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Prologue

The following work has been motivated by evidence that Josephus’ *Autobiography*, which was completed after the year 100 CE (chapter I), contains a cursory adaptation of an administrative report, which he as governor of Galilee recorded around late 66 or early 67 CE before the outbreak of the Jewish-Roman War. This evidence becomes apparent firstly in an examination of the *Autobiography*’s structure, in which we encounter all the passages leading up to later times as perplexing additions (chapter II); secondly in a comparison of the *Autobiography* with the *War*, completed between 75 and 79, which shows us that the former was the source for the latter and is therefore the older text (chapter III); and lastly in a close scrutiny of the core segments of the *Autobiography* which allows us to recognize with considerable surprise that Josephus knew nothing whatsoever about the great war against Rome when he was setting these passages down in writing (chapter IV). This justificatory writing, composed before the siege of Jotapata had begun, must have subsequently served as the basis for Josephus’ description of his life and for his treatment of the outbreak of war, because soon thereafter Josephus fell into the hands of the Romans and their ally Agrippa, in whose honour he undertook a systematic falsification of history for his presentation of the *War*, as will be demonstrated in detail below (chapter III).

The same relationship that exists between the administrative report and the *War* for the story of Josephus himself also exists between the historical introduction to the *War* and the parallel reports of the *Antiquities* (chapter V). In fact an examination of, for example, the observations compiled in chapter III sections 1 and 2 on the one hand, and those compiled in chapter V sections 8 and 9 on the other hand, quickly reveals that Josephus altered the events of the past in view of his changed political opinions and his aspirations as an author for the *Antiquities*, in the same manner as he had done with his own life story for the *War*. Thus the customary approach of source criticism, which up to now has made Josephus out to be a stupid copyist of the sources lying directly before him, is superseded by a recognition of his own work and of the gradual development of the unique style of this author (chapter VII); and conversely it becomes possible to construct a biography of Josephus from the differing perception of the same event as presented in the various writings and for the various periods. Whereas research
dealing with Josephus’ life has emanated up to now from the isolated superficial assertions that Josephus makes about himself in the *War* and in the additions to the *Life*, we shall avoid this unreliable and falsified material, and take as basis for the earlier period the newly-acquired administrative report which was derived directly from the events and in which there are one-sided biases that are easy to recognize and amend. For the later period we shall adopt new methodology, working with those conclusions about the shifts in his outlook that can be drawn from the deliberate falsifications of Josephus. Consequently, in chapter VIII there will emerge before our eyes a new image of the politician and author, by which we may uniquely appreciate his work fully.

About ten years ago I acquired the basic insights that are used in this writing; a primary composition was largely completed when the outbreak of war in 1914 called me to arms. After the terrible collapse that our fatherland suffered as a result of being outnumbered by its enemies, I immediately started to re-design the manuscript so that only a few passages contain the exact wording of the old draft. Just as the memory of my academic work never left me, even during the hardest times in the field, so also during the composition of this new writing, which was possible after a long interruption only by supreme exertion, I was pervaded by the proud and at the same time poignant memory of all the devotion and sense of duty that I was privileged to witness among my comrades every day, in fact every hour!

*Gießen, Pentecost 1920*
Chapter I. Josephus’ Antiquities and Autobiography

At the end of his Antiquities (20.266) Josephus explains that he hopes not to provoke any disapproval from his readers by giving a short report about his ancestry (γένος) and the course of his life (κατὰ τὸν βίον πράξεως) while there were still people living who could refute or confirm his presentation. With these words that are clearly intended to counteract harsh assessment of Josephus’ personality, the author is referring to the self-portrayal published as an appendix to the Antiquities, which in fact provides an overview of Josephus’ family (1 - 6) and deeds (7 ff.). Accordingly, in the self-portrayal we immediately encounter the defensive thinking that is inherent in the words of the Antiquities 20.266, because with the words that he “is presenting the sequence of his ancestry in the same way that it is found registered in the public records, in defiance of those who are trying to malign him” (Life 6) the author is alluding back to this sentence in the Antiquities: ἕως ἔχωζοντας ἢ τοὺς ἐλέγξοντας ἢ τοὺς μαρτυρήσοντας. In other words: Ant. 20.266 forms the transition from the Antiquities to the Life and these two works together form a unity – initially at least from a chronological point of view. But the physical layout also seems to have been constructed by Josephus with the intention that the self-portrayal would to some extent be considered as an appendix to the historical work; for this is the only way that I can understand the closing words of Life 430 where Josephus takes leave of the Antiquities and turns once more to Epaphroditus to whom it was dedicated (I, 8). From this it also becomes understandable that in his Church History 3.10.8 ff. Eusebius quotes from Josephus’ Life 361 - 364 but cites its source as the Antiquities, and that the conclusion of the Antiquities is designated to the same effect in the closing statement in Manuscript A of the [2] Life: τέλος τῆς ιωσήπου ιουδαϊκῆς ἀρχαιολογίας.¹

Thus the fact that the Antiquities and the Life belong closely together was indeed recognized long ago and has been generally accepted; but a serious chronological difficulty controverts this connection. The Antiquities was completed in 93/94 A.D. (20.267), on the other hand Life 359 mentions the death of Agrippa II, an event that is established through Photius

¹ When, in contrast to this, Vatican W adds πρὸς οἷς καὶ ὁ βίος ιωσήπου to the words τέλος ιωσήπου· φλαβίου ιωσήπου ιουδαϊκῆς ἀρχαιολογίας λόγοι εἴκοσι then this extremely infelicitous addition is of course not based on the transmission but it is rather a makeshift
(cod. 33) as having occurred in the third year of Trajan, i.e. 100 A.D. The self-portrayal written after 100 can therefore not be a part of the Antiquities, which was already completed in 93/94. Up to now this difficulty appeared to be resolvable in two ways. E. Schürer, Das jüd. Volz im Zeitalter Jesu Christi, 3rd and 4th ed. vol. 1 p. 87 [ed. The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ], has attempted to sever the connection that we established between the Antiquities and Life. He thereby quite correctly rejected a possible relation of Ant. 20.267 to the Life that is available to us, but he overlooked Ant. 20.266, a passage that is crucial to our problem; hence his expositions are inherently invalid. Therefore, most other researchers have adopted the other path and attempted to contest Photius’ report of Agrippa’s death. It is, however, unacceptable in principle to repudiate a well-authenticated report simply because it does not suit a given opinion. But in this particular case every such attempt proves that the origin of Photius’ information has not been taken into account; for it is precisely this origin that protects Photius’ report from any vacuous attack.

[3] In Life 359, Josephus explains that his opponent, Justus of Tiberias, had held off the publication of his work until the death of Agrippa II, and from Photius (cod. 33) we learn that Justus’ work did indeed extend to this point in time. Now then, if Photius, in the exact same passage and in the same context where he deals with the beginning and endpoint of Justus’ work, establishes the death of Agrippa II, with which Justus closed his work, to be in the third year of Trajan, i.e. 100 A.D., then this statement has been drawn from the work of Justus himself, which is exactly the same way, for example, that Photius (cod. 76 ex.) does not establish the chronological endpoint of Josephus’ Antiquities himself, but rather determines it on the basis of Josephus’ own statements (20.267). Because Photius’ report can be traced back to Justus' contemporary work it is once and for all protected against any attack.

For the sake of completeness alone, one must mention a further set of arguments that can demonstrate the inviability of the position of more recent researchers who maintain that Agrippa II was already dead in the year 93/94 and that the Life was completed at the same time

[addition] that was necessitated by an observation of the specific facts of the matter.

2 The attacks against the accuracy of Photius’ report of Agrippa’s death only occurred because there was no resolution to the problem that we have discussed. In Schürer page 88, footnote 20, one may read the juggling that has been attempted in order to gloss over Photius’ report. It makes a humiliating impression for scholarship to see the hoops through which even circumspect researchers have misguidedly jumped. Schürer’s own solution is certainly also

[7]
as the Antiquities. Justus' work, as we know (cf. chapter 2), was published as a refutation of the account of the Jewish-Roman War that Josephus had given in his War; Josephus' War was not completed before the year 75 (v. Gutschmid, Kl. Schriften IV, 344), so Justus could have composed his refutation at the earliest just at that time. Between completion and publication, however, Justus had left his work lying in his desk for 20 years (Josephus Life 360); so it could have been published at the very earliest in the year 95. Therefore Josephus' self-portrayal, which responds to the work released by Justus, also could not have been completed until after the year 95. The bond connecting the Antiquities and the Life is also disrupted by this, and the problem would persist, even if Agrippa had died before the year 100, which, however, now appears as firmly established. So then nothing truly remains but to acknowledge that the Life must have been written after the year 100, while the Antiquities, which forms a unit together with the Life, was already completed by 93/94. How is this discrepancy to be resolved?

The question posed here can be answered only by considering another connection: long before my attention was drawn to the aforementioned chronological difficulties, I had already ascertained that the conclusion of the Antiquities, i.e. precisely that portion containing the crucial passage 20.266, was problematic. It is quite understandable that Josephus, standing here at the end of a formidable task, would look back upon his accomplishment with satisfaction; it is however impossible that he, proceeding from a consistent mindset 'line of thought' – closer to the german??, should have designated the actual final endpoint of his work twice in immediate succession with almost the identical words (παύσεται δ’ ἐνταῦθά μοι τὰ τῆς ἀρχαιολογίας 259; ἐπὶ τούτοις δὲ καταπαύσω τὴν ἀρχαιολογιάν 267). So where then should the conclusion of his work actually be located? This is, however, not the only duplication. The reference in 258 to the “Jewish War”, now entering into consideration as a sequel, likewise discloses an exact equivalent in the words μεθ’ ἧν καὶ τὸν πόλεμον ἠρξάμην γράφειν (259). Who can in all seriousness believe Josephus capable of referring to the final conclusion of his work twice in succession and of commending twice in succession the sequel to the Antiquities provided elsewhere. It is unthinkable that 259 ff. be positioned either next to 258 or next to 267/8, i.e. 259 ff. is – let us state for the time being -- an added segment.

According to this finding, the two passages 258 and 267/8 fit together perfectly and designate the definitive conclusion of the work; because the information about the number of impossible, and he totally beats around the bush about the difficulty of Ant. 17.28 (cf. page 45).
lines together with the statement about the set of completed books and about the works Josephus planned for the future belong at the end of the whole work. Likewise 259 - 266 represents a clear self-contained unit unto itself, which, however, is substantially different from the exposition we have just discussed: indeed it similarly refers to the conclusion of the actual Antiquities, but, in contrast to 258 + 267/8 which indicate nothing about the self-portrayal, 259 - 266 leads directly over to the Life; because the sentence ἵσως δ᾽ οὐκ ἂν ἐπίφρονον γένοιτο καὶ περὶ γένους τούμοῦ καὶ περὶ τῶν κατὰ τὸν βίον πράξεων βραχέα διεξελθεῖν ἐώς ἔχω ζωντας ἢ τοὺς ἐλέγξοντας ἢ τοὺς μαρτυρήσοντας (266) should in truth be directly followed by the beginning of the Life (ἐμοὶ δὲ γένος ἐστιν). Accordingly, at the end of the Antiquities we have received two conclusions to the writing, both being viable by itself, but impossible in juxtaposition: these are [5] the same relationships as those that Arnim has proven for other fields in his excellent book about Dio of Prusa, p. 170 ff. The one conclusion (258 + 267/8) belongs to an edition of the Antiquities on its own, while the other (259 ff.) belongs to an edition of the work that has been expanded to include the Life. Thus 267/8 does not have anything whatsoever to do with 259 ff., and the date stated in 267 may in no way be transferred to that version (i.e. 259 ff.) which was supposed to serve just as a substitute for 267/8. Therefore even if the edition of the Antiquities is determined to date from the year 93/94 by means of 20.267, still the passage 20.259 - 266 leading over to the Life and the Life itself may be dated only on the basis of those facts which are to be found within these texts themselves.

Along with this realization comes the answer to the question that we had to pose above, namely, how is it possible that the Life, composed after the year 100, could form a unit with the Antiquities, which was already completed by 93/94. The answer: there were two editions of the Antiquities. The first appeared in the year 93/94; in this edition 257 was followed by the now combined conclusion of the work 258 + 267/8. After the year 100 appeared a second edition that was expanded to include the Life; in this edition 257 was followed by section 259 - 266, which was followed in turn by the self-portrayal with which the definitive conclusion of the work in its new version was reached.

3 From more recent literature I coincidentally recalled the two conclusions to Kleist’s The Broken Jug which were printed one after the other and where verses 1909-1914 must serve as the link for the two intersecting versions; or Goethe’s Stella where on page 190, line 30 ff. of the Cotta edition there is a modified version that is tied in by the keyword “Gott im Himmel” from the first version. The duplications in Josephus serve the same purpose.
From these facts the previously mentioned contradictions concerning the question of the *Life* belonging to the *Antiquities* are ultimately clarified as well. There was a first edition of the *Antiquities*, which was published without the *Life*, and which therefore includes the closing words and signature at the end of Book 20. In contradistinction to this, there is a second edition of the *Antiquities* which was expanded to include the *Life* and which therefore did not reach its conclusion until the end of the *Life*: this explains [6] the closing words which belong once again to the *Antiquities* and the signature of the *Life* which refers to them. Therefore, even though the *Life* is printed today as a separate text, such a division was never the intention of Josephus who rather wished to see the self-portrayal considered as a part of the *Antiquities*, as the very opening words of the *Life* (ἐμοὶ δὲ γένος) could have indicated to everyone. This erroneous practice of the publishers is a consequence of the fact that our manuscripts have arbitrarily mixed the text of two editions. Because closing words were to be found in 20.267/8, a new work had to begin with the *Life*; it has now become obvious that these closing words stem from the first edition, and do not belong at all in a text which includes the *Life*.

Chapter II. Josephus’ self-portrayal

1. Josephus and Justus of Tiberias

There are two direct sources available for the biography of the Jewish historian Josephus: because of the fact that the author played a significant role as statesman and officer during the course of the Jewish-Roman conflict, he had reason to make mention of himself very frequently in the description of the war. Besides this, he inserted his self-portrayal, discussed above in the previous chapter, into the *Antiquities* as an expansion, and it is self-evident that here also reference would have to be made in part to the same events. Of course, precisely this reciprocal relationship of the two writings presents certain difficulties; the younger of the two, namely the *Life* written after the year 100, is far from exhaustive, but rather presumes for its completeness an acquaintance with the older *War* published between the years 75 and 79. The conflict between Josephus and Vespasian, his involvement in the siege of Jotapata, his capture, and lastly his experiences during the siege of Jerusalem are not recounted in the *Life*; rather, for all these issues, which were of prime importance in Josephus'
life, the author refers to the [7] narrative of the War (Life 412). Despite this, the fact of the matter is not that Josephus would have refrained from a renewed presentation of all the events that he had recounted in the War, which would have been totally understandable. One should bear in mind that, for example, Life 85 - 103 reports the same facts, partly in literal correspondence, as does War 2.614 - 623, and that Life 126 to 148 stands in similarly close correspondence to War 2.595 - 613. So anyone who reads the Life and the War will learn numerous facts twice; anyone who reads only the Life will simply not learn about the most important facts from Josephus’ life. Actually one would expect either a Life that included everything worth knowing about Josephus, or a Life that presumed the reader had possession of the War, and that consequently dismissed everything already reported there with a short reference. If, on the other hand, the author provides us with a mixture of two possible presentations whose blending cannot be accounted for either on the basis of content or of external form, then without further ado we are forced to the thought that when composing the Life, Josephus provided some elements in a renewed presentation and left other elements aside for factual reasons, and that certain differences in content, which exist between the Life and the War with respect to facts reported in both sources, motivated Josephus’ procedure: the self-portrayal was to improve the presentation of the War; however where there was nothing to improve, Josephus could content himself with a simple reference to the older writing.

In fact, it appeared that the motive underlying the need for these modifications could also be demonstrated; because just before the publication of the Life, Justus of Tiberias had published a work projecting an image of Josephus’ activity in the rebel movement that did not meet with Josephus’ approval. For example, Justus had actually claimed that Josephus instigated the rebellion against Rome in Tiberias while Josephus for his part raised this same accusation against Justus (Life 340 ff.). Picking up on this, the researchers, who have recently been concerned with finding an answer to our question, 4 have repeatedly portrayed the following [8] essentially unchanging picture: in his presentation of the Jewish War Josephus had sought to cover up his participation in the conflict against Rome since he had won the emperor’s favour and therefore wished to suppress his anti-Roman past as much as possible. This attempt at denial prompted Justus of Tiberias to denounce Josephus’ lack of truthfulness

4 Besides the usual reference works, I emphasize in particular B. Niese (Historische Zeitschrift N. F. 76. 1896) and H. Luther (Josephus und Justus von Tiberias, Dissertation. Halle 1910).
and to compose his own presentation of the events in which Josephus’ activity with all its animosity against Rome would be presented to the reader. Josephus, who was living in Rome at the time, found this so distressing and was anticipating such unpleasant consequences for himself that he decided to counter the charges in his self-portrayal. Although he had already concealed much in the War, he now sought more than ever to deny everything that could convey an anti-Roman attitude on his part. Needless to say, he did not succeed in this attempt.

Admittedly, it is true that Justus’ work has in some ways exercised an influence on the formulation of Josephus’ Life, but in no way does this explain its peculiar condition; for Justus had not only provided his presentation of the history prior to the war in a form that differed from Josephus and that was repudiated by the latter in the Life, but he also recounts the actual history of the war differently from Josephus who at times emphatically stresses the sieges of Jotapata and Jerusalem as examples of their different views (Life 357). In spite of this, Josephus did not expose these events to a new presentation in his self-portrayal, which instead stops precisely at the point where the war erupted on a grand scale, in order to make room for a reference to the War (Life 412). So for this very reason the factual content of Justus’ work cannot be of decisive importance for the structure of the self-portrayal. But another point is more important.

If it is stressed time and again that Josephus’ status in Rome would have been damaged by Justus’ attack, then it should be pointed out that anyone there who wished to know it, had knowledge of the fact that Josephus had been captured as leader of the Jewish army in Jotapata, that he took full credit for having been in command of the serious battle in his history of the war to which he also explicitly refers in the Life, and that he owed his liberation from imprisonment uniquely to his personal relationship with the Flavians, who were fully aware of his past. And now we are expected to understand that 30 years after the conclusion of these events, Josephus’ status could have been damaged and not by the revelation of the possibly significant question of whether he had participated in the conflict against Rome in a leading position – for this he frequently admits in the War and in the Life without dispute –, but rather by the revelation of an problem that bears no relevance to Josephus’ status with respect to Rome, namely, whether he had led the rebellion in the one town, Tiberias; for, as a matter of fact, Josephus’ factual argument against Justus hinges exclusively on this point.
Had the Roman emperors, or whomever else one might think of, been so petty as to hold Josephus’ past against him after such a long time, long after he had been forgiven, then they could easily let him trip over facts that he himself admits. On the contrary, however, he points out quite emphatically (347), – without having been provoked to this in any way by Justus’ writing – that he had wanted to force the Sepphorites to fight against Rome, but their shrewdness had prevented this. How is one to reconcile Josephus’ alleged fear of political exposure in Rome with the author’s deliberate production of this presumably little known fact, when denial would have been at least as easy, since it dealt with an intention of Josephus that had failed. Under these circumstances there can be no talk of Josephus’ wishing to deny his activity in the conflict against Rome. Also in 104 Josephus stresses that the Sepphorites, who wished to remain true to Rome, stood in opposition to him personally precisely for that reason, and in 209 he recounts the vision that showed him his actual life mission – the campaign against Rome. An acute interpretation of these passages⁵ should actually have always sufficed to prevent the formation of an opinion that Justus had allowed himself to be led by the desire [10] to expose Josephus politically through his writing, even if one could not recognize that in reality the antagonism between Josephus and Justus lay in a completely different area. This, however, is the main issue in my opinion.

Essential to the understanding of the relations between Josephus and Justus is the long παρέκβασις (Life 336 - 367), which deals systematically with Justus. Here Josephus turns directly against Justus “and other historians”,⁶ who lie blatantly, unconcerned about the truth. “Justus, at least, has lied about me and his hometown ὑπὲρ τοῦ δοκεῖν φιλόπονος εἴναι, i.e. in order to create the impression that he has dedicated considerable effort to his work (338).” Josephus, who wishes with this to denounce the real intentions of his opponent, does not in any way accuse him of political aims or of the intent to expose Josephus politically, but accuses him rather of a motivation that is partly literary and partly related to business. From Ziebarth’s survey in his book about the Greek school system (2nd edition, p. 142 ff.) we know the importance that φιλοπονία had attained in intellectual competition. We still have lists of

⁵ In direct contrast to the point of view currently in effect, we shall later find that the War shows the greatest respect for Roman readers while the Antiquities and the Life show greater freedom in this sense.

⁶ In truth however, Josephus is thinking exclusively of Justus (cf. 367). In our passage he is using the plural form, which is as widespread as it is often misunderstood.
victorious students who proved to be φιλόπονοι, i.e. they had distinguished themselves precisely in the manner that Justus strove to appear to follow, according to Josephus. That Josephus was truly thinking here of the school competitions is apparent from the fact that he referred to the γύμνασμα ἐν σχολῇ μειρακίων (C. Ap. 1.53) in the same context (cf. p. 20). The concept spread from the academic environment to literature, and Nicolaus (F.H.G. 3.350 f.), when he had brought his work to completion, referred with pride to his φιλοπονία, which enabled him to accomplish an achievement that would have daunted even a Hercules. Now, if Justus truly proves to be φιλόπονος in his works – as he had aspired – then his historical work is accordingly commended to his readership in order to damage the older presentation of Josephus in the same way that the victors in the school competition for φιλοπονία gained an advantage over their inferior companions. [11] For this reason, such aspiration for the renown of φιλοπονία is extremely closely connected to disparagement of the opponent, an opportunity for which Justus also did not overlook.

Josephus addresses him in 357, “You have the impudence to claim that you have recounted the history better (ἄμεινον) than all others.” Justus’ words are produced verbatim once again by Josephus in 359 (εἰ δὲ θαρρεῖς ἄμεινον ἁπάντων συγγεγραφέναι): apparently they stem from the preface of Justus who, following the example of Anaximenes and Theopompus (frg. 25 Grenfell-Hunt), wished to justify right away why he had added a new presentation to those already in existence. Josephus believes that he can repudiate the claim raised by Justus by demonstrating how inadequate the factual credibility of his writing must be; thus he reinterprets the ἄμεινον of Justus by the term ἀκρίβεια (e.g. 358; 360 etc.) or ἀλήθεια (367). Surely this was not what Justus had in mind, for we learn from section 40 that he had intended to exert his effect by means of his expert rhetorical education. Josephus himself must admit to Justus’ mastery of rhetoric (καὶ γὰρ οὐδ’ ἀπειροῖ ἣν παιδείας τῆς παρ’ Ἕλλησιν), but he accuses Justus of feeling entitled to flout the truth by virtue of this formal education (ὡς τῷ λόγῳ τούτῳ περιεσόμενος τῆς ἀληθείας). Thus Justus had reproached – we may again assume in his preface – previously published literature for its stylistic inadequacy; only he among the authors in question had acquired the necessary Greek culture that enabled one to write to the full satisfaction of educated readers.

That the key phrase Ἕλληνικὴ παιδεία did in fact appear in Justus’ preface can be proven in another way: Josephus addresses Justus in 359, “If you insolently claim to have
written better than all others, why did you not publish your work during the lifetime of Vespasian, Titus, Agrippa and his relatives ἀνδρῶν τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς παιδείας ἐπὶ πλεῖστον ἦκόντων?" If Josephus, who in this context wishes to provide evidence only for the factual inadequacies of Justus’ work, adds such a statement, then this can be explained only in that Justus himself had claimed to be writing for people [12] who possessed those characteristics with which the above mentioned are endowed according to Josephus, i.e. Greek παιδεία.

But if Justus said that, as far as he was concerned, he had with intense effort accomplished a better work than all competitors by virtue of his Greek rhetorical education, then he hereby intends above all to emphasize the external form of his work. In this sense he also did envisage his readers as δεινότατος συγγραφέων (Life 340). The term δεινός is familiar to every ancient researcher from the Greek rhetorical discipline who would apply it with various nuances. In this context Justus probably did not have the particular stylistic category of δεινότης in mind; rather he used the word in Dionysius’ sense in order to designate the uniform mastery of all possible and existing kinds of style. After all this, it is certain that Justus, in his introduction, commended his work as a stylistic accomplishment exactly like the historians who, according to Livy (preface 2), wished to appeal to their ars scribendi or wished to demonstrate τὴν λόγων δεινότητα (Josephus, Ant. preface 2).

In the literary activity of antiquity, later works always had an advantage over the earlier; one need but consider how the older Roman annalistic tradition was lost after the publication of Livy’s works. In this particular case it also happened that Josephus’ work was harshly attacked by Justus, and indeed in a particularly vulnerable passage. Therefore if Josephus wanted to avert the unfavourable consequences that threatened his War, then he had to defend himself or, better yet, destroy the opponent. Thanks to the development of journals that facilitate scholarly literature, it is customary for us in such cases, to write a separate, self-contained, negative judgment of the work. In Antiquity – and I would like to see this mostly overlooked fact carefully considered – a corresponding means of publishing one’s opinion was not available to the author, and so he was forced to voice his own position by whatever opportunity that presented itself.

Of course it was not that easy for Josephus to refute the attacks of his opponent: if Justus, boastful [13] of his mastery of Greek education, proudly looked down upon the bad stylists who had dealt with the Jewish War before him, nonetheless Josephus had to openly
acknowledge his opponent’s ability in this field (Life 40). Since Josephus himself had definitely not renounced the deliberate application of rhetorical measures, but rather had drawn upon the help of authoritative judges for this purpose (C. Ap. 1.50) thereby announcing that he was by no means indifferent to form, then the publication of Justus’ brilliantly written work must have been doubly painful to him. He probably understood that he could not damage his opponent in the latter’s own field of expertise; and so instead of a head-on, open attack he chose a flanking engagement, i.e. to twist Justus’ words. Since Justus himself had claimed that he has written ἄμεινον than the others, Josephus reinterprets the word ἄμεινον as ἀκριβέστερον and then proves that there can be no question of ἀκρίβεια in cases where Justus neither was present at the crucial events nor understood the amplitude of significant documents (357 - 358). Since Justus had extolled himself to his readers as δεινότατος συγγραφέων because he mastered all the stylistic devices of Greek rhetorical art, Josephus again twists the fact to imply that Justus thereby wished to claim an outstanding factual knowledge, and then Josephus proves at length that Justus is truly lacking in this. For this reason, Josephus must deal here with the presentation of the events themselves, and it is precisely the detailed discussion of these events (340 - 354) that has led researchers to see them as an end in itself and hence to derive their view of the political antagonism between the two men from the time of the rebellion. That this is entirely out of the question is already illuminated by the fact that Josephus utters no word about Justus in the War where he mentions all his opponents. As has now become clear, the antagonism was, in truth, literary: Justus had commended his historical work through its stylistic perfection and had obviously found such approval for it that Josephus’ treatment of the war was pushed back by Justus’ new work. Therefore Josephus, [14] on his part, now attacks his competitor, but because he must acknowledge his stylistic superiority, he attempts to prove that Justus made factual errors in order to shake his renown as an author.

If we may therefore, on the strength of these observations, view the extensive discussion of the Tiberias question simply as a device in the literary competition, then a consideration of individual points leads to the same realization. The major part of the
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7 To this effect, in the Antiquities as well, he strives for the correct usage of words and for a corresponding σύνθεσις ὄνομάτων, and he wishes to spread the embellishment of rhetoric throughout the whole [work] (Ant. 14.2).
argument (345 - 353) deals with the question of why Tiberias persisted in continuous resistance to Rome. Admittedly Justus was no longer in Tiberias at that time (354) but had already fled long before (357); accordingly Josephus, in his remarks, turns deliberately not to Justus, but rather to the other Tiberians (345, 350, 351 ff.). But despite this, the entire question is dealt with διὰ σὲ, i.e. on account of Justus (345). Given that Justus cannot come into question as a statesman due to his absence from Tiberias, it follows that the presentation has been provided only on account of his literary activity, precisely in order to prove the inherent untrustworthiness, indeed the impossibility of the picture created by Justus (ἡλεύθησε δὲ οὐδὲ περὶ τῆς πατρίδος 338). A similar problem exists with the question of who had set the rebellion in motion in Tiberias (340 ff.) Justus had recounted that the Tiberians had been friends of Agrippa and the Romans (345) and that only Josephus had persuaded them to abandon the friendship (350). Josephus believes that he can refute this allegation as well, yet he does not do so out of political motives, but rather only for the purpose of disproving Justus’ claim that he was δεινότατος συγγραφέων, otherwise he would have also addressed him here (340) as statesman, and not as author.

To all intents and purposes, in the understanding of that time such a literary battle was played out in the realm of the personal. Justus had actually claimed that Josephus was a bad man – a reproach that, aside from general human reasons, cut particularly close to a rhetorical author because a rhetor can be only a vir bonus (Quintilian 12.1). In response to this, Josephus, on his part as well, now incorporates evidence of Justus’ [15] badness in his literary combat against him (355 - 356); indeed, a man thus labelled is capable of writing only a historical work that is totally indistinguishable from forgery of documents (337). However this attack also is only a means to an end, and evidence of the opponent’s badness is discontinued shortly thereafter (356) in order to resume the real literary combat; for just as Justus is attacked because of his historical work from the very beginning of Josephus’ insertion (336) so the presentation also concludes in this same vein (357ff): “You claim to write history better than others; but how can this be possible, since you were not acquainted with the events in Galilee nor with those from Jotapata because you were not present and you could not gather information? And if you should claim to have faithfully reported the incidents in Jerusalem, then this is likewise false; for you were not at all present at the war and you have not read Vespasian’s own reports; otherwise your book could not contradict them. And since you claim
furthermore to have written better than all others, why did you not publish your work, which had already been completed twenty years previously, during the lifetime of Vespasian, Titus and Agrippa, namely those who fought in this war, and who held Greek education in such esteem? You have mustered the courage to do so only now that they are dead and you need not fear any refutation or disapproval on their part. How differently did I myself submit my book to the participants of the war, even receiving a letter of recognition for it from one after the other of these participants! Titus himself designated my presentation as the only one that he wished to accept.” It is more than obvious that only the literary competitor who had vilified Josephus’ work is to be damaged here; and conversely Josephus now blatantly praises his own accomplishment to the reader.

Literary combat in antiquity was not tame; but whoever reads the personal abuse that Polybius, for instance, heaped upon Timaeus who had died long before, will be astonished that the two contemporary competitors, Justus and Josephus, indicted each other with such accusations of badness, which is somewhat disconcerting for us. It is therefore all the more important to discern the reason for this quite unusual personal acrimony. For this purpose we must first examine a similarly oriented attack that our author wrote in Contra Apionem. Just as Life 336 - 367 is an insertion into a strange context which Josephus considered necessary (ἀναγκαίαν λαβόντα τὴν παρέκβασιν 367), so also within evidence of the age of Hebrew literature Josephus inserts an attack which he closes with the words: περὶ μὲν οὖν τούτων ἀναγκαίαν ἐποιησάμην τὴν παρέκβασιν (C. Ap. 1. 57). Justus as author of a history of the war is the subject of the combat in the Life (cf. above), but in Contra Apionem an unnamed person who had dealt with the Jewish War is attacked (46). Justus had not paid attention to the truth (Life 336), the unnamed author argues with Josephus about the truth (C. Ap. 1. 56). Justus had demonstrated his ἀναιδεία (Life 357), the unnamed person is ἀναιδὴς (C. Ap. 1.46) and θπασύς (ibid. 56). Justus was πονηρός (Life 339) and ῥαδιουργύς (ibid. 356), the unnamed [author] is φαῦλος (C. Ap. 1.53). Just as the former (Life 357), so also was the latter far removed from all crucial events (C. Ap. 1.46 and 56). With respect to Justus it is written that he neither followed the matters himself nor was he informed by those in the know (Life 357), the unnamed author does not bear in mind that one may write history only ἡ παρηκολούθη(κὼς) τοῖς γεγονόσιν ἡ παρὰ τῶν εἰδότων πυνθανόμενο(ς) (C. Ap. 1. 53). Justus had maligned Josephus
(Life 337), the unnamed author does likewise (C. Ap. 1. 53). In comparison with Justus’ attacks, Josephus indicates

1. that he had presented his work to the emperors (αὐτοῖς ἐπέδωκα τοῖς αὐτοκράτορσι τὰ βιβλία Life 361),

2. that he had made his book available to many others including those who had fought in the war. Even Agrippa was included among these (καὶ ἄλλοις δὲ πολλοῖς εὐθὺς ἐπέδωκα τὴν ἱστορίαν ὃν ἐνιοί καὶ παρατετεύχεισαν τῷ πολέμῳ καθάπερ βασιλεὺς Ἀγρίππας Life 362),

3. that from all sides he received confirmation of the truth of his report (μαρτυρίας τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἐμαρτύρει Life 367). One must compare the almost literal correspondences to this from the combat against the unnamed author (C. Ap. 1.51 - 52):

To 1): πρώτοις γὰρ ἔδωκα τὰ βιβλία (namely to the emperors) C. Ap. 1.51.

To 2): καὶ μετ’ ἐκείνους πολλοῖς μὲν Ῥωμαίων τοῖς [17] συμπεπολεμηκόσι, πολλοῖς δὲ τῶν ἡμετέρων ἐπίπρασκον ... ὃν ἐστι ... ὁ θαυμασιώτατος βασιλεὺς Ἀγρίππας ibid.


Whoever should, in the face of these facts, still be in doubt that the unnamed author under attack in C. Ap. is Justus must learn otherwise from the following observation. When Josephus emphasizes, in comparison to the unnamed author, that his readers “likewise had benefited from Hellenic education” (ἀνδράσι καὶ τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς σοφίας μετεσχηκόσιν C. Ap. 1.51), it follows from the καὶ that his opponent had wished to write for readers who had received a thorough Greek education. Exactly this was expressed by Justus who, as we saw, had indicated in his preface that, by virtue of his παιδεία, he alone among the historians could write for men who had participated in Greek education. Therefore the unnamed author from Contra Apionem is none other than Justus.

But why – one must ask – did Josephus attack in Contra Apionem, without name, the opponent whom he had specifically named in the Life? The answer to this arises from the context in which the attack in the writing, Contra Apionem, is inserted. Josephus is dealing with the great age of Jewish literature and hence explains the special respect that each Jew feels towards the authentic scriptures received from God. In fact, every Jew is prepared to suffer even death for the sake of these scriptures. In contrast to this, the reason for the indifference
of the Greeks towards the older literature lies in the fact that they do not see any truth, but only inventions, in their own accomplishments as well, and that they calmly dare to write things about which they have not a clue. Thus have “some people” now presumed to recount the war without any knowledge whatsoever of the sources, thereby casting a slur on the holy name of history. By this somewhat tedious train of thought (C. Ap. 1.42 - 46) Josephus gains the opportunity to attack superficial Greek historiography as is, in his opinion, manifest in Justus’ work; for the latter was master of illusion and the art of deception which are characteristic of the essence of Greek education, and building upon them [18] he wrote his work that is therefore just as false as a Hellenic work (Life 40). Despite this, Josephus could not name Justus specifically in Contra Apionem; because Justus was still a Jew despite his successful career, and by naming him Josephus would have destroyed the entire logic of his reasoning, which rested precisely upon the fact that Jews, in contrast to Greeks, respected the truth highly in their literary activity as well. Therefore he must use (46 ff.) the indefinite τίνες behind which is hidden the Jew, Justus, who had absorbed Greek education to such an extent that he lies just as much as the Hellenes.

Now then, since an attack against Justus is not recognized until the general picture presented in 46 ff. one must also consider the remarks of 24 ff. to be directed to this same addressee. This passage also concerns an attack against historians who basically strive only to highlight their rhetoric art. They throw themselves into dealing with those fields which best fulfil their hope of surpassing others in the art of proving their rhetoric powers (ἐν τούτῳ παρευδοκιμήσειν τοὺς ἄλλους ὑπελάμβανον). Therefore some deal with the history of legends, others write encomia, while yet others, because they hope to acquire fame in this field (ἐνευδοκιμήσειν τούτῳ νομίζοντες), throw themselves into disparaging events or [disparaging] those recording such events. Josephus once more explicitly emphasizes this goal of the third group; because this is the only one that now preoccupies his mind. For this reason he returns exclusively to these people in the following section 26 as well: whoever disparages other historians is doing something that is diametrically opposed to history; because evidence of true history is the complete correspondence of all [writers] in its presentation. But they

---

8 The plural is used here with the same view as in Life 336 ff. where a group of ἄλλοι stands beside Justus, whereas Josephus was thinking only of Justus, as can be proven (cf. page 10, footnote).
suppose that they appear to be the most truth-loving of all when they recount the same things (ταῦτα not ταὐτὰ) in a differing form.

In part, there is nothing further to these expositions other than the usual aversion to rhetorical historiography: the rhetors wish only to display the art of their rhetoric and therefore chose for themselves subject matter that appears conducive to this in that they either deal with legends or compose encomia or defamations. But in the second part, this accurate and widespread train of thought takes a totally inappropriate turn. Encomia and defamations correspond naturally to such discussed subject matter and accordingly both statements τινὲς δὲ πρὸς χάριν ἢ τὰς πόλεις ἢ τοὺς βασιλέας ἐπαινοῦντες and ἦλθοι δὲ ἐπὶ τὸ κατηγορεῖν τῶν πράξεων stand correctly in parallel juxtaposition to each other. But the sentence ἢ τῶν γεγραφών ἐμφάσεων is tacked onto this last thought, which disrupts the unity of the structure and, moreover, arouses the impression that there existed a work of historiography whose purpose was not censure of the subject matter but rather censure of other historians who had dealt with the same subject matter. Josephus once again fiercely emphasizes that the goal of this group is only their own fame, in that they censure their predecessors; and we remember that Josephus, in his combat against the unnamed opponent, also viewed the very essence of Greek historiography as chasing after literary goals by deprecating previous records. This issue, which so deeply disturbs the structure of 24 ff., is what truly preoccupies Josephus and therefore only one conclusion remains: Josephus assumed the general combat against unobjective historiography, but on his own account he attached to this an attack against such historians who defamed their predecessors. At present, the assumed general good has less importance for us than these very factors concerning Josephus himself. Here we now see that he is attacking an author who disparages the other historians, because he himself hopes to acquire renown in this way. But it was precisely for this that Josephus reproached Justus; the latter had attacked him in order to achieve the prize of φιλοπονία (Life 338; cf. page 10 ff.). He had believed, to apply now the words in Contra Apionem 1.24 and 1.25, that he could thereby establish his fame. Therefore the words ὑπὲρ τοῦ δοκεῖν φιλόπονος εἶναι ἐμὸν μὲν κατέψευσται (Life 338) and ἦλθοι δὲ ἐπὶ τὸ κατηγορεῖν ... τῶν γεγραφῶν ἐμφάσεων ἐνευδοκιμῆσειν τούτω νομίζοντες (C. Ap. 1.25) are in fact directed to the same addressee, Justus.
Accordingly we can also determine in the following [20] passage that Josephus concedes superiority in rhetorical power to the historian whom he censured for his attitude to his predecessors, but in contrast he claims for himself the advantage of being truthful (27): exactly so was he, as opposed to Justus; because in Life 40 Josephus explains that Justus had acquired a Greek education which he had relied upon to write history ὡς τῷ λόγῳ τούτῳ περιεσόμενος τῆς ἀληθείας. That Justus’ name is not mentioned here must be attributed to the same reason as that found for the parallel train of thought in C. Ap. 1.46 ff.: here also Josephus is basically dealing only with the Greek historians, but his passionate hatred for his competitor forced him repeatedly to digress from his relatively clear thought processes in order to grapple with his opponent. Only he could not name him in the context of Greek historians, of course.

