 13, Josephus thought that God intended the Jews to lose their war against Rome. The temple had been fouled by the assassinations of the Sicarii, and there were other transgressions. The result was that God 'brought the Romans upon us and purification by fire upon the city, while He inflicted slavery upon us together with our wives and children; for He wished to chasten us by these calamities' (*Antiq.* 20.166).

From the point of view of ancient thinkers, matters could just as easily have gone the other way. It was not a question of calculating military strength, but rather of what God chose. Jews of all persuasions kept hoping that he would choose to back them. Josephus describes the 'impostors and deceivers' who

promised the people signs of salvation as thinking that these would be 'in harmony with God's design' or 'providence' (*Antiq.* 20.168).⁶

Josephus attributes belief in 'free will' to the Sadducees, and it is conceivable (barely) that they did not think that God controlled history. But everyone else did. God was thought to make all the real decisions. Those who hoped to trigger divine intervention in the cause of freedom were not, by the standards of the time, members of the lunatic fringe. The real question was whether Israel had suffered enough - as the second Isaiah had long since proclaimed (Isa. 40.2) - or whether the sins of the people required still further punishment at the hands of the Gentiles. Many people thought that the time was right for God to free his people from their bondage. They thought that they did not have to do much, but rather just to provide the right occasion and encourage God's action by demonstrating their trust in him. Their trust, after all, was based on the assurance of God's own word, as reported by Isaiah: 'I myself will fight against those who fight you' (Isa. 49.25; see more fully below, p. 297).

It seems likely, as I just hinted, that at least some Sadducees thought that God might take a hand directly. We may consider the career of the aristocratic priest, Ananus son of Annas. He was a Sadducee and had been high priest for a short time (*Antiq.* 20.199-202). In 66 C.E. he favoured reconciliation with Rome, as did the other aristocratic priests, but he finally joined the war party and became one of the leaders of the revolt (*War* 2.647-651; 563). When he fell, defending the temple against the Zealots and the Idumaeans, Josephus lamented him, saying among other things that

to maintain peace was his supreme object. He knew that the Roman power was irresistible, but, when driven to provide for a state of war, he endeavoured to secure that, if the Jews would not come to terms, the struggle should at least be skilfully conducted. In a word, had Ananus lived, they would undoubtedly either have arranged terms . . . or else, had hostilities continued, they would have greatly retarded the victory of the Romans . . . (*War* 4.320f.)

This gives a credible picture of a noble man: he led the fight in order to drag the war out and secure better terms.

There is, however, a further, supplementary possibility. After the opening stages of the revolt, the Syrian legate, Cestius, advanced on Jerusalem. His army suffered a minor defeat but still threatened the city. Cestius unexpectedly withdrew his troops from the siege, and as they retreated they were successfully attacked by Jewish insurgents (*War* 2.499-555). 'Many distinguished Jews' now fled Jerusalem, knowing that Rome would retaliate (2.556). It was immediately after this that Joseph son of Gorion and Ananus

the former high priest were elected by a mass meeting in the temple to head the revolutionary government (2.562f.). It seems to me quite possible that the aristocrats who stayed, including the Sadducee Ananus, saw in Cestius' retreat a *sign* that God was with the Jews. I think that we should not rule out entirely the possibility that even the Sadducees, who did not believe in 'fate', still thought that God could intervene to save his people. They had, after all, read the Bible.

This intermediate category – ready to fight, but hoping for miraculous intervention – was probably a large one and included a range of views. According to I Maccabees, Judas Maccabeus had reminded his followers of how their ancestors were saved at the Red Sea and urged them to 'cry to Heaven, to see whether he will favour us and remember his covenant with our fathers and crush this army before us today' (I Macc. 4.8–11). Yet, we know, the Maccabees were very good practical planners and knew how to organize guerilla warfare, as well as how to exploit the divisions within the Seleucid empire. If we knew enough, we would probably see that the militaristic or practical wing of our 'intermediate' group would embrace those in category 1, the hardcore, calculating revolutionaries. They too doubtless trusted in God. Our intermediate group also had a pacifist wing, those who would not plan and calculate revolt, but who would join in if the signs looked right.

