Endnotes for Part 5

Chapter 19

1. CD I.19.
2. All such ‘casting down’ allusions should be compared with CD IV.15-17 on ‘Belial casting down nets to deceive Israel’ and the corresponding material in Revelation 2:14 about ‘Balaam teaching Balak (two ‘B-L’s here) to cast a net before the Sons of Israel to eat things sacrificed to idols’ (the terms of James’ Directives to Overseas Communities in Acts) and commit fornication’ (also a part of these ‘Directives’ and banned at Qumran, specifically here in the Damascus Document); and see my article in DSSFC: ‘The final Proof that James and the Righteous Teacher are the Same’, pp.332-51.
4. Ant. 20.142.
5. Ant. 20.139-41 and cf. M. Sot. 6.8, where the actual passage being discussed is that found in the Temple Scroll, Deuteronomy 17:15: ‘Thou shall not put a foreigner over you.’ As we have already seen, Agrippa is so ‘Pious’ that those assembled on the Temple Mount cry out; ‘You are our brother, you are our brother, you are our brother’ three times.
6. See our Genealogy below, pp. 1010-11. There, it should be appreciated, Agrippa I (Drusilla’s father) is descended on his mother’s side from the ‘Costobaru’/’Salome’ (Herod’s sister) or ‘Idumaean’ side of the relationships (drawing us ever closer to ‘Saulos’, the ‘Helkias’es/Temple Treasurers, and ‘Juditus Archelaus.’ Of course, on his father’s side, he is descended from the last Maccabean Princess (Herod’s wife by coercion) Mariamme. It is here that the Rabbinic stricture that you are ‘Jewish’ if your mother was ‘Jewish’ probably developed, but it is doubtful if the ‘purists’ at Qumran would have accepted such a tenuous connection. Even the Rabbinic groups would have had to have been given pause by Agrippa I’s mother, to say nothing of both Drusilla’s mother and grandmother. In any event, as Josephus attests, once her father was dead, ‘Judaism’ as it were, seems to have hung very lightly on her shoulders.
7. 11QVII.15-19. This continues from the quotation of the Deuteronomistic King Law (17:15) in 11QVII.13-15. The first to have really called attention to the importance of this notation to Second Temple history was Robert Eisler. If he could have seen the Temple Scroll, he would have been very excited. Of course, one should also note 11QXVI.8-17, where the Scroll breaks off.
8. See Ant. 18.253-6, 20.145-146, and Vita 119. Note that Bernice’s first marriage in Ant. 19.276-7 was to Marcus, the son of Alexander the Alabarch of Alexandria (and probably Philo’s nephew), the richest man in Alexandria. Note, too, that in War 2.183, Josephus tells us Herodias and Herod the Tetrarch were banished to Spain, whereas in Ant. 18.252, he says that they were banished to Lyons in Gaul.
9. See Ant. 19.363-3, 20.173-84, and cf. Wär 2.457-93. Also note how in Ant. 19.355-9, the inhabitants of this city even go so far as to rape Agrippa I’s still virginal daughters when they were only girls after his death.
10. Ant. 20.197-215. The sequentiality here is of the utmost importance and even parallels that in Acts twenty years earlier of Stephen to Saulos. Here in the Antiquities it goes James to the riots and finally to the enumeration of the last Priest of Jerusalem. This – including the ending here in the Antiquities – is all very curious.
11. Vita 13-16. Note Josephus begins this excursus on his trip to Rome on behalf of some priests who were sent there by Felix and who would ‘eat nothing but dates and nuts’ by saying he ‘had completed his twenty-sixth year’ – meaning it was approximately 61-63 CE just around the time of James’ stoning. It would be also be well to add that this was also approximately the time Paul made his first plea to go to Rome, also just following the time of Felix’s Governor-ship. These link-ups are curious indeed.
12. Vita 16. It was not long after this that Nero Kicked his wife to death when she was pregnant, whether in Dio Cassius’ words in 62.28.1, ‘by accident or design.’ One always harbours the niggling suspicion that this
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child might have been Josephus', since he describes how well-received he was by Poppea and it is not clear when he finally left Rome. Only that he was back to Jerusalem in time to witness the events culminating in the Revolt against Rome. 13(12). Vita 13. As usual, these are "certain Priests." In addition the 'Piety of their practices' is noted and, it should not be forgotten that under the Essene 'Piety to God,' i.e., the First 'Love' Commandment, just such practices are noted. It should be noted that many individuals were sent to Rome at this time to plead their cause before Jesus, including the High Priests Ananus and Ishmael ben Phabi and the Temple Treasurer Helcias, the last two of whom Josephus actually notes in Ant. 20.189-96 stayed with Poppea in her own house. Our warrant is to try to figure out what the disturbance was that was causing all this disruptions and 'the Temple Wall Affair' seems to fit all the parameters.