The realization that the opponent in Contra Apionem 1.24 ff. and 1.46 ff. is none other than Justus facilitates our interpretation of the details as well as our understanding as a whole. If Josephus demonstrates (Life 358) that Justus could not have read the emperor’s reports because his presentation contradicts that of the emperor (cf. 342), we now learn that this accusation is especially stinging because Justus had claimed that he had read the reports (C. Ap. 1.56). Conversely, this λέγωσιν does not acquire its specific nuance until we set it in connection with the evidence from the Life; because after the context of 56 we would expect ἐντυγχάνωσιν instead of ἐντυχεῖν λέγωσιν, whereas now this λέγωσιν should indicate: to claim wrongly. Particularly sweet and meaningful for education research is the comparison of Life 338 with C. Ap. 1.53: there it states that Justus had maligned Josephus in order to obtain the prize for φιλοπονία just as if at school. How sharply this is stated, is not truly learned until C. Ap. 1.53: the unnamed person, i.e. Justus, as becomes obvious time after time again, has maligned Josephus just as if he had been assigned an exercise theme at school: κατηγορία παράδοξος καὶ διαβολή, i.e. to demonstrate his skill in the ability to malign against all reason. It is in this that Justus had wished to establish his renown (C. Ap. 1.25 ff.)

[21] It appears to me most important, however, that the comparison of the Life with C. Ap. fully confirms once again our conclusion above that the antagonism between Josephus and Justus was based upon their literary activities. Justus also had not attacked Josephus as statesman but as author; he paid back in the same coin. Moreover, we can now learn why this conflict took on such an intense personal bitterness. That is to say, when Josephus announces
in the *Life* that he had presented his work first to the emperors and then to many others, then the same is to be found in *Contra Apionem*, as stated above, but instead of the ἄλλοις δὲ πολλοῖς ἐπέδωκα from the *Life* Josephus here chooses the critical word ἐπίπρασκον. Therefore Josephus had published his book himself and had distributed it himself, which one might add to the examples produced by Birt (*Buchwesen* page 111 and *Rhein.Mus.* 72, 1918, page 311) as particularly conclusive. According to this he had not only idealistic but also the most enormous business’s interests in seeing his book survive Justus’ attacks.

It is only from this point of view that we rightly understand why Josephus referred to the emperor’s desire that people should gather their knowledge of the war exclusively from Josephus’ books (*Life* 363). Behind the mask of the critical investigator of history lies hidden the business-oriented bookseller. And when we consider in addition C. Ap. 1.51: “I have presented my work first to the emperors and then sold it to many Romans and Jews who had fought in the war,” then we are amazed to encounter here a recommendation in the most modern forms of business practice; indeed, Josephus informs us of the names of distinguished gentlemen who – let us say it quite bluntly – have favoured his business enterprise and are prepared to recommend it. Nor does Josephus withhold two of Agrippa’s letters of recommendation (*Life* 365) from the public, nor information about the imperial commendation. With this, Josephus emphasizes that among his buyers are to be found men who “likewise have mastered a Hellenic education” (*Contra Apionem* 1.51). This καὶ is significant: the statement was to parry Justus’ claim that only he had written intelligibly for people who esteemed their education. And the fact that Josephus had consulted with Greeks during his composition (ibid. 50) is again emphasized only because he hoped by this means to be able to counter the reproach that his work was stylistically worthless. If the highest and mightiest authorities have therefore bought Josephus’ work and acclaimed it with enthusiasm, if those who fought in the war took pleasure in his work, and lastly, if even those with Greek education advocated it, who would then be so stupid as to buy from Justus’ rival firm, that only had objectively bad merchandise to offer, as [can be] demonstrated with an example?

This blatant emphasis of a purely business-oriented point of view will certainly be felt as extremely disconcerting by everyone; nevertheless one should bear in mind that for us the

---

9 Josephus alludes to the extent of the expenses that he was incurring in *War* 1.16: καὶ γὰρ μὲν ἀναλώμασι καὶ πόνοις μεγίστοις ... τὴν μνήμην τῶν κατορθωμάτων ἀνατίθημι.
publisher as businessman steps between the author and his readership, and that the constantly necessary business of advertising falls upon his shoulders. In antiquity, according to Birt’s evidence, distinguished people released their books mostly by publishing them themselves and therefore business interests immediately came to the fore. Thus Polybius himself deemed it compatible with his dignity that he should refute the charge raised against his work that it was too expensive due to its length, by pointing out that it was still cheaper to purchase his long history than so many individual texts as would equal Polybius’ work in content (Polyb. 3.32). The author of *Rhetorica ad Herennium* 1.1 considers it necessary to counter, right at the beginning, the suspicion that he is acting out of business interests since much was earned from textbooks themselves, of course. The situation was much worse when a large number of copies were produced and could no longer be sold: this fate threatened Josephus, should Justus of Tiberias prevail.

When Cicero released his *Academica* in a new edition and the old copies now lay unused, his publisher Atticus was threatened with great loss. Indeed, Cicero thought he could console him (Att. 13.13.1): *tu illam iacturam feres aequo animo, quod illa quae habes de Academicis frustra descripta sunt*; because the new work will be much better – this we may imagine furthermore – you will therefore do such good business with the new edition that this will compensate you for the losses from the old edition. Josephus had no such consolation; he had had the manuscripts of the *War* produced at great expense (ἀναλώματι μεγίστοις 1.16), and in the midst of the sales and distribution appears Justus with his claim that Josephus’ book is rubbish and that only he, Justus, has written intelligibly. Josephus does not wish to give up his place to him; he himself requires the turnover of his unsold manuscripts and so he tears down his competitor and pursues him and his work with a hatred that sheds a significant light on the business practices of that time. How much “literary critical” combat in antiquity could be attributed to similar causes?

Now it is obvious why Justus, who played a major role in the *Life*, is not mentioned at all in the older parallel presentation of the *War*. Josephus had no reason to compete with his literary opponent until the year 100 when Justus, with his work, launched the battle against Josephus’ *War*. 
2. Josephus and Epaphroditus

The discovery that the opponent attacked by Josephus in *Contra Apionem* 1.25 and 46 ff. is none other than Justus, helps us to determine more exactly the time frame of this entire writing. Until now we knew only that it was composed after the *Antiquities* to which Josephus refers in section 1. Now it has been revealed in addition, that the writing of Justus of Tiberias about the Jewish war is assumed to be known in Josephus’ text, and since Justus’ work appeared after the death of Agrippa which occurred in the year 100 (*Life* 359), then the polemics in *Contra Apionem* also must have been produced at the same time as the *Life*, i.e. later than the year 100 – but admittedly only slightly later; because apparently Justus had only awaited Agrippa’s death in order to publish his writing that had been completed 20 years earlier, and Josephus would have responded immediately to this. At any rate, since the writing against Apion was not composed until after the year 100, we thus finally also have crucial information for evaluating the personality of Epaphroditus, to whom the *Antiquities* (1.8 and *Life* 430) and similarly the writing *Contra Apionem* (1.1; 2.1 and 296) were dedicated.

This Epaphroditus is almost universally equated with Nero’s famous freedman who accompanied his imperial master in the flight from Rome and helped him commit suicide. He had held the position of *a libellis* under Nero and again under Domitian, however the latter condemned him to death, by which we draw the definite conclusion that this Epaphroditus had died before the year 96. Since the *Antiquities* had already been produced by 93/94, it was possible to equate the Epaphroditus named in the *Antiquities* with Nero’s freedman, and the writing *Contra Apionem*, which remained undated, presented no obstacle to this. Admittedly, the closing words of the *Life* (430) should have caused concern, since they could not have been written until after Agrippa’s death. But we did see in the first chapter how lightly many dismissed the chronology of this work. Stein (in Pauly-Wissowa 5.2711), one of the few scholars who did not do so, believed that a later addition could be identified in the long attack against Justus of Tiberias (*Life* 336 - 367) in which Agrippa’s death is mentioned; this is in fact correct, as we shall see, but the entire *Life* itself is directed against Justus, after all (*Life* 40; cf. page 34). Nonetheless we must also continue to exercise caution in this line of thinking. Since the *Life* has not reached us as an independent writing, but represents only the later expansion of an
existing older book, then it would be possible after all that the expansion had been inserted after the death of [the person] to whom the first version of the work had been dedicated.  

[25] Henceforth matters lie otherwise: by virtue of its twofold attack against Justus, the writing *Contra Apionem* is likewise dated to the period following 100 thereby eliminating any possibility of equating the Epaphroditus, to whom this writing was dedicated similarly to the *Antiquities*, with Nero’s freedman who was killed before the year 96. On the other hand, the Epaphroditus to whom Josephus dedicated his works is undoubtedly an outstanding character as is apparent from the forms of address κράτιστε ἀνδρίων Ἐπαφρόδιτε (*Life* 430; *Contra Apionem* 1.1) and τιμιώτατε μοι Ἐπαφρόδιτε (*Contra Apionem* 2.1), and unreliable as any identification based on equivalent name must be by its very nature, one may nonetheless expect from the outset to find our Epaphroditus among otherwise well-known characters of this name. 

Josephus describes his patron as a man who was devoted to every form of education, but who especially took pleasure in examining historical events because he himself had experienced so many vicissitudes in his life whereby he had distinguished himself throughout by physical strength and outstanding virtue. It was he who urged Josephus to compose the *Antiquities*, just as he always spurred the ambition of those who were able to accomplish something beautiful or beneficial (*Ant.* 1.8). But we must recognize in him the one who inspired the writing *Contra Apionem* as well; for it concludes with the significant words: “this and the preceding book have been composed for you who love the truth above all, and for your sake, for those who like you wish to learn something about our people” (2.296).  

It follows from the ὁμοίως that Epaphroditus wished to learn something about the Jews; therefore he probably provided the inspiration. But it is more remarkable that Josephus should claim to have considered his larger

---

10 Such a case occurred, for example with Cornelius Nepos, whose book is extant in a second edition. It is dedicated to Atticus whose death is nonetheless assumed in additions (*Hannibal* 13.1; *Atticus* 19 ff.). Similarly, the chronicle of Apollodorus was published in 145 and dedicated to King Attalus who died in 138. Apollodorus then supplemented this work with an addition that extended at least to 120/19, and thus was not written down until after this point in time. Nevertheless this expanded work also remained dedicated to Attalus as we learn from [the fact] that Pseudo-Scymnus was acquainted on the one hand with the dedication to Attalus, on the other hand with the additions to the second edition (Jacoby, *Philologische Untersuchungen* 16.16); therefore both existed in the same manuscript. The basis upon which Jacoby’s incorrect assumptions are founded is invalidated by the reference to Nepos. 

11 σοὶ δὲ Ἐπαφρόδιτε μαλιστα τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἀγαπῶντι καὶ διὰ σὲ τοῖς ὁμοίως βουλησομένοις περὶ τοῦ γένους ἠμῶν εἰδέναι τούτο καὶ τὸ πρὸ αὐτοῦ γεγράφθω βιβλίον.
public only for the sake of Epaphroditus (διὰ σε). Does he mean by this that the book was basically intended only for Epaphroditus, and now that it was already written “for [26] his sake” others should read it as well? Is this a politeness formula or does something else not lie behind it?

In Suidas s.v. Ἐπαφρόδιτος we learn of the scholarly grammarian Epaphroditus; he was a slave born in Chaeronea who arrived as such in the house of the Alexandrian grammarian Archias. Modestus, the governor of Egypt, purchased him and took him along to Rome to educate his son, where he granted him freedom; because an extant statue in the Villa Altieri in Rome bears the name M. Mettius Epaphroditus grammaticus graecus (CIL 6.9454).¹³ According to Suidas, Epaphroditus engaged in outstanding activities in Rome under Nero until Nerva, at the same time that Πτολεμαῖος ὁ Ἡφαιστίωνος and many other τῶν ὀνομαστῶν ἐν παιδείᾳ were active there. This temporal association does not at first seem unambiguous; for the period during which Πτολεμαῖος ὁ Ἡφαιστίωνος himself was active is set under Trajan and Hadrian by Suidas himself s.v. Πτολεμαῖος. Therefore, if one were to force both statements, then Ptolemy and Epaphroditus would not be contemporaries, contrary to Suidas’ claim. To be sure, it is generally admitted that the phrase γεγονὼς ἐπὶ τε Τραϊανοῦ καὶ Ἡδριανοῦ τῶν αὐτοκρατόρων can in fact not be taken too narrowly, but the same must not be applied any less to the formula διέπρεψεν ἐπὶ Νέρωνος καὶ μέχρι Νέρβα.

In his now-famous essay about γέγονε in the biographical notes of Suidas, Erwin Rohde has indicated that the datings in Suidas’ articles are to some extent completely schematic. (Kleine Schriften 1.130.) “Whoever cannot be easily dated to Trajan, will have to put up with being dated to Nero. Wherever a completely definitive fact cannot be firmly fixed, the reigns of Galba, Otho, Vitellius, Vespasian, Titus, Domitian, Nerva are hardly ever found to be used for identifying an author’s ἀκμή. This observation is correct, but [27] still requires an additional remark; for the very dating used in the article about Ἐπαφρόδιτος ἐπὶ Νέρωνος καὶ μέχρι Νέρβα, which covers the omitted period of time [mentioned] by Rohde, recurs again elsewhere; certainly most significantly¹⁴ in reference to Apollonius of Tyana. About him it is written καὶ ἤκμαζε μὲν ἐπὶ Κλαυδίου καὶ Γαίου καὶ Νέρωνος καὶ μέχρι Νέρβα. If Suidas does not write here

---

¹³ Cf. page 28, footnote.
¹⁴ Cf. E. Rohde, loc. cit. page 119, note 2 concerning the dating of Διονύσιος Ἀλεξανδρεὺς that is related to this.
either ἐπὶ Κλαυδίου καὶ μέχρι Νέρβα nor follow Νέρωνος with an enumeration of all the emperors until Nerva, then it appears compelling that the concept ἐπὶ Νέρωνος καὶ μέχρι Νέρβα is a fixed extent [of time] extracted for a dating period that cannot be understood other than the extent [of time] ἐπὶ τε Τραϊανοῦ καὶ Ἀδριανοῦ. Therefore an endpoint under Nerva himself cannot really be inferred from the μέχρι Νέρβα, since this group of words belonging to ἐπὶ Νέρωνος suggests only the global time period. On the contrary, from a comparison of the article about Apollonius, in which Suidas follows the word Νέρβα by the information ἐφ’ οὗ καὶ μετήλλαξεν, with ours which lacks such information, one could even draw the conclusion that Suidas excludes Epaphroditus’ dying under Nerva. In any case, the information added to the article about Apollonius proves that Suidas does not intend, in principle, to imbue the words ἤκμαζεν ἐπὶ Νέρωνος καὶ μέχρι Νέρβα with the meaning that the person in question lived right until Nerva.

The result of the [above] discussion is that the phrase applied in reference to Epaphroditus means that he was a contemporary of the period from Nero to Nerva, while Ptolemy’s floruit belongs to the period from Trajan to Hadrian. But then, of course, the two men may well have lived for a while at the same time in Rome; for the very approximate [nature of] the purely literary designations concerning the activities of the two men do not exclude [the possibility] that the one, who, as we would say, belongs to the second half of the first century also lived beyond 100, [28] any more than that the other, who according to our language use belongs to the first third of the second century was active before the year 100 itself.

During his long stay in Rome, Epaphroditus must have acquired great wealth; after all, he personally owned two houses in the capital. The lessons that he gave must have earned him considerable money; besides this, he developed a prosperous literary activity, of which we have received some traces, however we need not examine these in detail.

---

15 With our fixed expression ἤκμαζεν ἐπὶ Νέρωνος καὶ μέχρι Νέρβα and respectively διέπρεψεν ἐπὶ Νέρωνος καὶ μέχρι Νέρβα which indicate that the ἀκμὴ falls within this period, one is not to confuse the manner of expression of, for example, the article about Aristeides γεγονὼς ἐπὶ τε Ἀντωνίνου ... καὶ διατείνας μέχρι Κομόδου and, respectively, the section about Porphyrius γεγονὼς ἐπί τῶν χρόνων Αὐρηλιανοῦ καὶ παρατείνας ἕως Διοκλητιανοῦ etc. Here, by virtue of the διατείνας μέχρι, the end of life is specified in contrast to the ἀκμὴ.
It is already clear according to the [above] discussion that the grammarian Epaphroditus fulfills all the conditions that we are to place upon Josephus’ patron. As this was a man ἅπασαν ἰδέαν παιδείας ἡγαπηκώς, so also Suidas’ Epaphroditus belonged to the circle τῶν ὄνομαστῶν ἐν παιδείᾳ. Even more than this somewhat general description of his character, the fact that Josephus’ patron had been exposed to such diverse strokes of fate indicates that he at one point had the occasion to put his physical strength to the test and that he ultimately became completely absorbed in pure questions of education [Bildungsfragen] (Ant. 1.8). Such a truly exceptional path of life was followed in every way by the grammarian Epaphroditus, who started as a slave from Chaeronea, went through Egypt, then became a widely respected teacher in Rome, and who, similarly to Josephus’ patron, was distinguished by his formidable physique; for Josephus’ words ἐν ἅπασι δὲ θαυμαστὴν φύσεως ἐπιδειξάμενος ἱσχὺν correspond to Suidas’ description τὸ δὲ σῶμα ἦν μέγας τε καὶ μέλας ὡς ἐλεφαντώδης. The emphasis on this characteristic, that does not have anything at all to do with the intellectual interests for which Josephus and Suidas mention their Epaphroditus, is crucial. It is simply out of the question that there were two scholarly Epaphroditoi in Rome around the year 100 who were distinguished by their formidable physique in such a way that this is mentioned in two sources – totally independent from each other. On the contrary, it is obvious that M. Mettius [29] Epaphroditus was a giant in stature by southern standards, and that this characteristic appeared so strange in the man who ultimately became a teacher of languages and a friend of literature, that one automatically could not avoid emphasizing it.

Should there still remain a doubt about the equivalence of the two Epaphroditoi in the face of this astonishing correspondence, then it must be dispelled by the following

16 The sitting figure of M. Mettius Epaphroditus (Bernoulli, Griechische Ikonographie 2, plate 28) shows us a man with a formidable thickset build and powerful muscles. One may easily believe Josephus that this Epaphroditus could evidence a physical strength that was not otherwise customary among scholars; not less striking is the description ὡς ἐλεφαντώδης in Suidas. The legs are certainly represented as heavy and clumsy. If the transmission is even accurate, Suidas has mistakenly read the “size” of the body into the word ἐλεφαντώδης of his source. In truth, it is not its size but its strength and clumsiness that are characteristic of an elephant. Thus I have no doubt that the statue in the Palazzo Altieri represents the grammarian and patron of Josephus. Since the figure belongs to the Antonine period and stems from a freedman of Epaphroditus who probably intended it for a library or school, there is no difficulty with respect to chronology. Incidentally, Bernoulli (loc. cit. page 201) correctly presumes the identity of Josephus’ friend and the grammarian, yet without substantiating it in the face of
consideration that will at the same time take us one step further. Josephus dedicated his *Antiquities* as well as the writing against Apion to Epaphroditus. Now, we know through Birt\(^\text{17}\) that such a dedication under the life circumstances given here means that the ownership of the book passes from the giver to the receiver who thereby assumes responsibility for the distribution of the work, but on his part he is morally obligated to pay a [30] commission to the author. Thus Epaphroditus acquired Josephus’ books, and when Josephus now on his part refers in his dedication (Ant. 1.8) [to the fact] that when he was in despair about the completion of his work he was urged to work energetically by Epaphroditus’ constant encouragement, then it is obvious that this here is an allusive reference to prior pecuniary support from his patron. But Josephus was not alone in enjoying this favour: “Epaphroditus had always supported the people who were in a position to create something beautiful or beneficial” (Ant. 1.9), and since this is specified by Josephus as the reason that he continued with his work on the *Antiquities* in accordance with Epaphroditus’ wish, so it follows that mainly authors must have been found among τοῖς χρήσιμοιν ἢ καλῶν τι πράττειν δυναμένοις, just as Josephus then also subsequently designates his work by τῷ περὶ τὰ κάλλιστα πόνῳ. So Epaphroditus had a large circle of authors around himself, whom he constantly supported and who also naturally handed over their works to him in the same way that Josephus did: thus we learn, from Josephus, to recognize a patron of literature and a friend of books in Epaphroditus – but Suidas again says of the grammarian ὄνομενος δὲ ἀεὶ βιβλία ἐκτήσατο μυριάδας τρεῖς καὶ τούτων σπουδαίων καὶ ἀνακεχωρηκότων. Now there is no more doubt possible: the famous grammarian and book dealer Epaphroditus is Josephus’ patron!

---

the general opinion.

17 *Kritik und Hermeneutik*, pages 315-327; *Rhein. Mus.* 72, 1918, page 311 ff., *Aus dem Leben der Antike*, page 129 ff. Birt certainly goes too far in the assumption of legal property transfer; the concept of literary property was unknown, after all; one must guard against considering as too similar those very things that by their nature contain strong personal elements. I am pointing this out because otherwise it is usually to Birt’s research that I owe the richest stimulation. In contrast, I cannot agree with Ruppert (*Quaestiones ad historiam dedicationis librorum pertinentes*, Leipzig 1911, page 30), who wishes to compare the dedication of Manetho’s History of Egypt to Ptolemy, and that of Berossus’ History of Babylonia to Antiochus, with the dedications of Josephus, on the ground that all three cases concern foreign historical works. Here the factor of the historical form, which is admittedly essential for establishing the origin of the dedications, has induced Ruppert to overlook the complete dissimilarity in the personal relations in the three cases. This will be because of what was noted in the text.
Josephus had not dedicated his first work [to anyone], and according to this we could establish that he himself assumed the production and sales. Birt’s assumption finds its confirmation here. But if Josephus then offered all his later writing to Epaphroditus, then it appears that his economic situation had worsened. In fact, Emperor Vespasian had paid for his apartment and [given him] a pension [Gnadengehalt] (Life 423) at the time that the War appeared; we may well assume that this was the salarium for the somewhat official presentation of the Jewish War (Life 363), and so Josephus would probably not have described the gifts of Caesar to his new patron without intent. He thereby also likely wished to create the impression [31] that he had enjoyed the same favour under Titus and Domitian; and this was indeed the case with respect to Titus (Life 428). But Josephus makes no mention of favours from Domitian other than that he punished Josephus’ Jewish accusers and that he granted Josephus exemption from taxes in Judaea: he remains silent about any actual duty-pay.

It is therefore quite possible that it was the change of rule after Titus along with the death of the leader in the Jewish War, which deprived Josephus of imperial favour. In any case, his life entered into a serious crisis such that he was about to put aside the writing of the Antiquities which he had been composing (Ant. 1.7), until Epaphroditus’ encouragement stirred him to resume his work (ibid. 9), or as we may say more precisely, until he had found in Epaphroditus the new patron who enabled him to continue his works.

Therefore Epaphroditus secured for himself the work that had been begun, just as it happened later with the writing against Apion (C. Ap. 2.296). This fact sheds a clear light on the closing words of the Antiquities: here Josephus lists a series of writings that he planned to compose in the future (20.267). It is a public recommendation: I am prepared to deal with the following themes, if desired. Who will purchase these works from me? This is why Josephus immediately stresses that the one writing would present the events in outline, while he brings the other four books into proposal. The purchaser must know in advance which wares are to be offered to him. It immediately results from this that Epaphroditus was no patron to Josephus in the sense of a Maecenus, but a book publisher who collected works in order to sell them on. For this reason Josephus now, in this context of ours, also specifies the extent of the completed Antiquities by number of books and verses — this is the only known case in ancient literature where the author communicates within the text itself how many lines the work constitutes. Josephus makes this note also for his patron and publisher. Therefore the section
Josephus never wrote the works announced here even though he must have lived at least another ten years after the year 93/94, as we now already definitely know. The book “About the Nature of God and about the Rational Sense of the Mosaic Laws,” which is the title of one of these as reproduced fittingly by Schürer (page 91), would have been too specialized even for the grammarian Epaphroditus, who, in principle, collected obscure literature as well (Suidas), that he could hope to attract a readership for it. Instead of this we see that in the following years Josephus prepared the writing against Apion at Epaphroditus’ instigation: I would like to presume here that the patron and publisher, while on the one hand rejecting the writing about God’s nature etc., on the other hand encouraged at the same time the treatment of this theme which indeed always excited special interest. And with this we might now also find a different and better explanation for the words already discussed above on page 25, διὰ σὲ from the concluding statement of the writing against Apion (2.296). We may no longer recognize in these [words] a mere politeness formula but rather, when Josephus wrote the book for Epaphroditus and for others only “for his sake,” then he is thinking of the other readership really only on account of Epaphroditus. But if the latter appears in some way interested that other people should read the book, then I can imagine him only as the intermediary between author and public, or as we would say, the publisher.

Josephus did not write the second text announced in Antiquities 20.267 either; for Schürer (page 87) was perfectly correct that a treatment of Jewish history from the outbreak of the war until the present κατὰ παραδρομὴν was promised there, and that this book [33] in no way coincided with Josephus’ Life that we have received as an expansion to the Antiquities. But why did Josephus not write this historical book, which would have been just as interesting as the Antiquities to Epaphroditus and his clientele? The animosity against Justus of Tiberias gives

18 The transmitted text reads κατὰ περιδρομὴν, a word that I cannot verify for the meaning required here. Thus I am changing it with a slight emendation to κατὰ παραδρομὴν. Cf. Plutarch perὶ παιδῶν ἀγωγῆς page 7C: ἀλλὰ ταῦτα μὲν ἐκ παραδρομῆς μαθεῖν... τὴν δὲ φιλοσοφίαν πρεσβεύειν; Polybius 21.34.2 οὐκ ἄξιος ἔστιν ἐκ παραδρομῆς, ἀλλὰ μετ’ ἕπιστάσεως τυχεῖν τῆς ἀρμοδούσης μνήμης. Thus Josephus now announces a projected shorter treatment compared to the rather extensive presentation that he had already given of the War.
us the answer. It was he who pushed his book about the Jewish War, which he had already finished long before, onto the market after Agrippa’s death in the year 100. The work was composed in a brilliant style and must therefore have attracted enormous acclamation and tremendous sales. Justus had addressed himself to people of “Greek education”; the work was intended for them. And what might Epaphroditus, Ptolemy and their circle have said about its appearance? The deferential way in which Josephus repeatedly acknowledges his opponent’s stylistic superiority is probably less the result of his own judgment than an echo of the opinions that he must have constantly heard there.

First he defends his Greek in the parts composed at that time: I, too, have a command of the Greek language, albeit only in written usage; my pronunciation leaves something to be desired since I am a foreigner (Ant. 20.263). But what is more, while composing the War I have availed myself of Greek assistants (C. Ap. 1.50) and the best proof of the intelligibility of my writing is that Vespasian, Titus and Agrippa — all [three] men who stood at the height of Greek education, have read it with pleasure (Life 359). Nevertheless, in rhetorical achievement Justus is superior to me (C. Ap. 1.27) and relying upon this he has attacked me as if this had been assigned to him as a school theme for a rhetorical exercise (C. Ap. 1.53), by fulfilment of which one could distinguish oneself (C. Ap. 1.25), indeed even acquire the prize of φιλόπονος (Life 338). But in truth he is a scoundrel, a twister of history and a liar, who could not even tell the truth about his own fatherland (Life 338), and who always only felt that he was above the truth by virtue of his rhetorical education (Life 40). So I, against whom false report has been spread, must perforce defend myself (Life 336): I derive my suitability as writer of the history of the Jewish War from the fact that I, in contrast to Justus, (C. Ap. 1.45 and elsewhere) constantly took part in the war and have been informed about each and every thing through the best sources (C. Ap. 1.47 ff.). One should but read for once Agrippa’s letter (Life 365), which upholds my precise investigation against all doubt. But I also derive my legitimacy as the historian of the Jewish War from my capacity as a Jew; for no people has upheld historical tradition so much as the Jews who are prepared to die for it (C. Ap. 1.42 ff.). While Justus berates other historians, thus doing something that is contrary to the essence of the science of history (C. Ap. 1.26), we stand for the unity and purity of tradition. But if the accuracy of my historiography depends to such an extent upon my Jewish lineage and my acknowledged status among the Jews, then it is necessary that one learn about my family and me (Ant. 20.266). Thus the Life
becomes a necessary link in the chain of Josephus’ defence; for by his personal status as a Jew and his knowledge of the subject Josephus offers the guarantee that no person — neither Jew nor Greek — would be in the position to publish a history so perfect as his (Ant. 20.262). By emphasizing his factual suitability in this way, he hopes to trump the merely formal education of his opponent. Undoubtedly all these remarks, which all belong to one and the same time after the appearance of Justus’ work, are directed primarily to Epaphroditus and his circle: Josephus hopes to retain the patronage of this literary group despite everything.

I would also like to bring, by way of speculation, to this wish of Josephus an observation that appears to me to be worthy of the highest interest. We already had to deal factually with the explanations that Josephus gave about his relationship to the three emperors of the Flavian house; but almost more important is the form in which this is given. That is to say, whoever reads Josephus’ words πολλῆς ἐτυχον παρὰ Οὐεσπασιανοῦ προνοίας ... Τίτος τὴν ἁρχὴν διαδεξάμενος ὡς πατρὶ τὴν τιμὴν μοι διεφύλαξεν .... διαδεξάμενος δὲ Τίτον Δομετιανὸς καὶ [35] προσηύξησεν τὰς εἰς ἐμὲ τιμάς (Life 423, 428/9), remembers having already heard exactly the same elsewhere, only summarized much more powerfully in few words. When Cornelius Tacitus began to publish his Histories around the year 104 CE, he reports on his political career in a way that even today does not seem completely unambiguous: dignitatem nostram a Vespasiano inchoatam, a Tito auctam, a Domitiano longius provectam non abnuerim (Hist. 1.1). These words constituted the work’s broadly illuminating point of reference, which appeared precisely in those years when Josephus was obliged to take up his pen in defence against Justus’ attacks after the year 100. It is to be understood that the appearance of Tacitus’ Historiae constituted [quite] an event in the literary circles of Rome, and tasteless as it may seem to us, we do understand that Josephus also felt obliged, right when he was concerned with the protection of his literary reputation from all denigration, to strut before the literary circle with an allusion to Tacitus’ work. Granted one cannot expect a Tacitean Greek of Josephus, and a philistine will remain a philistine; but for all that it is still not less proper that Josephus attempted here at the end of the Antiquities to describe his relations to the three emperors with the same words with which Tacitus introduced his Historiae.

19 Next to the overall structure, the use of the terms τιμή and προσαυξάνω, which correspond to the Latin cursus honorum, is indicative.
We also understand, however, that Josephus did not save his work by such means. The Greek grammarians, one of whom — Dionysius of Halicarnassus (Comp. 4) — counted Polybius among unbearable authors, had to give preference at all times to the skilful belletrist and formalist Justus, even should they have been as convinced of Josephus’ objectivity and love of truth as we are — not. Thus Josephus never could release the new presentation of the war together with the continuation into the present as he had envisaged in 93/94. Justus’ competition had beaten him.

[36] For our subsequent investigation, however, we shall bear in mind that in the year 93 Josephus retained the thought of publishing his war history in a modified form. Had he perhaps drafted some preparatory work for this in the years 93 – 100?

3. Justus in Josephus’ self-portrayal

One error tends to induce more. If, as a start, Josephus’ battle against Justus is transferred to the political arena, then it was inevitably associated with the observation, unavoidable to any reader, that the bulk of the Life is a writing of political defence. Hence the conclusion: outside the insertion as well, i.e. even where he does not name him, Josephus turns against Justus, and the entire self-portrayal is nothing but a reply to Justus’ political attacks. The conclusion collapses with the supposition: should one encounter in Justus the literary-bookselling competitor, whose writing provoked Josephus’ train of thought now familiar to us, and should the remainder of the self-portrayal be pursuing the goal of political defence above all, then the two have nothing to do with each other, and the παρέκβασις, which the author himself senses as disruptive (367), is that which its name already proclaims, [namely] an insertion that does not belong to the surrounding [text and] that has some other purpose. We may entertain even fewer doubts about this since the same attacks against Justus can also be detected in the writing against Apion and it is out of the question here that the contents of the writing had been influenced by the combat against Justus. If conversely, the combat against Justus is designated as παρέκβασις also in the writing against Apion (57), then we may conclude from the parallel designations that the insertions have the same character: they have nothing to do with the theme that is actually under discussion [within those writings].
And yet this finding appears to be contradicted by the fact that Justus is mentioned in the *Life* outside the παρέκβασις as well, such that one would like to assume that the combat forms an inherent part of the work. It is all the more necessary to examine how these other segments concerning Justus [37] relate to their surrounding [text]. Nobody will be surprised that the long insertion dealing with Justus can be removed from its context without disrupting [the text]; contrariwise, 368 joins to 335 so outstandingly that we would gladly forego the insertion, stylistically [speaking]. However, since this belongs to the nature of the insertion, we should not yet in principle draw any conclusions from this. It becomes quite different, though, if we consider the other passages that concern Justus, and firstly indeed the fundamental part in which alone — apart from the long insertion — the literary activities of Justus are mentioned and he himself is introduced to us (32 - 42).

The passage belongs within the broader context of sections 32 to 62. Josephus had previously (30/31) spoken about his arrival in Galilee and his measures in Sepphoris. Subsequent to this we are informed about the conditions in Tiberias (32 - 42), Gischala (43 - 45) and Gamala (46 - 61). Thereafter Josephus summarizes this presentation with the words: ἐπεὶ δ’ εἶν τὴν Γαλιλαίαν ἀφικόμην ἐγὼ καὶ ταῦτα παρὰ τῶν ἄπαγγειλάντων ἔμαθον, γράφω τῷ συνεδρίῳ τῶν Ἱεροσολυμιτῶν περὶ τούτων καὶ τί με πράττειν κελεύουσιν ἐρωτῶ. Thus according to these words, when he entered the territory of Galilee, Josephus received news about the Galilean conditions from a third party (through messengers); he reports this to Jerusalem and awaits precise instructions from there. Now, here lies a complete contradiction to 30/31: first of all we observe that Josephus’ arrival in Galilee is reported two times (30 and 62) without there being some possibility of a recapitulation in the second passage; for in 30/31 Josephus has already arrived in Sepphoris; insomuch that the words εὗρον and ἀπήλλαξα do not really in and of themselves presume presence in the actual place, but that they must have this meaning in our case follows ineluctably from section 64 (ἄρας οὖν ... ἀπὸ τῆς Σεπφωρίτῶν πόλεως). But an author can never append a recapitulation of a fact (arrival in Galilee) when this has already been long eclipsed by a new fact (journey to Sepphoris). And it leads to total nonsense when, in continuing the narrative, he does not resume from this “recapitulated” fact, but rather immediately again in section 64 makes the assumption [38] that Josephus was in Sepphoris. Thus it is beyond all doubt that the direct continuation of 30/31, which deal with the Josephus’ arrival in Sepphoris and his conduct there, is to be found in section 64, and that
the intervening words “when I arrived in Galilee” represent something that is totally impossible. It is equally impossible that Josephus, who already in sections 30/31 was in the middle of Galilee — because Sepphoris is located there — acts then and there on the basis of his own assessment, and now he does not set foot in Galilee until section 62, gathering the initial reports from messengers and on his part requesting orders from Jerusalem.

The problem posed here in principle finds its significant expression in two difficulties of interpretation. If in section 30 εὗρον has, as we saw, the precise signification: “during my presence I have found,” then directly following in section 31 a totally different meaning must be inherent in this same word where it refers to the findings in Tiberias. For Josephus had in fact not been in Tiberias at that time, rather in sections 30/31 and 64 respectively he appears in Sepphoris, while he comes into contact with the inhabitants of Tiberias for the first time in section 64. Therefore we must understand εὗρον here [to mean] something like: I found a situation of which I had been given account by another party. In principle, there can be no objection to this. But are we now seriously to believe that Josephus chose the [same] word twice in succession with [two] entirely different meaning[s] within a single uniform report? Whoever reads the end of section 31 as a continuation of 30/31 cannot but assume that Josephus was in Tiberius, — but this impression is altogether incorrect.

Parallel to this is the case regarding ταῦτα in section 62. To what is this word referring? No doubt can enter here either, factually [speaking]; it [refers to] everything that Josephus has learned from messengers, i.e. the events in Tiberias, Gischala and Gamala that he reported. But formally there is not the slightest reason to intend to exclude Sepphoris here; for Josephus had after all used the same word εὗρον regarding his findings in Sepphoris as [he did] regarding Tiberias (cf. above). Therefore ταῦτα refers formally, aside from Gischala and Gamala, either to Sepphoris and Tiberias or to neither of the two — and both are equally wrong. [39] In summary we [may] establish that Josephus headed towards Sepphoris (30/31) after his arrival in Galilee and from there he went to Tiberias. Contradictory to this is

1. εὗρον from section 31, which in conjunction with 30/31 leads to a much earlier point in time for [Josephus’] personal presence in Tiberias,
2. the beginning of section 62
   a) because it presents Josephus only at the border of Galilee, and in any case not yet in Sepphoris where he is staying according to 30/31 and 64,
b) because ὑπάρχοντα formally either refers to Sepphoris as well, or along with Sepphoris it eliminates Tiberias too, both of which are factually impossible.

Now the words at issue in the end of 31 and in 62 constitute necessary parts of the self-contained exposition about the conditions in Tiberias, Gischala and Gamala and the tidings that Josephus has received from there. As they are incompatible with 30/31 on the one hand and with 64 on the other, so they at the same time entrain the entire presentation that they enclose, in which we are thus to recognize an insertion.

An examination of the content itself confirms that this conclusion [arising] from the intersection of the passage[s] is irrefutable. That is to say, whoever reads through Josephus’ Life observes that solely personal experiences of the author are portrayed. Of course, it is inevitable that once in a while, for factual clarification of the situation, a sentence is provided in which Josephus does not appear; but then Josephus does regularly enter into the indicated situation directly thereafter. I cannot cite examples otherwise I would have to copy the whole book. The exceptions to this rule, which is by the way to be taken for granted in the portrayal of a life [story], are all the more significant. The first occurs in our section 32 - 61: not only is there no mention of Josephus here, but Josephus never comes into later contact with the circumstances described here either. Admittedly, 32 - 42 deals with the town of Tiberias that also plays a large role further on, but this part does not even remotely prepare the reader for the continuing exposition. In truth, the task that Josephus was to accomplish in Tiberias was the demolition [40] of Herod’s palace (65 ff.). The difficulties that opposed him there came from the radicals — the sailors and the poor — under the command of Jesus, son of Sapphias, about whose leadership Josephus would have already reported previously. And, as a matter of fact, he would have had to speak of this leading character if he had wished to inform the reader in advance about the forthcoming tasks in Tiberias and their execution. But in truth we neither learn about Jesus nor do we hear the slightest about Herod’s buildings, although the political circumstances in Tiberias are reported in 32 - 42. In short, an insufficiently informed reader who would read part 32 - 42 in order to understand 64 ff. better, would gain no benefit from it. For this reason, the piece does not fulfil that task upon which its right to exist could solely rest. Conversely, instead [of concerning himself] with this, Josephus deals with his literary opponent Justus, who on his part plays no role in the following events; the two reports
32 - 42 and 64 ff. therefore do not accord with each other; the former has nothing to do with the latter.

Even more peculiar are the things concerning Gischala. That is to say, in 43 - 45 we are introduced to John of Gischala who would indeed play such a significant role in the entire subsequent course of the Life, and with whom Josephus would come into contact immediately upon setting foot in Gischala (70). And yet there can be no question here either that section 43 - 45 constitutes the preparation for 70 ff.—be it substantive or be it literary—, for even though according to 43 - 45 (cf. 62) Josephus had been informed long ago about John’s activity, yet according to 70 he goes there first with his fellow envoys, “in order to determine what he [sc. John] is planning.” What is this to mean, since he was already fully informed? Had he perhaps wished to see for himself that the reports were accurate, then of course he would have stressed this specifically and not used an expression by which any reader must infer [that this was his] first reconnaissance [Erkundung].