4. Some quietly prayed for God to liberate his people. Their attitude is perhaps best conveyed by the end of the *Testament of Moses*. In ch. 12 God suddenly transports Israel to heaven. Others may have prayed for different kinds of miracles and different kinds of escape, but we may be sure that many people wished to do nothing except to wait and pray. They would not bare their necks to Roman swords in order to protest against transgression. They hid instead. The 'weaker' elements of the Jerusalem populace (as Josephus called them, *War* 1.347) tended to gather around the temple in time of trouble (see above), probably thinking that God's redemptive activity would begin there. As did everyone else, the meek (as we might better call them) had some kind of theology. If God wanted things to change, he would see to it. If he did not, there was no point in doing anything.

It is interesting to speculate on Josephus' own position. He was one of the aristocratic priests who joined the war, and he had responsibility for Galilee. Sometime during the early part of the war, he became persuaded that God intended Rome to win, and he found a new task, that of conveying to Jew and Roman alike the solemn truth: fortune had passed to the Romans. God, he felt, had chosen him to 'announce the things that are to come', including the fact that the Roman general Vespasian would become emperor (*War* 3.350–4, 401). This does not mean that he lost all hope for Jewish revival. Though

writing under Roman patronage and largely for a pagan audience, and though he wished to argue that Jews were law-abiding members of the empire, he still slipped in some sly remarks that show that he hoped for change in the future. God, he explained, 'who went the round of the nations, bringing to each in turn the rod of empire, now rested over Italy' (*War* 5.367): now rested, would not rest there in the future. Josephus noted that the prophet Daniel had predicted the profanation of the temple by Antiochus IV Epiphanes and its restoration, and he pointed out that both came to pass. Daniel, he wrote, also predicted the coming of the Roman empire. Here he broke off, and commented generally on God's providence, which governs human affairs (*Antiq.* 10.276–81). I do not doubt that he felt constrained from saying that the Roman empire too would come to an end and that Jerusalem would be restored; he could not say it, but he probably did think it. Earlier about Daniel he had written this:

And Daniel also revealed to the king [Nebuchadnezzar] the meaning of the stone, but I have not thought it proper to relate this, since I am expected to write of what is past and done and not of what is to be; if, however, there is anyone who has so keen a desire for exact information that he will not stop short of inquiring more closely but wishes to learn about the hidden things that are to come, let him take the trouble to read the Book of Daniel, which he will find among the sacred writings. (*Antiq.* 10.210)

Even the present-day reader of Daniel can see that the stone that breaks all other kingdoms is the kingdom of God, Israel (Dan. 2.34, 44f.). This is a broad hint of what Josephus thought would come: something that he could not write.

Josephus seems to have moved from our no. 3 (let us fight as best we can; perhaps God will help) to no. 4 (wait, pray and hope for the best). Even he, who came to think that God desired Roman victory, did not relinquish the hope that one day God would choose otherwise.

Positive hopes

I have been dealing largely with negative actions and with the means that people chose to accomplish what they wanted: war, 'passive resistance', symbolic acts of defiance and the like. Those who were ready to risk their lives, of course, often were filled with visions of a new and better age. In general, the visionaries looked forward to the full restoration of Israel. Just what that meant would have varied from group to group and even from person to person, but there was a lot of common ground, and the main lines can be clearly discerned. The chief hopes were for the re-establishment of

the twelve tribes; for the subjugation or conversion of the Gentiles; for a new, purified, or renewed and glorious temple; and for purity and righteousness in both worship and morals.

These hopes go back to the biblical prophets, and for convenience I shall illustrate the four points by quoting Isaiah.

1. The whole people of Israel will be reassembled. In particular, the ten tribes scattered by the Assyrians will be brought back to the land. This hope is expressed by speaking of 'Jacob', the father of the twelve tribes. The prophet depicts God as saying to his servant,

It is too light a thing that you should be my servant
to raise up the tribes of Jacob
and to restore the preserved of Israel . . . (Isa. 49.6a)

2. The passage just quoted continues by saying that the servant of the Lord will be 'a light to the Gentiles', so that salvation 'may reach to the end of the earth' (49.6b). In other passages there is the hope that the Gentiles will be subjugated and will pay tribute to Jerusalem.