15. As we saw, in Vite 364-67, Agrippa II is described by Josephus as writing him some sixty-two letters, attesting to his veracity and adding to his information in between the writing of the two works, several passages from which Josephus actually quotes.

16. We note in Acts 25:9-26:32, Paul's appeal to Caesar occurs in the presence of Festus around 61 ce and in the company of Agrippa II and Bernice, both of whom are present. In Ant. 20.214, the riot led by 'Saulos and Costobas' some 3-4 years later during the end of Albinus' Governorship when Gessius Florus was on the way to succeed him.

17. Cf John 12:10-11 with the more extensive 'plotting' preceding it in John 11:45-54, the duplication of which shows how tendentious these accounts generally are.

18. See, for instance, the allusion to 'joining' / 'Joiners' (in Esther, as we have seen, an expression for converts) in CD iv. 3 – in esoteric exposition of 'Leva'um' / 'Levites' in Ezekiel 44:15 – and 4QpNahm.8 and lv.5, with generally the same meaning of 'convert' or, in the case of 'Ephraim' perhaps, those backsliders who have since come back to Judaism. One should also note 'the joiners in the War of' of the last decipherable line of The Pacem for King Jonathan (4Q448) in DSSU, pp. 273-81 and 'joining' Christ's body in 1 Corinthians 6:16-7 banning 'foramation.'

19. Cf Acts 6:11 with E.H. 2.23,16-25 and pars. The unexplained 'stoning' (the penalty for 'blasphemy') is the same in both cases, but the 'why' is not clear. Moreover, in 'Stephen's case, despite the somewhat 'fuzzy' picture of him in Acts, 'Stephen' can hardly be reckoned a 'Jew,' so why the stoning? One should also note the 'blasphemy' charge depicted against 'Jesus' in in John 10:31-91 introducing the two passages about 'the Jews plotting' against both 'Jesus' and 'Lazarus' in Chapter 11 just noted above. Here the writer obviously understands more about the 'blasphemy' charge and thinks it has to do with 'claiming to be the Christ' or 'Son of God' (very Pauline), though 'Jesus' corrects them with the claim, as at Qumran and elsewhere, of multiple sons.

20. Here it is the Jews who are 'blaspheming' while Paul and the Gentle Christians he represents are presumably doing just the opposite. One should also note the repetitive picture in Acts 13:45-50, 14:19, 17:4 (including the word 'joined' again), 17:10-13, etc.

21. See War 3.536-41 and cf. Suetonius 6.19 on 'Nero.'
22(25). Ant. 1.8-9. Despite much scholarly controversy over this, Epaphroditus was executed in approximately 95-96 ce (see Suetonius 8.14.4 on 'Domitian' and cf. 6.49.4 on 'Nero'), in the same upheavals which seem to have taken the life of Flavius Clemens ('Clement') and probably Josephus himself – this, despite the fact, that some think Josephus (and therefore a second 'Epaphroditus') lived into the Second Century and Trajan's time, an unlikely proposition. It is for this reason, it is possible to conclude that Paul's 'Epaphroditus,' who has entrance into Nero's household, and Josephus' 'Epaphroditus' are identical.

23. Despite the seemingly mutually exclusive references to 'Timothy' and 'Titus' in 2 Timothy 1:2 and 4:10, it is difficult to escape the impression that both are the same person. N.b. also, the reference to 'Epaphras' in Philomen 1:23.