But much more important than these considerations is the observation that the opinion about John of Gischala in sections 43 to 45 is simply inconsistent with that in the rest of the Life. The image portrayed there stands so clearly before our eyes that not many words are necessary; John of Gischala is the embodiment of everything atrocious and shifty. His actions are motivated exclusively by self-interest, bloodlust, and jealousy of Josephus. From section 2.585 ff. of the War, which corresponds fully to the rest of the Life in the evaluation of John, we can learn in addition how Josephus wished to make known his evaluation of the moral character of this person from the very first moment when he is introduced to the reader: right at the beginning he is called πανουργότατος καὶ δολιώτατος τῶν ἐπισήμων ἐν τοῖσδε τοῖς πονηρεύμασιν ἀπάντων. A similar introduction should absolutely have been given by Josephus in the Life as well, if his intention otherwise was to prepare the reader for John’s actions described in the Life; instead of this he gives a description of John’s deeds, which leaves room for no doubt that the author is in perfect agreement with John’s course of action, indeed he values it most highly: John saw that some of his fellow citizens were considering deserting the Romans and therefore tried to calm them and keep them loyal. But despite his intense efforts he was not successful; for the neighbouring tribes attacked Gischala with a strong force, captured the town, plundered it and burned it down, [only] then to return home. John, infuriated by this, arms all those men who stood on his side, attacks the
tribes mentioned who had demolished Gischala, defeats them, and then rebuilds his hometown much more beautifully while fortifying it at the same time with walls for the more distant future.

Only an author who fundamentally approves of the actions he is reporting can relate [them] in this manner: John appears as a prudent man who thinks calmly; he acts only in defence against bad elements and thereby does the best for his fatherland. And this description is to be the introduction to 70 ff., where we immediately encounter John in the way Josephus constantly characterized the man further on: νεωτέρων ὀρεγόμενος πραγμάτων καὶ τῆς ἀρχῆς ἐπιθυμίαν ἔχων! There is no possibility of any doubt here: at the time when he recorded sections 43 - 45 Josephus was regarding the personality of John of Gischala entirely differently from when he was composing the rest of the Life and, as I [42] would like to add already here, the War. The same assembling of a force of troops by John is portrayed in Life 45 as the necessary defence of the inhabitants of Gischala against the attacks of the neighbouring tribes, while in War 2.587 it is made out to be the formation of a mob of Spartacists [Spartakistenhaufen]. John first plied the trade of robber on his own, afterwards he brought together an ever increasing number of dare-devils. Only those people were chosen who were distinguished by physical strength, presence of mind and experience in war, until the mob finally included 400 men: fugitive riff-raff from Tyros and the surrounding area with whom he plundered and pillaged all of Galilee. With these last words (War 2.589) he designates the very same incident that he had celebrated in Life 45 as the victory of John over the plunderers of Gischala.

It is therefore not really the interdependence of a group of facts that moved Josephus to paint such a congenial picture of John in Life 43 - 45 — his War, which had been completed long before, did provide a downright opposite assessment which gave the added benefit that it corresponded with the view in the rest of the Life — , rather, conversely, Josephus completely reinterpreted the old presentation of the War when composing Life 43 - 45 because he now held a different relationship to John. This certainly made the discrepancy between Life 43 - 45 and the rest of the Life so complete that the currently applied mode of criticism, if it were even to

© Ed.: Laqueur refers to the 1918/19 Spartacist rebellion in Germany (named for Spartacus), which was quickly put down. The surviving members of the Spartacist League became the Communist Party of Germany (KPD).
have become aware of this problem, would surely have drawn the conclusion that *Life* 43 - 45 was an interpolation originating from another hand. In truth, this book will show that Josephus, just like Polybius before him, wavered back and forth in his evaluation and description of certain people and incidents at quite different points in time. It is this fact that also endows *Life* 43 - 45 with its definitive character: the image of John that Josephus creates here originates from a different time than the rest of the *Life*.

From part 32 - 62 encompassing the section under investigation only the presentation concerning Gamala (46 - 62) remains to be examined. If the only observation of any significance to us at this point in time is that [43] this passage also in no way prepares the reader for the circumstances which Josephus encounters there, and that it consequently does not fulfill those premises which would be understandable within the frame of the *Life* alone, yet I shall still pass over this immediate task in order to deal with Josephus’ entire presentation of Gamala connected to this. The news that Josephus actually provides about this forms a self-contained group of absolutely uniform coherence.

The first passage is *Ant.* 17.23 - 30: Herod the Great settles Jewish colonists from Babylon in Batanea under the leadership of a certain Zamaris. Bathyra, the village settled there, acquires some importance as a base against the Trachonites and as a safe shelter for the Jews travelling from Babylon to Jerusalem for the sacrificial celebrations. Thus the population increased and [the village] maintained its special status until Roman times despite sporadic oppressions by Agrippa I and Agrippa II. The Babylonian Zamaris left several sons behind [him] among whom Jacimus was distinguished; he in turn died at an advanced age and was followed by Philip who had a particularly close relationship with King Agrippa and pleased him by frequent levying of troops. With this preview of the future, Josephus interrupts his presentation here, but not without first having indicated that in the “process of the narrative” he would provide more specific details about Bathyra etc., “where it was suitable” (17.28).

This suitable moment is first reached in *Life* 46 ff.; if this passage is thus directly connected to *Ant.* 17.30, as immediately springs to the eye, then it follows once again that Josephus considered his *Life* together with the *Antiquities* as a unified λόγος, which we suggested in chapter I. Philip the son of Jacimus, as is stated there, almost fell as Agrippa’s leader in Jerusalem, but his Babylonians saved him and he eventually reached Gamala. From there he sends a message about his escape to Agrippa and Berenice, namely through the
agency of the current vice-regent of Agrippa’s kingdom by the name of Varus. This man fears that his position will be shaken by the escape and return of Philip, who was held in high esteem by Agrippa, and so he intercepts Philip’s letter.

[44] In his plans he is above all also impelled by the hope of acquiring Agrippa’s kingdom one day. In order to do the Syrians a favour and start up the battle they desired against the Babylonian Jews in “Ecbatana”, as the settlement had been named, Varus sends 12 Jews from Caesarea to Ecbatana with the mandate to explain to the Babylonians that Varus had heard about a strike planned by the Babylonians against Agrippa; he therefore demanded that they lay down their weapons and send 70 envoys who were to render an account of the Babylonians’ conduct. These 70 envoys were in fact sent to Caesarea, however Varus kills all but one and prepares the attack against the Babylonians. But the one envoy escapes to Ecbatana and discloses the incidents and the impending attack, whereupon the Babylonians with women and children flee to Gamala. It is there that Philip reaches them and with considerable effort dissuades them from their plan to engage in battle against Varus. When Agrippa hears about Varus’ conduct, he removes him from office and appoints Aequus Modius as his successor. This report is again immediately connected to Life 114: the leader named by Agrippa, Aequus Modius, moves against Gamala and lays siege to the town in which Philip was to be found among the Babylonian Jews who had wished to begin the battle against Agrippa’s commander.

The next passage is to be found at 179 ff.: Philip, Jacimus’ son had departed from Gamala. In fact he had heard about the dismissal of Varus and the appointment of Aequus Modius who was his friend. He took advantage of this circumstance in order to finally have his letters, which had been previously intercepted by Varus, reach Agrippa through the agency of [Aequus Modius]. Agrippa saw that all the gossip about Philip, namely that he wanted to lead the Jews in waging war against the Romans, was false and he summoned Philip to his presence. After a friendly reception Agrippa issues Philip the order to return now to Gamala and from there to relocate with the Babylonians back to Ecbatana. Philip did as he was commanded.

Clearly we have here before us a report that is inherently quite uniform, forming an integrated whole; the theme reads roughly: the colony of the Babylonian Jews and their particular fate under Philip. But what do these things have in common with [45] the self-portrayal of Josephus who never came into contact with them? Nothing, absolutely
nothing. The best proof of this, besides many others, is that a part of this report exists in the Antiquities. Evidently Josephus got hold of this account and then inserted it piece by piece wherever it seemed factually appropriate to him. Now we can fortunately determine precisely the time when Josephus recorded the story of the Babylonian Jews. From Antiquities 17.28 it follows that Agrippa II must have died, since this passage speaks about the transfer of his rule to the Romans as if it were a bygone fact: παρ᾿ ὧν (sc. Agrippa I and II) ῶΡωμαῖοι δεξάμενοι τὴν ἀρχὴν. Now we already know that the entire part Life 32 - 62 was also composed after the death of Agrippa II; for it (40) presupposes [the existence of] Justus' work which did not appear until after the death of Agrippa II. But it is still very gratifying when the same evidence can be provided once again as well for 46 - 62 in particular.

But now if, as has just been proven, the entire report was written down after 100, the year of Agrippa’s death, then it follows with irrefutable logicality that we are to recognize Ant. 17.23 - 31 as an addition, since the Antiquities was already completed by 93/94. The fact of an insertion from a later time into the old text of the Antiquities is admittedly no longer surprising to us since we already had to recognize 20.259 - 266 as an addition once again from the time following Agrippa’s death. Nonetheless it is significant that we see Josephus at work in a second passage after the year 93/94 as well. Nobody who casts a glance at the section Ant. 17.23 - 32 and its surrounding text will doubt that we are facing a subsequent insertion here; because up to section 22 Josephus is dealing with the situation at Herod’s court, [only] to resume this presentation again after section 31. Our report is sandwiched in between; meaning and order return to Josephus’ text by removing it.

For the Life as well, implications arise that are of no slight significance. As a start — to return to [46] the initial point of this investigation — it has now been proven concerning also the part dealing with Philip and the Babylonian Jews in Gamala (46 - 62) that it has nothing to do with the presentation of Josephus’ experiences in the Life: Josephus never comes into contact with the situation described here; it belongs within an entirely different context. For this reason 46 - 62 has the same factual status as groups 32 - 42 and 43 - 45 discussed above, and the same is also proven from the contents of the overall passage 32 - 6221 as was from [an

20 Luther, *Josephus and Justus von Tiberias*, page 57.
21 The exact upper boundary [of the passage] is yielded from the preceding explanation in such a way that [the text] is to be cut before τοὺς ἐν Τιβεριάδι (31). The end must lie between
examination of the way in which the individual parts intersect: it is oriented in a direction other than that of the surrounding passages and originates from a different time than these, as is proven above all by the entirely different evaluation of John. A self-contained older report that first deals with Josephus’ journey to Sepphoris (30/31) and then his continued travels to Bethamus was subsequently split by an insertion that completely disrupted its context. And if 336 - 337 was merely disturbing, then it must be said here, the result of the insertion was that the context was factually and formally stripped of any reasonable meaning. The defensive trend inherent within the entire Life can therefore not have anything to do with the combat against Justus which was only inserted afterwards and which stems from an entirely different time period.

Now, if 32 - 62 is a later insertion into an older text, then all those parts which are based on this [47] report or are in some way connected to it must be likewise secondary and discarded without objection. Those passages that deal with Justus of Tiberias and with Philip and the Babylonian Jews will be affected by this stipulation. Our expectation is not only fulfilled but in truth is greatly exceeded.

Already H. Luther22, to whom the methods adopted here were totally unknown, nevertheless observed correctly that “in two passages where mention is made of Justus’ alleged participation in the opposition against Josephus, it appears exactly as if his name was added only afterwards.” Luther, who likewise clearly realized and stressed that there was no mention ever made of Justus’ opposition in the parallel presentation of the War, had sections 88 and 279 in mind there. In fact, the word τοῖς λεχθεῖσιν here does not acquire its correct reference until elimination of the intervening sentence ταῦτα ἐπήνει ... 63 and 64; moreover, since in 64 μετ’ αὐτῶν refers to his fellow envoys, these were [therefore] discussed previously, i.e. 63 belongs to 64, and we obtain a division point between 62 and 63. If according to this, 63 includes the factual continuation of the description of the events in Sepphoris (30/31), then this agrees excellently: it was precisely there that the fellow envoys, who were indeed priests (29), had enriched themselves so much. Had they just recently arrived in Galilee then the acquisition of wealth would remain incomprehensible. Factually the insertion includes sections 32 - 61. In its intersection [with the preceding passage] Josephus formulates the phrase τοὺς ἐν Τιβεριάδι (31), while section 62 is to establish the connection [with the following text]. Hence an allusion to the envoys had to be placed here, which formally fulfilled a connective function, even though it is factually awkward — Josephus had not even given an account of the envoys.

22 Josephus and Justus von Tiberias, page 45 f.
Ἰοῦστος καὶ ... συνέπειθεν and the same applies there to αὐτοὺς after the sentence μάλιστα .......τῷ Ἰωάννῃ is removed. Above all, however, even here Justus plays no role whatsoever in the continuing course of events; what occurred here was a retroactive grafting of names. But just like these cases recognized by Luther, [the same] stands for the parenthetical ἐληλύθει δὲ σὺν αὐτοῖς καὶ Ἰοῦστος (65), which is once again totally left in the air. Not even by a single word is anything at all mentioned about Justus afterwards. Luther perhaps did not come to this realization only because the connection of this group of words to section 36 ff. must have prevented him from doing so. To be sure, not only these two passages but all those that deal with Justus belong together. But after seeing that even 32 - 62 is secondary, the factor which stood in Luther’s way not only applies no longer, but conversely it also becomes evidence for the later addition in section 65.

This same parenthesis is inserted almost verbatim in section 175: ἦν δὲ σὺν αὐτοῖς Ἰοῦστος καὶ ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ Πιστός, and assessment of it must naturally be exactly like that of the phrase in section 65. How peculiar are things here after all! [48] While Josephus understandably virtually never adopts parentheses for the introduction of people and actions elsewhere23, this form is implemented consistently in all four passages where Justus is mentioned in few words. This cannot be a coincidence, rather it is only a gratifying confirmation for our conclusion, already established, that all the Justus passages have been subsequently inserted.

23 It must be said about Josephus’ use of parenthesis that this means of expression, which generally betrays a poor style, is to be encountered rather frequently [in his works]. By far the most prevalent application is used for the purpose of justification, be it an objective [justification on the part] of the author (e.g. the type in 11.107: τοσαῦτα γάρ εἰσιν αἷ... φυλαί), be it a subjective [justification] in terms of one of the people under discussion (e.g. the type in 11.253: φιλεῖσθαι γὰρ ἑαυτὸν). The second case, which is already much less common, occurs with the more precise definition of the appearance of a person or a matter, that is mentioned in the actual sentence, but the author presumes that the reader does not know them or does not expect them in this passage. The link is then provided with δὲ (e.g. the type in 11.235 ὦτος δ’ ἦν ἐκ ποικίλης μὲν ἐσθῆτος), and a demonstrative pronoun then most often establishes the connection (cf. 11.1; 12.171; 303; 13.144; 228; 270 etc.); thus, substitution for a relative clause. Lastly, in order to identify, [elsewhere] in Josephus, a formation such as that regularly found in the passages discussed above concerning Justus — i.e. the mention of a new matter or person within the framework of parentheses — I was obliged to read through four books of the Antiquities before I found the longed-for parallel in 14.328 (συνὴν δ’ αὐτοῖς καὶ ὦρκανός)! It is seen that Josephus is obliged to work with stylistic makeshifts in the later insertions of Justus.
But also the larger passages dealing with Justus and Philip respectively present the same pattern. Most informative are the things in sections 177 ff. which seem to me to be of particular significance because they provide the same connection, that is factually not at all justified, between passages about Justus and Philip as we found in the long insertion and which we shall encounter again in 407 - 410. Here as well, further evidence is provided that we are dealing with an insertion into the surrounding text. According to 174 ff. Josephus freed from prison the leaders of the rebellious Tiberians who had been imprisoned in Tarichea, and invited them to a banquet. On this occasion he expounds to them his view of the political situation: he, too, judges the Roman forces as quite powerful, but he remains silent about this in consideration for the rebels; he advises them to do the same and to not be dissatisfied with his leadership. [49] It is obvious that a conciliatory meal has taken place here, which presents the conclusion to the preceding story: still, one does not invite prisoners to a banquet and at the same time give them political advice in a speech! No, in 175 and 176 the Tiberians are clearly free and Josephus’ words τοὺς ἐκ τῆς εἰρκτῆς μεταπεμψάμενος... συνδείπνους ἐποιησάμην (175) are supposed to disclose the release from prison; if this is reported once again in 178, then this is an error produced by the insertion.

Even more important, however, is [the fact] that the chronological framework of the narrative is completely disrupted by this insertion. In 177 ff. Josephus claims to have told Justus among others during the banquet how the Gamalites had killed Chares “after the departure of Philip.” But the reader knows nothing at this point about a “departure of Philip”; so in 179 - 184 Josephus goes back in [the story to describe] how Philip reached Agrippa from Gamala and how the Gamalites then killed Chares. This had happened “before that” (179), i.e. before the banquet mentioned in 175, and therefore Josephus could refer to it there in conversation. The writing to Josephus and the fortification of Gamala that he initiated (186) also occurred at the same time that Chares was killed. This also occurred before the banquet and consequently also before the uprising of the Tiberians which was brought to an end with the banquet. This information about the fortification of Gamala became, on its part, an opportunity for Josephus to list the other towns that were fortified by him. With this it is clear that this entire report lags behind and that the chronological sequence, which is otherwise generally observed, is thereby thrown into a muddle. Thus sections 177 - 188 must then share
the same fate as the other segments about Philip and Justus that we have dealt with: they are to be eliminated from the original context.

We may be brief about the remaining segments dealing with Justus and Philip respectively since, with one exception, they are generally passages such that it would be downright possible to weed them out—[although] we could, in principle, accept them within their surrounding [text]—because they are inserted quite loosely. Apart from the long insertion 336 - 367, this applies to 390 - 393 which deals with Justus, as well as 114 which belongs with the passages about Philip and Gamala. By comparison, matters lie differently in 407 - 410 [50] where for the third time we encounter the peculiarity that the parts about Justus and Philip, exist in conjunction [although] they do not at all belong together; here it is impossible to eliminate [the passage] from the surrounding [text]; for it is only through it that we learn of Vespasian’s arrival, information which is indispensable for the continuing course of the entire narrative.

But the passages that name Justus personally are not the only ones in which [his existence] is presumed in the self-description. In chapter I we already established that our Life is announced in Ant. 20.266; however section 266 represents the conclusion of a longer exposition beginning in 262: nobody else has the same factual knowledge at his disposal as Josephus has. His fellow citizens testify that nobody knows the law and its interpretation as he does. But this is important only for the Jews; of course Josephus must admit that his knowledge of Greek is sketchy, and that despite all effort he was not successful in completely mastering Greek. From this angle, the statement that no one could have written this work as he did requires a qualification; but— he adds disdainfully—even slaves learn to speak foreign languages fluently; for him only knowledge about the Holy Scripture has value. That he, however, holds [such knowledge—] it is to prove this that he wishes to describe his life while there are still people living who can testify to its truth or who may wish to dispute it (266). The logical continuation of these thoughts is provided in the introductory pieces of the Life. Here Josephus describes his priestly lineage, in order to prove thereby the tradition in which he was raised. But just as we see from Ant. 20.266 that another agenda was in effect here, so the overview of his family concludes with the significant words: τὴν μὲν τοῦ γένους ἡμῶν διαδοχήν, ὡς ἐν ταῖς δημοσίαις δέλτοις ἀναγεγραμμένην εὑρόν, οὕτως παρατίθεμαι τοῖς διαβάλλειν ἡμᾶς πειρωμένοις χαίρειν φράσας (6). To family tradition must be added one’s own
understanding, and thus Josephus boasts with pride that as a 14-year-old lad he was already admired by all on account of his knowledge, even before he had passed through the upper school (7 - 12). In other words, in its introduction the Life explains with greater detail the thoughts that had been suggested in Ant. 20.262 ff., in order to prove thereby the factual knowledge of the author.

Antiquities 20.262 ff., however, is just as closely related to the combat against Justus. He had given himself way too much credit for his Greek education that he had the audacity to write on this basis, against which Josephus had explained: granted, you may be superior to me formally, but I have the factual knowledge (cf. page 33). Exactly the same is stated in Ant. 20.262 - 266, only in sharper terms: to speak Greek — just like Justus does (Life 40) — [is something] every slave can learn, but only I have the factual knowledge necessary for historical presentation. Thus Justus is attacked in 262 ff., and his work is designated as slave labour.

Furthermore Josephus, proud of himself, explains: I am writing my biography ἕως ἔχω ζῶντας ἢ τοὺς ἐλέξοντας ἢ τοὺς μαρτυρήσοντας (Ant. 20.266), but you, Justus, did not publish your work which was completed long ago ἧντων Οὐεσπασιανοῦ καὶ Τίτου..., from whom you could have received την ἀκριβείαν μαρτυρίαν... νῦν δ', ὅτε ἐκεῖνοι μὲν οὐκέτει εἰσίν μεθ' ἡμῶν, ἐλεγχθῆναι δ' οὐ νομίζεις, τεθάρρηκας (Life 359 - 360); and so once again: Ant 20.266 is directed against Justus. But because the Life is being prepared for here, therefore this is also aimed against Justus, i.e. by οἱ διαβάλλειν ἡμᾶς πειρώμενοι (Life 6) nobody else is to be understood but Justus himself who had maligned Josephus (Life 338; C. Ap. 1.53; cf. page 16).

Now an objection will be raised without further ado: the antagonism between Josephus and Justus that we discussed above pertains to the presentation of the war that both men produced in competition. By comparison, in Ant. 20.262 ff. and correspondingly in the sections of the Life mentioned [above] Josephus stresses exclusively his particular qualification for composing the Antiquities which he like no other — neither Jew nor foreigner — was capable of producing with such accuracy. The contradiction that exists here is solved by the observation that Justus, like Josephus, did not portray only the Roman-Jewish War, rather he was known (PW 10.1344 ff.) to have composed in addition a chronicle which entered into a similar competition with Josephus’ Antiquities: therefore the same questions play a role here as in the previous case. The decisive proof for this close connection is supplied by C. Ap. 1.54: in the middle of the defence of his history of the war which is directed against Justice, the
author inserts the reason for which he was particularly qualified to compose the *Antiquities*; because he has translated the Holy Scriptures (*Ant. 20.261*), γεγονὼς ἱερεὺς ἐκ γένους (*Life 1 - 6*), καὶ μετεσχηκὼς τῆς φιλοσοφίας τῆς ἐν ἑκείνοις τοῖς γράμμασι (*Ant. 20.263 - 265; *Life 7 - 12*).

Now, since the opponent under attack in *Contra Apionem* is Justus (cf. page 17), it follows that the parallel presentation, *i.e.* *Ant.* 20.262 ff. and *Life* 1 - 12 is also directed against Justus. No matter whether one wishes to accept along with most researchers that Justus composed two separate works, a chronicle from Moses to Agrippa and a history of the war, or whether the latter was a part of the former as I would rather suppose, it is certain that Josephus was affected most deeply by Justus’ writings in conjunction with his personal attacks, which were published after Agrippa’s death, and that he consequently felt compelled to provide evidence for his personal qualification in both areas in which Justus’ competition threatened to defeat him.

Now then, if reasons for [writing] the *Life* are provided in *Ant.* 20.262 and at the same time the attack against Justus is prepared there, and if it is the function of the *Life* to prove Josephus’ factual qualification for writing in the face of Justus’ attacks, then the *Life* and the combat against Justus originated at the same time, and there was never a self-portrayal of Josephus which would not have included the parts directed against Justus. But now if on the other hand it were to be proven by us that all the passages dealing with Justus [53] are later insertions into a foreign context, that a text thus originally existed without these insertions, then it now follows that this older form of the text also did not contain those passages by which the *Life* becomes the *Life*; because without the [section] 1 - 12 directed against Justus the *Life* is actually no longer the *Life*. In other words: **behind the self-portrayal which Josephus composed in response to Justus’ attacks, there stands an older writing that the author later formulated and expanded into the self-portrayal that we now have.**

---

24 The fact that both the chronicle and the presentation of the war appeared after Agrippa’s death and that Josephus’ polemics against Justus as author of the chronicle are so deeply entwined with his combat of Justus’ war presentation appear significant to me for deciding this question. Justus appears to have turned against Josephus in a purely uniform attack as well. The only factual objection to the equation of both works — the conciseness of chronicle (Photius) compared to the thoroughness of the history of the war — does not deter anyone knows that chronicles in antiquity become more expansive as they approach the author’s era. Compare what Dionysius 1.6 says about Fabius and Cincius.
Surprising as this result will appear at first glance, in principle it provides at the same time the answer to a question that can already be posed on the basis of superficial consideration and therefore has already been expressed by another party. The Autobiography is in truth no autobiography, as Schürer and many others explain to us, rather it deals almost exclusively with the preparatory activity of Josephus as commander of Galilean before the collision with the Romans. “The short biographical notes at the beginning and end of the writing are related to this main body of the contents only as introduction and conclusion.” But now if, as we were able to demonstrate, these biographical [notes] were actually only secondary elements worked into a foreign context, then what remains as the old part of the writing is precisely what Schürer and others took as the actual nucleus: Josephus’ report about his activity as governor of Galilean until the hostile collision with the Romans.

Now we are also finally prepared to return to the problem from which our investigation departed at the beginning of chapter 2: How is it that Josephus does not present in the Autobiography a portion of the things reported in the War, rather he refers to the report in the War for [these details], while he recounts others as if there had never existed a parallel writing? — All the explanations that we attempted to provide above had to fail; now after it has been recognized that the Autobiography is compiled from the old report about Josephus’ actions in Galilean and the biographical elements that were added later, a new solution is unavoidable: How, then, are the two parts, that are stylistically oriented in such a different manner, related to the two groups that have just been identified? The formulation of the questions leads directly to our objective: Josephus’ report about his preparatory activity as governor is entirely without a single reference, even though it is also right here that the parallel [passages] are to be found (cf. page 7), whereas the bordering sections, that we have recognized as additions, are those that contain the references. But from here it follows: if Josephus, did not refer factually to the War wherever he could have in his report about his actions in Galilean, then there is only one single explanation for this author who so loved to quote from himself: the parallel [passages]

25 Felten I.612: The Autobiography ... apart from some biographical comments at the beginning and the end, ... includes only a defence of Josephus’ conduct in Galilean before the beginning of the actual war with the Romans.
presentation of the War did not yet exist when Josephus was drafting the nucleus of the later biography, namely the administrative report, i.e. this stems from the period before 75/79. On the other hand, the formulation of the Autobiography, which did not occur until after the year 100, presupposes everywhere [the existence of] the War, which is therefore cited so often in these passages.

Now this, combined with the remaining facts that have been established above, provides the possibility to differentiate accurately the old and new [texts] from beginning to end. When in Life 27, during the presentation of the causes of the Jewish War, reference is made to the War, then it is indeed self-evident that an exposition of the causes of the Jewish-Roman War do not belong within Josephus’ administrative report about his administration of Galilee. Therefore the old text begins after section 27, i.e. just with the start of Josephus’ activity in Galilee. What lies before this point was not written until after the year 100.

However, the end point of the old administrative report surely lies before section 412; because here the War is referred to once again on the occasion of Vespasian’s invasion. But let us continue. We [55] remember that section 407 - 410 remained apart as the only passage naming Justus and Philip respectively among those which otherwise were consistently to be removed from their context. However these passages [concerning] Justus and Philip respectively are precisely those elements by which the Life becomes the Life. Therefore they must of course be eliminated entirely as late additions so far as they are located within the old administrative report, whereas so far as they belong to the biographical parts they must be inextricably incorporated with this because they did originate from the same time. But this is the case for 407 - 410, which absolutely cannot be separated from its continuation; therefore the end of the old administrative report lies before section 407 — it began with the takeover of Galilee by Josephus (28) and reached its end before the arrival of Vespasian. Many years later this report was then extended into the self-portrayal directed against Justus in that the work was provided with a beginning and an ending in sections 1 - 27 and 407 - 430 and additions were inserted into the individual passages discussed above.

The examination of Josephus’ self-portrayal has consequently brought us the important result that incorporated within it [survives the oldest text stemming from Josephus: his administrative report about the administration in Galilee. Before we continue, we must verify this result by a comparison of the parallel
narratives contained in the *War* and in the administrative report; for if our path is the correct one, then the administrative report must offer the more original version of the narratives [when] compared to the *War*. This problem is to occupy us in the next chapter.

[56]

Chapter III. Josephus’ *Life* and *War*

The preceding investigation has brought us to the important realization that even before the *War* Josephus composed an administrative report about his activity during the Jewish revolt, and that he published this report after the year 100 as an appendix to the *Antiquities* — after expanding it with his combat against Justus and with biographical details. The *War* is therefore younger than this old recovered nucleus of the later *Life*. We [can] verify this finding by an exhaustive comparison of the parallel reports to be found in the *Life* and the *War*. It is a fact — and a downright outrageous one at that — that no research at all has been dedicated to this task before now. But this fact is explained by the circumstance that one could not possibly have arrived at [such] a result with the previously accepted means of source criticism. Since this [writing], in fact, concerns the personal experiences of the author himself, about which only he has kept records, it was of course impossible to ascribe, for example, the one report to this source and the other [report] to that [source]. And since it is thought that an author’s contradictions can be explained only by [the fact] that he has used diverse sources, and this possibility is excluded here, thus an insoluble puzzle was encountered in this case — with silence. In so far as things were being retold, at times this version was used, at times that one, and consequently a picture was painted that had only a rather vague relationship to the actual course of events.

As opposed to source criticism which has run into such a quagmire, we shall compare the two reports with each other in great detail, and through this comparison two findings will emerge which are methodically invaluable; for we shall not only find confirmation that the nucleus of the *Life* is older than the *War*, but we shall also see that the different reports that Josephus has produced about the events do depend upon each other in such a way that he pursued different political purposes at the different periods of time and therefore he changed certain details of his formulation. In the place of source criticism — and as a
complement — must appear the assessment of Josephus’ mental development; it alone will allow us to understand the varied presentation of the parallel reports.

1. The Dabaritta affair

*Life* 126 - 148 = *War* 2.595 - 613

The essence of both parallel narratives is roughly as follows: some Jewish youths from the village of Dabaritta assault a member of King Agrippa’s court on the “Great Plain” and bring their plunder to Josephus in Tarichea. He does not give the Dabarittans the share in the plunder that they had hoped for and thereby provokes them to the disastrous step of maligning him as a traitor to the population. Thereupon the infuriated mobs of Tarichea and surroundings swarm together in the racetrack of Tarichea clamouring for the traitor’s death. Josephus cannot deny that he confiscated the plunder, but he advanced another intention; he did not mean to forward the profits to Agrippa, rather he intended to use them to build the longed-for fortification walls for Tarichea. Thus he won the Taricheans over and at the same time aroused the others’ jealousy of those who were favoured in this way. The outcome was that the masses that had previously appeared united against Josephus were split and consequently Josephus was saved. In any case, once again his enemies crowd in front of his house in order to kill him; but he now entices one of the attackers into his house and then sends him out again mutilated, thus at same time inducing such horror into the others that they definitively refrain from attacking Josephus from now on.

A closer inspection of both texts now shows that despite their general, and at times literal, correspondence, certain details are reported in extremely differing form. I [have] compiled the points to be considered directly into a specifically ordered sequence.

1. In the *Life* (126) the object of the Dabarittans’ attack is the wife of Ptolemy, who is King Agrippa’s vice-regent; in the *War* (595) the attack is directed against Ptolemy himself, Agrippa and Berenice’s vice-regent. Accordingly, in the *Life* Josephus takes the view that the plundered baggage of Ptolemy’s wife is private family property and rightfully belongs to Ptolemy (128). On the other hand, in the *War* Josephus no less consistently assumes the position that the attack made against Agrippa and Berenice’s vice-regent is in reality an injury
to the royal couple by whose order Ptolemy was travelling. According to this, Josephus is determined here to maintain Agrippa and his wife as the rightful owners of their belongings (τοῖς δεσπόταις 596; τοῖς βασιλεῶν 597). But the Life does not remain true to this view throughout its narrative; because, in contrast to section 128 but in agreement with the passages of the War referred to just [above], Life 130 and 131 explain that Josephus awarded the possessions to Agrippa who alone may be understood by δεσπότης and ἐκεῖνος respectively. And when we compare even the words τὰ χρήματα τῷ βασιλεῖ τετηρηκέναι (Life 140) with the thought referring to the same incident διαφυλάξαι τῷ Πτολεμαίῳ (Life 128), then the contradiction between the two passages of the same writing becomes obvious.

Thus arises the following matter of fact: the Life and the War are oriented according to different points of view. While the War maintains its view consistently until the end, the Life is influenced by the outlook of the War in some passages.

2. According to the version in the Life the attack of the Dabarittans is absolutely legitimate. Ptolemy’s wife, who was attacked, had intended to cross from Agrippa’s realm over to Roman domain and the Dabarittans had at least prevented the removal of goods into the enemy’s land. According to this, it is understandable that the Dabarittans, proud of their success, bring the plunder to Josephus who disposes of it in the manner to be discussed later. The War [is] completely different. There is not a trace of [the fact that] Ptolemy, who is indeed the one attacked here, wished to cross over to Roman territory; [59] therefore it is a matter of a simple armed robbery. But when these stolen goods are brought to Josephus, a justification for this is required: “the Dabarittans could not conceal their robbery”. Josephus, however, naturally wants nothing to do with the robbery “and therefore reprimands the Dabarittans because of their violence against the royals” (596). In conclusion: when the Dabarittans wish to malign Josephus who did not give them a share of the plunder, they indict him absolutely logically in Life 129 and 132 “of betrayal to the Romans”; for when, under suspicious

---

26 When Josephus uses the singular here as opposed to the plural [that is in] the War, then this is the necessary consequence from Life 126 where Ptolemy is designated as vice-regent of the king alone, whereas War 595 named the royal couple. That only Agrippa may in fact be understood by δεσπότης and ἐκεῖνος respectively follows from 131 where ἐκεῖνος refers to βασιλεὺς. Josephus avoided a precise designation in 130/1, however, in order that the contradiction not be made too obvious.
circumstances, he withholds the plunder that was taken from the woman fleeing to Roman territory, then he is maligned as being in cahoots with the Romans. [This is] different [in] the *War*: Ptolemy had not crossed over to Roman territory, therefore Josephus here (598) was to be designated simply as “traitor”; the addition “to the Romans” is omitted.

The view of the incident as a whole ultimately corresponds to all these facts. In the *Life* the Dabarittans were identified as “audacious”; after all, Ptolemy’s wife was guarded by horsemen who had to be overpowered (126) and because of that Josephus justifies why he could not leave the plunder to the Dabarittans by exhaustively citing Jewish commandments (128) as well. In the *War*, on the other hand, the Dabarittans are not labelled by any additional distinguishing adjectives und it is understood in and of itself without any justification that Josephus wants to have nothing to do with the robbery (596).

When the plunder was brought to Josephus, he explains that the walls of Jerusalem were to be built from the proceeds according to *Life* 128; he wished to set aside the plunder for this purpose. Yet according to the full context of the *Life* Josephus needs a pretext in order to withhold this plunder. But the Dabarittans became angry because they had not received a share of it and in revenge they started the rumour that Josephus intended to betray the land to the Romans. This rumour gains general credence, [people] gather together in the racetrack of Tarichea and demand the punishment of Josephus for high treason. But just as in [point] 1 above, where the inherently clear view of the *Life* is disrupted by a strange addition which was entered from the *War*, so also the same obtains here; for the Dabarittans, who according to 129 [spread] the rumour that Josephus meant to betray the land to the Romans [with the intention] of maligning him, with [this] same intention declare in 130 that Josephus wanted to return the money to its owner, *i.e.* Agrippa (*cf.* footnote, page 58). Now, once again it is precisely sections 130 - 131 that assume, in contradiction to the preceding presentation of the *Life*, that Agrippa was affected by the robbery, while according to 128 it is Ptolemy. With respect to this last point, we have already established in 1[above] that there is an influence from the view of the *War*. In principle, therefore, we shall already expect the other details contradicting the rest of the *Life* to be influenced [by the *War*] as well. The facts truly satisfy this [expectation].

The *War* contains no information about the ruse [concerning] the walls of Jerusalem; instead Josephus plays an open hand here in conformity to the overall view: he reprimands the
Dabarittans from the outset (596) and openly deposits the plunder with an inhabitant of Tarichea with the intention of returning it to its rightful owner. But the Dabarittans become angry because they are to receive nothing from the plunder, and because they had correctly seen through Josephus’ intention. Therefore, precisely that which is given in *Life* 130 - 131 in contradiction to the remaining presentation of the *Life*: “Josephus intending to return the plunder to Agrippa and the Dabarittans correctly recognizing this true intention of Josephus” finds its correspondent and its model in the *War*; because that which exists in the *Life* as a strange element fits perfectly into the overall view of the *War*. From this it follows that *Life* 130 - 131 developed under the influence of the *War*. But if we strike out this passage that disrupts the coherence of the *Life*, then an impeccable coherence remains by bringing together [sections] 129 and 132: “The Dabarittans spread the rumour that Josephus intends to betray the land to the Romans (129); as this rumour of Josephus’ treason now speeds throughout Galilee, even the inhabitants of Tarichea [come to] believe it etc.” (132).

Lastly, one more test of our evidence. If [sections] 130 - 131 are a later insertion arising under the influence of the *War*, then as a result the information [61] about the deposit of the money with Dassion and Janneus (131) no longer applies to the original context of the *Life*; thus, before the addition of 130 - 131 was made on the basis of the *War*, the money must have still been in Josephus’ hands according to the *Life*. This consideration is correct: when the wild mob appears before Josephus’ house, he immediately knows that it is a matter of releasing the money that he withheld and he consequently requests, “people to be sent to him who were to take possession of the money” (146). When Josephus recorded this sentence, he could not yet have had any idea about the deposit of the money as disclosed in 131. This is more than amply proven further by Josephus’ conduct in the *War*; according to this [version] the money had been deposited from the outset (596) in agreement with the overall view of this writing, thus Josephus no longer has this [money] at his own disposal and therefore when the mob comes before his house, he must first ask what they wanted from him (611) and there is also no word about the money in the answer. One sees how consistently both presentations have been executed initially. But when Josephus then wove into the *Life* later additions based upon the view of the *War*, he neglected to rectify all the old passages thoroughly. Therefore a stark contradiction from all sides exists in *Life* 130 – 131.

Two findings from our investigation are already established; Josephus recounted the
attack of the Dabarittans differently in the Life and the War despite a mutual dependency; these differences, however, are not accidental, rather they are based upon a thoroughly deliberate reworking. The question of which story corresponds to the truth is absolutely impossible to answer from external historical evidence; I would not with the best will in the world know by which method a researcher would prove whether Ptolemy or his wife had been the attacked party, and it would be just as impossible to advance a clear assessment of the various other points that are connected to this. The path to insight is indicated rather in the second finding from our stratification [Zergliederung] of the text. We observe that the presentation of the War had a subsequent effect upon that of the Life, such that the additions made on the basis of the War actually led to a rupture [62] in the view of the Life. Originally there was an inherently self-contained presentation in the Life that betrayed no acquaintance with the view of the War; the additions that had their origin in the expositions of the War were made only later. But [the fact] that the necessity for these additions did not emerge until later will prove that this version of the Life, which did not contain the additions generated on the basis of the War, is older than the War.