They shall bring gold and frankincense,
and shall proclaim the praise of the Lord. (60.6b)

Those who do not submit will be destroyed. (60.12)

3. In 'the latter days' God will make Mount Zion, the site of the temple, 'the highest of the mountains', and the Gentiles will come to worship (Isa. 2.1-3). Jerusalem will be built as never before:

I will make your pinnacles of agate,
your gates of carbuncles,
and all your wall of precious stones. (54.12)

Lebanon will supply 'the cypress, the plane, and the pine', and the temple ('the place of my feet') will be made glorious. (60.13)

4. The kingdom that will be established, since it will be God's, will be pure and righteous.

Your people shall all be righteous;
they shall possess the land for ever,
the shoot of my planting, the work of my hands,
that I might be glorified. (60.21)

These hopes, fostered by reading the scripture, were widely held among Jews. That is so to such an extent that we can speak of common Jewish hopes for the future. For the sake of clarity and succinctness I shall present the

evidence in outline form. The four themes (the gathering of the whole people; subjugation, destruction or conversion of the Gentiles; Jerusalem and the temple rebuilt, renewed or purified; purity and righteousness) will be presented in that order, and passages from the surviving literature will be cited, divided into three sections: (a) non-biblical literature from the pre-Roman period that continued to be used and read; (b) Palestinian literature of the Roman era; (c) Diaspora Jewish literature.

1. The twelve tribes of Israel will be assembled.

(a) Pre-Roman era literature:

God will 'gather all the tribes of Jacob' (Ben Sira 35.11); Elijah will 'restore the tribes of Jacob' (48.10) (Palestine, pre-Hasmonean). Israel will be regathered 'from east and west' (Baruch 4.37; 5.5) (Palestine, c. 150 BCE).

Jonathan (the Hasmonean) prays that God will gather 'our scattered people' (II Macc. 1.27f.; cf. 2.18).

God will gather his people from among the Gentiles (*Jub.* 1.15) (Palestine, pre-Hasmonean or early Hasmonean).

(b) Palestinian literature of the Roman era:

Jerusalem's children will come from east and west, north and south, as well as from 'the islands far away': *Ps. Sol.* 11.2f..

The people will be divided 'according to their tribes upon the land': *Ps. Sol.* 17.28-31; cf. 17.50; 8.34.

The twelve tribes will be represented in the temple service:

1QM 2.2f.; cf. 2.7f.; 3.13; 5.1.

The *Temple Scroll* also envisages the restoration of the twelve tribes: 11QT 8.14-16; 57.5f..

(c) Diaspora literature:

Philo does not mention the number 12, but he does look forward to the return of the Diaspora Jews to Palestine: *Reverend* 164f. (Alexandrian Jew, early to middle of the first century CE).

2. The Gentiles will be converted, destroyed or subjugated.

(a) Pre-Roman era literature:

Ben Sira calls on God to lift up his hand 'against foreign nations', to 'destroy the adversary and wipe out the enemy'; and he prays that 'those who harm thy people' will meet destruction (Ben Sira 36.1-9).

The author of *Jubilees* looks forward to the time when 'the righteous nation' will eliminate the Gentiles; 'no remnant shall be left them, nor shall there be one that shall be saved on the

day of the wrath of judgment' (*Jub.* 24.29f.). In the repetition of biblical history in *Jubilees*, this is directed against the Philistines, but in the author's day it was probably meant more generally.

According to *I Enoch* 90.19 'the sheep' (= Israel) will kill the wild animals (= Gentiles).

(b) Palestinian literature of the Roman era:

The Davidic king will 'destroy the lawless nations by the word of his mouth': *Ps. Sol.* 17.24.

After the Davidic king purifies Jerusalem, 'the nations shall come from the ends of the earth to see his glory': *Ps. Sol.* 17.31.

(Thus not quite all the Gentiles were destroyed.)

In the endtime God will punish the Gentiles and destroy their idols: *T. Moses* 10.7.

In the endtime the Gentiles will be destroyed: 1QM.

The *Covenant of Damascus* allowed for proselytes (CD 14.6), and so we cannot attribute the hope for destruction of the Gentiles to all the Essenes.

(c) Diaspora literature

Sib. Or. 3 (the third *Sibylline Oracle* is Egyptian Jewish, 160–150 BCE) has a rich store of literature on the Gentiles, some looking forward to their defeat and destruction, some to their conversion. Some examples: All people will 'bend a white knee . . . to God the great immortal king' (3.616f.); those who attack the temple will be destroyed by 'the hand of the Immortal' (3.670–2); the Gentiles will be defeated by God himself (3.709), but then, not all destroyed, they will recognize the one God, send gifts to the temple, and study God's law (3.710–20); 'from every land' will be brought 'incense and gifts to the house of the great God' (3.772f.).