24. Cf. War 2.227 with Ant. 20.112. The former gives the figure of either 'ten' or 'thirty thousand' depending on the redaction; the latter, 'twenty thousand.'

25. War 2.223-4/Ant. 20.108. Interestingly, the latter actually calls this 'a blasphemy against God.'

26. It should be appreciated that the Homilies, which came down through the Greek, begins with the Letters from Peter and Clement to James, the latter in Chapter 20 explaining that all that follows are the reports of Clement to James. The whole of Book One of the Recognitions, which came down through the Latin and the Syriac and contains the meeting with James and the attack on him by Paul, is missing from the Homilies; while the Letters are missing from the Recognitions.

27. War 2.228-31 and Ant. 20.113.

28. See E.H. 2.1.1-2 and 23.5 and pars...

29. See Ps. Rec. 1.72-73, where James sends out Peter from somewhere outside of Jericho on his first 'Missionary' journey to stay at the house of one Zacchaeus and confront Simon Magus in Caesarea (note that in Luke 19:2-8, Zacchaeus is 'a little man,' 'a tax-collector,' who shimmys up a Sycamore Tree as 'Jesus' is passing through jericho and invites him to stay at his house there – a very curious parallel). In Josephus
(Ant. 20.142), the ‘Cypriot magicari’ he calls ‘Simon’ or ‘Atomus’ is presumably also in Caesarea where he persuades Drusilla to divorce her previous husband Azizus, who had specifically circumcised himself to marry her in deference to her father Agrippa I’s wishes, and marry Felix.

For this squabbling between Greeks and Jews, see notes 9 and 10 above (Ant. 19.357-65, 20.173-84, and cf. War 2.457-93); for Samaritans and Jews, see Ant. 20.118-36.


33. For Petronius (later the author of the Satyricon), see War 2.185-203 and Ant. 18.261-209; for Cestius, see War 1.20-21 and 2.280-564 and cf. Quadratus, the base of whose Governorship was Antioch in Syria, here in War 2.238-46 and Ant. 20.125-36.

34. Cf. War 2.239-44 with Ant. 20.130-131. For Tacitus’ comment, see Annals 12.54.

35. See n. 25 in Chapter Seven above and see ARN 25.3 (27a) for how the sages led by R. Akiba brought R. Eliezer’s body back to Lydda; also see Lam. R. 1.5.31 on R. Eliezer and R. Judah going back into Jerusalem to take R. Zadok out via the Gate to Lydda at Vespasian’s (sic) bidding and Suk. 2b-3a and Tose. Suk. 1.1 on the construction of Queen Helen’s giant Sukkah there.

36. See Ant. 20.130 above and War 2.241. Also, for the various crucifixions at Lydda in Talmudic tradition, see JBJ, pp. 494-7 and 1018 and Suk. 52a-52b, which considers that ‘the Messiah ben Joseph’ – probably the Samaritan Messiah – who was supposed to precede ‘the Messiah ben Judah’ (the Judean one) was crucified there. Also, another curious nom a diat (probably for ‘Jesus’ or ‘Simon Magus’), ‘Ben Stada,’ is mentioned in San. 67a – cf. San. 43a and Shab. 104b, which says he brought ‘magic from Egypt’ – as having been crucified there. For more on ‘the martyrs at Lydda,’ see B.B. 10b and Pes. 50a.

37. See pp. 101-107 above on the Samaritan ‘Messiah’ or ‘Tahib’ and Acts 9:32-43 on how Peter meets all ‘the Saints that lived at Lydda’ just prior to his ‘tablecloth vision’ in 10:1-32, among whom are ‘Dorcas’ a.k.a. ‘Tabitha’ a woman, whom quite naturally he raises from the dead!