And now we remember that Josephus remitted the War to Agrippa, who expressed to Josephus his complete approval of the presentation (Life 363 - 367). If Josephus was primarily targeting Agrippa when composing the War and had him in mind as the reader, then it is obvious that the bending of the old report, such as that provided by the nucleus of the Life, to the view of the War occurred in order to show Agrippa how willing Josephus was to sacrifice himself on his behalf. For this reason, an attack upon Ptolemy’s wife that did not affect Agrippa was turned into an armed robbery against Agrippa’s vice-regent himself, by which the king was affected. The Dabarittans who had once conducted themselves audaciously (Life 126) are now promptly the object of the sharpest censure from Josephus (Life 130). Once it was legitimate plunder (λάφυρα Life 129), now it is called stolen goods (ἀρπαγή War 2.596 and subsequently in the added segment, Life 130). Accordingly, it can no longer be Josephus’ intention to erect the walls of Jerusalem with the plunder as was maintained in the old context of Life 128, rather he feels obliged to restore the stolen goods to the aggrieved Agrippa (War 596 - 597 and subsequently in the added segment Life 130 - 131). But it was precisely for this reason that he almost had to suffer death. Thus everything is intensified with the thought of gaining Agrippa’s recognition and of placing Josephus’ meritorious efforts on his behalf clearly in the
Therefore the oldest narrative is present in the Life stripped of additions, i.e. in 126 - 129 and 132 ff.; this report was reinterpreted in deference to Agrippa [and formed] into the version of War 2.595 ff. and finally the Life was expanded through the additions 130 - 131 [63] which were to bring about an equalization with the view of the War.

Our finding from chapter 2.3 is entirely confirmed by this realization. We had established there that an older administrative report of Josephus, which was already composed before the War, was worked into the Life, and now we have verified in a single instance that of the two parallel versions of the War and the Life, that of the Life is in fact the original one. Since this same finding will repeatedly impose itself on us, we [shall] already register it here as a firm result of our research, and in order to express this outwardly as well I shall use, in the future course of [this] research, the expression ‘administrative report’ as a confirmed item, and I understand by this the foundation of the Life that has been stripped of later additions and that was composed before the War.

4. Our findings encounter a very important and gratifying complement in immediate connection with these discussed texts, if we turn our attention to the actions of the Taricheans. According to the War, the crowd who gathered at the racetrack of Tarichea demands the traitor’s stoning or burning, as the case may be. Josephus’ friends — thus the report continues in essence — had fled, frightened by the crowd’s attack; he himself was still sleeping, and when the house was already set on fire he quickly arose and stepped before the assailing crowd without regard to his personal isolation and without fear, assuming the demeanour of one who was humbling himself in order to win over the crowd in this way (600 ff.). According to this, the building inhabited by Josephus must have been located in the most immediate vicinity of the racetrack; because nowhere is it indicated, even with one word, that the crowd or a part thereof betook themselves from the racetrack to Josephus’ house; rather, as soon as Josephus leaves his house he stands directly in front of the crowd gathered at the racetrack. — Matters lie downright opposite to this in the Life; for here it is unquestionably understood that the house inhabited by Josephus can be reached only by a more or less distant route from the racetrack. [64] Indeed, from sections 132 and 136 one can infer only that there is a certain distance from the racetrack to the house — but both passages at best still agree
with the War — in contrast, in 138 ff. the location is obviously such that Josephus had to cover a greater distance in order to come before the crowd of people; he still managed to anticipate the hoplites that were sent from the racetrack to his house [and evade them] by using another route (139).

Hand in hand with this difference between War and Life comes another: In the Life the hoplites are sent from the gathering to Josephus’ house while the crowd remains at the racetrack, whereas the War lacks the medium of the hoplites. Both views are again consistently integrated within the context of the two writings. If Josephus’ house is located near the racetrack then the gathering meets in its immediate vicinity and the events that take place before Josephus’ house are occurring at the same time at the racetrack; the involvement of the hoplites is unnecessary. Compared to this view in the War, that in the Life is just as logically consistent: Josephus’ house is located far away from the racetrack, at the very least it is separated from it by streets with houses. Thus the hoplites become necessary in order to connect the events at the racetrack to those in front of Josephus’ house. Or conversely: if the hoplites were included then Josephus’ house had to be placed at a distance from the racetrack; if the hoplites were missing then Josephus’ house had to be located near the racetrack where the gathering met.

From a factual consideration in deciding between the two possibilities it can already be easily shown that the presentation in the Life contains an error. That is to say, if Josephus’ location is such that he can leave his house by a secret route, then his plight is not so severe that there is no longer any other escape for him other than to risk [appearing] before the infuriated crowd in the guise of someone who has humbled himself. Strikingly as the view of the Life is refuted by this consideration, an effective solution to the problem is made possible only by an stratification [Zergliederung] of the text here as well. Already on page 58 we [65] had to establish that the telltale phrase in Life 140 τὰ χρήματα τῷ βασιλεῖ τετηρηκέναι stood in incompatible contradiction to the administrative report; in contrast to this, [the phrase] corresponds absolutely to the War. So here exists a later insertion based on the War, just as in [sections] 130 - 131. And the use of the word ἁρπαγή (139) in reference to the Dabarittans’ plunder (page 62) displays the same trend. Finally, when Josephus explains in 142 that he had put aside the money to build the walls of Tarichea, then this is ludicrous in the face of the fact that he had just previously declared with the same openness that the walls of Jerusalem were
to be constructed with the plunder (128).

In fact, it is not difficult to determine the exact extent of the insertion into the *Life* that has just been identified. We read the same thought almost literally in 136 on the one hand, and in 145 on the other:

136. ἀναλαβών τινας ὀπλίτα ἐπὶ τὴν οἰκίαν ἐν ἥ κατηγόμην ἔσπευδεν ὡς ἀναιρήσων
145. ἀναλαβόντες ἑξακοσίους ὀπλίτας ἦκον ἐπὶ τὴν οἰκίαν ἐνθα διέτριβον ἐμπρήσοντες αὐτήν

Thus, similarly to *Ant.* 20.259 (cf. page 4) and *Life* 62 (cf. footnote page 46), Josephus has applied duplications here in the manner of Polybius in order to implant an insertion into the original text. This is no stylistic artifice, rather [it is] an accommodation that is forced upon any author when he must insert a new element into an old context. If the whole text is not to be entirely reworked then there is nothing else to be done other than to establish ties that uniformly connect the insertion with text surrounding it, [both] before and after. Conversely, these duplications constitute an important resource for us [in determining] the margins of the insertions, which may of course be established as such only on the basis of factual observations.

Our finding will be corroborated in a surprising manner. That is to say, if we engage in reconstructing the old text as it read before the expansion generated under the influence of the *War*, then it can only be a question now of identifying the transition from one duplication to the next, in general. It is certain that in 137 the words ἰδὼν τὴν ἐπιδρομὴν τῶν πολιτῶν belong to the expansion; [66] because according to the immediately preceding section 136 it is indeed not the townsmen who rush to Josephus’ house, but the hoplites. But one truly ought not to corrupt [verschlechtern] the [textual] transmission by changing πολιτῶν to ὀπλιτῶν, because according to the *War*, which is the source for the insertion, it is actually the townsmen who swarm in front of Josephus’ house. From the discrepancy between ὀπλιτῶν in 136 and πολιτῶν in 137 it now follows, conversely, that 136 belongs to the old administrative report. And now it also becomes immediately clear why Josephus had to corrupt the narrative of the *War* by the insertion of hoplites into the *Life*: the sentence [stating] that hoplites were
sent to Josephus’ house from the gathering at the racetrack is a remnant from the original context of the Life where the gathering at the racetrack is followed by the dispatch of the hoplites who attacked Josephus’ house according to 146 ff.

The information from section 145 corresponds to the results obtained here. When the Dabarittans, who undertook the attack, are designated here as “robbers” who must fear their punishment from Josephus, then this view does not belong to the administrative report but to the War (page 58 ff.). Therefore Life 145, in fact, has its model [Vorbild] in War 2.596 where Josephus speaks of “robbery” and severely reprimands the Dabarittans because of their violence; therefore Life 145, which has no place beside 136 in the original text, belongs to the expansion: Among the duplications, section 136 is the pattern according to which 145 was shaped. Unfortunately the corruption of the text at the end of 136 precludes the original context and the transition from being identified to the word, but our factual result is not compromised by this: In the old administrative report section 146 directly followed section 136 and so we are in a position to sketch an outline of the original context of this report as it has been conserved for us in sections 126 - 129; 132 - 136 and 145 ff.

The audacious Dabarittans attack Ptolemy’s wife while she is meaning to bring her possessions to Roman territory under heavy guard. They take her property away from her and bring [67] it to Josephus. Concerned about the law, he wishes to keep these possessions for Ptolemy and therefore explains to the Dabarittans, as a pretext, that he intends to put aside the plunder in order to build the walls of Jerusalem with it. The Dabarittans, however, are infuriated because they have received no share of the plunder and they spread the rumour that Josephus intends to betray the land to the Romans (126 - 129); the crowd is agitated by this and gathers at the racetrack of Tarichea where notably Jesus, son of Sapphias, distinguishes himself by his diatribe against Josephus. He takes some hoplites along in order to kill Josephus, “the betrayer of the law”. They rush in front of the house where Josephus was resting (132 - 136); he is deserted by all and can save himself only by guile; he climbs onto the roof of his house and, in the hope of calming them in this way, he invites the assailants to send people into the house who are to fetch the money. This comes to pass; they send the most audacious man into the house; but Josephus injures him so seriously and thereby induces such fear into the others who believed Josephus to be protected by armed [guards], that they flee in
all directions (146 - 148).

This text was already available to Josephus when he was composing the War but new points of view emerged, which he believed he had to apply. Consideration for King Agrippa, who was to read the work, motivated a fundamental shift in the presentation of the details (page 62). It should become particularly significant with respect to this, that Josephus, who henceforth condemned this “armed robbery” against Agrippa’s vice-regent most sharply, could no longer as previously explain openly that he intended to use the profits from this raid to build the walls of Jerusalem. His plan can now only be to return the stolen [property] to its rightful owner, and Josephus carried this out [despite] the ever so serious risks that he encountered in so doing, which he nonetheless gladly sustained for Agrippa’s sake (War 2.596). The theme of building the walls was thus no longer to be applied in the old sense, yet Josephus was not able to bring himself to definitively [68] discard it, rather he resurrected it again in another manner that was highly significant for him.

The narrative of the War has undergone considerable embellishment compared to the old administrative report (page 66f.): When the crowd had gathered at the racetrack, they throng in front of Josephus’ house that is nearby; [since] it is impossible for him to flee he seeks refuge in the ruse of acting remorseful (599 - 601). He thereby arouses the compassion of the Taricheans whereas the inhabitants of the countryside still wish to continue persecuting him. The opponents are thus split and now when Josephus is able to speak in his defence, he explains that it was not his intention to send the money back to Agrippa, rather he intended to help the town of Tarichea [build] a town wall with it; but since he knew that the Tiberians and the other towns wished to take the plunder for themselves, he hid the money for the time being. But in the case that anyone wanted it, he would bring it forth (602 - 607). The Taricheans now praise Josephus whereas the Tiberians and the others become infuriated. Thus a split between the two parties develops and Josephus, relying upon the Taricheans who are favourably disposed towards him, can risk reprimanding his opponents; but eventually he explains that he intends to secure Tarichea first of all by building walls, but then [he would secure] the other towns as well. They should only be at peace; the greater part of the crowd

---

27 Cf. page 62. This dependency is revealed quite significantly in one passage. War 2.594 speaks of a betrayal to the Romans. This information has no support within the War itself (cf. page 59), but it does indeed in Life 129 and 132, which thus provided the model.
went away, even though displeased, only 2000 armed [men] stormed in front of Josephus’ house and with this the report then slips over into the narrative of the old administrative report (610).

Admittedly, the report of the War retold here is again by no means uniform or self-contained. It immediately springs to the eye that sections 602 - 607 report approximately the same as sections 608 - 609, – only in greater detail: Josephus splits his opponents by promising the Taricheans [that he will] fortify their town with the money that stands at his disposal, which inspires the intense displeasure of all others against him, whereas the Taricheans support him from now on. Accordingly, sections 602 - 607 are then also enclosed within such duplications as have already acquired a significant relevance for us:

[69]

§ 602: πρὸς παῦτα [sic] τῶν μὲν οἰκείως ἐχόντων καὶ μάλιστα τῶν Ταριχεατῶν οἶκτος ἦν· οἱ δ’ ἀπὸ τῆς χώρας...
§ 608: ἐπὶ τούτοις οἱ Ταριχεᾶται μὲν αὐτὸν ἀνευφήμουν, οἱ δ’ ἀπὸ τῆς Τιβεριάδος σὺν τοῖς ἄλλοις ἐκάκιζον καὶ διηπείλουν

Purely externally, these two [passages] lead to [the possibility] that the part between them is an insertion. In fact, a careful observation of the factual details of this assumption confirms it as a hard and fast result.

1. In section 602 Josephus’ opponents request that he produce “[their] common money” — what is meant by this is the money seized by the Dabarittans that Josephus must therefore have at hand. One may perhaps wish to argue here that the Taricheans would not have known that Josephus had deposited the money with the Tarichean, Eneas (596), all the same, this is not a possible means of explanation considering sections 606 and 607 where Josephus himself says: “I preferred to withhold the money quietly in order to build a wall for you. But if you are against this, then I will bring forth (namely out of my house) the money that was brought to me.” Now, according to the full context as established by Josephus in composing the War, we already know that Josephus no longer had the money at his disposal and that, on the contrary, he had deposited [it] with Eneas (596). What a brilliant means of defence it would have been to indicate right here that he does not even have the money any more at all. It is in this sense as well that the author, in section 609, speaks not actually of the money that was in his possession
but rather of [the fact] that he would be in a position to procure the money for building the walls — so he does not yet have it — and it is in section 611 that the modification in comparison with the administrative report, already discussed by us on page 61, had been made precisely because Josephus did not have the money on him. Thus sections 602 and 607 proceed from very different premises than do 596, 609 and 611 with which they stand in contradiction.

2. In section 605 Josephus explains that he did not have the intention of transferring the money to Agrippa; “because I will never deem your enemy to be my friend nor consider as a benefit something that brings harm to the community.” That such a sentence, in which Agrippa is designated as a pest, [70] did not exist in the book that Josephus trimmed for Agrippa’s reading [pleasure] requires little explanation; we did see how, quite to the contrary, the underlying thought of the War was that Josephus had done everything for Agrippa’s sake and that the context was altered with precisely this in view (cf. page 62).

3. In the mutually parallel passages 602 and 608 there is still a remarkable difference to be found. According to 602 the party hostile to Josephus consisted of “people from the countryside”, whereas in 608 the Tiberians are named as opponents. Now, it will arise later that the War has acquired a further characteristic in that all of Josephus’ conflicts with the Tiberians are deleted (cf. page 84); therefore, at that time Josephus could neither have produced the sentence (606) according to which he had to fear that the Tiberians had intended to steal the monies, nor 608 according to which the Tiberians reviled and threatened Josephus. From this last observation it also arises that, of the two parallel versions, the one from section 602 is to be assessed as the original, so that the first version initially read: πρὸς ταῦτα τῶν μὲν οἰκείως ἔχοντων καὶ μάλιστα τῶν Ταριχεατῶν οἶκτος ἦν, οἱ δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς χώρας καὶ τῶν πλησίων, ὡσις ἔδοκεν φορτικός, ἐβλασφήμουν· // καταλιπόντες δὲ ἐκάτεροι τὸν Ἰώσηπον ἄλληλοις διεφέροντο· κα’ κείνος ταρρῶν ἤδη τοῖς ψευδεωμένοις, ἦσαν δὲ εἰς τετρακισμυρίους Ταριχεᾶται, παντὶ τῷ πλῆθει παρρησιαστικῶτερον ὤμιλει. By this, it is now quite clearly seen how the ὑκειωμένωις from section 608 incorporates the οἰκείως ἔχοντων from section 602.

4. All the same, this version that has just been delineated is not yet the final one. Josephus’ [rapport] with Tarichea unfolds in the opposite sense to that of his rapport with Tiberias (page 91 ff.) as an inevitable consequence of the fact that these two towns stood in opposition to one another. In particular, we shall see that Josephus deleted all his close relations with Tarichea while composing the War, because Agrippa and the Romans took
extremely severe action against this town. In our context as well we therefore encounter the opposition between Josephus and Tarichea. Namely when Josephus, according to 609, promises to erect walls for the Taricheans, then this is not to be interpreted as some magnanimity on the part of Josephus, rather — as a means of deception; because the people who lend credence to Josephus’ words are designated as “those who have been deceived” in 610; therefore the promise to build walls was only a ruse by Josephus in order to be freed from the noose, and when in so doing he promises first of all to fortify Tarichea but then also the other towns, then this is only a consequence of [the fact] that he is indeed hard pressed above all by the Taricheans with whom he is staying and therefore must win them over as a priority. It is however incompatible with this fact that the Taricheans are addressed as Josephus’ friends in sections 602 (beginning) and 608 (end); this view belongs rather into the context of the insertion and therefore the words καὶ μάλιστα τῶν [sic] Ταριχεατῶν in 602 and ἦσαν δὲ εἰς τετρακισμυρίους Ταριχεᾶται in 608 are to be deleted from the passage that has just been reconstructed (page 70). Josephus introduced them into his text at the same time as the insertion [consisting] of 602 (end) to 608 (beginning).

Thus the original report of the War read: when the crowd from the hippodrome beleaguered Josephus’ house, he sees no escape other than to present himself, humbled, before the mob. He thereby arouses the compassion of those close to him who then also sided with him such that his opponents are split. This state of affairs grants Josephus courage, he dares to give a speech in which he promises, in pretence, to fortify Tarichea and then the other towns; the crowd falls for it and, even though infuriated, disperses.

When Josephus composed the War by imitating and using the administrative report, he enriched his presentation through this narrative. On what is it based? — Indeed, it is not inherently impossible that Josephus should have later remembered an aspect that he had originally forgotten or perhaps even intentionally suppressed. On the other hand, his powers of imagination, as we shall recognize more and more clearly, operated in such a way that truth and fiction flowed into each other[. The fact] that the fabulist is speaking to us here is proven by a consideration of the theme of building the walls to which we can return after our stratification [Zergliederung] of the War.

The report about the intended building of the walls of Jerusalem, as it was given by Josephus in the administrative report [that was] the source of the War, became
superfluous after Josephus had to delete it from the War for the reasons described on page 67. But the theme of building the walls — once it existed in the source — continued to have an effect and could fortunately be exploited even now: instead of designating the money for building the walls of Jerusalem it was now ostensibly to be claimed for Tarichea and the other towns. Admittedly Josephus could not set this forth as the true purpose, since he did after all intend to restore the money to Agrippa, but [he could] well [set it forth] as a guileful means to deal with the opponents that were threatening him. Of course these are then the ones who have been deceived and Josephus underscores this particularly forcefully (610) so that the impression may not arise that he had any intention other than to restore the stolen goods to their owner. Thus our findings consolidate into a well-rounded picture: According to the administrative report it was Josephus’ intention to give the plunder back to Ptolemy; he therefore withholds the money under the pretext that he intends to use it for building the walls of Jerusalem. The War turns the legitimate plunder into a violent robbing of Agrippa that Josephus criticizes most vehemently; the proceeds from it could thus not be designated for building the walls of Jerusalem even in pretence. But then, when Josephus is hard pressed by the Taricheans, he extricates himself by now promising the Taricheans etc. in pretence to build the walls, [this being] a transference of the theme of building the walls that had become superfluous. Thus the transformation of the narrative in the War is due only to the author’s unrestricted powers of imagination. One sees how strong the dependency on the administrative report is despite this, not only by the retention of the theme of building the walls even though it was used otherwise, but also by [the fact] that Josephus even now (596) did not send the money directly back to Agrippa, but only had the intention of doing so; the money was not to be dispensed with for the subsequent narrative which follows the administrative report.

Thus Josephus actually used his old administrative report as a model when he composed the War, but in [certain] details he expanded it diversely [mannigfach] in such a way that it was not new sources but rather his freely working powers of imagination [73] that provided him with the material for his expansions that were inspired in addition by the objective of moving Josephus’ meritorious efforts on Agrippa’s behalf into the spotlight. Consequently a certain discrepancy did arise now between the two reports and in order to smooth this over the old administrative report was expanded by the passages Life 130 - 131 and
by the use of these the view of the War was to coincide with the administrative report. We therefore turn [our attention] now to a consideration of these insertions.

It has already been established (page 60) that Life 130 - 131 to all intents and purposes has adopted the point of view of the War with respect to the attack of the Dabarittans.

Originally in Life 129 Josephus had specified the refusal of the reward that the Dabarittans expected as the only reason for the uprising — in revenge they had denounced Josephus as traitor. In the War, which Agrippa was to read, the assumption of the Dabarittans that Josephus intended to restore the plunder to Agrippa (596) was added to this as a second reason; in doing so the author underscores this reason (cf. 596) so that it becomes completely clear to what risks he has exposed himself for Agrippa’s sake. This idea, for its part, now became the source for Life 130: the building of Jerusalem’s walls is indeed only a pretext, — so it was rumoured by the Dabarittans, in order to instigate the uprising against Josephus — in truth, Josephus intended to return the plunder to “its owner” (page 58). And — thus the author continues afterwards in section 131 — this was in reality the intention of Josephus, who gave over the stolen goods for this purpose to Agrippa’s close friends with the order to deliver them to the king. This last sentence also ties in with the War (596), but at the same time it goes somewhat beyond; because according to War 596 the money was only deposited in order to give it back eventually to the king, while here in the Life immediate restitution was to ensue. I would like to see the reason for this small alteration in [the fact] that the money is required in the War for the continued narration after 596 as well, because the issue of the building of Tarichea’s walls — as ἀπάτη — which presumes the availability of the money, is not dealt with until 609. In the Life, on the other hand, the corresponding (cf. page 72) problem of the building of Jerusalem’s walls — as σόφισμα — is already settled in 130, the money is [74] thus no longer required for this narrative after section 131 and Josephus therefore could easily carry his zeal for Agrippa one step farther here than in the War. Thus the insertion Life 130 - 131 in effect presents itself to us from all angles as dependent upon the narrative and view of the War. One may well assume that when Josephus was composing the War on the basis of his administrative report and suffusing it with a new bias, he at the same time enriched his old manuscript by an addition that was to bring about an equalization between the two expositions.

Matters stand differently with sections 137 - 145, which we shall discuss in conjunction with their parallel in War 2.602 - 608. For the sake of brevity, we wish to designate the War in
the form considered up to now (i.e. without 602 - 608) as War I. The theme of the building of Jerusalem’s walls, having now become unserviceable to this War, had been transferred over to Tarichea in such a way that Josephus could give this promise to build the walls indeed only as a deception (ἡπατημένων 610; ἀπάτη δευτέρᾳ 611) because he had claimed here that in reality he intended to restore the money to Agrippa and because, on the other hand, his rapport with Tarichea was to be portrayed negatively. But now the theme of building the walls of Tarichea also has been inserted subsequently into the Life, which had reported the intention to build the walls of Jerusalem in its old text. This procedure has thus admittedly led to a factually totally inappropriate and absolutely unhistorical duplication, and this all the more so for Josephus very consciously and logically abstains from the contention that there was any deception in the Life; because ἡπατημένων and ἀπάτη are mentioned in the corresponding context of the War — as is appropriate to its bias (page 72) — [but] the corresponding passage in the text of the Life reads: πιστεύσαντες (144); in contrast, there is not a word about ruse or deceit to be found.

It follows from section 140 that when Josephus composed this part of the Life he did in fact intend to have it taken as true that he wished to fortify Tarichea and the other towns with the money that belonged to Agrippa. According to this [section] his opponents wished to kill him for having been found guilty of treason “in the event that he should admit that he had put aside the money for the king” — but he does not make this [75] admission; on the contrary he sets forth his intention that he meant to use the money for building the walls. Whoever reads the narrative [in] 137 - 144 impartially will never be able to come to the idea that the money was set aside for any purpose other than to be used for building the walls. In fact, Josephus did intend it to be understood thus, because in the section of the War (605) that corresponds to our passage, Josephus says quite sharply that it was not his intention to restore the money to Agrippa in whom he sees the common enemy of the Jewish cause. Here then, in fact, a completely different wind is blowing towards us: there is no longer any trace of the consideration for Agrippa and the effort to attribute his own risks to this consideration, i.e. of the fundamental idea of War I; on the contrary, Josephus moves far away from Agrippa. However this movement is very sharply elaborated in War II, whereas in the Life it is more a tacit premise of the narrative.

But it is not only the attitude towards Agrippa that had shifted in the two parallel
sections in comparison with *War I*, but also [the attitude] towards Tiberias. This town has played absolutely no role in our context as yet; now all at once the town is brought up in the added segments and its inhabitants are characterized in such a way that Josephus’ opinion of them leaves no doubt: The Tiberians, thus reads *War* 2.606, wish to appropriate the stolen goods; it is they who, in contrast to the Taricheans, revile and threaten Josephus (608). This passage is especially indicative because “the people from the countryside” were named instead of the Tiberians in the passage according to which 608 was shaped, namely 602. Now, Josephus’ attitude towards the town of Tiberias had completely shifted during the course of his life, as already mentioned (page 70; cf. 84 ff.). Whereas he adopted a friendly bearing towards Tiberias while composing *War I* and always stressed their mutual agreement, both earlier and later he persecuted the town of Tiberias with fierce animosity. We distinctly encounter this sentiment especially in the added segment *War* 2.602 - 608, which is precisely where his pronounced stance against Agrippa is also most noticeable. Conversely, the Taricheans [76] are highly featured in 606, and it is in their honour that the insertions, discussed above on page 70, are integrated into 602 and 608; [these insertions] are to emphasize Josephus’ close rapport with Tarichea: *When Josephus recorded his War, he was acting in honour of Agrippa and the town of Tiberias patronized by the latter; on the other hand he persecuted Tarichea, which was hostile to Agrippa and the Romans. Later on, this entire relationship was reversed: Josephus moved away from Agrippa, [and] consequently censured Tiberias and praised Tarichea. And it is precisely this sentiment that we encounter with total clarity in the insertion *War* 2.602 - 608; it therefore originates from a much later period than the first draft of the War.*

Consequently, when Josephus wished to have his attitude to Agrippa, the Tiberians and the Taricheans be understood as modified for reasons that are to be discussed elsewhere, he brought forth his *War* and inserted passages into it which were to take his new sentiment into account. According to *War I*, the split between the opponents resulted from [the fact] that Josephus presented himself to the crowd in the demeanour of one who was distraught and part of the crowd thereupon sided with him, and part against him, so that Josephus, relying upon his newly won adherents, was able to speak frankly and promise the fortification first of Tarichea and then of the other towns. Josephus now makes the fortification of the towns as the
main point and thereby gains the possibility of censuring the Tiberians as opposed to Tarichea, and of making known his enmity towards Agrippa. Correspondingly, [the importance of] his appearance as one who has humbled himself is reduced; this self denigration becomes merely a ruse (604). Thus the theme of building the walls has now found its third and final application, because when Josephus now set about also reconciling the Life with the War thus formulated, the basic lines remained essentially conserved. Only the sharp edges that had arisen from the insertion of the War, were avoided in the new consistent formulation.

According to War I (602) the split [in his opponents] was produced by Josephus’ appearance, whereas in War II [Josephus’] favouritism of the Taricheans became the instrument of the [77] separation (604 ff.). The consistent scheme of Life 138 ff. was able to smooth over this internal contradiction through literary means in that Josephus’ appearance did not yet split the opponents, rather it aroused compassion in everyone so that the split was then caused solely by the theme of building the walls. But more important for Josephus’ personal development is that henceforth in the Life he deleted his antagonism towards Agrippa and lent a gentler colouring to his relationship with Tiberias: the harsh words that the Tiberians wished to steal the loot (War 606) were completely discarded, the response of the Tiberians against Josephus on account of the building of Tarichea’s walls is softened at least inasmuch that, alongside the Tiberians, even the Galileans are mentioned before them (143), and that Josephus from now on explicitly promises a wall also to the Tiberians, besides “to the remaining towns” (144), where the War had spoken only of the other towns in contrast to Tarichea (609). Obvious as it thus is, that the insertion of the Life (137 - 145) is dependent upon War II — the mention of the Tiberians in the Life is, after all, nothing but an influence of the War — so obvious is it also that Josephus has abandoned the pronounced attitude of War II. In anticipation, let it just be noted that this new orientation of Josephus corresponds to his view after the year 100, when he appeals to Agrippa as an authority for other reasons (Life 361); i.e. 137 - 145 originated when Josephus cast the Life in its present form.

Our view of Josephus’ literary activity has been substantially enriched by our stratification [Zergliederung] of the text: just as the administrative report exists beyond the Life and worked within it, so also the War available to us is no organic whole; on the contrary, we have determined that 602 to 608 [constitute] a part that stems from a completely different time than that draft which Josephus presented to Agrippa between 75 and 79. I believe that I
can now also determine when this addition was inserted into the *War*. It has already frequently been pointed out (cf. Luther, page 57 ff.) how odd it is that Josephus judges Agrippa unfavourably in the last book of the *Antiquities*; if this fact were also applied in reverse in order to determine Agrippa’s death, then the observation is absolutely correct [78] in principle. But this unfavourable evaluation of Agrippa is so particularly important now because it stands in contrast to the earlier period when Josephus, as we saw, falsified the story in honour of Agrippa, and in contrast to the later period when Josephus greatly emphasized his own close relations to Agrippa (*Life* 359 ff.) during his vehement attacks against Justus after the year 100.

If we place these facts into a purely external chronological order, then Josephus judged Agrippa favourably in the seventies and after the year 100; in contrast, in the year 93/94 when he finished the *Antiquities*, he stressed an antagonism towards Agrippa. The well-known passage *Ant.* 16.187, that is unfortunately corrupted, also belongs within this antagonism. Here Josephus admits that he is not afraid of arousing the ire of Herod’s descendants if he has served the truth by his history; only one who writes in opposition to the Herodians, *i.e.* Agrippa, expresses himself thus. The expansion *War* 2.602–608 is to be incorporated into this [time] line; for it too is characterized [by the fact] that Josephus, in contrast to the past (*War I*) and the future (*Life* 143), elaborates his enmity towards Agrippa (*War* 2.605); thus *War* 2.602–608 is in chronological agreement with the conclusion of the *Antiquities*.

In this regard, we remember that just at the time when Josephus had completed the *Antiquities* he was contemplating the idea of writing the history of the war anew (cf. page 32). If we therefore already had to introduce the question of whether Josephus perhaps had already engaged in preparatory work for his new treatment of the war, then we now have found the answer to this: *War* 2.602–608 is **nothing other than a passage destined for the planned reworking of the Jewish War, and it is for this reason that it agrees entirely in its political leaning with the *Antiquities*, at the conclusion of which Josephus once again embarked upon the narrative of the war.** Consequently we do not have before us the *War* in its original version any more than we have the [original] *Antiquities*; on the contrary, Josephus has diversely [mannigfach] amended his works even after their completion and first publication, thereby doing something similar [79] to Polybius who repeatedly reformulated his great historical work afresh and thus only gradually fashioned it into [the text] that we encounter [today]. All our manuscripts trace back to this autograph of
Josephus; thus we do not possess his works in a collection of published works that was subsequently compiled, but rather in the form that Josephus bestowed upon them, partly after their publication. This fact will become particularly significant in another context.

After the War had acquired its final structure around the year 93/94, it lay in this form in front of Josephus, who set about creating the self-portrayal out of his old administrative report after the year 100. He then combined both sources in the manner discussed [above] in that he incorporated the insertion 137 - 145, based on the War, into the old administrative report, while thereby deleting the attack against Agrippa in accordance with his other view, and greatly tempering his antagonism towards Tiberias. — Thus, when we summarize the findings of this paragraph, we find:

1. the old administrative report = Life 126 - 129; 132 to 136, 145 - 148; composed before the War.
2. War I = War 595 - 602 beginning; 608 end to 613, 28 composed between 75 and 79; at the same time as this, Life 130 - 131 as equalization.
3. War II = 603 end to 608 beginning, 29 composed around 93/94 on the occasion of the planned new edition of the war.
4. Life 137 - 145 beginning, developed after 100 on the occasion of the elaboration of the administrative report into the Life.

It has hereby been proven that Josephus worked on his Life in at least three chronologically well-separated layers and on his War in at least two [such layers].

2. John of Gischala in Tiberias

Life 85 - 103 = War 2.614 – 623

Both sources are in fundamental agreement in their narration of the attempt by John of Gischala to precipitate an uprising [80] in Tiberias. John requests permission from Josephus to use the thermal baths of Tiberias (ἐπιτρέψαι πρὸς θεραπείαν αὐτῷ χρήσασθαι τοῖς ἐν Τιβεριάδι θερμοῖς ὕδασιν War 2.614 = ἐπιτρέψαι καταβάντι χρήσασθαι τοῖς ἐν Τιβεριάδι θερμοῖς ὕδασι τῆς

28 Without the groups of words καὶ μάλιστα τῶν Ταριχεατῶν (602) and ἦσαν δὲ εἰς τετρακισμυρίους Ταριχεάτα (608), which belong to the third stage = War II.
29 Including the segments mentioned in the footnote above.
Josephus, who has no suspicion (οὔπω γὰρ ὑπώπτευεν = κἀγὼ μηδὲν ὑποπτεύσας), writes to this effect to the officials of Tiberias (γράφει τοῖς κατὰ τὴν πόλιν .... παρασχεῖν = τοῖς Τιβεριάδος τῇ δίκησιν ύπ’ ἐμοῦ πεπιστευμένοις γράφω παρασχεῖν); John, on the other hand, abuses the trust and incites defection in Tiberias (ἀνέτειθεν ἀποστήναι = ἐπειθεὶς ἀποστάντας τῆς πρὸς με πίστεως). Having been notified by Silas, the commander of the troops in Tiberias, Josephus hurries there (νυκτὸς ὁδεύσας συντόνως = δι’ ὅλης τῆς νυκτὸς τὴν πορείαν ἐποιούμην) and arrives in the early morning. The crowd swarms towards him (καὶ τὸ μὲν ἄλλο πλῆθος ὑπῆντα = τὸ πλῆθος ὑπηντίαζεν), and Josephus betakes himself to the Stadium where he gives a report about the situation. But John secretly sends forth heavily armed men to murder Josephus (ὑποπέμψας ὁπλίτας προσέταξεν αὐτὸν ἀνελεῖν = τῶν ὁπλιτῶν ἐπιλέξας τοὺς πιστοτάτους ... προσέταξεν ἀνελεῖν με). Upon tidings of this danger that was threatening him, Josephus leaps down from the spot where he was speaking, hurries to the sea and, in the company of two men, he boards a boat upon which he saves himself. But his followers took up arms and wished to proceed against the defectors (ταχέως ἁρπάσαντες τὰ ὅπλα κατὰ τῶν ἐπιβούλων ἔχωρουν = ἀρπάσαντες οὕν τὰ ὅπλα παρεκάλουν σφᾶς ἀγεῖν ἐπ’ αὐτούς) however Josephus pacifies [them] and remains there also while all around the Galileans want to join him; because he considers any civil war to be dangerous.

One sees the absolutely similar structure of both reports, which furthermore correspond verbatim in large segments to such an extent that their mutual dependency cannot be doubted. Nevertheless, alongside these correspondences there are, on the other hand, certain discrepancies that I wish to discuss immediately in groups in order to avoid useless repetitions.

1. According to War 619 it is the demos of Tiberius who makes Josephus aware of the impending danger; according to Life 94 it is one of Josephus’ close companions.

[81] 2. According to War 617 John was absent when the Tiberians welcomed Josephus; he excuses himself by his illness; according to Life 91 John appears with the remaining crowd of Tiberians in order to pay his respects to Josephus.

3. In War 616 Silas reports John’s plot (ἐπιβούλη) to Josephus; in Life 89 [he reports] the Tiberians’ disposition (γνώμη τῶν Τιβεριέων) that emerged due to John’s agitation

4. War 620 mentions “the hatred of a few [men]” whereas in Life 97 Josephus speaks quite generally about the distrust of the Tiberians.
5. According to War 615 John attempts to prevail in Tiberias through deception and bribery, in which he was not very successful; according to Life 87 [the Tiberians] gladly accept his offerings, “given that they were forever striving for innovations, were by nature disposed to changes and rejoiced in upheaval.”

6. According to War 2.621 the Galileans joined forces to battle against John, according to Life 98, [it was to battle] against the Tiberians. Correspondingly, in Life 99 they wish to raze Tiberias, an idea that is suppressed in the War.

If each of these discrepancies, to which no one before has ever paid any attention whatsoever, is considered separately, then hardly anything at all will be accomplished; however, by considering them together we gain a fundamental realization. We constantly notice that John and the people of Tiberias stand closely by each other according to the report of the Life, whereas the War presents an account whereby the Tiberians are far away from standing up for John; he attempts to incite them but does not succeed. Therefore, according to the Life, the Tiberians join John on their own initiative, therefore the Life speaks about the “unfaithfulness of the Tiberians”, and Silas, according to [the Life], reports on the disposition “of the Tiberians” to Josephus. And because Josephus is abandoned by the Tiberians, it could not be they who, in the Life, rescue the commander from pursuit by John, rather one of Josephus’ companions (τις τῶν οἰκείων) makes him aware of the impending danger. Therefore it is also [82] only natural that in the Life the anger of the Galileans partial to Josephus be directed against the Tiberians. Conversely in the War: John tries to act among the Tiberians through lying and cheating, but they remain distant; as a result of this, relatively “few [men]” remain with John’s “plot” and it is the demos of Tiberias itself who alerts Josephus to the impending danger. Therefore the Tiberians are also not persecuted by the hatred of the Galileans, which is, on the contrary, directed exclusively against John.

If the discrepancies of both reports can therefore be ascribed to the deliberate intentions of the author, then of course there are no coincidences or thoughtlessness at hand. But we now also understand why there can be certain discrepancies in the face of the correspondences that extend as far as linguistic details: various biases have been worked into a fixed framework. At one point John alone is at fault whereas the Tiberians remain by Josephus’ side, at another point the Tiberians, of their own free will, are so willing to commit to John’s propositions, that he [himself] eventually drops into the background.
Thus far things are quite clear. But now the more difficult question subsequently arises, where is the original version and where the modified [one]. In other words: Did Josephus originally see an opponent solely in John and only later add the trend against the Tiberians or did he originally hold the Tiberians to be equally at fault and only later delete them from this enmity? Is the version of the War or that of the Life earlier? — Here one must first of all bear in mind that the focus on John’s hostility totally corresponds to the context of the War; because here the author structures the narrative in such a way that first Josephus’ general administration is described, and then it is reported how the hostility of John (585 ff.) alone is raised against it. Therefore those passages of the War that do not have any model in the Life (ἐπίβουλος ἀνήρ 585 = τὰ περὶ τὴν ἐπιβουλὴν 616; ἀρετὴν ἡγούμενος τὴν ἀπάτην 586 = ἀπάταις διαφθείρων 615) correspond to the general characterization that Josephus gives of John (585 ff.). The focus on [83] the person of John thus agrees with the structure of the Life and therefore has been suitably adjusted [zurecht gemacht].30

On the other hand, one could also think that the Life is directed against Justus of Tiberias, if we simply accept it just as it is and set aside everything that has been established in the preceding chapters. Consequently it may also be said: a focus against the Tiberians is justified by the purpose of the Life, therefore an adjustment [Zurechtmachung] exists here and the original [version] lies in the War. One sees that a line of reasoning has been applied here that can be twisted in both directions and thus appears useless, therefore we must attempt to reach our goal by another path. For this purpose we present a second pronounced discrepancy between the two narratives, which has remained just as unnoticed as the previous group.