The Gentiles will come to recognize the virtue of the Israelites among them and let them return to their own land. The Gentiles will fare well if they do not try to stop the resettlement and rebuilding of Palestine, but if they do they will meet defeat: Philo, *Rewards* 93–7, 164.

3. Jerusalem will be made glorious; the temple will be rebuilt, made more glorious or purified.

(a) Pre-Roman era literature:

Jerusalem will be built with precious stones and metals, and the temple will also be rebuilt: *Tobit* 13.16–18; 14.5.

The temple will be rebuilt: *I Enoch* 90.28f.

In the end time (the 'eighth week') the temple 'for all generations forever' will be built: *I Enoch* 91.13.

God will build his own sanctuary: *Jub.* 1.17; cf. 1.27.

In the time to come the sanctuary of the Lord will be created on Mount Zion: *Jub.* 1.29

God's people will build his sanctuary 'unto all the ages': *Jub.* 25.21.

(b) Palestinian literature of the Roman era:

On 'the day of blessing', God promises, 'I will create my temple and establish it for myself for all times': 11QT 29.8–10.

From protests against impurity within the temple or the city, and against desecration of the temple, we may infer that many wished to see the temple and, indeed, Jerusalem purified, though perhaps not rebuilt: Herod's golden eagle was pulled down from the temple; many demonstrated against Pilate's introduction of Roman standards into the city; the 'pious' of the *Psalms of Solomon* objected to the impurity of the Hasmonean priests (8.12) and looked for the son of David to purify Jerusalem (17.30).

(c) Diaspora literature:

In the last days 'the Temple of the great God (will be) laden with very beautiful wealth', and the kings of the Gentiles will want to destroy it. They will attack the sanctuary, but 'the sons of the great God will all live peacefully around the Temple', defended by God himself: *Sib. Or.* 3.657–709. Here the temple is not rebuilt as part of the endtime, but has already been made glorious and is defended by God.

God will rebuild Jerusalem so that it will be 'more brilliant than stars and sun and moon', and the temple will be 'exceedingly beautiful in its fair shrine'; there will be 'a great and immense tower over many stadia touching even the clouds and visible to all': *Sib. Or.* 5.420–5 (*Sib. Or.* 5 is Egyptian Jewish, from the end of the first century CE).

When the captive Israelites are released they will rebuild the cities of Palestine and will have great wealth: Philo, *Rewards*, 168.

4. In the time to come worship will be pure and the people will be righteous. This more or less goes without saying, but I give a few examples. (The theme of purity of people and worship partly overlaps with purity of temple, the previous category).

(a) Pre-Roman era literature:

Placing the commandment in the time of Jacob, but thinking of his

own period, the author of *Jubilees* wrote that 'there shall be nothing unclean before our God in the nation which he has chosen for himself as a possession' (33.11), and that 'Israel is a holy nation unto the Lord its God . . . , and a priestly and royal nation . . . ; and there shall no such uncleanness appear in the midst of the holy nation' (33.20).

(b) Palestinian literature of the Roman era:

Those who mourned the deaths of the teachers of golden eagle fame urged Archelaus to depose the high priest and appoint a man 'of greater piety and purity' (*War* 2.7).

In the congregation of the last days no person who is impure will enter, 'for the angels of Holiness' will be present: 1QSa 2.3-10.

In the *War Rule* the impure are excluded from the battle, again because holy angels are present: 1QM 7.5f.

The *Temple Scroll* excludes the impure from Jerusalem: 11QT 45.11-17.

The Davidic king will gather 'a holy people, whom he shall lead in righteousness . . . and he shall not permit unrighteousness to lodge any more in their midst': *Ps. Sol.* 17.26f.

(c) Diaspora literature:

In the time to come there will be 'a common law . . . throughout the whole earth'; Gentiles are to worship God, avoid adultery, refrain from homosexual practices, and not expose their children; even wealth will be 'righteous': *Sib. Or.* 3.756-81.