In any event, ‘Ben Stada’ is probably another corruption of ‘the Standing One’ and one should note that for the Pseudoelcentines (Rec. 2.7-12 and Hom. 2.17-32), ‘Dositheus’ (i.e., ‘Dositheus’) is a Samaritan Disciple with Simon Magus of John the Baptist. For Josephus, though the ‘Dositheus’ who is executed here at Lydda by Quadratus is a Samaritan, he is ‘a Leader of the Jews’ (thus). Curiously enough, in War 4.145-6, Josephus identifies another individual, ‘John the son of Dorcas’ (i.e., ‘Dositheus’) as the ‘Zealot’ assassin who creeps into the Temple prison and assassinate Saulos and Costobarus’ kinsman, Antipas the Temple Treasurer who is awaiting trial as a ‘traitor’ preceding the murders of James’ executioner Ananus ben Ananus and Josephus colleague Jesus ben Gamala that follow.

For Justin Martyr, a Samaritan himself, in the early Second Century, ‘the Sotadists’ are definitely related in 2 Apology 14-15 in some way to the Samaritan Simon Magus. Further, one cannot go but, as we have noted above, ‘Tabitha’ is definitely a variation on ‘Tirathaba,’ the location of the activities and Pontius Pilate’s subsequent crucifixion of the Samaritan Taheb as described by Josephus, Ant. 18.87-89. Nor, can there be any doubt, that Dositheus is in some manner a Samaritan.

38. See War 2.225-249 and Ant. 20.115-138 above. The point is that in Ant. 20.142-3 ‘Simon’ or ‘Atomus’ (i.e., ‘the Primal Adam’) is a ‘magician’ who convinces Drusilla to marry Felix, while at the same time one can hypothesize that he was the ‘Samaritan who informed’ Quadratus in Lydda that the instigators of the Jewish mob against the Romans there was ‘Dositheus together with four other Religious Innovators’ or ‘Revolutionaries.’

39. See above pp. 6-11 and 224-5.


41. See Ant. 20.51 and 101 which make it clear that Helen spent large sums of money to send her treasury agents to Egypt and Cyprus to purchase grain and dried figs to relief the famine in Jerusalem. It is Helen who comes up to Jerusalem and not necessarily Paul, but Paul may have accompanied her as the merchant Ananias who got in among her husband’s harem to convert her might have done.

42. Cf. 1QSviii.20-25.

43. Since he is speaking mainly about circumcision in many of these passages, it can be assumed this is what he means, but cf. 1QpHabxi.2-15, where the subject is Habakkuk 2:15 ‘spying on their Festivals’ but which in the received Habakkuk is ‘spying on their privy parts’ (me`oreihem vs. `me`alelehem – very similar spellings in Hebrew) and ends up with the assertion that ‘the Wicked Priest did not circumcise the foreskin of his heart’ and that in the end he would drink from ‘the Cup of the Right Hand of the Lord.’ One should also note that in 1QpHabxi.8-9 quoting Habakkuk 2:16, the words ‘Drink also and stagger’ are substituted for the received version, ‘Let your foreskin be uncovered,’ which however, as we just saw, is picked up in the exegesis in 1QpHabxi.13. These substitutions and transformations are too insistent to be accidental; see my article ‘Interpreting Abiit-Galuto in the Habakkuk Pesher: Playing on and Transmuting Terms,’ DSSFC, pp. 247-71.

44. See, for instance Galatians 4:11-5:12 where he is making just these sorts of complaints and ends up with an expletive about circumcision.

45. Jerome, Vir. ill. 2.
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46. 1QpHab xi.8-15.
47. Ps. Hom. 11.15.
48. 1QpHab xi.13 above.
49. See CDiii.5-12 (giving the eschatological picture of the History of Israel) and 1QSi.2, ii.13-18, iv.9-14, etc.
50. For this kind of ‘building’ imagery and ‘puffed up’ language in the Habakkuk Pesher, see x.9-12 on ‘the Worthless City,’ the Spouter of Lying ‘builds upon blood’ and ‘the Church,’ he ‘erects upon Lying’; and vii.14–viii.15 on Habakkuk 2:4 introducing the all-important ‘the Righteous shall live by his Faith,’ ‘Behold his soul is puffed up and not Upright within him,’ which ends with how the Wicked Priest’s ‘heart became puffed up and he deserted God and betrayed the Laws for the sake of Riches’ and how ‘the sins’ of persons like him (presumably meant to include ‘the Spouter of Lying’ / ‘Liar’) ‘would be doubled upon them and they would not be pleased with their Judgement.’
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