Josephus flees to Tarichea in the Life (96), and hence it is the inhabitants of this town (οἱ τὴν πόλιν ταύτην κατοικοῦντες 97) who take up arms in order to avenge Josephus and who subsequently call the Galileans to battle. In contrast, according to the report of the War Josephus flees “to the middle of the sea” (619), thus he does not come to Tarichea, and hence the Taricheans must cease to apply as Josephus’ avengers: it is his soldiers who take up arms (620) while the Galileans, who according to the Life were incited by the Taricheans, gather

30 Evidently connected to this [is the fact] that John has been inserted into the Dabaritta story of the War as well. From the oldest version (Life 134) it emerges that Jesus primarily agitated against Josephus. When Josephus then composed the War, he set John beside, or rather, before Jesus (599). For everyone who has recognized Josephus’ method of working, it is certain that John had nothing to do with this context, as the oldest report proves.
together on their own initiative upon tidings of the events (622). Thus, here too is a complete reworking and it would be evident even to me that it was methodically executed in full consciousness and with deliberate intention, if I were not able to indicate a second fact as well. On the occasion of another story, the context of which is not relevant now, Josephus recounts in the Life that he had [84] remained in Tarichea entirely without troops; because he had dismissed them to [go] home since the next day was a Sabbath, and he had wished to spare the Taricheans the burden of billeting [his troops]. In Tarichea he never had to provide for his personal protection, πεῖραν παρὰ τῶν ἐνοικούντων τῆς πρὸς με πίστεως λαβὼν πολλάκις (160).

So, whereas here the absence of the troops is explained by a reference to Josephus’ close relations to Tarichea, [a town] devoted to him that had often furnished evidence of its loyalty, in the War there is no trace of this view; it is replaced here by the simple notice that Josephus had sent the troops away to procure supplies (634). It seems to me that there is no doubt possible that the same difference in trend exists here as above. Precisely because the Taricheans had been discarded as friends of Josephus in War 619 ff., the friendship theme could not be retained in 634 either. Conversely, the views of Life 96 f. and 160 are in agreement: The author, who repeatedly stressed his deep relationship with Tarichea while composing the Life, categorically discarded this view when he wrote the War.31

Now we are in a position to establish in summary where the earlier view is to be found, whether in the Life or in the War.

1. In the Life the Tiberians attack Josephus; when the Taricheans “hear about the unfaithfulness of the Tiberians”, they protect him and call the Galileans to battle against Tiberias; so Josephus fears a civil war between Tiberias on the one side, and Tarichea and Galilee on the other side (97 - 100). The War retains the theme of his concern about the civil war (620); but in truth the premises for this are missing because the Tiberians are not involved, the Taricheans are completely missing, and the Galileans are mentioned only later in a further step of the plot (621). Section 620 deals only with the punishment of John by Josephus’ soldiers. But this is no civil war, when a few murderous thugs are arrested in a loyally minded town. Therefore this theme, [85] which is an organic element of the Life, does not fit into the War, i.e.

31 As we shall remember, this fact has already been applied on page 70 ff. There it was also shown that an antagonism was constructed between Josephus and Tarichea. Both analyses mutually complement and substantiate each other.
the Life contains the earlier view.

2. In the War (620) Josephus fears that he would “futilely consume” the town of Tiberias by a civil war. It remains entirely unclear why serious damage to Tiberias is the result of John’s private uprising in which the Tiberians were indeed not involved. In contrast, we understand the words exclusively as a reverberation from Life 99 where the town of Tiberias is very heavily involved in the uprising; therefore the version of the Life is the older one.

3. Josephus’ flight is necessary in the Life; he has been deserted by all since the Tiberians have rebelled against him and he has only a few guards around him. On the other hand, in the War Josephus’ flight is a puzzle; the Tiberians are on Josephus’ side, and moreover, the soldiers who were in full control of the town (620), stood at his disposal, and his opponents are [but] “a few [men]”. Thus the case here also is that a theme existing in the War without explanation is illuminated exclusively by [the fact] that we see within it an influence [Nachwirkung] of the presentation of the Life, which is therefore older. Naturally Josephus himself, when composing the War, felt the ungroundedness [Grundlosigkeit] of the flight and therefore portrayed the danger that he was facing as particularly calamitous by other means. That is to say, while the Life mentions only the assault that has been planned against Josephus (95), the War enhances the narrative to a description of the deed itself: Josephus sees the drawn sword right in front of himself (619).

4. In the Life, Josephus’ speech before the Tiberians is the outcome of their defection; he means to reprimand them and win them back. This reason for the speech does not apply in the War, where the Tiberians had not undertaken anything at all against Josephus; but the author requires this external setting in order to continue the narrative; thus a dull and silly περὶ τῶν ἐπεσταλμένων in 618 provides a substitute for something that truly fits only into the context of the Life; therefore [the Life] is the source.

5. In the Life the Galileans rise up at the instigation of the rebellious Taricheans. Since these have been deleted from the War and [86] replaced by Josephus’ soldiers, then the soldiers also must have taken over the needling of the Galileans; but of course this did not work out because the soldiers act only on the orders of their commander. Thus here as well, the author has no recourse other than the utterly colourless and unmotivated formula: οἱ δ’ ἀνὰ τὴν περὶ εὖ ὑφόραν πυθόμενοι τὴν ἐμιβουλήν καὶ τὸν συσκευάζοντα συνηθροίζοντο κατὰ Ἰωάννου (621). But what reason exists for this, where Josephus had already been master of the
area for some time? And why are the Tiberians missing, who were also against John according to the *War*? We see here too that we are dealing with a vestige [Überlebsel] of the view that has its place in the *Life* but is completely wrong in the *War*.

6. According to the *Life* Josephus was helped in his flight by his bodyguard James and by a Tiberian, Herod. In so doing, this one Tiberian stands out conspicuously from the mass of people from Tiberias who are hostilely disposed towards Josephus. But if the Tiberians as a whole were well disposed towards Josephus, then the emphasis on this one man could no longer have any sense. For this reason Josephus turns the Tiberian into a second bodyguard in *War* 619. The original is therefore given in the *Life*; the modification is in the *War*.

In view of such observations, the fundamental fact is obvious to anyone who understands something about source criticism, that the version of the *Life* is the original one, and that the report of the *War* was formed in such a way that Josephus intended to make it known that his attitude towards Tiberias and Tarichea had shifted, and therefore he remodelled the presentation of the *Life* indeed logically, but as a result of precisely this he created an inherently impossible narrative. Hence, once again, our finding from chapter 2.3 as well as from chapter 3.1 is fully confirmed; the old administrative report, which was composed before the *War* and later worked into the *Life*, is a fact that is unequivocally established.

But beyond this confirmation of our general findings we shall be led to further special insights here as well. We have seen that John alone is at fault in the *War*, whereas the Tiberians, who according [87] to the *Life* had defected, on the contrary remain true to Josephus here. Thus Josephus logically had to delete the attack of the town of Tiberias by Josephus’ followers. His loyal followers can have gathered together only against John of Gischala, Josephus’ sole opponent. But according to the *War* he was alone in Tiberias with only a few companions, hard pressed by the Tiberians and by Josephus’ soldiers. Therefore, if the “thousands of Galileans” should have still intended to fight against him, then nothing remained but to remove him from Tiberias and locate him in a spot where he could have forces around himself against which the Galileans’ attack was possible.

For this reason Josephus has John flee from Tiberias to his hometown Gischala, and the Galileans in the *War* logically now turn their hatred, which that they could have had in the *Life* against Tiberias, against John and Gischala, the inhabitants of which had taken John in. Thus
Life 99 and War 622 correspond to each other — only with the necessary shift in direction: the burning of Gischala intended here is nothing other than a reverberation of the planned attack of Tiberias according to Life 99. But from here it now follows further that, when the Life, in addition to the attack on Tiberias that is consistent with its outlook, describes such an attack against John of Gischala (101 - 102), then here again an inverse influence of the War has occurred in the Life; because this story could not evolve before the existence of the War with its definite bias directed against John. In other words: the Life was expanded after the appearance of the War by a section that matches the bias of the War just as much as it is contrary to that of the Life (cf. page 60).

Once this has been factually established, we observe formally as well, that the report about the attack on Gischala in the Life really is nothing other than an expansion of the old text. The report about the bitterness of the Galileans ends in 100; Josephus has calmed their zeal for war since he did not want to let it come to a civil war (ταῦτα λέγων ἐπαύσα τῆς ὀργῆς τοὺς Γαλιλαίους). With this the final point has been definitively reached, yet the affair suddenly erupts [88] afresh: again the Galileans gather together, again Josephus thanks [them] for their zeal for war, again he is resolved to end the disputes without bloodshed: καὶ πείσας τὸ πλῆθος τῶν Γαλιλαίων εἰς τὴν Σέπφωριν (103).

This repetition of the events is naturally not historical but, as has now become obvious, Josephus has duplicated the entire presentation of the theme in order to incorporate the strike, newly derived from the War, into the Life.

In this case, therefore, only the very easy task of precisely differentiating the old context from the expansion still remains. In sections 100 and 103 are the duplications that we have already detected so often in Josephus [who used them] just like Polybius as a means of interweaving insertions. Therefore the old text runs either from 99 to 103 or from 100 to 104, or the transition is to be set in the middle. The second possibility is immediately discarded because a new fact (arrival in Sepphoris) that belongs to the old part is given at the end of 103. The fact that we now know that Josephus composed the War on the basis of the old context of the Life is decisive for the choice between the two other possibilities. Now, the parallel idea (War 623) that is at issue for our segment has nothing in common with section 100 of the Life, in contrast it clearly presents an imitation of section 103. Not only is the structure the same (I praised their zeal but I did hold them back since I wished to end the disturbances without
bloodshed), but also the formulation of details [Einzelformulierung] coincides (ἐννοιαν; ἔφασκεν = ὡμολόγου; usw.). Therefore section 103 already existed when War 623 was formed, by which it follows that section 103 belongs to the old part of the Life, whereas section 100 is a doublet to section 103 with the purpose of interweaving the insertion. Factually this includes sections 101 - 102. Josephus takes over from the War the motive of the strike against Gischala, which he had introduced into the War as a substitute for the strike against Tiberias, and transfers it subsequently into the Life. Hence both texts affect each other: ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰωάννην τὸν κοινὸν ἐπίβουλον (War 2.622) becomes εἰδότες τὸν ἄνθρωπον ὡς πονηρός ἐστιν καὶ ἐπίορκος (Life 102); συγκαταφλέξειν γὰρ αὐτῷ καὶ τὴν ὑποδεξαμένην πόλιν (War ibid.) becomes ἀρδὴν ἀφανίσειν σὺν αὐτῷ καὶ τὰ Γίσχαλα [89] (Life ibid.). Some details had to be changed, however: the plot had still remained consistent in the War and consequently John could flee directly to Gischala before the counter-thrust [Gegenbewegung]. On the other hand, in the Life the first act was already concluded when John departed for Gischala. As a result, a new conception had to be provided from which the desire for an attack on Gischala could be derived.

The answer to the question of when Josephus introduced the insertion 100 - 102 into the administrative report is yielded by our findings of the preceding paragraph. There we found Josephus twice “improving” his administrative report: once directly while composing the War when he was borne by the wish to effect an agreement between the two texts; and then after the year 100 when he was finally formulating the administrative report into the Life, whereby he took into consideration the remodification of the War that was planned and begun in 93/94. Surely the insertion 100 - 102 belongs to the first group and, in analogy to this, to 130 - 131; in both segments we cannot but recognize the wish to incorporate into the administrative report the new guiding principles that were decisive for Josephus when he composed War I, in order to effect a converging agreement between the two reports. But more important for us at this moment than even this question is the realization that the findings of the preceding investigations are now fully confirmed as well: the nucleus of the Life, our administrative report, is the oldest written specification [Festlegung] of the events by Josephus and it comes before the War. Admittedly [the War] derives its stock of facts from the administrative report, but [the War] provides it with a new political trend and for this purpose it twists the individual details of its source: Tiberias is deleted as Josephus’ opponent, and in the same way
[Josephus’] following of Taricheans is discarded. This view is then subsequently inserted into the old administrative report for the purpose of equalizing [the two versions], such that it truly falls apart internally. According to this we find:

[90] 1. *Life* 85 - 99;\(^{32}\) 103 = older administrative report before the *War*.
   at the same time as this, *Life* 100 - 102 as equalization.
3. the segment concerning Justus in section 88 after the year 100.

Therefore, within this part Josephus has worked on the “*Life*” in at least three chronologically well-separated layers (cf. page 79).

### 3. The ships on Lake Tiberias

*Life* 155 - 174 = *War* 2.632 – 645

A short story, that is rather unusually nonviolent as far as Josephus is concerned, is recounted with only slight discrepancies in the *Life* and in the *War* as follows: the Tiberians request troops from King Agrippa since they wish to surrender their town to him. While Josephus was nearby in Tarcheia, Roman horsemen appeared by chance in the vicinity of Tiberias, whom the Tiberians accidentally mistook for the forces expected from Agrippa and accordingly welcomed. In this way Josephus learns about the intended defection of the Tiberians from a messenger. Since he had dismissed his troops from Tarcheia, however, he was not in a position to assert himself by force in Tiberias and so he decided upon a ruse: first he blocks the gates of Tarcheia in order to prevent all communication with Tiberias, then he confiscates all the ships that are on the lake, and occupies them with the few [people] whom he has at his disposal. In order to evoke a strong impression on the Tiberians despite [his] low numbers, he had the ships sail in the direction of Tiberias but maintain such a distance that no one from Tiberias could discern the light crew complement of the ships. In fact, the terrified Tiberians throw down their weapons; Josephus approaches the town in his boat, censures the defection but is willing to grant pardon if negotiators are sent to him. This happens, and thus Josephus eventually has the council and the leaders of the people in his power. He sends them

\(^{32}\) With the exception of the sentence dealing with Justus in section 88. This belongs just to the period after 100 (cf. page 47).
to Tarichea where the imprisoned Tiberians admire him because he had put an end to the defection without bloodshed: only a certain Clitus, who was the ringleader, atoned for his lack of judgment by the loss of one hand; but otherwise there was a quick reconciliation.

The discrepancies between the reports of the *War* and the *Life*, which agree entirely in substance, are limited here also to the new formulation of Josephus’ relationship to Tarichea and Tiberias. The *Life* speaks of an extremely deep rapport between Josephus and Tarichea; he had dismissed his troops from Tarichea because he did not want the Taricheans to be burdened by the rampaging troops [Soldateska], but he also did not need to worry at all about his physical protection there, since he had so often witnessed demonstrations of loyalty on the part of the Taricheans (160). Thus he can also use their services for his deceitful plan: the town’s wealthy are requested to make their ships available and to have one helmsman aboard each [ship] (163). Since there is no doubt about the loyalty of the Taricheans, the captured Tiberians are then simply sent to Tarichea (169); there they are in secure custody. The *War* is different: the praise for the Taricheans’ loyalty is missing; the reason for the momentary absence of the troops is provided by problems with provisions (634); in principle, Josephus had troops with him also in Tarichea. In the absence of any special relationship Josephus naturally cannot draw on the Taricheans for the execution of his cunning plan: certainly, here too, the ships are assembled on the lake — but it is not the Taricheans who receive the assignment [of manning the ships] and who supported Josephus (635). The design of forcibly subduing the seceding town (*Life* 162) with the help of the Taricheans must fail according to this. And when the council of the Tiberians was providentially captured, they could naturally not be surrendered to the custody of the Taricheans: they had to be brought to the prison of Tarichea by the sailors (*War* 641). In this way the Taricheans are discarded as Josephus’ assistants; it is just a factually irrelevant coincidence that Josephus proceeds out from Tarichea against Tiberias with his people.

Josephus proceeds contrariwise with respect to Tiberias in the *War*. One would have scarcely believed it possible that Josephus [92] glosses over this insurrection movement [Aufstandsbewegung] of Tiberias, and yet he attempts this also in a significant way; because

---

© Ed. The rare German literary term Soldateska (from the Italian soldatesca – “troops, soldiery”) came to signify “an undisciplined, marauding band of soldiers” in the writings of Grimmelshausen and Schiller in their descriptions of the Thirty Years War.
wherever the Tiberians are spoken of by name in the Life, Josephus replaces this expression by a colourless designation: in 632 he speaks “of the people inside”, in 635 of “the defectors”, in 637 “of the enemies”. In this way it is left unclear who actually is behind the uprising in Tiberias, and as a result the possibility arises, at least in superficial contemplation, to separate the uprising in Tiberias from the inhabitants of the town. According to this the councillors of Tiberias are also understood differently than previously in their relationship to the uprising. In the Life the councillors are the same [people] who led the mass in the uprising (168 f.), whereas in the War (638) they are intended as trustworthy people who should apologize for the events in Tiberias. Briefly summarized: while in the Life the uprising of the Tiberians is defeated with the help of the Taricheans, in the War Josephus wishes to evoke the impression that an uprising that arose in Tiberias was quelled by Josephus and his people from Tarichea. I understand that the picture could not emerge clearly in the War; but precisely this is the compelling proof that here also the Life is the source of the War, which brought a new trend into the old stock of facts.

But the Life has undergone subsequent expansions here as well; in section 156 it is assumed that the fortification of Tiberias was to begin only after the building of Tarichea’s walls was completed. This part is thereby referring to 143 - 144, which two paragraphs belong only to the final edition of the Life (cf. page 77 ff.); therefore 156 cannot be older. There is absolutely no mention of the building of the walls in the corresponding passage of the War (634); on the other hand, later on in his speech to the Tiberians Josephus refers to how it would indeed be ungrateful “to shut the gates in front of the one who had erected the walls” (κλείειν τὴν πόλιν αὐτῷ τῷ τειχίσαντι 638). Thus we still find here the more accurate old view that is not influenced by the formulation and remodification of the Dabaritta narrative, because it is only by its remodelling that the idea arose at all that Tiberias would later be fortified (cf. section 1), while we know by chance from War 3.465 that Josephus fortified Tiberias first, as it is also understood from War 638. As a result, the stratification [Zergliederung] of the text of the Dabaritta story undertaken in section 1 acquires renewed confirmation.

On the other hand, it is clearly seen that Josephus could no longer use the idea from War 2.638 for his Life, because according to this [passage] Tiberias was to be fortified only in the future (144). As a result of this, he removes the theme of building the walls from the
surroundings of the War and inserts it into a passage where there could be mention made of the intention to build walls for Tiberias; so in the Life this segment necessarily moves to section 156. Thus the complaint of the Tiberians, which was raised there, is nothing other than the modification of the theme of building the walls from War 2.638, which had become necessary for the Life. Therefore this is the source, and for this reason also section 156 must be recognized as an added segment that was introduced into the context while the administrative report was being formulated into the Life.

In fact, this paragraph [can] be easily removed from its surrounding [text], which gains clarity only by its extraction. Instead of many words I [shall] write down the original context: οἱ δὲ τὴν τῶν Τιβεριέων πόλιν κατοικοῦντες γράφουσιν πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα παρακαλοῦντες πέμψαι δύναμιν τὴν φυλάξουσαν αὐτῶν τὴν χώραν· θέλειν γὰρ αὐτῷ προστίθεσθαι. // μετὰ δὲ τρίτην ἡμέραν // συνέβη τινὰς Ῥωμαίων ἱππεῖς οὐ πόρρωθεν τῆς πόλεως ὁδοιποροῦντας ὁφθῆναι, οἳ δόξαν παρέσχον τὴν παρὰ τοῦ βασιλέως δύναμιν ἥκειν. A glance at War 2.632 ff., where a paraphrase of the idea just written [above] is present, shows that this context truly did exist. When Josephus then formulated the Life, he supplemented the text with two sentences in which he spoke about the walls of Tiberias in the sense identified above. But if the Tiberians were making complaints to him, then Josephus must be in Tiberias (156). Since this, however, did not fit into the continuation of the narrative, Josephus had to be brought again from Tiberias to Tarichea in section 157. Both passages, which essentially complement each other, are thus the indispensable result of the new view[point] of the theme of building the walls, and fall [into place] with it [chronologically]. In reality, the Life had [94] already pictured Josephus in Tarichea since section 127, so that the data from Life 159 connect smoothly to this, whereas the insertion of 156 and of [the segment] in 157 now disrupt this context as well. The additional consequence of this insertion is that the unsuspecting reader is due to calculate the date “after the third day” from Josephus’ presence in Tiberias whereas it refers factually to the dispatch of the written [message] to Agrippa.

Thus the same result as in sections 1 and 2 has emerged for us by the stratification [Zergliederung] of this story as well: Josephus’ oldest report about the relevant events exists within the nucleus of the Life, the old administrative report; this was reworked with a definite bias by Josephus for his War, and finally Josephus formulated the Life to [the text] that we [currently] have.
Now that matters and their development present themselves clearly to us in this sense, and there can no longer possibly be any doubt about the correctness of our view, we still require an explanation for [the fact] that Josephus believed he had to portray his attitude to Tarichea and Tiberias in such a different manner. The influx of new historical sources can never ever be the reason for this; because the personal experiences and actions of the author himself are being dealt with here, and he knew precisely about all matters from the beginning; furthermore we saw that no new facts at all were added, but only new perceptions [Beleuchtungen] of [matters] that were reported long ago, such that every later report of Josephus was increasingly removed from the actual course of things in the long run. The theme of building the walls is representative of exactly this. War 3.465 shows that Josephus fortified Tiberias first, and only then Tarichea with the remaining resources. War 2.638 agrees with this too. But while an explanation was given in Life 144 according to which Josephus promised to build walls first for the Taricheans, then for the Tiberians for the reasons presented in section 1, this idea was [presented as] an accomplished fact in Life 156 and 188. These fabrications cannot be solved by the usual source criticism but rather by a stratification [Zergliederung] of the text. But precisely this [method] [95] has given us an obvious hint to the answer of our question in the treatment of the Dabaritta affair: it was for the sake of Agrippa, who was to read the War and to bring about its distribution, that the tenor of the narrative had been shifted. Josephus’ new attitude towards Tarichea and Tiberias in the War can be derived from this.

Emperor Nero had extended King Agrippa’s rule in that he delegated to him, among other [areas], Tarichea and Tiberias in Galilee (War 2.252; Ant. 20.159). After the disturbances that occurred during the time of Josephus’ administration in Galilee, Tarichea overtly defected from Agrippa, while similar attempts to alter the situation were brought to bear in Tiberias (War 3.445). Vespasian consequently decided upon a campaign against these towns for the sake of Agrippa “in order to subjugate these same [towns] to Agrippa as a gift in return for the hospitality he had received.” But now it transpired very quickly that in Tiberias only a dwindling minority was for the defection, while the elders and all the distinguished citizens of the town, with the approval of the people (448), hurried into the Roman camp and, referring to Agrippa, they begged Vespasian for mercy; because the people of Tiberias always had acted in Rome’s interest (453 ff.). Since Agrippa now appeared truly concerned about the fate of the
town, Vespasian gave in to the pleas of the Tiberians; he entered the town where he was enthusiastically welcomed, he spared the citizens and left the walls standing “for Agrippa’s sake” τῷ βασιλεῖ χαριζόμενος (War 3.461).

Conversely, the Taricheans are faring very badly. In a bold surprise attack Titus succeeded in capturing the town, and in so doing performed a deed of arms that even Suetonius found worthwhile mentioning (Tit. 4). A dreadful bloodbath unleashed by Titus among the defenders of Tarichea showed everyone how very much the Romans, who had spared Tiberias, were persecuting the Taricheans with hatred. Even though the reasons are still unknown to us for the moment, the irrefutable fact still persists that Agrippa and Titus, for whose eyes the War was intended, were as benevolently disposed towards the Tiberians, [96] as they were hostilely minded against the Taricheans. But this became the reason for Josephus to discard from the War his antagonism towards the Tiberians and his friendship with the Taricheans, which we encountered in the administrative report. His feelings were supposed to coincide with those of his patrons, even though the historical truth was to fall apart as a result.

In conclusion, we [shall] clearly compile the emergence of the text here as well.

1. *Life* 155; 157 (without insertion); 158 - 174: recorded before the *War*
2. *War* 2.632 - 645 between 75 and 79.
3. *Life* 156 and insertion in 157 composed after the year 100 on the occasion of the formulation of the *Life*.

**Chapter IV. Josephus’ administrative report**

The investigations of the preceding chapters have yielded compelling proof that the main body of Josephus’ present self-portrayal reveals his oldest presentation of the events in Galilee. It has been solidly established that these parts were written before the *War*. The question of sources has been placed on a new basis by this finding; previously the *War* was justifiably taken as the starting point because the oldest version was considered to be [contained] within it, but now the foundation of the *Life* will be moved into the central point because this truly gives [us] the oldest report. Admittedly, matters are such that the oldest
source is not necessarily the better one, in theory; for we are dealing with the same writer who is recounting his own personal deeds; the factual knowledge is therefore the same and only the elucidation [Beleuchtung] of things is different. Accordingly, it would still be possible that a bias had also been worked into the older version for the sake of some specific reason or other, which must lead to a distortion of the historical presentation no less so than was later the case, but perhaps only in a different direction. This thought will have to be taken into consideration even more, [97] once we have proven how greatly Josephus wavered back and forth in his later evaluation of the incidents. Did this first occur from the moment when he remodelled his old report for the sake of Agrippa and Titus and recorded the War in this spirit, or was he guided by specific considerations or preconceptions when composing his oldest report as well? An exhaustive examination of this appears all the more necessary. It will permit us at the same time to advance beyond the treatment of source-critical problems to definite historical results. Indeed, for everyone who wishes to gain information about Josephus’ life, this is primarily a matter of the very important question of which attitude Josephus actually adopted in Galilee.

In order to answer this, an exhaustive inspection of the oldest report is necessary. It will permit us at the same time to advance beyond the treatment of source-critical problems to definite historical results. Indeed, for everyone who wishes to gain information about Josephus’ life, this is primarily a matter of the very important question of which attitude Josephus actually adopted in Galilee.

In the modern literature, as we noticed in chapter II.1, in many cases [scholars] took as a starting point [their] observation that Josephus spoke so little in the Life about [his] participation in the Jewish-Roman War and about his position as leader, which he occupied during this same [war], and it was thought that the conclusion must be drawn from this that Josephus had subsequently wished to conceal something here (cf. page 8). Now, this conclusion was certainly false; for in truth the self-portrayal, in the form we have before us, repeatedly emphasized Josephus’ leading role very forcefully — but the observation that [originally] served as starting point was, at any rate, derived from a correct point of view: one does, after all, read through the greater part of the Life, namely the actual administrative report, without finding Josephus’ leading role during the Jewish-Roman War mentioned in it! But one may not stop with the determination of this fact; rather one must add the observation that the concept of the Jewish-Roman War, in the sense in which we use the word, was actually still unknown to Josephus when he was composing the report about his deeds in Galilee. When we take one look at Josephus’ use of language, then it becomes absolutely significant for [understanding] his point of view.

When the author refers to his presentation of the War in his later works he uses the
expression [98] ὃ Ἰουδαϊκὸς πόλεμος, which33 is also common to him elsewhere when he mentions events of this time, e.g. Life 412: τὰ πεπραγμένα μοι κατὰ τὸν Ἰουδαϊκὸν πόλεμον καὶ τὴν ἱεροσολύμων πολιορκίαν. Naturally this expression originates from Roman circles; indeed Ἰουδαϊκὸς πόλεμος does not mean “the war of the Jews” but rather “the war against the Jews”. Therefore a Jew could not, from his standpoint, coin the expression “the Jewish War”, and it is completely wrong when Niese applies ἱστορία Ἰουδαϊκοῦ πολέμου πρὸς Ῥωμαίους as a heading for the War; for here the opponent would be indicated by the expression Ἰουδαϊκὸς πόλεμος as well as by πρὸς Ῥωμαίους. In fact, Josephus uses the phrase πρὸς Ῥωμαίους only where he wishes to accentuate the Jewish standpoint, e.g. Ant. 1.4: τὸν μὲν γὰρ πρὸς τοὺς Ῥωμαίους πόλεμον ἡμῖν τοῖς Ἰουδαῖοι γενόμενον; Life Ῥωμαίοις ἱλαροντας ἱράν Ἰουδαίοις τοῖς πρὸς Ῥωμαίους πόλεμου; Life 182: ὡς στρατηγοὶ τῶν Ἰουδαϊῶν ἐπὶ τὸν πρὸς Ῥωμαίους πόλεμον; War 1.1 τὸν Ἰουδαίων πρὸς Ῥωμαίους πόλεμον. Here again, the adjective Ἰουδαϊκός must be absent – commensurate with the addition of πρὸς Ῥωμαίους by which the opponent is expressed. Our formula is present in abbreviated [form] in Contra Apionem 1.46: περὶ τοῦ γενομένου νῦν ἡμῖν πόλεμον ορθείς συμπληροῦ τὸν πόλεμος (Life 358; 362; Contra Apionem 55 and elsewhere). "The War", for Josephus, is quite simply the one in which Jerusalem was destroyed.

The starting point of this war is established by War 2.409, according to which we are to recognize the beginning of “the War” in the refusal of sacrifices for non-Jews, whereas in Life 24 ff. it is Cestius’ defeat that destroyed the last hopes for peace. In any case, there is no doubt that according to both sources Josephus was sent to his province of Galilee after the outbreak of “the War”; because both the War and the Life report that he was sent out only [99] later; indeed the War states explicitly that he was among those who were sent off as στρατηγοὶ τοῦ πολέμου into the provinces (2.562), and correspondingly, Contra Apionem 1.47/48 designates Josephus’ activity as that of a strategos of the Galileans during “the War”.

Under such circumstances it goes without saying that every reader of the Life expects a substantial presentation of everything that Josephus accomplished in preparing for and

---

33 Ant. 1.203 ὃς μοι καὶ πρότερον λέλεκται τὸν Ἰουδαϊκὸν ἀναγράφοντι πόλεμον; 20.258 ταῖς ὑπ’ ἑμοῦ περὶ τοῦ Ἰουδαϊκοῦ πολέμου βιβλίοις γεγραμέναις; Life 27 and 412; ἐν ταῖς περὶ τοῦ Ἰουδαϊκοῦ πολέμου βιβλίοις δεληλώκαμεν οἱ ἀπήγγελκα; Ant. 18.11: ἐν τῇ δευτέρᾳ βιβλίῳ τοῦ Ἰουδαϊκοῦ πολέμου. Abbreviated in Life 413: ὧν μὴ κατὰ τὸν Ἰουδαϊκὸν πόλεμον ἀνέγραψα.
conducting the war against Rome. Even if he encountered inhibiting inner difficulties so that he felt it necessary to address these also – surely the war that he was appointed to lead does belong as the central focus of the report. But what do we find instead of this? – The old report – after discarding the additions that have already been separated out – actually passes over the war, and this becomes all the more apparent when we bear in mind that it is in these [very] additions that there seems to be a constant need to mention the war. First I give the evidence:

1. In sections 27 and 412 Josephus refers to his books \( \text{περὶ τοῦ Ἰουδαϊκοῦ πολέμου} \) with two similar phrases and in 412 he mentions his deeds in the Jewish War as well: \( \text{τὰ πεπραγμένα μοι κατὰ τὸν Ἰουδαϊκὸν πόλεμον} \), while in 413 one finds the abbreviated formula: \( \text{δοκὶ κατὰ τὸν Ἰουδαϊκὸν πόλεμον ἀνέγραψα} \). It has been demonstrated on page 54 that both 27 and 412/13 belong to the added segments.

2. In section 182 Josephus speaks of the rumour that was afloat about Philip: \( \text{ὡς στρατηγὸι τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐπὶ τὸν πρὸς Ῥωμαίους πόλεμον} \). The proof that an insertion is at hand here has been provided on page 48 ff.

3. In the segment concerning Justus 390 - 393 Josephus dates an incident: \( \text{λαβόντος Ἀρχὴν Ἰουδαίως τοῦ πρὸς Ῥωμαίους πόλεμου} \). The Justus parts were composed after the year 100 (cf. page 49).

Even though we do apparently find ourselves within a period of the Jewish-Roman War, the official designation that this war has acquired is not at all noted in the original text; the extent to which it is factually unavoidable, however, \([100]\) is recognized by [the fact] that the pertinent language usage appears immediately in the additions. Hence arises the inevitable conclusion that Josephus did not yet entertain the concept of the Jewish War while he composed his report about the actions in Galilee. And since, as we saw, the concept of the Ἰουδαϊκὸς πόλεμος must have been coined from the Roman side, one would furthermore expect that it was still unknown to Josephus because he had not yet come into contact with the Romans while he was composing the report. All this is indeed correct and will be confirmed for us from another aspect further on; but it is only half the truth; because in the old administrative report not only is the fixed expression ‘the Jewish War’ lacking, but even the clear-cut idea of standing within the great war directed against Rome is [also] missing, which is much more important. A comparison with the
added segments illustrates best what I mean here as well!

When Josephus returns from Rome he attempts to bring the rebels to their senses in that he pointed out to them Rome’s power and good luck; they should not frivolously provoke [such] formidable danger. “I emphasized this” – so he continues – “because I foresaw that the end of the war would be disastrous for us” (19). Here Josephus quite manifestly has the matter itself clearly in mind even though he does not use the expression ‘the Jewish War’; he senses that this is the eve of the war that was to bring about the downfall of the Jews – but section 19 belongs to the introduction that continues until section 27, which originated after the year 100. This also explains section 24 where Josephus likewise has the war clearly in mind when he writes the phrase, “Cestius’ defeat became a disaster for our whole people”.

In section 32 ff. concerning Justus, Josephus is also aware of the concept of the Jewish-Roman War when he explains that the Tiberians were split into three factions, of which one was for [remaining] loyal to Rome, while the second was decided upon war, and the third only pretended to have misgivings about the war. This part [of the text], however, did not emerge until after the year 100 (cf. page 37 ff.).

Likewise, there is an addition in section 100 (cf. page 87 ff.); here Josephus expresses the expectation that the Romans would be pleased if the Jews were to mangle themselves within a mutual στάσεις; therefore Josephus attempts to calm all strife. Thus he evidently has the feeling here that the Romans were the common foe of all Jews, who must therefore stand together harmoniously in order to overcome their powerful foe. Without a doubt, the idea of “the War” is present in this addition as well.

The same holds for section 177. Here Josephus is working with the concept πρὸ τοῦ πολέμου, thereby thinking again of the great Jewish-Roman War which had begun before his arrival from Jerusalem. This section 177, however, because [it is a] segment concerning Justus, has also already proven to be an addition on page 48 ff. above; according to the evidence produced there, this [addition] extended to section 188; so the latter passage also ceases to apply to the administrative report. In this [passage] we distinctly sense that Josephus is thinking likewise of the Jewish War in the form that is familiar to us when he describes the extensive construction of the fortifications, the stockpiling of provisions etc., which he has

---

34 Since we here have a segment added from the time after 100, Josephus lists Tarichea first and then Tiberias. This agrees with the later segments Life 144 and 156 but does contradict the view
set up “for future security”: here Josephus obviously feels himself to be a responsible leader in a widely extensive war. And he also appears to us as such in the vision that he reports in section 209: when Josephus wishes to stand down from further activity in Galilee because of the fierce enmity that he finds everywhere, a man appears to him in a dream with the admonition that he should leave all fear behind; for that which is causing him grief at the moment will make him great: “Therefore do not lose heart, rather remember that you must even wage war against the Romans.” Thus here the [102] war against Rome is also mentioned, – in an addition\textsuperscript{35} – Josephus is portrayed as the leader responsible for [waging] it, who will thereby gain great renown.

This same situation is assumed in the long insertion (336 ff.). There Josephus replies to Justus that he could indeed not be at fault for the defection of the Tiberians from Rome because the Tiberians had already taken up arms before Josephus had been appointed \textit{strategos} by the \textit{koinón} of Jerusalem. So it is tacitly assumed here that Josephus is the leader of Galilee in the \textit{War} (cf. pages 92 and 94).

\textsuperscript{35}Admittedly, Josephus relates the vision mentioned above in order to give the reason why he ultimately did still persevere in his position despite all the attacks that first disposed him to step down from the scene. But, as a matter of fact, the report reads differently. When they learned about Josephus’ intention, the Galileans gather together with women and children in the great plain where Josephus was staying (207). That night he saw the wonderful dream (208/9) and arose with the intention of going down into the plain. When the Galileans – there were women and children among them too – caught sight of him, they threw themselves down upon the ground and begged him not to leave the land and allow it to become plunder for the enemy. But Josephus does not allow himself to soften; only when they forced him to stay by oath did he, moved by compassion, decide even to take risks openly for this crowd. The vision therefore had so little influence on the course of events that afterwards Josephus was at first still determined to step down and even later on, this decision was in no way shaken by the memory of the vision but rather by the renewed entreaties of the Galileans. Therefore, in the first instance, the vision [itself] is redundant, and also the report about it disrupts the entire context later on; for according to section 207 the Galileans stream into the plain in which Josephus was already to be found; but according to 210 Josephus was only intending to go into the plain [at that point]; therefore the two paragraphs do not add up together, rather they belong to different stages of development. It is easy to reconstruct the original context: ἦκον οὖν πάντες εἰς τὸ μέγα πεδίον, ἐν ὧν διέτριβον 207. // καὶ δακρύοντες ἱκέτευον μὴ σφᾶς ἐγκαταλιπεῖν 210. When Josephus then made the insertion he added the doublet πᾶν τὸ πλῆθος τῶν Γαλιλαίων, ἦσαν δὲ ἐν αὐτοῖς γυναῖκες καὶ παῖδες (210) to [section] 207 (πολλοί δὲ καὶ πανταχόθεν μετὰ γυναικῶν καὶ τέκνων), so that the wives and children took part in this critical situation according to the expansion as well. The purpose of the entire insertion, however, is none other than to parade Josephus before the reader in his role as leader in the great war.
the war against Rome and that it was by virtue of this official position of his that he organized this Roman war.

All the passages quoted here – as well as those where the concept of the Jewish War is specifically mentioned (page 99 ff.) and also those in which it is tacitly assumed (page 100 ff.) – belong to the added segments by means of which Josephus shaped his old administrative report into the *Life* in its current version. It is evident that in these passages there is absolutely no expression of the wish to cover up Josephus’ position as leader. Quite to the contrary, insertions such as those of 188 or 208-210 make it obvious that Josephus actually wished at that time to underscore his leading position in the war against Rome. So the error of the modern opinion that claimed to perceive a subsequent cover-up by Josephus (cf. page 8) becomes evident here as well; in truth the exact opposite is correct: the old report is silent about Josephus’ leadership position against Rome, which was later underscored.

The stance in which Josephus appears in the added segments now agrees fully with the image that is portrayed in the parallel source, the *War*, and which has been adopted from there into the modern literature. The main features are universally known from there: Josephus does not have much confidence in the outcome of the war and therefore initially tries to calm things down, together with the high priests. When this fails, he makes himself available to the movement and is appointed as the governor of Galilee for the war. In this position he organizes the rebellion, fortifies places and trains troops. He eliminates the opposition that he encounters in so doing, [and is] pervaded by [a sense of] the magnitude of his task. Josephus has set down this view in the *War* as well as in the added segments of the *Life*; hence it unfolds that this view remained unchanged for him from the recording of the *War*, i.e. in the middle of the 70s, up to the period of time after 100. It is all the more significant that the core segments of the *Life*, i.e. the old report about Josephus’ deeds in Galilee, yield a completely different picture, which at the same time makes it understandable to us how it happens that Josephus is silent about his leadership position in the conflict against Rome in this [writing].

In *War* 2.568, and correspondingly in the added segment *Life* 341, Josephus says that he was appointed as the commander of Galilee for the Roman war by the community of the inhabitants of Jerusalem; however, another view is found right at the beginning (cf. page 54) of
the old administrative report [in] Life 28/29: the principal men of Jerusalem had found out that “the robbers” had weapons at their disposal. Since they (sc. the principal men of Jerusalem) were for their part unarmed, they were afraid of being subjected to these opponents and for that reason they sent Josephus to Galilee with two other priests, Joazar and Judas, with the mandate to convince these fellows to lay down their arms. It is seen clearly that the enemies of Jerusalem are not the Romans but “the robbers”; protection from them is desired; for that reason a legation consisting of three priests is sent to them; for it is indeed clear that [the person] who has the mandate to persuade the robbers to lay down their arms is not a commander but an envoy. Therefore, according to Life 28/29, Josephus set foot in Galilee not as commander in the Jewish-Roman War but as an envoy [sent] to the robbers. It also corresponds completely to this situation when Josephus says about himself in section 65 that he was sent off as envoy (ὑπὸ τοῦ κοινοῦ τῶν Ἱεροσολυμιτῶν πρεσβεύσων μετὰ τούτων πεπόμφθαι πρὸς αὐτούς), and he then refers three times to his fellow envoys Joazar and Judas as συμπρέσβεις (63; 73; 77). At first Josephus also manifestly conducts the negotiations with the robbers entirely in accordance with the directive that he had been issued in Jerusalem (section 77 ff.). He must certainly realize in so doing that the disarming planned in Jerusalem is impossible; instead of this he attempted to make the robbers harmless by inducing the Galileans to pay them fees, in return for which the robbers were to promise to set foot on Galilean territory only when they were summoned or when they did not receive their fees. Josephus thereupon dismisses the robbers with the strict order that they are not to wage war with either the Romans or with the surrounding inhabitants; because he was concerned above all that peace should reign in Galilee (78).