These four elements of the future hope were very common, but it is obvious that there was nothing like uniformity of expectation. The general hope for the restoration of the people of Israel is the most ubiquitous hope of all. The twelve tribes are sometimes explicitly mentioned and often indirectly referred to (e.g. by use of the name 'Jacob'), but sometimes the hope is stated more vaguely: the children of Israel will be gathered from throughout the world. In such instances we cannot be sure that the lost ten tribes were explicitly in mind, though it seems likely enough; in any case the reassembly of the people of Israel was generally expected.

'Reassembly' implies a focal point, and hopes for the future of the Jewish people often explicitly included the free possession of Palestine. Philo, who, in accord with his philosophical and mystical outlook, defined 'Israel' as 'the one who sees God', and who thought that the mystical vision of God was the true goal of religion,⁷ nevertheless looked forward to the time when Jews would return to Palestine and rebuild its cities (1(c) above).⁸ More

particularly, Jerusalem was the focal point, and thus its rebuilding, improvement or purification is usually implied even when it is not directly mentioned. This holds true of the temple as well. Not everyone who looked forward to the worship of God in the Land thought that a new or more glorious temple must be provided. Expectation ran the range from 'this temple will do' to 'God will build his own, the most glorious building the world has ever seen'. In the period that we study, it seems that virtually no Jews wished to exclude worship at the temple when they envisaged an ideal future. How common the expectation was can be seen when we note that in the New Testament Apocalypse, when the seer has a vision of the new Jerusalem descending from heaven, he explicitly excludes the temple, since there was only one Lamb of God (Rev. 21.22). This is a Christian adaptation of the Jewish theme of a new Jerusalem. Non-Christian Jews expected sacrifices to continue.

There was wide variety in views about what would happen to the Gentiles. The Qumran sect was hardline: Gentiles will be destroyed. Others could envisage their conversion, though when they thought of Gentiles as God's enemies they predicted their subjugation or destruction. Both views are found in the biblical prophets, and so they are both echoed in later literature (e.g. the *Psalms of Solomon*; *Sib. Or.* 3). Philo exhibits a nice balance: the Gentiles will be left alone if they do not hinder the return of the scattered Jews and the rebuilding of the cities. They will be defeated if they do.

That in the future Israel would be pure and righteous was the general expectation. The Qumran sectarians thought concretely and in terms of the biblical law: those ritually impure by reason of bodily blemishes (blindness and the like) will be excluded. Further, they applied the exclusion to the city of Jerusalem, not just to the priests who ministered in the temple (as was the case in the Bible). Other authors spoke more generally of 'purification' and 'righteousness' (e.g. *Ps. Sol.* 17).

The expectation of a messiah was not the rule. It is hard to discuss messianism in general terms that are satisfactory to all. It was once the scholarly custom to talk about the hope for a Davidic king as a standard expectation of first-century Jews. Then scholars, recognizing that there are relatively few passages that attest to this expectation, began to play it down.⁹ Now, as is to be expected, there are reassertions of the importance of the longing and hope for a return of Davidic rule.¹⁰ There are a few clear biblical passages, of which these are the most famous:

Behold, the days are coming, says the Lord, when I will raise up for David a righteous Branch, and he shall reign as king and deal wisely, and shall execute justice and righteousness in the land. (*Jer.* 23.5f.)

Of the increase of his government and of peace there will be no end, upon

the throne of David, and over his kingdom, to establish it, and to uphold it with justice and with righteousness from this time forth and for evermore. (Isa. 9.7).

The hope is missing from important sections of the prophetic corpus (such as Isa. 40–66), but with such clear statements as these in the Bible it could not be completely surrendered by first-century Jews.

Despite this, there are relatively few – strikingly few – references to a Davidic king in the literature of our period. He plays the key role only in *Ps. Sol.* 17. In Qumran, there was belief in two messiahs, a priestly messiah ('the Messiah of Aaron') and a secular messiah ('the Messiah of Israel') (1QS 9.11).¹¹ The priestly messiah was the more important. According to the *Messianic Rule*, when the messiahs arrive there will be an assembly, into which members will enter in order: first the priestly messiah, then the priests, only then the messiah of Israel, and finally the rest. There will be a messianic banquet, with rank properly respected: the priestly messiah takes the lead (1QSa 2.; *DSSE*³, p. 102).

We cannot trace in much more detail what the messiahs and the prophet (also mentioned in 1QS 9.11) were supposed to do. It appears that the sect expected the priestly messiah to run the new community and to teach its members how to live. The *Midrash on the Last Days*¹² refers to 'the Interpreter of the Law', who will arise in the last days, and the *Covenant of Damascus* looks forward to the one who 'teaches righteousness in the end of days' (CD 6.11). This person repeats, in perfect form, the role of the original Teacher of Righeousness. In accord with the general view of the Scrolls, and the importance of the sons of Zadok to the community, the end-time teacher is probably the messiah of Aaron the priest.

We would expect the secular messiah to be a descendant of David and also to be a great warrior. One can see traces of this view in the surviving Scrolls. According to the *Midrash on the Last Days* the 'Branch of David', who will be accompanied by the 'Interpreter of the Law', will 'arise to save Israel'.¹³ The *Blessings of Jacob* maintains that the 'covenant of kingship' was granted to the Branch of David 'for everlasting generations'.¹⁴ 'The Prince of the Congregation' is given a war-like role in the *Blessings*, a work that seems to refer to the age-to-come, but the Zadokite priests play an even more prominent part.¹⁵ What is most striking about the sect's 'messianic expectation' is that there is no Davidic messiah in the *War Rule*, where one would expect him to take the leading role. In the war against the forces of darkness, the chosen priest does his part by urging the troops on, but the Branch of David does not put in an appearance. Angels, especially the archangel Michael, the 'Prince of Light', play a major role, but God himself

steps in to bring about the final victory of 'the Sons of Light'. 'Truly the battle is Thine!', proclaims the author (1QM 11.1). God will raise up 'the kingdom of Michael' (17.7), not of David, and God will strike the last blow: the victory of the Sons of Light comes 'when the great hand of God is raised in an everlasting blow against Satan and all the hosts of his kingdom' (18.1).¹⁶

I believe that there are two explanations of these aspects of Qumran's hope for the future (the superiority of the priestly messiah and the non-appearance of a Davidic messiah in the *War Rule*). First, the Bible is by no means entirely in favour of kings, not even Davidic kings. There are two main theories of government in the Bible. One is that a Davidic king rules, but the other is that the priests rule. Moses handed the law to the priests to administer, not to a king (Deut. 31.9). Government in the second-temple period was priestly, though the Hasmoneans took also the title 'king'. Some people protested and wanted to be ruled by non-kingly priests instead (*Antiq.* 14.41). The Qumran sect was founded by overthrown Zadokite priests, who believed that priests were the people who knew things and who should run things. Qumran is a special case; no other group, to our knowledge, emphasized priesthood to the same degree. Nevertheless, the Qumran sectarians were not the only ones who thought that the proper order of things was for priests to be in charge, as we shall see in ch. 21.

The second explanation is less certain, though it seems to me probable. I suspect that the *War Rule* not only reveals that the climactic battle can be imagined without mentioning David, but also hints why that is so. The scale had become too large for a mere king. The Qumran sectarians knew about the biblical promises to David and his line, but they contemplated fighting Rome, and they knew that they needed divine help. Once God is thought of as doing the main fighting anyway, the need for a warrior-king is reduced. The sectarians did not invent the theory that God would fight on behalf of his people. Above (p. 287) we quoted Isa. 49.25, 'I will fight those who fight you'. Subsequent writers, not just at Qumran, often saw God as their warrior. This view governs, for example, *T. Moses* 10.7: God himself will wreak vengeance on the Gentiles and destroy their idols (though 10.2 looks forward to the coming of an avenging angel); and *Sib. Or.* 3.708f.: 'No hand of evil war, but rather the Immortal himself and the hand of the Holy One will be fighting for them'. Even in *Ps. Sol.* 17, where the son of David is expected to do a lot of kingly things, he will not 'rely on horse and rider and bow', because 'the Lord himself is his king, the hope of the one who has a strong hope in God' (17.33f.).