Whoever proceeds from the views of the War or the added segments must again be amazed. The commander, who is to prepare for the war against Rome, sees his principal duty as keeping robbers, whom he cannot disarm, away from his province and – the Romans – by payment. One would perhaps like to imagine that he wished in this way to prevent a premature attack on the Romans, but this is contradicted not only by the designation of the robbers as enemies (28/29), but even more so [by the fact that] the report 70 ff. actually makes such considerations irrelevant; because here John of Gischala requests that Josephus and his fellow envoys hand over the grain that is being stored in Upper Galilee. [105] Josephus refuses delivery because he intended to keep the grain either for himself or – for the Romans. Josephus
therefore is seriously entertaining the thought of keeping the grain that is being stored in
Galilee for the Romans, where there can be absolutely no doubt that such a repository of grain
in Galilee must have been of highly singular importance for the Romans who were waging war.
Josephus, however, does not presume even the slightest astonishment in the reader for his
idea [that is] totally impossible from the standpoint of the War and the added segments. In
light of section 72 there is no possibility at all other than that in the relevant moment Josephus
was not at all thinking that he was at war with the Romans, and section 78 is now indeed
properly clarified by this: **Josephus feels obliged to stand up for the protection of
the Romans as well.** So it is also only logical if the first action of Josephus himself in Galilee
was to protect the Sepphorites who were being persecuted by the Galileans **because of their
friendship with Rome** (section 30).

From the remnants of the old administrative report we thus gain a clear self-contained
picture of Josephus’ first appearance in Galilee. He was sent as envoy in order to persuade the
robbers to lay down their arms; just like those who had commissioned him – he sees the enemy
in these [robbers], whereas there is so little thought of a war with Rome that Josephus, by
contrast, shows himself to be filled with concern for the Romans and their followers. From this
observation it follows that sections 28 and 29 have also undergone later expansions. They
belong, in their basis, to the old administrative report as has already been stressed frequently,
which is why they see only the envoy in Josephus; on the other hand, in two passages Josephus
is influenced by the assumption that he is in a [state of] war with Rome. But both passages
stand out from the surrounding [text] so completely that I may well offer the Greek text
forthwith. It likely read as follows: ... οἱ πρῶτοι θεασάμενοι τοὺς μὲν λῃστὰς ἁμα τοῖς
νεωτερισταῖς εὐπορουμένους ὅπλων, δείσαντες δ' αὐτοὶ μὴ ἄνοπλοι καθεστηκότες ὑποχείριοι
gένωνται τοῖς ἐχθροῖς // πέμπουσιν ἐμὲ καὶ δύο ἄλλους τῶν ἵερέων καλοὺς κα' γαθοὺς ἄνδρας,
Ἰώζαρον καὶ Ἰούδαν, πείσοντας τοὺς πονηροὺς καταθέσθαι τὰ ὅπλα. // Λαβὼν οὖν ἐγὼ τὰς
ὑποθήκας ταύτας ἀφικόμην εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν ...

Only now does it become clear how the word ὑποθήκας is related to Josephus’ mandate
described above, although it is separated from it by a disruptive sentence in the expanded text
format [that has been] transmitted [to us]. It is only in the first sentence [following the
expansion] that the structure now becomes understandable: “Since the principal men of
Jerusalem had observed, and since they were afraid on the basis of what they had observed,
they sent off the legation”; yet in the transmitted text a new statement is attached to “they were afraid” so that this moves to an incorrect position. These minor stylistic oversights, which are a result of the insertions, confirm our view in the most desirable way. It is of course also self-understood, in principle, that Josephus introduced expansions right at the beginning of his old report when he was shaping it into the Life.

Similarly to the other insertions, it is also the role of these to suggest the idea that the High Council in Jerusalem was occupied with war issues in the [same] manner as was determined for the War on page 103: they see the rebel movement against Rome escalating, but in any case they wish to keep it under control, and wait, armed, to see what the Romans do. If these thoughts were inserted here by Josephus only later, however, then this is once again a new proof that when he was composing the old administrative report Josephus did not at all have the feeling yet that his posting to Galilee had something to do with the war that he designated simply as “the War” later on. Josephus was to take the weapons away from the robbers, because the Council in Jerusalem was afraid of falling upon hard times otherwise. And it was only later when Josephus was composing the War that he reinterpreted things to such an extent that henceforth his first activity in Galilee already became a part of “the War”. In this respect as well, it is therefore the War that quite intentionally shifted the stock of facts to a new viewpoint to which Josephus also remained true later on, when he was making the additions to the administrative report. The old view still figures in this very [writing] itself, however. When Schürer believes from this (page 607, note 18) that Josephus [107] was insolent enough to declare in the Life that the purpose of his being sent was to calm down Galilee, so in truth it was precisely this calming of Galilee and the disarming of the robbers that was Josephus’ actual mandate. The reproaches that one must raise against him are therefore to be brought forward for just the opposite [reason, namely] because Josephus concealed the picture in the War and in the added segments of the Life: he [had] wished to appear as the appointed army commander in the war against Rome in these [writings] later on.

After the departure of [Josephus’] fellow envoys reported in section 77, his activity and attitude now change quite suddenly, and it seems to me that a very important observation is provided by this. First the evidence. John of Gischala attempts to persuade the Galileans to desert Josephus and to join him[Self] with the rationale: κρεῖττον γὰρ ἐμοῦ στρατηγῆσειν αὐτῶν ἐφασκεν (123) – so Josephus is likewise an army commander. In Tiberias Jesus attacks
Josephus with the words: ὁ πρῶτος ὑμῶν στρατηγός (135), and for his part Josephus attempts to sway the imprisoned Tiberians, μὴ δυσανασχεῖν ἐμοὶ στρατηγῷ (176). As a matter of fact, the Galileans did esteem Josephus as commander (231, 250), they approved of his military leadership (251) and refuted the allegations that he was a bad commander (249). But even now, in all these matters, it is not really the war with Rome that is under consideration; according to 205 the Galileans are afraid of becoming prey for the robbers if they should be deprived of Josephus’ leadership.

At any rate, we see the complete shift in Josephus’ attitude after the departure of his “fellow envoys”: He transformed himself from an envoy into a leader. But Josephus did not now in any way convey a new directive that should really have been imparted to him from Jerusalem; the presentation completely passes over this drastic change, which is not actually disclosed as such anywhere. So this observation, which we have acquired on the basis of a wealth of material, has in fact not been made until now either. But it is fundamental to everything that happened at that time; because if Josephus, together with two fellow envoys, had the mandate from Jerusalem to disarm the robbers and to provide for peace in Galilee, but after fulfilment of this [108] mandate and after dismissing his fellow envoys he then actually remains in the land and exercises a military position there, then this constitutes a clear [case of] overstepping his orders. Since this is not justified or excused by Josephus with a single word, however, it is then quite obvious that Josephus intended to evade this dark point. But fortunately for us his opponents prevented this: In an open gathering Josephus’ opposition, i.e. the envoys coming from Jerusalem, raise the serious accusation: Josephus has aspired to tyranny, and by deceiving the mob of Galileans with his speeches he gained the rulership for himself (302). According to this, no doubt is possible: Josephus used the departure of the envoys in order to set himself up as regent of Galilee. The entire opposition against Josephus emerged because of this, and only because of this. The official delegate from Jerusalem was allowed to function, but it was against the man who remained behind in the land, after his fellow envoys had returned home, in order to be able to fish in troubled waters there, that people turned both in Galilee and in Jerusalem, as soon as they had heard there about the events in Galilee. Therefore, at that time Josephus no longer held any official position; he had remained in the land against the orders of government authority!

But how did he manage all the same to gain such a position in Galilee as he actually did
hold? It is understandable that Josephus himself did not shed any light on this with a clear statement; but whoever is able to read between the lines can still come to a firm decision. Josephus repeatedly stresses how Galilee remained protected from the robbers by his clever strategy (198, 251, 206), and how he was acclaimed by the Galileans as benefactor and saviour (244, 259) for precisely that reason. When Josephus’ departure [seemed] imminent, the Galileans are horrified and implore him to remain since they would perish if they were to be deprived of his leadership (205); they are afraid of being delivered over to the robbers after his departure (206). But how was Josephus capable of achieving such results since he did not even report anything in the least about any fighting with the robbers? – We receive our answer to this in section 77 ff.: *Josephus’* [109] **tried and tested strategy against the robbers consisted in his convincing the Galileans to pay the robbers a fee in return for which they were to promise Josephus that they would only enter the land of the Galileans if they were summoned or if the relevant fees were withheld from them.*

Josephus gained a double advantage by this recruitment of the robbers: **for one thing he secured the land of the Galileans against devastation, for another he won free rein for himself in Galilee,** because the Galilean population had to obey Josephus out of fear of the robbers whom Josephus could summon into the land at any moment. And the pecuniary resources for this were delivered to him by none other than the Galileans themselves whom he kept under control through [their] fear of his robbers. **Truly the statement of Josephus’ opponents ὅτι τυραννεῖν ἐπεθύμησε καὶ τὰ τῶν Γαλιλαίων πλῆθος λόγοις ἀπατήσας (cf. in addition: ἔπεισα τὸ πλῆθος μισθοφοράν αὐτοῖς παρέχειν ἄμεινον εἶναι λέγων ἐκοιντασ ὁλίγα διδόναι μᾶλλον ἢ τὰς χτήσεις διαρπαζομένας ὑπ’ αὐτῶν περιοράν 77) τὴν ἄρχην αὐτῷ αὐτῷ κατεκτήσατο 302 is literally correct: he pointed out to the Galileans the great advantage of paying the fees, thereby truly binding them to himself completely.** It even seems probable to me that Josephus’ bodyguards (τοὺς σὺν ἐμαυτῷ στρατιώτας 213) were recruited from these very robbers who were paid by the Galileans; because in the place cited this force of 3000 men was expressly compared to the 5000 men who were drawn from Galilee. So we are evidently dealing with a bodyguard [consisting] of people from the mob to whom the Galileans paid fees; for Josephus did not come into contact with [any] other masses [of people].
Therefore, in Josephus’ course of action with respect to the robbers I see a repetition of the procedure that had to be undertaken with respect to the Galatians in the third century BCE. Polybius\(^{36}\) informs us that the fear [110] of the Galatians was so great that the kings of Syria had to resolve to pay them stipendia. Evidently these are the fee payments that are mentioned in the Γαλατικά as attested in the inscriptions OGIS 223, 28:\(^{37}\) by these [payments], the Galatians were obligated [to refrain] from devastating the territory of the towns that paid tribute. But an inscription (BCH 3 (1879) p. 388 ff. = Dittenberger Syll.\(^3\) 410) from Erythrae referring to the Galatian circumstances touched upon [above] coincides almost completely\(^38\) with Josephus’ comportment in section 77. Nine strategoi are commended in this [inscription] because they provided protection and armaments (τῆς τε φυλακῆς καὶ τῶν ἐξοπλασιῶν ἐπεμελήθησαν ὑπὸ ὑπάλληλων τε κατασκευῆς καὶ πόλεων ἐχυρότητος πρόνοιαν ἐποιοῦμην Josephus), and because at great expenditure for peace they saved the land from devastation ἀπανθίνα πρὸς οὐκ ὀλίγης ἐν ἅπασιν διετήσαν τὴν πόλιν καὶ τὴν χώραν ἀκέραιον εἰρηνεύεται γὰρ πρὸ πάντων τὴν Γαλιλαίαν ἐφρόντιζον Josephus), in that they took care of collecting the money and delivering it to the barbarians (ἐπιμεληθέντες μὲν τῶν χρημάτων συναγωγῆς τε καὶ ἀποστολῆς τοῖς περὶ Λεοννόριον βαρβάροις ᾤσυνετάξατο ἢ πόλις ἀμέτρητα ὑπὸ ἀυτῶν περιορᾶν ἐπιμελήθησαν ἢ τὰς κτήσεις διαρρεκτικὰς ἐπικύρωσαν διὰ τῆς ἡμερίδος τῆς πόλεως ἢ τῆς τῆς πόλεως ἀκέραιον ἀπανθίνα πρὸς ἀπελθάντας ὑπὸ τῶν τῆς περὶ τῆς πόλεως ἀκέραιον ἠμαθίας ἀπανθίνα πρὸς ὀλίγης ἐν ἅπασιν διετήσαν τὴν πόλιν καὶ τὴν χώραν ἀκέραιον εἰρηνεύεται γὰρ πρὸ πάντων τὴν Γαλιλαίαν ἐφρόντιζον Josephus). The Galileans truly could have decided [to bestow upon] Josephus an honourary decree according to the model of the one which the Erythraeans, who were threatened by the Celts, had dedicated to their strategoi. That there was also a provision with respect to the Celts that kept them away from the land as long as fee payments were made can be inferred from [the fact] that when Attalus first refused to pay the fees, [right] from the outset he anticipated an attack and invasion of the Celts, which then did really occur (Polybius, loc. cit.). “By the way – thus remarks Stähelin on page 15 quite rightfully – whoever sought reliable protection for his rulership, or, having been dispossessed of his power, wished to reassert himself, [111] found no greater effective help at that time than to ally himself with the Galatians or to recruit mercenaries among them.” It is the

\(^{36}\) Livy 38.16.13: ut Syriae quoque ad postremum reges stipendium dare non abnuerent.

\(^{37}\) Correct in this form [in] Stähelin, Galater\(^2\) page 15, whereas Dittenberger had tribute for a war against the Celts in mind.

\(^{38}\) Just a brief reminder that the Roman emperors resorted to the same means [in dealing] with the Goths in the third century. A comprehensive assessment of the material is to be desired.
same situation as [the one] that Josephus exploited with respect to the robbers: the Galileans paid them fees in the guise of tribute for protection, by virtue of which they protected Josephus' position in Galilee.

It is quite probable that the Galileans generally found conditions tolerable by dint of Josephus' described procedure [in dealing] with the robbers. In the first instance, they were freed from the tremendous pressure that weighed heavily on the land because of the activities of the robbers, and for this reason we understand very well that they acclaimed Josephus widely as “benefactor and saviour of the land” (244; 259); they thank him for his skilful leadership (251) and are convinced that they will suffer no misfortune as long as he is in the land, whereas they would become easy prey for the robbers after his departure (206/7). On the other hand it is understandable that some individuals felt that the tyranny of Josephus was too high a price to pay for the security of Galilee; according to Josephus' indication there were evidently only one or two opponents in the individual towns and villages (237) and he understandably remains silent about their motives. But we may well assume that these motives essentially corresponded to John's remarks in 302: it was, in fact, an absolutely ignoble state of affairs that the Galileans themselves were paying the robbers the money that established and sustained Josephus' domination. And it is no less understandable that Josephus was reviled as a tyrant (260; 302), because he openly relied upon the foreign troops of the robbers; and only the delight in the resultant tranquility in the land may have prevented the opposition from becoming stronger among the people. The antagonism of John of Gischala was all the more acrimonious because he was aspiring to the same goals as Josephus, albeit by different means.

At the same time, John of Gischala held the rights of seniority, if the expression may be permitted here; because he is already active when Josephus arrives in Galilee, and he is aspiring to the rulership for himself (νεωτέρων ὥρεγόμενος πραγμάτων καὶ τῆς ἀρχῆς ἐπιθυμίαν ἔχων 70); in fact he also has a [112] not inconsiderable force of troops at his disposal. Josephus reports [in] 371/72 that when they disbanded, 4000 men switched over to him while only 1500 mercenaries from Tyre remained with John, along with his fellow townsmen. Therefore John – just like Josephus – had an army that was composed of mercenaries and townsmen, and one may indeed well surmise for John as well that the real support of his rulership was based on mercenaries of whom he had 5500 at his disposal.
Admittedly, John also acquired the means to recruit them through shady dealings, but not in such an ingenious manner as Josephus: John took advantage of the price differential for ritual oil that existed between his hometown of Gischala and beleaguered Caesarea by importing it into Caesarea and earning 1000% in selling it (74 - 75). Furthermore, he had at his disposal the large repositories of grain in Upper Galilee, which were of highly singular importance for the maintenance of his troops (70 - 72). In addition to all this, John was firmly rooted in his hometown and he [had] achieved considerable success in defending it (43 - 45), so in just this way he had such a head start over Josephus that later on, when Josephus had really asserted himself in general, he himself was able to continue functioning in Gischala, unchallenged.

So in Josephus and John we recognize two men who both aspired to a leading position for themselves in Galilee and precisely for that reason were to enter into opposition. Indeed, their relationship was apparently good initially; even if Josephus portrayed it in such a way that he agreed to the relegation of the grain and the transfer of the oil to Caesarea only under constraint (73; 76), yet we would still easily have the right to consider the report of the alleged constraint to be a result of Josephus’ subsequent, extremely spiteful disposition against John, and, in truth, to infer a good relationship from the [113] agreement between the two men about these issues, which [relationship] stands at the least in direct contrast to the conflict they later directed against each other. Only thus is it also explained why John approached Josephus for use of the baths in Tiberias and why the latter had entertained no misgivings whatsoever in welcoming John in the most hospitable manner (85, 86). Later on Josephus does get wind of duplicity in John here as well, but initially the facts that are reported in 73, 76 and 85 speak an entirely different and unequivocal language. And this is only natural as well; for Josephus had first come into in the land as a delegate of the Council in Jerusalem in order to persuade the robbers to lay down their weapons. Since John, for his part, was likewise an opponent of these robbers (43 - 45), there was therefore no reason for him to cause difficulties for the official delegate of Jerusalem, nor for the latter to express any misgivings or to

---

39 It is a pity that the author of the second book of Pseudo-Aristotle’s *Economics* did not live later. The recruitment tactics of Josephus and John would have provided him with quite wonderful material.

40 I am using this passage for our context [even though it stems from a later period (after 100). When composing the administrative report, Josephus did indeed suppress everything that was in any way favourable to John.
confront John with hostility. This did not change until the moment after the fellow envoys had returned home when Josephus had entered into an agreement with the robbers, which was to make him master of Galilee, and for that very reason he was to become John’s enemy.

Therefore it is quite natural that the strife broke out immediately afterwards: in Tiberias John evidently noticed what the goal of Josephus’ dealings was, and it was only self defence, after all, when he presented things as they were and advised defection from Josephus. The latter identifies envy of Josephus’ accomplishments three times (85, 122, 189) as the main reason that motivated John; and surely this was the very emotion that John, who was in power and on his own home territory, felt towards Josephus, the intruder. In his defence, however, Josephus significantly does not think in the remotest of perhaps referring to his official mission from Jerusalem. John demands that they desert Josephus and devote themselves to him ἀποστάντας τῆς πρὸς με πίστεως προστίθεσθαι αὐτῷ (87, 123) and a corresponding wording keeps recurring (158, 273, 333). Josephus speaks everywhere only about loyalty with respect to his [own] person; he never expresses the concept that defection from him would perhaps be a defection from [114] Jerusalem or from the Jewish cause, no matter how much this [concept] would have been within the interests of his own cause. As a result it also becomes obvious that Josephus did not in the slightest have more rights in Galilee than any other revolutionary who has made himself autonomous there; he could not dare to touch this point after the departure of his fellow envoys. John, however, could well take advantage of the situation: if Josephus, the delegate from Jerusalem assigned to Galilee, instead of returning home like his fellow envoys, remained in the land and in so doing now relied on the robbers whom he was on the contrary supposed to disarm as ordered, thereby establishing dominance in Galilee, then this was certainly an act that must have interested the government in Jerusalem. How significant it is indeed again for the entire situation that John complained to Jerusalem about Josephus. If, after the departure of his fellow envoys, Josephus had remained on in Galilee as a representative of Jerusalem, then he would have had cause to complain about the rebellious John; in truth, however, the latter is accusing the former because he was hoping for support from Jerusalem against the man who had twisted the intentions of those who had commissioned him into their complete opposite!

John stated in his claims that Josephus, who had wrongfully created a position of power for himself, should be stripped of this [power] (190), and those in Jerusalem readily agreed
with this proposal even though among those who participated in the decision were people like Simon whose calm and prudent discretion even Josephus had to acknowledge (192).

If those in Jerusalem proceeded in such a manner without actually consulting Josephus, then this only proves once again that he really was the insurgent that we were to see in him – after the departure of his fellow envoys!

It is less important for us to follow the individual tricks by which Josephus attempted to elude the new legation now coming from Jerusalem, which was to relieve Josephus from his office. The main point is and remains that [Josephus’] following had a firm footing in Galilee due to fear of the robbers; conversely, however, Josephus’ followers reproached his opponents along with the Jews in Jerusalem that they wished to begrudge the land its peace and quiet (207; 211 ff.). On this basis Josephus was able to prompt the Galileans, now for their part, to send a committee of representatives to Jerusalem (266 ff.), so that the mandate “to remain in Galilee” would now be imparted to him by the authorities.

The success of the Galileans’ performance in Jerusalem met with Josephus’ expectations; the legation that was to recall Josephus was [itself] recalled in conformity to the request of the Galileans (267) and the rulership, which Josephus had exercised unlawfully up to that point in Galilee by relying on his agreement with the robbers, was transferred to him henceforth in valid form (310). Thus he, to whom a legation was entrusted originally, now is appointed administrator of the land: ἡ προστασία τῆς χώρας is [now] his own (312). In view of all the events described, one understands that Josephus quickly passed over many a fact in his report and illuminated others in a distorted fashion; he was indeed standing before the ultimately intractable challenge of producing, in lawful format, a presentation of his violent rise to power. How great his position of power was in Galilee, however, is recognized best in that nothing else could be done in Jerusalem other than to approve the status created by Josephus. The power of the robbers stood right behind Josephus!

But it also did so in a completely different sense. The robbers, with whom Josephus had come into contact and whom he was to have disarmed, were not murderers and plunderers in the usual meaning; rather, law-abiding radical Judaism was at the same time embodied within them, which contended against any compromise and therefore even persecuted the statesmanlike leadership in Jerusalem (War 2.256) and in the land (ibid. 265 etc.), yet loathed the Roman enemies of the land even more intensely. These zealots even went so far as to
threaten with death anyone who would obey the authority of the Romans (*ibid.* 264). The entire system by which the Jewish people were governed at that time was to be affected as a result. Just as, for example, in modern Bolshevism the most common criminality and a world of high political ideas are associated in such a way that because the earlier appearance is overwhelming and more noticeable, the name [116] of Bolshevism has in many cases acquired the tone of criminality, so also, under the concept of “robbers” in Josephus’ [case] one is not only, and perhaps not even primarily, to understand the urban riff-raff of Tyre etc., but also the zealots, who had gained an ever-increasing following just at that time, but because of their violence, which did not shrink from murder, they were inevitably included within [the category of] robbers. Therefore these fees may well have sufficed for many of the robbers who were paid by the Galileans to deter them from continuing attacks, but the spiritual leadership of the zealots could not allow themselves to be satisfied with this: their goal was liberation from the current government and ultimately from Roman dominance.

And with this it is already inevitable into which paths Josephus was to be pressed once he had become involved with the zealots and had built up his power in Galilee with their [backing]: there was absolutely no possibility other than either to lose his rulership in Galilee, which meant so much to him, or to fall under the influence of the zealots’ policy. Now we understand better why the Council in Jerusalem declared itself so quickly in favour of Josephus’ dismissal; but we also understand what it signified when this dismissal had to be revoked under the impact of the Galilean delegation: Those in Jerusalem realized that the zealots were in control and therefore left Josephus in his position in the hope that external peace could thus be preserved. In the long run this hope was to prove to be deceptive: when Josephus at one point explains to the Tiberians that he too knows, “that Rome is most powerful of all, but he must remain silent about Rome for the sake of the robbers” (*Life* 175), then this passage demonstrates not only the antagonism of the robbers towards Rome once again, but even more, it indicates that Josephus is essentially in the hands of the robbers, if he may only do and say what they allow. **Josephus, who dominated Galilee by means of the robbers, thus has become at the same time their dependent servant and had to comply with their policy.**

In fact, a complete shift in Josephus’ political attitude has also emerged. We [117] saw that Josephus set foot in Galilee as a friend of the Romans and implemented his directives (*cf.*
– in conformity to the orders from Jerusalem. In the following [period] as well, this relationship is not yet changed at first. Admittedly, according to our conclusions Josephus, in his administrative report, is dealing exclusively with the issues that concern him and his administration of Galilee, and he never directly speaks about the relations with Rome. Nevertheless, these play a complex [role] in the internal circumstances in Galilee and discussing them allows [us] to identify a gradual shift with respect to Rome, even if the facts that appear crucial to us are not [immediately] evident as such.

The exposition that Josephus gives of his relationship to Tiberias is most instructive in this regard. The Tiberians were the ones who most disputed Josephus’ policy; through John of Gischala they became aware of the consequences of this policy, and they therefore attempted in diverse ways to evade the pressure that Josephus exerted on them by virtue of his connection with the robbers. At first they joined John who promised them protection from the robbers apparently in another way than [that of] Josephus to whom they had to pay money for the maintenance of the [very] troops with which he dominated them. Josephus sees in the action of the Tiberians an act that was directed exclusively against him personally:

“ἀποστάσιν τῆς πρὸς με πίστεως προστίθεσθαι αὐτῷ (87). Since John did not afford the Tiberians sufficient protection against Josephus, who in fact forced them again into joining [him], they attempted it the next time with Agrippa, and requested that he occupy the town as protection against the robbers; they were determined to defect from Josephus (ἀφίστασθαι μου διεγνώκασιν 158) and to turn to Agrippa (θέλειν γὰρ αὐτῷ προστίθεσθαι 155) – thus it reads with the exact same phrase that Josephus had used above. Obviously Josephus is thinking there only about his very own personal position in Galilee. That any thought of high treason, [118] which would be justified in the action of the Tiberians, is excluded is shown most convincingly by the conclusion that ends the narrative in section 175 ff.: there Josephus explains to the Tiberians that he, too, fully recognizes the magnitude of the Roman power, but that, taking the robbers into consideration, he considers that the moment for joining Rome had not yet come. They should therefore be patient and not be dissatisfied with his leadership. Thus Josephus sees joining Rome as a desirable goal in principle, which is unattainable only for the time being. At this point one is very obviously not standing within a war against Rome now either;

41 Therefore he also discussed them negatively throughout his works with the exception of the War, which was intended for Agrippa and was not to criticize his protégés for that reason.
on the contrary, it follows as a consequence of Josephus’ stated outlook that he also wishes to associate with the Romans.

As logical as the Tiberians were in their aversion to Josephus’ policy, so [illogical] were they [when it came] to the question, with whose help did they intend to free themselves from the pressure that weighed upon them due to the cleverness of Josephus’ policy. After John had failed, and after Agrippa had not appeared early enough, the Tiberians made an attempt with the delegation sent from Jerusalem, which was to dismiss Josephus. Once again [we have] the same underlying perception as on the previous occasions: the Tiberians attempt ἀποστῆναι μου (273), by joining the delegates: τὴν πόλιν ... ἐκείνοις προστεθειμένην (314). Josephus, on the other hand, again manages to occupy the town by force and he investigates, οἵτινες εἶεν αἴτιοι τῆς ἀποστάσεως (331). The Tiberians promise to atone for their errors of the past by loyalty to Josephus in the future: τῇ μετὰ ταῦτα πρὸς ἐμὲ πίστει (333). This here concerns only his [own] person, not, for example, a common cause of the Jews.

Shortly thereafter this view was to undergo a fundamental change. When the Tiberians repeat their attempt to join Agrippa (381 - 389), Josephus now no longer feels as the one deceived: the Galileans denounce the town of Tiberias as a “traitor and friend to the King” that deserves destruction (384). Josephus, however, aims at a compromise even though he knows that the Tiberians “have become traitors to our freedom” (386); still, he also knows that Tiberias is not the only hotbed of plans to betray the people; these are in fact shared by the “principal and [119] best known men in Galilee”. Whoever speaks with such feelings about the δοκιμώτατοι ἐν Γαλιλαίᾳ (386), no longer differs in his policy from the zealots who “plunder the houses of the powerful men in the land and kill [the men] themselves” (War 2.265); for the law-abiding and patriotic zealots could rightly invoke Deuteronomy 13:13 ff. when they set fire to the houses of those who recognized and supported the godless foreign rule, and hauled these [“traitors”] themselves off to death. Granted, Josephus was able to prevent the fulfilment of such intentions by a ruse and in this way saved Tiberias once again. But we do see that the trend of the zealots has now prevailed in Galilee, and that Josephus, who increasingly based his power on them, must operate within their system of thought [Gedankengängen]. How long will it last until the zealots could no longer be contained, and demanded from their protégé Josephus the fulfilment of their plans? One grasps more and more clearly the evolution that Josephus had to follow since the moment when he deported his fellow envoys to Jerusalem and
established a position for himself that drew its power from his relationship with the zealots and the robbers. He, who had been sent to Galilee in order to disarm them, ultimately became their leader. The word “war” or anything at all that is associated with it still does not occur even now; but it is still significant that Josephus’ appointment as commander of Galilee is reported (310 ff.) between the next to last defection of the Tiberians (273), which was directed only against the person of Josephus, and the last [defection] in which Josephus saw an offence against the freedom of the Jews (381 ff.). That which up to now had affected him personally has, as a result, become a concern of the Jews.

We notice a very similar evolution with respect to Sepphoris. From the outset this town was basically friendly to the Romans and therefore remained neutral in the entire conflict between Josephus and John (124; 232). Since it is this antagonism, however, that initially determines all of Josephus’ doings, he therefore is not necessarily malevolently inclined towards the town; on the contrary, he protects it when it is attacked because of its Roman-friendy attitude (30/31). And even the authorities in Jerusalem see absolutely nothing questionable in this attitude of [120] Sepphoris; for the delegation debates Josephus’ qualities quite calmly with the Sepphorites. In so doing the Sepphorites, for their part, have no guilty conscience with respect to the Jewish envoys (232). All this demonstrates that initially it could in no way have been the issue of the “war” that determined Josephus’ policy in Galilee. At the end of the writing the view shifts slightly: When the Sepphorites find Josephus otherwise occupied, they – relying upon the strength of their walls – request that Cestius Gallus occupy their town. Josephus, however, pre-empts him, occupies Sepphoris (373 ff.) and this evolves into a genuine battle against the Romans (394 ff.). Once again the nomination of Josephus as strategos of Galilee comes between the appearance of the delegation in Sepphoris, which showed itself to be friendly to the Romans without any misgivings, and Josephus’ attack on Sepphoris on account of its attempt to join Rome. Thus the reversal in the relationships must have set in at this time: the zealots and the robbers have now firmly established Josephus’ position by means of their power and are therefore in a position to push him towards a more active policy in accordance with theirs: we, from posterity, see the dawning of the battle against Rome, the great decisive war, but when Josephus composed his administrative report he did not even remotely imagine that the skirmishes with the Romans that set in at the end of the writing formed a part of the war that was to end with the destruction of Jerusalem. The
idea of the war κατ’ ἐξοχήν is still completely missing.

It is hereby quite abundantly confirmed yet again that the administrative report is older than the War; for when Josephus was composing this [War], he had already come to the definite realization, to which he remained true later on, that his posting to Galilee followed upon the outbreak of the great war. There is no trace of this to be found here yet. But we can still go one step further.

The core segments of the Life that we have considered are nothing other than an administrative report of Josephus with its apologetic bias, which lies in the nature of the matter. It was to prove that the measures taken by Josephus in Galilee were [121] correct and necessary. Besides verbal attacks, Josephus’ opponents had made use of their pens in order to undermine Josephus’ position. They had sent letters (γράμματα, ἐπιστολαί) to Jerusalem in which they had set forth their grievances against Josephus. By clever surveillance of the routes Josephus gained possession of such writings in which he naturally, from his point of view, could recognize only falsehood and defamation (245, 260/1). Admittedly, we learn in particular only that the accusation was raised in these writings against Josephus that he was aspiring to tyranny. But precisely this accusation is the one that was taken up again by the delegation from Jerusalem (302) – evidently they therefore acquired a good part of their information from the γράμματα of the Galileans. Now, the entire problem, which arose out of Josephus’ peculiar relationship with the Galileans on the one side and with the robbers on the other, is essentially contained in the accusation that Josephus is aspiring to tyranny; and for that reason Josephus’ defence writing, available to us [now], seeks to refute in detail the accusation that he is truly a tyrant. This is why Josephus constantly stresses the love and veneration, which were his to enjoy everywhere in Galilee, and it is quite delightful to observe in detail how the entire writing presents a defence against the attacks levied against him.42

If this is now the case, however, then a writing is at hand, [which has the] definite [purpose] of producing a direct temporary effect: in it Josephus responds to the Galileans’

42 Thus Josephus responds to the accusation of an opulent [lifestyle] (284) by the reference to his morally strict living (259); when the committee – evidently under the effect of the γράμματα again, of course – raised the accusation of a poor administration against Josephus (249), then he responds to this in 198; 206/7; 251. Conversely, from his constant emphasis that he wished to settle the disputes without bloodshed (103, 244, 369), we may well draw the conclusion that the charge was raised against him that he had prevailed only by force, as is
grievances that were set down in writing, and he does this in order to justify himself before those in power and along with them, before the people in Jerusalem. His report is the response to the epistles of his opponents. It follows from this, however, that [the report] must have originated from a time when the issues discussed in it were of interest to the public. [122] It is therefore totally impossible that Josephus’ self defence, with all its details that were specific to the moment, should have originated a generation after the events, because the problems had fallen into oblivion long before. But I [shall] continue; already after the fall of Jerusalem no person could have [continued to] take any interest in these incidents: Josephus himself had made his peace with the Romans; he had broken his ties with Jerusalem, and it made no difference whatsoever at this time whether John’s allegations were correct or not, the more so as completely different issues affected Josephus himself.

Things lay the other way around at the time when Josephus had attained the office of strategos in Galilee; just as his opponents wished to eliminate him by [their] epistles, he had to stand up for himself by responding to their attacks. Consequently the text can have originated only so long as Josephus was playing a political role; but this ceased with his capture in Jotapata. As a result we have a fixed terminus ante quem. Now, this consideration also corresponds completely to the other facts. We have already seen that Vespasian’s invasion of Galilee did not belong to the old part [of the writing]: since this incident, which led directly to the siege of Jotapata, the turning point in Josephus’ life, is not reported although it must have imposed itself upon Josephus out of personal interest, so it follows that our core report is older than the siege of Jotapata.

And lastly: all the discussions of this chapter are pervaded by the fact, repeatedly observed, that Josephus knew nothing yet about the Jewish-Roman War when he composed the report. Up to now we have not been able to provide an explanation; now it is obvious that Josephus remained silent about this war κατ’ ἐξοχήν because his writing originated at a time when the course of this war and its consequences could not yet be surveyed. To be sure, the skirmishes with the Romans did take place, but Josephus himself did not suspect that a war would arise from them, which [123] would lead to the destruction of Jerusalem; because unrest in Judaea had not stopped since the year 44,
rather the conflict between the Roman soldiers and the Jews continued unabated. And it was precisely the robbers, above all, who carried on the battle from the Jewish side. So how should Josephus have come already at that time to the thought that he was standing in an era that would, in a completely different manner than earlier, grow into a Jewish-Roman War? How could he suspect, in light of the minor skirmishes, that these would become the prelude to the great tragedy of the Jewish people, about which he did not yet know anything?

To be sure, in light of the completely different governmental and intergovernmental relations, the outbreak of the war represents for our present time a decisive turning point, [which would] not be mistaken even by its contemporaries [now]; but this did not hold true in those times when unrest had existed for decades and was forcefully suppressed without shaking the status of the Jewish state as a whole. Admittedly, we may rightly recognize a symbol of the coming times in all this unrest, but still only because we are acquainted with the outcome. But no person knows what the historical significance of his own time [is to be]. We sense this best of all in the face of the present time, which holds so many totally diverse issues. In truth, herein lies the explanation for Josephus’ peculiar conduct with respect to the Roman issue, which he could not recognize as such in its significance. He is still filled solely with the issues that affected Galilee [but] made no difference to later times; but this is only conceivable before the fall of Jerusalem. And since Josephus could not compose the administrative report during his captivity, therefore the writing originated before the beginning of the siege of Jotapata. We are repeatedly being led to this point in time.

As a result, the literary critical relationship between the administrative report and the War only now acquires its correct elucidation [Beleuchtung] as well. As we have seen, the War was based upon the administrative report in such a way that it adopted its stock of facts, but gave it another historical colouring [124] by falsifying the facts in honour of Agrippa and Titus. Now after his capture Josephus entered into the service of these persons directly, after he has flattered them in every imaginable way. As a result, however, it is impossible that he wrote anything at all after his capture in Jotapata, which he would then have had to adjust for the War later on for the sake of Agrippa and Titus. From this it follows, however, that the view of the administrative report did not correspond to the opinions that Josephus believed he had to assume with Agrippa and Titus; therefore the report is older than the moment from which Josephus, to all intents and purposes, attuned his existence to
these persons, i.e. older than his capture in Jotapata. From all sides we are led to this same point in time: **the administrative report, the nucleus of the Life, dates from the time when the Roman-Jewish War itself was beginning; as a result, a document of entirely unique significance has been gained, which is to yield the foundation of all research on the genesis of the war.**

We would love to know something about the external form of Josephus’ report; but since we only have it in a reworked version as the *Life*, so we must be content [with this]. Surely the writing was to have a political effect, and therefore one must think of an epistle, be it in the form of a letter or a ὑπόμνημα. Both of these genres are so similar\(^{43}\) that a distinction would be possible only if we had acquired the writing entirely in its original form; but the beginning and ending are missing – which is crucial. It is also not impossible that the [125] writing did not progress beyond the creation of the notes; after all, the events followed upon one another so quickly that it is at any rate possible to presume that the work was not completed.

It is already stated therewith that we may on no account enter upon a path that appears to help us perhaps for [just] an instant. In two passages Josephus states that in his *War* he is providing nothing other than the Greek translation of his presentation of the Jewish War (1.3 and 6), which was written in Aramaic. Initially it appears that a magnificent external confirmation of our entire line of reasoning has been provided with this. We have, after all, discovered a writing that existed before the *War*, which covers the same events as the *War*, and here Josephus tells us something in his own words, which we first had to determine with arduous work. And if our administrative report exists in the Greek language, then one may wish to see in this the first translation of the Aramaic original. But such thought processes and associations cannot be maintained [in the face of] more serious scrutiny. At the beginning of the *War* (1.3) Josephus explains that, for his Roman audience he is translating into the Greek

\(^{43}\) I do not know if it has already been noted that Caesar’s *commentarii de bello Gallico* are based on the reports that Caesar sent to Rome at the end of every year. We have such an epistle of Cicero [in] *Fam.* 15.4 where he reports about his administration with the purpose of securing a *supplicatio* for himself. Now, books 2, 4 and 7 of Caesar[’s work] conclude with the formula *ob easque res ex litteris Caesaris dierum quindecim supplicatio decreta est*, so the letters mentioned by Caesar have incorporated precisely that which now exists in the individual *commentarii* and which has its definitive parallel in Cicero’s letter; both the *litterae* and the *commentarii* are administrative reports.
language the work that he has previously composed for the “Upper Barbarians” in his mother
tongue *i.e.* Aramaic, and in fact, he is doing this because he considers it foolish that the
Parthians, Babylonians, the remotest Arabians, the Jews beyond the Euphrates and the
Adiabenians should be informed about the beginning of the Jewish-Roman War, its course and
its end, by means of his work, while the Greeks and Romans, in so far as they had not
participated in the fighting themselves, had no possibility of acquainting themselves with this
war (1.6). Thus Josephus is not writing for those who fought in the war and is therefore taking
into consideration neither the Jews in Palestine nor the combatants on the enemy side;
besides, his Aramaic presentation was to be valid for the entire Orient – by no means only for
the Jews [living] there like Hölscher (col. 1942, note), for instance, thinks: because the Jews are
no barbarians –, and his Greek [presentation was to be valid] for the Graeco-Roman world.44
The Aramaic book cannot have been recorded until after the termination of the [126] Jewish
War, which is narrated as far as its conclusion; just at that time Josephus moved to Rome, as is
well known. Thus the Aramaic work has nothing to do with our ὑπόμνημα; but at this point the
question certainly must be posed: what should it indicate when in the first half of the 70s, a
Jewish writer in Rome, who was paid by the emperor and presented with a mansion, composed
a work in the Aramaic language, which was intended for the far Orient.