According to the gospels, Jesus was hailed as 'son of David' (Matt. 21.9), and descent from David is a main feature of the genealogies in Matthew and Luke, as well as being mentioned by Paul (Rom. 1.3). The importance of

David in Christian messianic thinking¹⁷ has led to the view that all Jews hoped for a son of David. That is misleading; Jewish hope for the future took many forms. Since there are biblical prophecies about the house of David, few Jews would have wanted to say outright, 'our ancestors were warned against kings (I Sam. 8.10–18), and we don't want one either, Davidic or not', but some were not enthusiastic about kings. They thought, as did the author of Deuteronomy, that kings needed to be controlled by priests, the guardians of the law (Deut. 17.18–20). More to the present point, when Jews who thought about the future concretely sat down to describe it, they did not have only one model to follow. They all trusted in God. *That* is common. There seems to have been no overwhelming consensus about what people he would use, and what their descent would be; and indeed some thought that he would do everything himself.

To conclude: many Jews looked forward to a new and better age. This applies very widely. The same hopes are seen in literature from the time of the Maccabees to the destruction of Jerusalem, and in the Greek-speaking Diaspora as well as in Palestine. The hopes centred on the restoration of the people, the building or purification of the temple and Jerusalem, the defeat or conversion of the Gentiles, and the establishment of purity and righteousness.

Life after death

Individual immortality or resurrection is not a major topic of our literature, but it is probable that most Jews expected death not to be the end, though they may have conceived the future quite vaguely. Many were influenced by Greek thought – often remotely, to be sure. The spread of Hellenistic culture meant, among other things, that acceptance of immortality was easy and, to many, self-evident. I do not mean that life after death was a major topic in the Greek-speaking world, but it was generally supposed that each person had an immortal element. In traditional mythology, the shades wandered down to Hades, where they had a weakened and not very satisfactory existence. There were, however, many different opinions about the soul, and there was no Hellenistic orthodoxy.¹⁸ Nevertheless, that death was final would have been a view that was against the spirit of the age. Persian influence, acquired during the exile and the long suzerainty of Persia after the return to Palestine, was perhaps even more important than Greek. From Persian Zoroastrianism came such ideas as the resurrection of everyone, the last judgment, destruction of the wicked and eternal happiness for the righteous.¹⁹

Philo had imbibed a major Greek philosophical view: God made the world partly of the immortal, partly of the mortal (*Rewards* 1). These two natures

mixed in individual humans as well. This is Philo's description of Moses' death:

The time came when he had to make his pilgrimage from earth to heaven, and leave this mortal life for immortality, summoned thither by the Father Who resolved his twofold nature of body and soul (*sōma kai psychē*) into a single unity, transforming his whole being into mind (*nous*), pure as the sunlight. (*Moses* 2.288)

Moses, whose two-fold nature was resolved into 'mind' at death, was a special case. But everyone, in Philo's view, had these two component parts while alive, one immortal, usually called either 'soul' or 'mind'.

The immortal part could sometimes escape the body even while the latter still lived, and look directly on the immortal world, or at least something closer to it than the world that is perceived by the five senses. The mind can 'come to a point at which it reaches out after the intelligible world' (higher than the world of sense-perception), and it 'seems to be on its way to the Great King Himself', though it cannot quite make it (*Creation* 70f.).²⁰ In any case this escape was accomplished at death. Philo does not give a picture of heaven: no harps, angels or clouds. Just what happens to the soul is not entirely clear.²¹ It is, however, immortal.

Philo, perhaps needless to say, is an extreme case. While the broad spread of Hellenistic culture may have helped incline Jews towards taking some kind of future existence for granted, the full acceptance of the soul's immortality (which implies pre-existence in some form or other, e.g. *Heir* 274) seems to have been fairly rare.

Josephus distinguished the Pharisees and Essenes from the Sadducees partly on the question of 'Fate', partly on that of the afterlife. We shall consider his passages on the latter.

1. The Pharisees:

- (a) Every soul, [the Pharisees] maintain, is imperishable, but the souls of the good alone pass into another body, while the souls of the wicked suffer eternal punishment. (*War* 2.164)
- (b) [The Pharisees] believe that souls have power to survive death and that there are rewards and punishments under the earth for those who have led lives of virtue or vice: eternal imprisonment is the lot of evil souls, while the good souls receive an easy passage to a new life. (*Antiq.* 18.14)

2. The Sadducees:

- (a) As for the persistence of the soul after death, penalties in the underworld, and rewards, [the Sadducees] will have none of them. (*War* 2.165)