This is understandable only if Josephus intended to make an impact on the Orient by
means of his presentation, in the service of imperial politics. Josephus dealt with the history of
the Parthians in detail (Ant. 18.39 - 54; 96 - 105; 20.17 - 96) and on this occasion he recounts that
King Izates, who had converted to Judaism, tried to talk Bardanes, the king of the Parthians,
out of the thought of the possibility of a successful war against Rome (Ant. 20.71); in so doing
he referred to the strength of Rome’s troops and her good luck in the same way that Agrippa
does in his famous address [directed] to the Jews (War 2.345 ff.; above all 373). Surely this entire

44 The idea expressed by Täubler (Hermes 51, 1916, page 211 ff.) that the so-called references in
Josephus’ Antiquities were in truth referring to the – lost – Aramaic original of the War, is not
worth discussing already in light of the fact that, with his Antiquities as with his War, Josephus
was addressing himself to an audience who understood Greek, whereas of course no person in
Rome or Greece knew of Josephus’ Aramaic book, which he τοῖς ἄνω βαρβάροις ἀνέπεμψεν, nor
could they read it. – Incidentally, when Täubler (loc. cit. page 226 ff.) makes me out to be an
adherent of the anonymity hypothesis, then he has incurred an oversight here; at that time I
already stressed that I consider the purely external transfer of the formula from the source to
be implausible, and Destinon’s hypothesis rests on this.
documentary material, which was made available to Josephus here, was not to have been made serviceable for both historical and political purposes; and Agrippa’s speech, which expresses the ideas of Rome’s invincibility in such a way that every reader must be convinced of the futility of resistance, does aim primarily at the future. Thus the War as a whole is surely a writing that was suited for nipping any possible desire for war against the imperium Romanum in the bud.

It follows from the external political situation, however, that the Roman emperors must have desired the spreading of such ideas precisely at that time. Vespasian had to reinforce his troops in the east massively, [he had] to keep Armenia firmly under control by means of garrisons, and also take other measures, which focussed their effect against the threatening danger of the Parthians above all (Mommsen, Römische Geschichte 5.395 f.). Indeed, “the ferocity and high spirits of the Parthians” had mounted to such an extent that in the year 75 the governor Ulpius Trajanus prevented the outbreak of a war only by dealing the Parthians a formidable scare. The appearance of the Aramaic War would fit in well with the policy described by Pliny (Pan. 14) thus: cum ferociam superbiamque Parthorum ex proximo auditus magno terrore cohiberes: it is a somewhat official attempt to dampen the agitation among the Upper Barbarians by means of showing them, by example, to where a frivolously begun war must lead. And it is not without purpose that the emperor would have appointed for its execution the man who had once himself directed the Jewish revolt, only then to dedicate himself heart and soul to his new master.

Our administrative report therefore does not have anything at all to do directly with the Aramaic War; but one could perhaps contemplate the idea whether we are justified in drawing a conclusion about the language of the old administrative report from the Aramaic War. But, considered from many sides, such an assumption appears as implausible as can be; for even if the general public among the people in Jerusalem spoke Aramaic (Acts 21:40; 22:2; Josephus War 5.361; 6.96), still the entire administration of the state is interspersed with Hellenistic members in such a way that the use of Greek was a necessity within it. The mastery of Greek was therefore assumed among the educated (cf. Schürer, vol. 2, page 57 ff.; 84), and so Josephus also could invoke his thorough competence in the written use of the Greek language, which he did not master orally in the same way (Ant. 20.263). This written Greek fully sufficed for practical use in state affairs; but no more than an Egyptian, who was writing a papyrus in
the Greek language, would thereby be qualified to achieve a work of Greek literature, would the mastery of Greek grammar suffice for Josephus to compose a refined work about the Jewish War. That is why Josephus refuted Justus’ charge that [128] Josephus’ Greek was illegible for an educated man, by way of referring to his associates who had assisted him. Still, here it is a matter of purely stylistic issues that are not applicable to our administrative report nor to the notes either; for the administrative report is no work of literature, rather only a collection of material, which must first be formulated into a work of literature. And if someone like Cicero himself did not shrink from sending his report about the consulship to Posidonius, *ut ornatius de iisdem rebus scriberet* (Att. 2.1.1), then for Josephus it was absolutely imperative to consult expert rhetorical help if he wished to create a work of literature from his unrhetorical administrative report. The direct linguistic dependency of the *War* on the administrative report (*cf.* page 80) shows at the same time that at least in the introduction, the Greek *War* cannot be a literal translation of the Aramaic; in the event that this one even provided a historical introduction, it would still be based on the administrative report in a similar way as is the case for the Greek *War*. Accordingly it is possible that Josephus drafted his sundry notes in Greek too, and utilized them first for the Aramaic, then for the Greek *War*.

**Chapter V. Book 14 of the *Antiquities***

The results that we have attained in the preceding investigations are suitable for elucidating the frequently discussed problem of the relationship of the sources in the introduction of the *War* and the corresponding segments of the *Antiquities* from an entirely new standpoint. The situation here is indeed quite similar to the narratives of the *War* and the *Life* that we have examined; because, just as long stretches of the *War* coincide in substance with the self-portrayal, so also the last books of the *Antiquities* repeat, albeit in more detailed form, the report that had furnished the introduction to the *War*, and it is a fact beyond all doubt that behind the *War* and the *Antiquities* stands a source text, which must therefore be identified with Josephus’ administrative report, which we have attested [above]. There is a distinct correspondence [129] in chronological sequence between the series: administrative report *War* – self-portrayal, on the one hand and on the other, the series: Josephus’ source –
War – Antiquities. A difference exists only insofar as Josephus himself was involved in the actions [in the former case] and so the first recording of the events is also traced back to him, whereas [in the latter case] he was standing before a tradition formed by others about the more distant past.

Now, whereas the relationship of the War and the Life, which we have examined in detail, had never been seriously investigated before, there does exist extensive scholarly research about the connections between the War and the Antiquities. The basic assumption from which this research very generally proceeded is that, in both these works, Josephus has quite mechanically copied his sources that lay right before him; so Juster could enter as a finding of his investigations: Les antiquités, dans la partie qui nous intéresse — the last books are meant — valent en général ce que valent ses sources. In doing so, one is caught up in the same error in which our entire assessment of sources in the field of ancient history is currently ensnared, to its detriment. In my Polybius I have contended in vain against this mode of examination [Betrachtungsart] and in one case I have identified in detail the significance that is inherent in the authorial personality as such. Certainly the stratification [Zergliederung] of sources will be able to be continued in the previous mode as well, but this investigation can only be successfully applied if the nature of the extant historical work and of the author who stands behind it has been identified. For histories of literature, compendia, and investigations, what purpose is there in actually dealing with “the life” of the historians before examining their works, if one does not really view these [historians] as anything other than copying machines? With decided consistency, Walter Otto and Gustav Hölscher, in their far-reaching investigations of Josephus, have drawn these last conclusions from this view, and along with that [they have] unwittingly proven their impossibility.

In his well-known polemic against Nicolaus of Damascus, who has coloured his historical work with a strong partisan [bias] out of obsequiousness towards Herod (Ant. 15.183

---


– to the point of falsifying facts –, the author makes the following remarks about himself in deliberate contrast to this court historiographer: “I, who come from a family that is closely related to the Hasmoneans and therefore am vested with the dignity of the priesthood, consider lying about history to be indecent and therefore am dealing with things purely and fairly. Although I revered many of Herod’s descendants who also were kings as well, I have still honoured the truth above them, even to the point of risking incurring their wrath” – thus, more or less, reads the substance of the concluding sentence that is corrupted. Like everything else, so this thought of Josephus naturally is supposed to have been taken literally from the source as well, and therefore not to signify anything for Josephus, rather only for the author of the source who thereby is established as an opponent of the Herodians and of Nicolaus of Damascus, while Josephus continues on in his insubstantial and bleary existence. Now, surely source criticism must take into account that [sometimes] a comment that fits in only with the time and life situation of the source will be copied without thought; but that the author of a work that is at least so immense as is represented by Josephus’ mass of writings, should have managed to introduce[47] his source to his audience – as himself, is an adventurous [131]

[47] Otto’s “reasons” proceed from the following: the composition of the Antiquities comes after the death of Agrippa II, but the sentence πολλούς μὲν τῶν ἐγγόων τῶν ἐκείνου καὶ βασιλεύοντας ἐτι δι᾽ ἐντροπῆς ἔχοντες (16.187) presupposes that a king from the house of Herod is living, therefore the statement cannot have been recorded by Josephus for his Antiquities. – This is all wrong. Firstly, Agrippa II was still alive when the Antiquities was produced in the year 93/94, because he did not die until 100. Secondly, from the plural of βασιλεύοντας it follows that ἔχοντες represents the imperfect tense, not the present: “I personally revered many of his descendants who were even kings as well.” The relationship had long cooled before the Antiquities was composed; but it suited Josephus very well that he could now cover up his current anit-Herodian bias with his former friendship with the Herodians. – Finally, ὡς ἔφην is supposed to be proof positive for the literal takeover of the section from a source because the thought to which ὡς ἔφην refers has not been expressed before in Josephus (Hölscher). In truth things are different here as well. The actual thought sequence leads from section 184 (out of [his] love for Herod, Nicolaus has stressed everything favourable and suppressed everything unfavourable) to section 187, in which Josephus contrasts himself and his love of truth with Nicolaus. Then Josephus decided to demonstrate the general thought of section 184 by discussing the story of Mariamne (185 a) and now, in order to reassemble his previous train of thought he formulates a doublet to section 184 in sections 185b and 186. In it, by ὡς ἔφην he refers to the train of thought of section 184: Nicolaus is writing in the service of Herod. Admittedly, it follows from the ὡς ἔφην in conjunction with the doublet that Josephus did not write down the segment 184 - 187 stylistically at one stroke, but it has become quite definite as a result [of these formal considerations] that [the passage] can indeed stem only from him.
assertion from which the only possible conclusion that can be drawn from its ultimate deliberation [Durchdenkung] is that Josephus never existed at all, but only his source; because who can guarantee to us that the Autobiography and all the other passages that report about Josephus really have him in mind and not his source?

It is obvious, after all, that 16.187 reports about the very same man who forms the subject of the Autobiography. The author of 16.187 affirms, with reference to his ancestry, that he is closely related to the Hasmonean kings, but Josephus says of himself not only, as Otto thinks, that his family belongs to the first of the 24 priestly courses, but he adds to this that on his mother’s side he belongs within the family of the Hasmoneans from which she stems (Life 2). But in addition: the author of 16.187 accounts for his unconditional love of historical truth by his priestly descent, and from Josephus himself we know that he derived his suitability as a historian from his priestly descent and he wrote his self-portrayal to prove just this (cf. page 34). Under such circumstances it is absolutely definite that in 16.186/7 no one other than Josephus is speaking about himself. But now, since Josephus explicitly contrasts himself here to the presentation of Nicolaus of Damascus, which was positively inclined towards the Herodians, and his [132] contrast to it does not derive from some contradictory sources, but rather from his personal attitude towards the Herodians on the one hand and the Hasmoneans on the other, so it follows that Josephus was induced by his own personal opinion to give his Antiquities an anti-Herodian trend, be it that he chose for himself a source to this purpose, which followed the same bias, be it that he himself imposed an anti-Herodian bias into a source that was otherwise oriented. But the main point, which has has until now been completely unrecognized, is this: Josephus covers the direction of his work with his person; that by pushing the Tendenzen back exclusively onto the sources one follows the wrong path entirely.

And this incredibly important discovery corresponds perfectly indeed with what we have determined about the War and the Life: whereas the presentation of the War was tailored completely to the personality of the Herodian Agrippa, the later additions and revisions showed an attitude that was inimical to Agrippa. Here, however, in the relationship of Josephus to Agrippa it is impossible from the outset that any intervening sources could have been swept in; furthermore, we could reveal time and again that Josephus only reworked his original material in order to bring his new bias into the work. And if, in the historical parts
about the distant past, the War therefore features a trend that is friendly to Herod and the Antiquities [features] one that is inimical to him, then this development goes hand in hand with the shift in [Josephus’] judgment about the Herodian Agrippa: therefore no one other than Josephus himself has fundamentally changed his opinion of the Herodians and expressed this modified view in the Antiquities. Psychological understanding of the personality must take the place of the stratification of sources [Quellenzerlegung] in the usual sense, which traces each sentence back to an author and makes Josephus out to be a dim-witted copyist. Josephus, too, is a human being who has passed through an infinity of experiences in his life and therefore evolved only [133] gradually. To detect traces of this evolution is truly the task of anyone who wishes to evaluate Josephus as a historian.

If we are to take up our task in this sense, however, then virtually all preparatory work is lacking – despite the rich literature mentioned; because, since Josephus’ individuality had been cast aside from the start, a larger stock of facts was manifest within the younger writing, the Antiquities, in comparison to the older War; therefore [it was thought that] both works must have originated independently from older sources. On the other hand one could not fail to recognize, from the extremely far-ranging correspondence that can be observed between the [two] works, that ultimately a common basis existed, which was traced back to Nicolaus of Damascus. In this way arose the currently quite widespread assumption that Josephus expanded upon Nicolaus’ work in his War; [but that] in contrast, he based the Antiquities on an anonymous author, who, for his part, also used Nicolaus as a source, but who gave his work an anti-Herodian bias. Thus the War and the Antiquities came to be valued as two sources, which were independent from each other and which could, for that reason, be invoked at will with equal justification. Proceeding from an assumption of such a nature, in all the basic works that address the presentation of the history of the Herodians and especially of Herod himself, the historical narrative is constructed equally from the War and the Antiquities in such a way

that [where] discrepancies [arise] the Antiquities is actually most often granted preference. Of course it appeared as the more comprehensive and therefore probably also as the more accurate apographon of the common source. In contrast, we shall have to demonstrate that this notion is fundamentally wrong, and that, with the exception of the additions from secondary sources that can easily be distinguished, the Antiquities is nothing but a tendentious ‘correction’ of the facts that were transmitted in the War. [134] As a matter of fact, the Antiquities and the War are related to each other exactly as are the War and the administrative report, or Life and War respectively: The existing factual material is reinterpreted in accordance with Josephus’ new view. According to this, the Antiquities – wherever the secondary sources do not provide us with new material – has to be completely ruled out as a historical source in comparison to the War. The critical foundation for the historical presentation is thrown into a muddle by this new discovery, thereby clearing the path for a new and more accurate conception of the history of the Herodians.\footnote{Proceeding from the realization that only the exhaustive treatment of a text from all aspects grants us a real insight into the sources available [Quellenlage] to the author and his method of working, I [shall] provide an extensive analysis [Zergliederung] of the 14\textsuperscript{th} book, however, I am restricting myself to this so that the scope of my research does not become excessive. By the way, the results can be easily applied to the other books.}

1. The first agreement between Hyrcanus and Aristobulus

\textit{War} 1.121/2 = \textit{Ant}. 14.6/7

When Hyrcanus and Aristobulus had fallen into a dispute after Alexandra’s death (67 BCE), they eventually come to an agreement that the younger Aristobulus should assume the kingship in the place of Hyrcanus. Even though War 121/2 corresponds to Ant. 6/7, both sources diverge in the formulation of details [Einzelformulierung]: according to the War, Hyrcanus does indeed lose the kingship, but was to “enjoy the other honours as the king’s brother”. We can learn how much this signifies from Polybius 30.2.4. according to which the entire difference between the king and the king’s brother is that the latter does not wear a diadem and does not bear the title of king; but otherwise his position of power is identical to that of the king. This sentence, which was first stated for [the case of] Pergamon applies, in its
basic concept, to all Hellenistic rights of kingship; consequently it can be said, for example, also of Aristobulus that he has surpassed his brother in power, [during the time] when Hyrcanus was king (War 120). According to this, when Aristobulus and Hyrcanus trade palaces pursuant to their arrangement, [135] then this indicates that Hyrcanus is to assume the official position of king’s brother, which Aristobulus has occupied until now. The Antiquities deliberately twists this view around by eliminating the statement, “Hyrcanus is to enjoy the other honours as the king’s brother” and turns it into the opposite by noting, “he should live free from the affairs of state by consuming his personal property undisturbed”; for in this way Hyrcanus is stepping down from public life. And in order to impress this idea firmly upon the reader, the Antiquities further inserts the addition in section 7 “as a commoner”. Therefore the position of Hyrcanus in the Antiquities has been quite deliberately reduced in comparison to [his position in] the War.

That the view of the War is the correct one follows from [the fact that] at the conclusion of the agreement both parties to it had roughly equivalent cards in their hands: Aristobulus had scored the military victory, Hyrcanus had power over Aristobulus’ family as valuable hostages. If Hyrcanus had been as crushed as the Antiquities claims, then the author would not at all have needed to give an account first of Hyrcanus’ advantages, which were not even really exploited. Above all, however, the Antiquities did not at all even draw the final implications from its outlook; because logically the information that Hyrcanus acquired Aristobulus’ palace should also have been deleted; but this was not possible because of the continuation of the narrative, and so the insertion “as a commoner” should at least prevent one from drawing the conclusions from the acquisition of the palace, which must have imposed themselves upon the Greek reader. As a result it is proven that the Antiquities has brought a new view into a fixed framework, [which] had been furnished by the War; it is not new facts that exist in the Antiquities, rather, the facts that were reported in the War have been reinterpreted, but in such a way that the reinterpretation could not be carried through to the end.

Why were these changes introduced into the Antiquities? – Hyrcanus later attempted to revolt against Aristobulus; if he did this as “the king’s brother” then he was no better than Aristobulus who had provided the example for [such behaviour]. If, on the other hand, he had become a commoner and had acknowledged this status by [formal] agreement then [136] his
revolt was a crime. In order to stress this idea quite strongly, Josephus introduced an additional significant change in the *Antiquities*. According to the *War*, the quarrelling brothers were reconciled in the temple where they embraced each other; the *Antiquities* retains this – also not logically since Hyrcanus was supposed to be in a sorry state indeed –; but adds to this that the reconciliation “had been reinforced by the swearing of oaths”. Thus Hyrcanus in his insurgency had actually perjured himself; because he had acknowledged his intended role as a commoner in this most ceremonious manner and despite this he revolted against his brother. Granted, Hyrcanus’ insurgency is in truth the sole fault of Antipater, as will be shown, and so the revision is ultimately directed against the latter, the progenitor of the Herodians. Already here we have happened upon a manifestation of the phenomenon that we shall encounter again and again. – As far as modern authors engage in questions of details, they consistently follow the *Antiquities*, for example, Ewald 516, Réville 91, Felten 90, Schürer 291, Wilcken, *Realencyclopaedie*. 2.908, Bertholet 21, Renan 140, who all emphasize Hyrcanus’ private status and to some extent stress in addition that they “especially liked his character”. In truth, this outlook lacks all critical foundation, which is granted to us exclusively by the *War* instead: according to this, the tenor of the agreement is that Hyrcanus and Aristobulus exchange their positions, the latter becomes king whereas the former, as an official personality, enjoys the honours due a king’s brother. Everything else in the *Antiquities* is an adjustment [Zurechtschreibung] resulting from Josephus’ later feelings towards the Herodians.

2. The appearance of Antipater and Hyrcanus’ escape

*War* 123 - 126a = *Ant.* 14.8 - 18

The peace between the two brothers was not to last long. The Idumean Antipater appears and tries to persuade Hyrcanus to flee to Aretas, the king of the Arabians. Hyrcanus does then flee to Aretas who, when requested, declares that he is prepared to lead him back with forces in order to oust Aristobulus. Despite the much more succinct version of the *War*, both of the reports are again very close to each other; [137] especially in the presentation of Hyrcanus’ flight to Aretas [where they agree] almost *verbatim*. But on the other hand, in contrast to this there are conspicuous expansions of the old text in the *Antiquities*, for one, and reinterpretations that twist the sense of the whole, for another. The narrative of the *Antiquities*
in the original version signifies: Antipater stands in opposition to Aristobulus and fears for his existence now that the latter had become king. He therefore tries to overthrow Aristobulus; thus the line of thought: φίλος δέ τις Ὑρκανοῦ Ἰδουμαῖος Ἀντίπατρος ....... ἀλλοτρίως εἶχεν πρὸς τὸν Ἀριστóbουλον καὶ δεδιώς μή τι πάθη διὰ τὸ πρὸς αὐτὸν μίσος ἐπισυνιστᾷ (8a, 11b).

What stands between is an obvious insertion in this context whereby the final words of section 8 and the beginning of section 11 act as interfaces [Verzahnung], while sections 9 and 10 contain the factual nucleus: this deals with the ancestry of the Herodians in a form that in fact dismisses the claim of Nicolaus of Damascus that Antipater descends from the first Jews who had come from Babylonia to Judaea, [while] alluding that Nicolaus had wished to flatter Herod with such a claim (9). Section 10, on the other hand, deals with Antipater’s father, Antipas, and his relations with the Arabians, Gazaites, and Ascalonites. For the evaluation of the relationships among the sources this section is of very special significance: it has already been shown externally that there is an expansion of the text in sections 9 - 10, [but] the observation that a correction of the War goes hand in hand with this insertion seems even more important to me. In the War it says of Antipater that he has “played the foremost role among the people on account of his ancestors, his wealth, and his further strength”; the Antiquities indeed adopts the “wealth” and the “strength”, whereas it deletes the ancestors from this context exactly because [the Antiquities] maintains the view expressed in the insertion that the Herodians do not descend from the first Jews. It ensues from this that the tradition followed in the War is traced back to Nicolaus who is attacked in the Antiquities on account of the comment, presented in the War but deleted in the Antiquities. Therefore, when Josephus composed the Antiquities he interpreted the statement from the War, [namely] that Antipater was the first [138] on account of his ancestors, in a deliberately terse manner in order to construct on this basis a polemic against Nicolaus whom he had followed [when writing] the War. To the well-known reasons, which have already been made from another aspect for [identifying] Nicolaus as the source of the War, this one must be added as the more convincing [one].

Another conclusion is even more important for our context: indeed, it follows directly from the facts mentioned [above] that in the War there is by no means a condensed excerpt from the same source that would have been reproduced in greater detail in the Antiquities; rather the War [itself is the] underlying source of the Antiquities, which brings a new bias into
the tradition by eliminating the aristocratic ancestry of the Herodians. The Antiquities is coloured with an anti-Herodian [trend] otherwise as well, in that other nuances are introduced in details: the War states that Antipater has excelled by his strength, so the Antiquities describes him as a brutal person and a friend of factions; in the War Antipater was an object of hatred for Aristobulus who therefore was at fault for the conflict, but according to the Antiquities Antipater hates Aristobulus and thereby becomes the culprit [himself]. No new material exists anywhere here, as is seen, but only a reinterpretation of the War. It is different with section 10, which deals with Antipas: a secondary source must [have been] used for this part of the insertion, and we shall establish its origin [to be] in the memoirs of Herod with which Josephus was familiar (page 214, footnote).

The motives for Antipater are given in the War in that he, who is hated by Aristobulus, understandably feels apprehensive when the latter assumes the rulership. For this reason he attempts to regain the rulership for Hyrcanus; in this spirit [Antipater] advises him to flee to Aretas and to conquer the land from there, while he [himself] wins Aretas over [and convinces him] to take Hyrcanus in and help him regain the rule over his kingdom; in this spirit he presents to him how unjust it would be that the older and more deserving Hyrcanus was pushed aside in such a manner. The Antiquities twists the substance around: Hyrcanus is not moved to flight by the hope of recovering rulership but rather because Antipater maligns Aristobulus to him [claiming] that he is seeking his life (12, 14), and accordingly Hyrcanus [139] goes to Aretas seeking refuge (15) after he had been promised by [Aretas] not, as in the War, reinstatement to his rulership, but rather only secure accommodation. This is also a deliberate reworking. Indeed, in the War Hyrcanus was absolutely not the weak character who had given up everything but his bare existence; there he still enjoyed the honours due to the king’s brother and could accordingly aspire toregnancy again. In the Antiquities he had cast everything aside in his weakness, and had saved only his life. Thus when Antipater wished to malign Aristobulus, this could only still happen by [alleging] that Aristobulus was seeking Hyrcanus’ life. As a result a complete rupture in the narrative of the Antiquities is introduced here just like in section 1; if Hyrcanus had betaken himself to Aretas in order to save his skin from Aristobulus’ persecution, how does it then happen that he nevertheless ends up persuading Aretas to lead him back with forces? This military action belongs within the view of the War where Hyrcanus had fled to Aretas in order to recover his rulership; in the
it is without rhyme or reason, and while reading this work it remains completely incomprehensible, too, why Hyrcanus decided upon a violent return to Jerusalem, since he had really only sought from Aretas protection for his [own] life. From this, however, it follows compellingly once again that within the old established framework a new bias has been introduced secondarily, but such that not all contradictions were eliminated: the *War is therefore the source of the Antiquities.*

By Hyrcanus’ fleeing to Aretas for fear of assassination, the theme that had been put forward in the *War* as the reason for the flight (the older Hyrcanus having been dispossessed of his kingship by the younger Aristobulus) became redundant: But Josephus does not cast it aside any more than [he discarded] the theme of building the walls (*cf.* page 71 f.), rather he uses it in such a way that he has Antipater make those remarks, which he had made to Aretas in the *War,* now to the “most powerful of the Jews”. We do not find out how they reacted to this or what happened otherwise as a result; this part is left hanging in the air. But here also we detect the secondary handiwork, which threatens to disrupt a fixed framework! In its execution it is noteworthy that Josephus again [*140*] expands the context with an insertion. Antipater – so it reads in section 12 – attempts to malign Aristobulus by suggesting that he is seeking Hyrcanus’ life; the latter does not believe these aspersions because this went against his character. When Antipater saw that he was not being successful, he maligned Aristobulus to Hyrcanus, suggested that Aristobulus was after his life, and convinced [him]. It can be clearly seen that the narrative about the maligning is interrupted by the characterization, and that for the purposes of interpolation [*Verzahnung*] the report about the maligning was duplicated. The original thought read: τούτους τε συνεχῶς πρὸς τὸν Ὑρκανὸν ποιούμενος διετέλει τοὺς λόγους καὶ // διαβάλλων πρὸς αὐτὸν τὸν Ἀριστόβουλον ως ἀποκτεῖναι θέλοντα καὶ μόλις ἐγκείμενος πείθει (12a, 14b). The trait of Hyrcanus that was given in between, that he “did not lightly accept maligning because of his sense of lawfulness”, was to serve [the purpose of] excusing Hyrcanus for his character and of thereby shifting the entire blame onto *Antipater in whose hands Hyrcanus was a hapless tool*; this is why Josephus time and again underscores this characterization of Hyrcanus as a shiftless person (*cf.* 44 and 179) in the *Antiquities,* thereby exaggerating an image that is only slightly implied in the *War* where their mother, Alexandra, appoints the “more indolent” Hyrcanus as high priest as opposed to the “hot-blooded” Aristobulus because she fears no persecution from the former (*War* 1.109).
That Hyrcanus, however, was not the dunce that the *Antiquities* and modern historians make him out to be, should be proven by the course of history (cf. page 154).

Until now the *Antiquities* has therefore presented only reinterpretations in order to wrest away the sympathy that belonged to the Hyrcanus-Antipater party in the *War*. This [same] purpose is served also by the only segment that introduces new material: section 18. Hyrcanus promises, in the event of his reinstatement, to restore to Aretas the Arabian *Dodecapolis*, which his father Alexander had taken from the Arabians. It was recognized long ago that this list belongs to the overview of the expansion of the Jewish empire at the time of Alexander, which had been provided in *Antiquities* 13.395 ff. and which likewise forms an insertion into the surrounding context [that had been] taken from the *War*. [141] The author has therefore drawn these data from an additional source [*Nebenquelle*] but inserted the piece referring to the Arabians here where he was dealing with the story about Hyrcanus, who promised to give back the towns. As a matter of fact, at the end of section 17 Aretas has already been convinced to lead back Hyrcanus, so section 18 proves to be an insertion from this [fact] as well.

For the historian it therefore follows that the report of the *War* comes into exclusive consideration as a source; in contrast, the *Antiquities* with all its reinterpretations is utterly worthless and acquires significance for us only through those segments that were taken from other sources, *i.e.* section 10 can be utilized for the history of old Antipas while section 18 provides material for Alexander and Hyrcanus. This last passage itself is quite suitable for validating the view of the *War* factually as well: if Hyrcanus committed himself to such concessions towards Aretas then he wanted more than the simple preservation of his skin, he wanted the kingship for himself. If we examine the modern literature in comparison to our conclusions then it fails completely for the section at hand. Those like Schürer (293) and Felten (90) appear not to have noticed any discrepancy at all between the two reports when these [scholars] reproduce the contents of the *Antiquities* as “history” and quote the *War* and *Antiquities* side by side as evidence. But also Ewald (518/9), Réville (92), Hausrath (188), Lehmann-Haupt (208) and even Wellhausen (291 ff.) take the *Antiquities* as the exclusive basis for their narrative and therefore present the events as if Hyrcanus, as far as he was concerned, was perfectly content with his lot “as a commoner” and as if Antipater had persuaded him to flee only half against his will by means of the false pretence of the impending assassination.
But how then is one to explain Hyrcanus’ return and his promise to give back the *Dodecapolis*? – H. Holtzmann (212) was therefore logical when – now going beyond *Antiquities* 18 – he has not Hyrcanus, but Antipater promising to give back the *Dodecapolis*. But this has neither been transmitted [by tradition] nor is it factually even possible.

By contrast, I [shall] establish the following main features based on the groundwork that we have produced: Hyrcanus only gave way to force when he renounced his regnancy [142] and had to content himself with his position as the king’s brother (War 121). Therefore it goes without saying that he was anxious to regain the throne that he had defended in battle, as soon as an opportunity to do so presented itself. Here the Idumean Antipater intervened; his father had acquired the command over all Idumea from Alexander, and in this capacity [he] entered into friendship with the Arabians, etc.; he himself had remained loyal to the legitimate ruler Hyrcanus, but for that very reason he stood in opposition to Aristobulus who now had gained the rulership and threatened him himself. [Antipater] seems to have already lost his position in Idumea, – because he cannot place sufficient forces at Hyrcanus’ disposal there – but his father’s friendship with the Arabians was to pay off now. Through his intermediation an agreement is negotiated between Aretas and Hyrcanus: Hyrcanus was to flee in secret to Aretas, acquire an army from him and win back his rule with this; as payment Aretas was promised the return of the *Dodecapolis*. For the time being, it was enough for Antipater that his enemy had been ousted from the throne; he would entertain further aspirations once Hyrcanus again exercised the rulership to which he had been helped [by Antipater].

### 3. The siege of Jerusalem

*War* 126b - 130 = *Ant.* 19 - 33

Aretas forces Aristobulus to Jerusalem and lays siege to the city; in the meantime Scaurus appears in the land; both brothers bring their issues before him and Scaurus decides in favour of Aristobulus. He forces Aretas to give up the siege of Jerusalem; Aristobulus goes after his opponent who is withdrawing and deals him a crushing blow at Papyron.

For *Antiquities* 19 – Aretas’ victory over Aristobulus – the source is provided in the *War*, but again this source has been expanded, namely by the insertion of the legend of Onias, the
origin of which is certain due to [the fact] that it also exists in the Talmud.\textsuperscript{50} The insertion of this narrative, which takes up sections 21b to 28, was to lead to minor corrections to the report in the War; in fact, whereas the War includes only a siege of Jerusalem by Aretas’ Arabian troops, the legend of Onias assumes that the bulk of the Jews are on the side of the besiegers while the priests themselves are trapped within the city. Therefore it had to be explained how this situation could arise: this purpose is served, for one, by the participial construction in 19 (“after many had defected to Hyrcanus after the victory”), and above all by the thought expressed in 20b: the Jewish people together with the Arabians are attacking Aristobulus, while the priests alone remained with Aristobulus. Now, it appears that this thought has first been inserted by Josephus himself, because it stands between the two doublets: Aretas lays siege to the city [in] 20a and 21a. Therefore the legend that was implanted with the help of this insertion was first introduced into the text by Josephus himself.

While the siege is in progress, Scaurus suddenly appears on Jewish territory by order of Pompey; Aristobulus and Hyrcanus both avail themselves of his presence in order to send delegates to him with the request for help. Antiquities 29 - 30 takes this subject matter from War 127 - 128a. But then a divergence [between the two texts] occurs again; understanding it becomes possible by means of the observation that the Antiquities has undergone an expansion; because the original line of thought is given by the progression: ἰσημενὸν δὲ Ἀριστοβούλου τετρακόσια δώσειν τάλαντα // λαβὼν τὰ χρήματα λύει τὴν πολιορκίαν (30a, 32b), this corresponds exactly to the War. But the view given as a result, [namely that] Aristobulus could attain Scaurus’ approval only by bribery, can no longer suffice for Josephus, who had become Antipater’s opponent. Scaurus was to have decided for Aristobulus and against Antipater for practical reasons. Consequently, Josephus now strikes out the thought expressed in War 128 that “a bribe has triumphed over justice” and instead of this he states to the contrary in the insertion (31) that Hyrcanus has offered just as much as Aristobulus, but that Aristobulus’ offering won the day because Scaurus had greater confidence “in the wealth and high-mindedness of Aristobulus, and especially his goals that were easier to achieve”, than in\textsuperscript{144} the poverty, timidity and the more difficult task that

\textsuperscript{50} Derenbourg, Histoire de la Palestine depuis Cyrus jusqu’à Adrien, Paris, 1867, pages 112-113; Wünsche, Der babylonische Talmud, vol. 1, 454 - 457.
Hyrcanus proposed to him; because the latter requested the conquest of Jerusalem, a fortified city, whereas for Aristobulus it was simply a matter of once more driving away the Jewish renegades and the Nabateans. Therefore, whereas Josephus claimed in the War that Aristobulus triumphed over justice by bribing Scaurus, now he relates that Aristobulus and Hyrcanus had made similar attempts at bribery – this serves to exculpate Aristobulus – and that Scaurus objectively gave preference to Aristobulus – this represents a new commitment to Aristobulus. According to this, there are no new sources that underlie the extensive expansion in 30b - 32a, rather the entire report arises from Josephus’ own thought creation [Gedankenbildung], which grafted his new anti-Herodian bias onto the old text.

By Scaurus’ intervention the siege of Jerusalem is lifted as Aretas withdraws. Aristobulus follows him and beats him and Hyrcanus at Papyron. Antiquities 32b - 33 takes this presentation over from the War (128b - 130), by quite characteristically just striking out the sentence from the War “it was not enough for Aristobulus to have escaped capture, however” since it expressed a certain insatiability in Aristobulus. It is also seen here that the new bias stems from Josephus; [and it is] not as if Josephus were now doing it in order to protect Aristobulus; he is totally indifferent [to Aristobulus], but he sees it as his mission to discredit Antipater on all accounts, and he achieves this primarily by elevating his opponent.

According to this, the War alone comes once again into consideration as the actual source; besides this, one can at most still ask whether there is a historical nucleus inherent in the insertion about Onias that stems from the rabbinic tradition; but should this even be the case we gain nothing at all for our era from its completely legendary character; because it is well-known that all these legends have been drawn from the most varied [145] figures. But if we also leave aside this legend, which one may address from various [points of view] and, for the rest, examine the modern literature against our [own] results, then here too we notice the same fundamental error that underlies the Antiquities. In the two crucial points in which the distortion [Verballhornung] of the Antiquities’ tradition is concretely available to us, –

51 The thought process that Josephus attributes to Scaurus naturally does not suit the situation; in truth, Aristobulus was facing disaster (War 127), it was therefore easy to overcome him. But now Josephus must somehow give practical reasons for Scaurus’ taking Aristobulus’ side, and so he happens upon this roundabout path.
52 The legend does not fit into the situation portrayed in the War, as is proven by the adjustments that were required for the Antiquities.
alleged defection of the Jews to Hyrcanus and the attempt at bribery by Aristobulus and Hyrcanus – Schürer (294), Wellhausen (292), Ewald (519 f.), Renan (145), Holtzmann (213) and Lehmann-Haupt (208) subscribe to [the reading in] the Antiquities, while the other researchers beat around the bush about these matters. In view of this, [let us] briefly outline the progression [of events] here as well: Aretas forces Aristobulus back to Jerusalem and besieges him in the city, which would have undoubtedly fallen too, if Scaurus had not intervened. Envoys from both brothers appear before the Roman commander who decided in favour of Aristobulus and issued the order to Hyrcanus and the Arabians to withdraw from Jerusalem. Aristobulus sets out after his retreating opponents and defeats them decisively at Papyron.

4. Hyrcanus and Aristobulus before Pompey

with supplementary information about Theophanes of Mytilene

War 131 - 132 = Ant. 34 - 47

The ruling that Scaurus passed was only temporary, because Pompey himself arrived in Damascus in the spring of 63. Both parties called on the Roman imperator, whereupon it finally came to an open rift between Pompey and Aristobulus. – First of all, in the Antiquities the citation from Strabo, which is already formally bracketed [verzahnt] by doublets (Ἦκον παρ’ αὐτὸν πρέσβεις = Ἦκον πάλιν πρέσβεις πρὸς αὐτὸν) is to be omitted; the basic conception therefore reads: When Pompey came to Damascus [146] and Colesyria, Ἦκον παρ’ αὐτὸν πρέσβεις // Ἀντίπατρος μὲν ὑπὲρ Ὑρκανοῦ, Νικόδημος δὲ ὑπὲρ Ἀριστοβούλου (34a, 37b). Hence it follows that Josephus himself saw [a work of] Strabo or one that was reworked, extracted an excerpt [from it] and incorporated this into his [own] work.

The [text] that is now remaining shows us some very interesting facts with respect to the War; according to War 131 Hyrcanus and Antipater call on Pompey in Damascus and beg him “without having brought any gifts, trusting in the justice of their cause” to reinstate Hyrcanus. Aristobulus, on the other hand, trusted in the gifts that he had previously given to Scaurus, and appears in regal robes. But since he could not bring himself to appear upon

53 The source of the War attempts to promote Antipater; consequently it can attribute Scaurus’ supporting Antipater’s side only to bribery. No one will be able to determine today whether Scaurus really was bribed, or whether he actually joined Aristobulus’ side, which is the second
demand, which he considered to be beneath his dignity, he departed from Diospolis. Pompey is angered by this and decides upon military action against Aristobulus. It is impossible that this report be taken over by the *Antiquities*. First of all, the real premises are already missing, since according to *Antiquities* 30 Hyrcanus also had attempted to bribe Scaurus, so that the comparison given in the *War* between δίχα δωρεῶν (131) and πεποιθῶς τῇ Σκαύρου δωροδοκίᾳ (132) became impossible here. In addition, however, the view became different; indeed the sympathies of the *War* lie on the side of Hyrcanus, since he wins Pompey over to himself “without gifts, only using the justice of his cause” as opposed to Aristobulus’ “violence”, and as a result he manages to have the Roman commander reinstate the regnancy to the one “who was in truth entitled because of his [greater] age”. Conversely, this violence of Aristobulus was to correspond to his regal robes and his reluctance to appear in an unroyal manner. But if according to the *Antiquities* justice was on now Aristobulus’ side, as we saw, then this line of thought had to be abandoned.