- (b) The Sadducees hold that the soul perishes along with the body. (*Antiq.* 18.16)
3. The Essenes:
- (a) It is a fixed belief of [the Essenes] that the body is corruptible . . . , but that the soul is immortal and imperishable. Emanating from the finest ether, these souls become entangled, as it were, in the prison-house of the body, to which they are dragged down by a sort of natural spell; but when once they are released from the bonds of the flesh, then, as though liberated from a long servitude, they rejoice and are borne aloft. Sharing the belief of the sons of Greece, they maintain that for virtuous souls there is reserved an abode beyond the ocean . . . ; while they relegate base souls to a murky and tempestuous dungeon, big with never-ending punishments. (*War* 2.154f.)
- (b) [The Essenes] regard the soul as immortal. (*Antiq.* 18.18)
- It will be worthwhile here to give other passages in which Josephus ascribes similar views to himself, to other specific Jews, or to Jews in general.
4. Judas and Matthias (the golden eagle teachers) taught that it was a noble deed to die for the law of one's country; for the souls of those who came to such an end attained immortality and an eternally abiding sense of felicity. (*War* 1.650)
5. Josephus ascribes to himself the view that those who depart this life in accordance with the law of nature and repay the loan which they received from God, when He who lent is pleased to reclaim it, win eternal renown; . . . their houses and families are secure; . . . their souls, remaining spotless and obedient, are allotted the most holy place in heaven, whence, in the revolution of the ages, they return to find in chaste bodies a new habitation. But as for those who have laid mad hands upon themselves, the darker regions of the nether world receive their souls, and God, their father, visits upon the posterity the outrageous acts of the parents. (*War* 3.374f.)
6. Josephus composed for Eleazar, leader of the last defenders of Matsada, a lengthy speech on the immortality of the soul, in which he said that life, not death, is a person's misfortune. For it is death which gives liberty to the soul and permits it to depart to its own pure abode . . . It is not until, freed from the weight that drags it down to earth and clings about it, the soul is restored to its proper sphere, that it enjoys a blessed energy and a power untrammelled on every side, remaining, like God Himself, invisible to human eyes. (*War* 7.343-6)

7. Finally, he ascribes to Jews in general the following view:

Each individual . . . is firmly persuaded that to those who observe the laws and, if they must needs die for them, willingly meet death, God has granted a renewed existence and in the revolution [of the ages] the gift of a better life. (*Apion* 2.218)

One may make a few distinctions among these passages. The last two do not say that punishment is in store for some; since dying for the law was the topic, however, the question of punishment did not arise. Passage 1(a) implies transmigration of the soul, which is different from a happy existence under the earth (1(b)). In 5 souls wait in heaven until they migrate to another person. The phrase 'revolution of the ages' (5; a short form in 7) may point towards transmigration (souls return to chaste bodies), though perhaps it reflects the Stoic idea that periodically the world is consumed with fire and starts all over again.

It is not wise to make too much of the details of these passages. Josephus wanted to present the Jewish 'schools' in Greek dress, as is clearest when he compares the future state for which the Essenes hoped to the Greek Isles of the Blessed (*War* 2.156).²² Belief in the transmigration (or reincarnation) of souls also crops up in various Greek thinkers.²³ In some of the passages above Josephus depicts all souls as basically immortal but as retaining the individuality of a single human being, rather than as migrating from one to the other: some live forever in bliss, some in torment (1(b); 3(a)). Long-enduring individual bliss or suffering is more likely to be a Palestinian conception than is transmigration, since it is closer to Persian thought than to the Greek schools that influenced Josephus' description of the parties, and it also corresponds to Judaism's natural drive to distinguish the wicked from the righteous and to maintain that God punishes each person justly. Josephus' attempt to use Greek categories is so thoroughgoing, however, that we cannot confidently say just what the Pharisees and Essenes thought - nor even, in the speech that Josephus attributes to himself, just what he thought.

At another level, we can probably rely on what his discussions imply: it was not just the Pharisees, but most Jews, perhaps all but the Sadducees, who thought that there was an afterlife, though often they may have conceived it very vaguely.

The other primary literature is of some help with regard to the Pharisees and Essenes. The rabbis, as we saw above (pp. 274f.), believed in reward and punishment after death, but they were reluctant to discuss details.

All Israel gathered together before Moses and said to him, 'Our master Moses, tell us what good things the Holy One, blessed be He, has in