After the view that “bribery has triumphed over justice” had been eliminated in the *Antiquities* as opposed to *War* 128, the idea that Hyrcanus had based himself on “justice” could also not be adopted from *War* 131 for the *Antiquities*. And after Hyrcanus had affirmed that he agreed to live as a commoner and had reinforced this by oath (6 - 7) in the *Antiquities* as opposed to *War* 121, [147] Hyrcanus could no longer allege that he was entitled to the regnancy because of his [greater] age. All these moments logically had to be abandoned in their old form, but Josephus retains each individual theme, as we have already observed so often, and just resurrects it in a new form. The idea of Scaurus’ being bribed (*War* 132) becomes the motive for the report about the complaint that Gabinius and Scaurus had allowed themselves to be bribed (Ant. 37). Aristobulus’ violence mentioned in *War* 131 became a motive in the *Antiquities* for clarifying the circumstances for Aristobulus’ purposes; for he responds to the grievances of his opponents [by explaining] that he has deposed Hyrcanus of necessity because of his lack of energy, since he feared that the rulership would otherwise pass over into other hands (44) – meaning Antipater. Therefore Aristobulus is the true proponent of the Jewish high priesthood, and no usurper of the crown. But then Aristobulus’ haughty act reported in the *War* naturally must no longer apply either; Josephus transfers – quite foolishly – this theme of Aristobulus over to his attendants (45). Finally, when Pompey decides upon possibility.
[military] action against Aristobulus at Hyrcanus’ request in the War, then this constitutes an acknowledgement of Hyrcanus’ rights by Pompey, and Josephus did not want this very thing to hold true any longer in the Antiquities. But now in order to set the scene for Pompey’s military action, which could not be denied outright after all, without having to concede that Hyrcanus and Antipater were in the right as a result, Josephus reckons – by exploiting the bribery theme –, that the raising of these grievances earned Aristobulus only ill-will among the Romans (37). Thus the Antiquities is based on the War but completely remodels its view and we hereby encounter the phenomena that are [already] more than well known to us from [our] comparison of Life and War, so that there is no doubt that here, in fact, exists the very work of [none other than] Josephus himself.

But some parts do not fit into this point of view, rather they expose new material; already in 35 - 36 there was a direct excerpt from Strabo, which of course had no antecedent in the War; and the same applies later to the appearance of the Jewish people against both pretendants, which was described in the report about Pompey’s [military] actions in Syria and Lebanon (38 - 40), and finally [it also applies] to Hyrcanus’ accusation that it is Aristobulus “who has provoked the raids into the neighbouring territory and the acts of piracy at sea” (43). Especially the last comment, which has absolutely no model and no support at all in Jewish lines of thought, leads inevitably to the conclusion that here a writer is being used who has narrated the Roman history of this time – [namely] Pompey and the war against the pirates. Thus, Hölscher (page 42) too, following Otto (Leipziger Studien 11.230), already thought of Strabo as a source and attributed to him, albeit incorrectly, those segments that had been extracted directly from the War by means of reinterpretation; Josephus had expanded upon Nicolaus’ [work] in the War, and when he composed the Antiquities he compared [Nicolaus’ writing to] the historical work of Strabo and by the comparison he established the similarity between the two reports (section 104). He utilized Strabo for supplementing by partly interlacing literal quotations from him and partly interweaving his larger stock of facts into the new presentation; but since the use of Strabo has now been established precisely for 34 - 36, then it is only self-evident, purely formally, that the supplementing parts in 38 ff. must be ascribed to this same source. Hölscher correctly emphasized the similarity of the contents to Strabo’s Geography.

By a fortunate coincidence we are even able to go one step further with respect to this
result. Diodorus (frg. 40.2) reports to us about the same events as those that are provided in the *Antiquities* as a supplement to the *War*: “While Pompey is staying in Damascus, King Aristobulus and his brother Hyrcanus, who were fighting about the regnancy, appear before him. In addition, more than 200 of the most prominent [Jews] came to Pompey and explained that their forefathers, who had stood at the head of the temple, had sent a legation to the Senate from whom they had been granted the leadership of the free and autonomous Jews, so that no king ruled, rather the high priest guided the people. These [men], however, – Aristobulus and Hyrcanus – had abolished the laws of the fathers and had subjugated the citizens by force and had thus usurped the kingship in an unjust way. Pompey postponed his ruling on the disputes until later, reprimanded Hyrcanus and his people regarding the violation against the Jews and the offence against the Romans and explained that they would in principle [149] merit a more drastic and bitter change of circumstances, yet he pardoned them after all.”

From this fragment it follows, first of all, that an offence against the Romans,54 for which Hyrcanus was being held responsible, had been mentioned in the preceding [passage]. Now, we read in Josephus 43 that in his defence Hyrcanus maligns Aristobulus, [claiming] that it was he who conducted the raids into the neighbouring territory and the acts of piracy at sea, and therefore it emerges that this same accusation had been raised against Hyrcanus in Josephus’ source as [was raised] in Diodorus; for the acts of piracy were of course a violation against the Romans. In addition, however, the accusations of the 200 most prominent Jews in Diodorus coincide perfectly with those in *Antiquities* 41, so that the uniformity extends as far as the structure of the two reports: first they stress that they do not want to be dominated by kings, since from ancient times among them the high priest has ruled over a free people, and then they add to this that Aristobulus and Hyrcanus attempted to enslave the people by instituting the kingship (καταδεδουλώσθαι Diodorus = δοῦλον γένοιτο Ant. 41). In view of the fact that the Jews had for a long time – since 104 – already been under a kingship, the agreement of the two reports in this technically incorrect accusation against the two brothers is certainly crucial, and the only remaining conclusion is that the additions in *Antiquities* 41 and 43 originate from the same source as Diodorus 40.2. Now, since the [passage from] Strabo

---

54 I would prefer not to work with the παρανομία τῶν Ἰουδαίων since it is difficult to decide whether this is a subjective genitive or an objective genitive.
directly used by Josephus here can of course not have lain before Diodorus, it therefore follows that Strabo and Diodorus must be traced back to a common source that is in turn chronologically confined to a minimum [period] by the lifetime of Diodorus; because an event from the year 63 can be extracted by Diodorus, who was writing under Caesar and at the beginning of Augustus’ [reign], only from a source that originated between 63 and about 40. Therefore it is worthwhile to find the Greek author who examined the history of Pompey at this time in the detail such as we can still discern in the fragments of Strabo, in Josephus and Diodorus: there is only the one name: Theophanes of Mytilene.

[150] According to Strabo 13.617 he was a writer; “but besides this he also acted as a politician and as a result of exactly this he became a friend of Pompey the Great and contributed to the success of all his undertakings.” In gratitude for these commendable services [Verdienste] Pompey restored the freedom of Theophanes’ hometown so that [Theophanes] enjoyed godlike honour there in the aftermath (Dittenberger, Sylloge inscriptionum graecarum 3.753). From all this one sees what importance Pompey attached to Theophanes as a person and to his political activity. So we can then easily envisage this Greek also in the midst of such diplomatic negotiations as Diodorus and Strabo report in the place cited; at least there is no doubt that he was informed as accurately as possible about the incidents since he was indeed in the company of Pompey (Strabo 11.503).

But Pompey had intended yet another role for his diplomatic assistant: he was to become the reporter of his deeds. Indeed, long ago it had become common in Rome for a commander to bring his historiographer along on campaigns in accordance with Hellenistic custom; just recently Pompey’s predecessor Lucullus had found in the poet Archias someone to glorify his deeds in the Mithridatic War. Lucullus had procured citizenship for his poet, but the validity of this conferment was contested so that it came down to a court case in the year 62. Cicero assumed the defence of Archias. He, who indeed did not tire of advertising the glorious deeds of his [own] consulship to the world, believed likewise to have found in Archias the right man who was to celebrate his consulship in an epic (Arch. 28 and 31). When he was defending Archias just for that reason, the latter had begun the epic; Cicero was so satisfied by the draft, that he expected an aeternum testimonium laudis from it and therefore placed all necessary material at the disposal of the poet. He also made no secret at all of [the fact] that in this case he was defending Archias with a view to this epic De consulatu suo: through Cicero he was to
acquire citizenship again, so to speak.

Shortly before, Cicero had sent an “epistulam non mediocrem ad instar voluminis scriptam” to Pompey, in which he had fully reported “de rebus suis in consulatu gestis” (Sull. 67; schol. Bob. page 270, Or.). [151] As we learn from the scholion mentioned above, Pompey had taken this epistle of Cicero amiss and had written a letter to Cicero in which the latter found only an exiguam significationem tuae erga me voluntatis. Cicero had expected a gratulatio, but was dealt a slap in the face (Fam. 5.7); he is most deeply hurt. One must keep this situation in mind if one wishes to understand the passage Arch. 24 in which Cicero speaks about Pompey and Theophanes. Strabo had told us in all seriousness that Pompey has welcomed Theophanes into his circle of friends because of his political activity, yet Cicero claims that he has presented him with citizenship as “scriptor rerum suarum”. Not only was Cicero given credence to the word, but from his statement the conclusion was even drawn that Theophanes’ work had been completed at that time, i.e. in the year 62 (W. Fabricius, Theophanes von Mytilene als Quelle des Strabon, Straßburg, 1888, page 5). This isfactually impossible because up to that point there was no time available for recording, but above all because the work did require a conclusion. But where could it lie other than with Pompey’s return (cf. page 152)? – In truth, Strabo’s view is the correct one: Pompey had rewarded the politician Theophanes. But Cicero had just received the latest news from the Orient: Pompey had also chosen Theophanes as “scriptor rerum suarum” for himself. His vanity wounded by Pompey, [Cicero] could not control his caustic tongue now either: “Our great man”, so he proclaims, “has honoured the herald of his deeds in order to secure eternal memory for himself”. Thus on the one hand Archias’ right was reinforced in that it appears to be the custom of commanders, as it were, to endow the heralds of their deeds with citizenship, which is why Cicero also singles out precisely this distinction, on the other hand, however, as a result of exactly this he excites suspicion against this writing of Pompey’s favourite, which was to be expected soon. It probably was then published around the year 60.

So the timing, orientation and factual knowledge correspond perfectly to our requirements for the source common to Strabo and Diodorus. But there is more. It is a well-known fact that Strabo used Theophanes to a very great extent; his reports about Pompey’s [military] actions campaigns [152] are based on him (cf. W. Fabricius), and Ant. 38 - 40 obviously belongs to these very [military] actions, which furthermore, by their accurate
geographic enumerations betray their derivation from official hypomnemata. Finally, the reference to the war against the pirates in the context of Ant. 43 can be easily included only in an author who has described the deeds of Pompey as a whole. So it appears to me that everything, in fact, points to no one other than Theophanes as the historian who was writing between 63 and 40, to whom Strabo and Diodorus can be traced back.\textsuperscript{55}

In any case, there can be no doubt that here we have before us a source that is lacking any personal involvement in Jewish issues and which is of inestimable value to us precisely for this reason; it is indeed suitable for according a beneficial correction with respect to the one-sided presentation of Nicolaus. As a matter of fact, it must appear questionable to the highest degree that Nicolaus reported nothing at all about the action of the 200 most prominent Jews; his presentation was based exclusively on the opposition [between] Aristobulus and Hyrcanus; we now see here that completely different issues have in truth pushed themselves to the fore in comparison to this. Shall we therefore be able to follow the basic view of Nicolaus in those passages where a correction has not been granted to us by chance? The answer to this serious question can be given only by a detailed examination of the material acquired in Diodorus and in the additions to the Antiquities.\textsuperscript{56}

\textsuperscript{55} It is from this very source that Diodorus then also has knowledge of the triumphal tablet erected by Pompey (40.4). Arnold has emphasized the factual agreement between this [tablet] and Theophanes (Jahrbuch für classische Philologie, supplementary volume 13, page 86); it is most easily explained if the tablet was reproduced by Theophanes. Incidentally, it follows from this that Theophanes extended his work up to Pompey’s triumph, which is also natural, in principle. Cicero had even anticipated the publication of the work (cf. page 151).

\textsuperscript{56} It is admittedly not difficult to distinguish in general between the material from Theophanes - Strabo compared to that which Josephus had gained by reinterpreting the War, yet certain details require closer examination since the reinterpretation of the War occurred at the same time as the insertion from Strabo and both were therefore assimilated to each other. Undoubtedly, the narrative of Pompey’s march up to the reference to the piracies (38 - 43a) is based on the new source. Likewise the basis of 46 - 47 belongs to the new source, as is proven by the proximity to Diodorus and by the contrast to the War. In Aristobulus’ speech of defence, the reference to the royal title of Alexander appears to be influenced by the lines of thought in Strabo (frg. 124, Otto). But the reinterpretations of the War have been worked into these segments: 43b - 45 must be understood on this basis. That the delegates of the Jewish people had been incited by Antipater to testify against Aristobulus is a distortion motivated by Josephus’ new attitude against Antipater. From precisely this same sentiment it arises that Josephus has only Aristobulus defend himself whereas the grievances of the Jews had been raised against both Aristobulus and Hyrcanus. So the picture portrayed in 43 - 45 becomes quite distorted. Section 45 is nothing but the necessary distortion of a theme from the War
First we learn that the Jews had participated in the piracy at sea and that Hyrcanus had been held responsible for this (Diodorus) even though he tried to pass the fault on to Aristobulus (Ant. 43). The incidents that are alluded to here must have taken place during the reign of Hyrcanus; because the Romans explain that he had deserved even worse punishment for his acts of violence than [just] his fall [from power]; only in this way can the fact that Hyrcanus was held responsible be explained as well. Now, Aristobulus lost the rule in the year 63 after a reign of three years and six months (Ant. 14.97); he therefore began [to rule] around late 67 or early 66. According to this, Hyrcanus, who had ruled before him, was king in the year 67, [which was] well known as the year of the war against the pirates. The calculation fits perfectly; but we shall also understand it factually that the piracy, which had its headquarters in Cilicia etc., surged towards Judaea as well, even though up to now the concept of pirates has not really been associated with that of the Jews due to the one-sided sources. From the participation of the Jews in piracy it finally becomes understandable that when Pompey then immediately [154] settled matters conclusively, he cut the Jews off from the sea by taking their harbours away from them (War 1.156).

A second point that springs to the eye is the substantially different view[point] in which Hyrcanus was seen. Indeed, we have already established that the War, which copied Nicolaus more closely, by no means emphasized Hyrcanus’ inactivity in the same way as does the Antiquities; Theophanes - Strabo confirm this view; because Hyrcanus appears as a powerful personality in Diodorus and this still shows through in Ant. 43. His conflict with Aristobulus does not have him appear any more the weakling [either], and as a result, what was conjectured above on page 140 is in fact proven, [namely] that the lines of thought about Hyrcanus’ weakness are nothing other than a means that Josephus employed in the Antiquities in order to formulate his new bias.

(page 147), which had become superfluous, and as a result belongs to the same category as the theme of bribery discussed in the same place, which Josephus reinterpreted in order to explain Pompey’s attack against Aristobulus without taking Antipater’s side in doing so. When Gabinius also is mentioned as [having been] bribed in this passage (section 37) besides Scaurus, about whose bribery Josephus had reported, then it is not impossible that Strabo offered grounds for this purpose, but it seems more likely to me that Josephus spun this assertion out of section 55 ff. and transferred it here in order to set the scene for Pompey’s attack against Aristobulus. In any case it is dangerous to wish to apply this as history as do Drumann-Groebe 3.42 and many others. Cf. page 155 f. for the influence of the War on section 47.
The most interesting [aspect], however, may well be the report of the Jewish opposition to the two Hasmonean brothers. The Jews make an accusation against Hyrcanus as well as against Aristobulus; they also claim against the former that he has disregarded the laws of the fathers and intended to enslave the people by force. Therefore Hyrcanus surely did not appear as a weakly figure to them either. In Diodorus, the accusers contrast the situation in the past, when the high priest led a free people, to the present where the rulers dominate an enslaved people by means of mercenary troops. And Strabo (in Josephus 41) has repeated this information from Theophanes even more pointedly when he blames Hyrcanus and Aristobulus exclusively for a state of affairs that they found and did not, of course, amend. Surely this much is correct, [namely] that after the very weak rule of Alexandra, Hyrcanus would have inevitably made a move to seize the rulership, and it is understandable that the Jewish nobility took the opportunity [so] offered in order to make an attempt once again to shake off the yoke that was upon them. Thus, from all aspects Theophanes’ report really evinces the credibility that we are to expect from this politician and writer who was active in an outstanding position and who perhaps also participated in these very proceedings.

In this section, therefore, the Antiquities provides us with truly significant new material in comparison to the War, but – and this is the crucial [point] for our general query – this material does not stem from the accepted common source of the War and the Antiquities, but rather from an additional source [Nebenquelle], which Josephus had then combined with the material from the War, and in doing so he took his new view of matters into account in [his portrayal of] the details. This combination of the War with Strabo must still be examined briefly; because we are now in a position to resolve the chronological confusion in Josephus’ presentation, which has already frequently been observed. The War stated the route very briefly: Syria - Damascus - Dium (131, 132). Strabo indicated the route more precisely: Apamea on the Orontes [river], Lysias, Heliopolis, Chalcis (all these are sites in Syria), then he crossed over the mountains and reached Damascus in Colesyria (Ant. 38 - 40). Both reports therefore coincide with each other (cf. Ant. 14.104), only Nicolaus conveys it more tersely. In the Antiquities, however, Josephus at first follows Nicolaus-War and as a result brings Pompey to Damascus; but since Strabo reported that Pompey moved to Damascus from the winter quarters (38), Pompey then had to be brought out of Damascus again. Josephus accomplished this purpose by switching [the order] Syria-Damascus, which is the view in the War. Pompey
first comes to Damascus and then goes to Colesyria (Ant. 34). From there he marches again to Damascus in the following spring (38)! The result of this double presence in Damascus was to be subsequently that Pompey now dealt twice with the Jewish parties; whereas the first time there can be report only of Aristobulus’ gift based on the Strabo quotation. Josephus has shoved his two sources together in such a superficial manner that he could not in the slightest be successful in creating a uniform entity out of these two reports that complement each other.\footnote{Niese correctly evaluated the quotation from Strabo 35 - 36 (Hermes 11.471); one may also accept his allocation of the winter quarters to Antioch; in any case, it at least follows from Ant. 38 that it was located north of Apamea. Otto differs from Niese only negligibly in his}

[156] The combination of the two sources falls apart even more awkwardly at the end. Nicolaus and the War had recounted that Aristobulus parted company with Pompey in Dion, after a conflict arose on account of the demanded honours (cf. page 146). Aristobulus goes to Judaea and Pompey begins the war. Theophanes - Strabo recounted more precisely that Pompey had postponed his final ruling on the Jewish problem until his return from the campaign against the Nabataeans. Apparently Pompey believed that he could best cover his back for the time being by stringing along all the Jewish parties thereby enchaining them to himself. Aristobulus, the most powerful [of them], was thereby charged with securing the base of the Roman army; but for him it certainly seemed too tempting to get rid of the irksome Romans and arbitrator in one fell swoop. He revolts behind the back of the Roman army thereby forcing Pompey to abandon the war against the Nabataeans, in order to turn first against Aristobulus. This report does not in principle contradict that of the War: one may well imagine that Pompey established the base for his Nabataean campaign in Dium and that Aristobulus, who was entrusted with safeguarding the approaches [to this base], parted company here with Pompey, who continued advancing inland. The rift that followed thereupon, which in truth is to be ascribed to strong Jewish feelings, would then have been derived by Nicolaus from his sense of personal injury, in his well-known bias – against Aristobulus and for the Herodian Antipater – ; whereas in Theophanes one can still noticeably sense the indignation that Aristobulus did not keep his promise to Pompey and forced him to abandon his campaign against the Nabataeans prematurely (Ant. 47). Thus the two reports, which have been recorded from different points of view, complement each other rather well in
principle. But what does Josephus make out of this? First he follows Strabo and has Aristobulus revolt behind Pompey’s back, and then following the *War* he sends him to Dium! But what more was to happen here now? The rift that occurred there according to the *War* had already been recounted [in the version] based on Strabo! So Dium is mentioned without rhyme or reason in the *Antiquities*; Josephus was not successful in unifying the two sources in this passage either.

**[157]** The researcher has the following at his disposal as independent sources: 1. *War* 1.131 - 132; 2. Theophanes available as reflected in Diodorus 40.2 and – conveyed by Strabo – in the additions *Ant.* 38 - 43 and 46 - 47, not including Josephus’ reinterpretations addressed above, 3. the quotation from Strabo in *Ant.* 35 - 36. Theophanes thereby distinguishes himself from Nicolaus, who was used in the *War*, by greater thoroughness and by an unbiased judgment in Jewish matters; on the other hand he is strongly influenced by the sentiments in Pompey’s headquarters (*cf.* above).

When we compare the presentation of modern works of history to these findings then their views are in general to be judged more favourably here than in the preceding paragraphs; since, as we saw, they in fact draw primarily upon the *Antiquities*, which reworks the valuable products of Theophanes - Strabo precisely here, thus it follows as an inevitable consequence that the modern historian unknowingly used the best available source as a basis here. But everything that Josephus read into the sources on his own because of his bias must be removed here as well. Thus Ewald (page 521) and Bertholet (page 25) should not have recounted that the 200 Jewish noblemen had acted at Antipater’s instigation; this assertion was contrived by Josephus; and when Wellhausen (page 293) thinks that Pompey did not appear to have any further concern for the legation of the neutral party, then this assertion cannot be proven since we hear about this legation only through an additional source [*Nebenquelle*] that is no longer quoted later on. Indeed, within the report about the negotiations itself in section 43 Josephus swings over to his reinterpretations derived from the *War*. On the other hand, Aristobulus’ revolt behind Pompey’s back has not been considered sufficiently: in this [incident] one has not referred to the excellent source from *Ant.* 47, which has just been poorly exploited by Josephus. Instead of this the opinion was held, following Nicolas (*War* 132) who is quite biased here, that the “arrogant” Aristobulus deserted Pompey without any reason, (in

*Quaestiones Strabonianae (Leipziger Studien 11.229 ff.).*
this sense, for example, Schürer, Wellhausen, Wilcken). In contrast, I [shall] identify the main facts from the preceding [discussion]: Pompey gathers his troops from their winter quarters and marches towards [158] Damascus (Ant. 38 - 40 = War 131a). Hyrcanus, Aristobulus and the Jews appear there among other legations (Ant. 34). They all bring along gifts, among which the golden grapevine of Aristobulus was still seen by Strabo (Ant. 35 - 36). Pompey listens to the three parties (Ant. 41 - 43), but postpones his ruling until the completion of the Nabataean campaign during which he wishes to remain unburdened by other problems. While Pompey advances from Dium towards the east, Aristobulus stays put with the task of securing the [army’s] base. But he does not remain true to his task, thereby forcing Pompey to interrupt his combat against the Nabataeans and to turn against the rebellious Aristobulus.

5. Pompey’s fight against Aristobulus

War 133 - 140 = Ant. 48 - 56

Even a superficial glance shows that the Antiquities provides nothing other than a liberal transcription of the War, only a few small details had to be altered in a significant way. The desire to eliminate his earlier partisanship for Antipater was indeed crucial for Josephus while he composed the Antiquities; consequently, in the preceding section he has removed the beginning of Pompey’s fight against Aristobulus from the dispute over the Jewish throne so that Pompey’s attitude towards Aristobulus could in no way be construed as if the Romans had taken up the side of Hyrcanus - Antipater as a result. This endeavour of Josephus continued to have an effect here as well. In War 133 Josephus had reported that Pompey began his military action against Aristobulus out of anger, “since Hyrcanus also begged him to [do] this many times.” In Ant. 48 this explanatory statement has been logically deleted, thereby preventing the impression that Pompey stood behind Hyrcanus and Antipater. These same reasons induced Josephus to not transfer the statement of section 136 “as the brother (Hyrcanus) requested this” into Ant. 50 - 51: Pompey was not to be influenced by Hyrcanus and Antipater. The assertion that Aristobulus had the intention of defying Pompey in order to precipitate a decisive struggle in the “manner of despots” (War 135) could no longer be used in future because in [159] the corresponding passage (section 132) of the Antiquities (cf. page 147) this trait had also been eliminated from Aristobulus’ nature, from which one could after all infer a
justification for Hyrcanus and Antipater. Therefore this idea is also missing in Ant. 50. And yet an informative observation can be connected precisely here. When Aristobulus’ intentions to attack were eliminated from the Antiquities, his friends’ dissuasion lost its sense: nevertheless, the παρῄνουν οἱ φίλοι (War 135) persists in the παραινούντων πολλῶν (Ant. 50). Thus the Antiquities was adjusted according to the War. And one more thing: according to the additions to the Antiquities discussed in section 4 [above] it came down to a war between Aristobulus and Pompey because the former had revolted behind the back of the Roman army. Nevertheless Ant. 50 retains Aristobulus’ defence against Hyrcanus from War 135 ff. even though this matter, according to the preceding [discussion], could have nothing more to do with the outbreak of the war and therefore is completely redundant here: once again the pattern functions such that in the Antiquities we can also detect such traces of the War as ought to have been eliminated by a thorough consideration of the problem by Josephus; but he required these themes in order to be able to carry on his narrative.

An additional small change in Josephus’ text leads us to another issue. In War 135 Aristobulus’ friends attempted to dissuade him from battle against Pompey by suggesting, “that the strength of the Romans cannot be vanquished”. This thought, which should and could have been placed in section 50, is missing from the Antiquities. Similarly eliminated from Antiquities 58 is the thought expressed in War 142 according to which many “would be seized with fear in the face of the outstanding discipline of the Romans” so that they wanted to open the gates to Pompey. This two-fold deletion is no coincidence of course, rather it is deliberately intended. We already know (cf. page 126 f.) that with his War Josephus was at the service of the official policy of Rome and for this reason he expressed the idea that any resistance against Rome was futile. We even derived the Aramaic War inevitably from this basic trend. But now it is more meaningful to us that Josephus did not adopt such thoughts in the Antiquities, but eliminated them on principle, i.e. Josephus detached himself from official Roman [160] policy when he composed the Antiquities. If we just hold this in comparison to the completely different attitude towards the Herodians, then we already see here before us the lines of Josephus’ inner development. We cannot yet assemble these lines into a [unified] picture, but we are gaining more and more material for the inner biography of the author, which should allow us to improve our understanding of his personality as well as his works!

With respect to the deletions addressed [above], which the Antiquities undertook and
which derive without exception from Josephus’ new bias, in our section there is also a factual statement that has no antecedent in the *War*. While section 138 [of the *War*] reports that the tidings that arrived about Mithridates’ death prompted Pompey to accelerate his attack against Aristobulus, *Ant.* 53 recounts that Mithridates met his end [at the hands] of his son Pharnaces. The presentation also acquires another colouring inasmuch as the particular circumstances are communicated under which Pompey received the tidings (people arrived from Pontus) whereas the question is entirely ignored [about] *what meaning is attached to this event within the framework of the narrative*. While the *War* was exclusively concerned with this, the *Antiquities* recounts the arrival of the news as something meaningful in and of itself. Whoever reads only *Ant.* 53 will therefore ask himself in vain what this paragraph actually means within the setting of Pompey’s advance; it can be understood only as an after-effect [Nachwirkung] of *War* 138 where the arrival of the news becomes significant for the Jewish War. Thus *War* 138 is the model for *Ant.* 53 – but not exclusively so; for Josephus has supplemented the succinct notes with the material supplied to him from Theophanes - Strabo. We know from section 4 that Josephus compared Strabo with the *War* created [on a basis] from Nicolaus and took notice of further remarks that would be meaningful to him, in order to use them in the *Antiquities*. As a matter of fact, *Ant.* 53 obviously originates from an eyewitness. The image of people arriving from Pontus with the good news for Pompey recurs similarly in Plutarch *Pompey* 41;58 [161] this has its place in a presentation of Pompey’s [military] actions but not in a book that is to depict turmoil among the Jews. So *War* 138 became the opportunity for Josephus to take note from Strabo of the particular circumstances under which Pompey received the tidings, and to work these notes into *Ant.* 53, where they actually do not belong: The *Antiquities* can only be explained on the basis of the *War*.

6. The siege of Jerusalem

*War* 141 - 158 = *Ant.* 57 - 79

The shift in Josephus’ attitude towards Antipater and Aristobulus respectively could

58 Furthermore, compare Josephus 53: τὴν Μιθριδάτου τελευτὴν τὴν ἐκ Φαρνάκου τοῦ παιδὸς αὐτῶ γενομένην with Plutarch 41: Μιθριδάτης τέθνηκε στασιάσαντος Φαρνάκου τοῦ γίος.
not come into view in the presentation of the siege of Jerusalem; consequently the *War* here constitutes the source of the *Antiquities* in such a way that only a simple paraphrase is given. On the other hand, Josephus’ new attitude towards Agrippa and Titus appears in one small feature. In *War* 153 it was indeed stated that Pompey did not touch any of the holy implements when he entered the temple, but in *Ant.* 72 Josephus underscores this fact by adding: Pompey behaved thus not “out of pious awe” but rather here also “he showed himself worthy of his virtue”. If one bears in mind how the spectacle of the holy implements in Titus’ triumphal procession wounded the Jewish spirit, one will readily sense that this was a compliment accorded to Pompey so that Titus’ godlessness would be all the more distinctly emphasized against this background. In this respect this trivial addition is of vital significance to Josephus’ disposition.

The date of the fall of Jerusalem was of particular importance. The *War*, following Nicolaus, had only recounted that the city was conquered in the third month of the siege; there is no information that this occurred on the Sabbath or the Day of Atonement; indeed, the *War* stresses on the contrary that the priests had not refrained “from their daily worship” when the Romans invaded the city (148). Josephus gained the exact date from Strabo for *Ant.* 66 (179th Olympiad, in the consulship of Antonius and Cicero), however, in the same source he also found that the conquest took place τῇ τῆς νηστείας ἡμέρᾳ. [162] Although we do not require any confirmation, it is still delightful to see that even Strabo 16.2.40 announces that Pompey waited τὴν τῆς νηστείας ἡμέραν. This note in the *Geography* was taken over from the historical works; in Josephus it stems from the same source. Nevertheless, this corroboration based on the sources is not sufficient; because in the passage cited Strabo indicates this tradition with a qualifying ὡς φασί, and Nicolaus basically rules out the Day of Atonement since he certainly would have emphasized this exact day, of course.

The paraphrase of the *War* is interrupted in another two passages. When Josephus indicates in section 68 that all historians are agreed in their praise of the Jews for their conduct during the conquest, then a strengthening of the Jewish standpoint in comparison to the *War* is manifest here as well; Josephus feels himself to be an apologist for Judaism and this is why he appeals to pagan testimonies. It goes without saying that Strabo and Nicolaus appear at the forefront of these; Josephus had copied the *War* from the latter and the former was the source for the additions to the *Antiquities*. It is not evident from Strabo’s *Geography* 16.2.40, that
he truly sang the praises of Jewish courage; but it is understandable that it could have nevertheless stood thus in the historical works. More likely, however, this is a pious misrepresentation on the part of Josephus. The second addition Ant. 77 - 78 also induced an intensification of the Jewish-patriotic convictions. Here Josephus summarizes once again the evil that arose through the conflict between the two brothers: for this reason we had to lose our freedom, for this reason we had to surrender the land that we had taken from the Syrians, for this reason the Romans took more than 10,000 talents from us within a short period of time, for this reason the kingdom which previously belonged to the noble high priests had to become the plunder of common people. This is the most acrimonious attack against Antipater, Herod and his family; just as the polemic against Nicolaus (section 9) was borne by the idea of Antipater’s lowly origin, so [also] the same idea of the unworthiness of the Herodians pervades the pessimistic reflections in 77 - 78. The addition War 2.602 - 608, for example, is to be explained by this same attitude and this same period of time. And we shall encounter similar [163] ideas time and again: Josephus has withdrawn completely from the Herodians, and therefore he had to twist the view of the War, which was based on Nicolaus, into its opposite for the Antiquities. And naturally the intensification of Jewish national pride and the emphasis of the wrong that the Romans dealt the Jews go hand in hand along with this. Josephus, who had falsified history in honour of Agrippa and the Romans in his War, finds the way back to his people. How did it come about, however, that our contemporary “source criticism”, which sees an addition from a foreign source in these impassioned words of Josephus, “judges according to the first person of speech?”

The desire to spare Jewish feelings has caused Josephus to make some additional slight changes, which admittedly mean something only to those who understand Josephus’ inner development. In War 156 Josephus states that Pompey had freed all the towns located in the midst of the land from the Jews, insofar as these [Jews] had not previously destroyed them. In Ant. 76 Josephus deletes not only the assertion that these towns had been freed from the domination of the Jews (ἀφῆκεν ἐλευθέρας takes the place of ἠλευθέρωσεν δ’ἀπ’ αὐτῶν), but also the information that the other towns had been destroyed by the Jews. Ἀ χωρὶς τῶν κατεσκαμένων (Ant. 76), which is hardly to be understood without the underlying text must be replaced by the explicit phrase ὅσας μὴ φθάσαντες κατέσκαψαν (War 156).
7. From the fall of Jerusalem to the death of Pompey

War 159 - 186 = Ant. 80 - 126

The dependence of the Antiquities on the War pervades this entire report to such an extent that comments become necessary only for a few passages. The events portrayed here have virtually no effect upon the turmoil among the Jews; so Josephus remains uninvolved with respect to these matters and he had no reason to construct the Antiquities differently from the War. Therefore it is only in occasional comments that we encounter the new ideas, which are not lacking here either.

In the consecutive list of high priests and kings, Josephus recorded the duration of Aristobulus’ reign in Ant. 97, and in doing so he described him of his own accord “as a noble and [164] magnanimous man”. We already know how this view corresponds perfectly to the anti-Herodian tone of the Antiquities; yet this enters even more sharply into sight when we consider Josephus’ judgment of Herod’s occupancy of the priesthood. There he indicates that it was Herod’s wish that indeed none “of the noble men” be assigned to the high priesthood; on the contrary he appointed an unprepossessing priest (Ant. 15.23). Similarly, Simon is designated as ἀδοξότερος (15.322) – in contrast to the source copied in 25.320. The respected high priesthood of Aristobulus stands in contrast to this policy of Herod.

Likewise, there is an expansion of the War stemming from Josephus in Ant. 105b - 118. [Sections] 105b - 109 derive from Jewish legendary tradition; they offer important material only insofar as Josephus bluntly reproaches Crassus for breaking his oath, [in comparison] to whom he holds up the “good and righteous” priest Eleazar as the Jewish counterpart. The following sections 110 - 118 derive from the lines of thought of Jewish apologetics: evidence of the wealth of the temple in Jerusalem is to be produced from pagan sources, and in so doing Josephus again chooses Strabo, the author who consistently presents the complement to Nicolaus; he is to demonstrate that it is not idle Jewish boasting [Ruhmredigkeit], which is speaking about these riches, rather the plain and simple truth. Admittedly, Josephus could have noted from Strabo only the fact that Mithridates had seized the money that Cleopatra had deposited in Cos and the “800 talents of the Jews” (112). By now demonstrating that public funds existed for the Jews only in the form of the temple treasure, he believes that one may recognize in Strabo’s account the information about the temple treasure that was brought into
safety [away] from Mithridates. This is, of course, a purely arbitrary combination that does not get any better by Josephus’ adding on another quotation from Strabo as confirmation, which deals with the Jews of Cyrene and, interesting as it is in and of itself, [which] has absolutely nothing to do with the matter of the temple treasure (115 - 118). In the face of these facts, one cannot shake the impression that Josephus copied out all the passages in Strabo that concerned the Jews and with every [possible] [165] means he now attempted to push across his information, no matter whether or not it was suitable to support the opinions he had just submitted. So in another added segment (104) Josephus himself then specifies Nicolaus of Damascus and Strabo as his sources: Nicolaus was copied in the War and Strabo was examined and excerpted for the reworking of the Antiquities. Both sources were worked into each other by Josephus in such a way that for him an inner unity arose from this, which he underscored specifically as such.

Just as Jewish apologetic interests are expressed in the expansions, so also a minor modification indicates a shift in the point of view. In War 168, Alexander’s mother, allowing herself to be ruled by her concern for her relatives who were in Roman captivity, adulates Gabinius [whereas] according to Ant. 90 she has “taken the Roman side”; the contrast is sensed and expressed more strongly. It appears to be even more important that in the Antiquities Josephus changes the critical statement of the War in regard to Gabinius’ directives to such an extent that he replaces the word σύνοδοι (War 170) by συνέδρια (Ant. 91). Regarding this, cf. the context on page 182 f.

8. Caesar in the Orient

War 187 - 200 = Ant. 127 - 155

The political situation among the Jews is radically altered by the death of Aristobulus, and the result is that with the sweeping innovations Josephus’ interest in the events also increases, a fact that reveals itself to us in a shift [in his] evaluation of them. That is to say, while Aristobulus was alive the conflict between the two brothers was the force that determined the course of the internal history, and Antipater remained more in the background, but now begins the critical dispute between the surviving Hasmonean Hyrcanus and the rising house of the Herodians led by Antipater. I [shall] first compare some details
from the *Antiquities* and the *War*, which have eluded observation [166] just like everything else that we are turning into a subject of our investigation.

1. According to *War* 187 Antipater supports Caesar and the Pergamene Mithridates, whom he accompanied with troops on his march towards Egypt. *Ant.* 127 adopts this report but adds independently that Antipater is acting “on Hyrcanus’ orders” so that he appears merely as a tool in Hyrcanus’ hands.

2. Antipater subsequently supports Mithridates in that he persuades the Jews of Egypt to join him (*War* 190). *Ant.* 131/2 adds to this that he managed to do this by producing letters from *Hyrcanus* who requested on the basis of their common roots [*Stammesgenossenschaft*] that they become Caesar’s friends. It is only when the Egyptian Jews become aware of the concurrence of Antipater and the high priest that they join the Romans.

3. In Egypt it comes down to a battle, which is decided in favour of the Romans at the last minute due to Antipater’s intervention. Antipater, his whole body covered by wounds, is distinguished by Caesar in the highest degree with the prospect of a brilliant future before him. Caesar grants him citizenship and confirms Hyrcanus in the position of a high priest “for his own sake” (War 193 - 194). The *Antiquities* again adopts the factual [contents] from the *War*, but imbues them with another colouring. From the glowing description (*War* 193) of how Antipater “wounded over his whole body, manifests the marks of his virtue”, *Ant.* 136 states the simple fact that Antipater was wounded in battle. It corresponds to this as well then, that “the hopes” for the future (*War* 193) are eliminated and that in *Ant.* 137 the granting of the citizenship to Antipater slips into second place compared to the confirmation of the high priesthood for Hyrcanus, which was emphasized as most important. But then it was also no longer acceptable that this confirmation occur “for the sake of Antipater”; the *Antiquities* deletes these words. In this way Antipater is forced [into the] background again and again, but Josephus only deals with individual symptoms; in principle the confirmation of the high priesthood for Hyrcanus was intended as the conclusion to the report about Antipater’s deeds. The *Antiquities* retains this [167] structure of the narrative even though it is henceforth stripped of its actual sense; therefore Josephus has adopted the established framework here as well and only changed some details: the *War* is the source of the *Antiquities*, into which Josephus brings a new [point of] view.

4. Shortly thereafter, Aristobulus’ son Antigonus makes an accusation to Caesar and as
a result, contrary to his expectations, becomes the reason for a further increase in Antipater’s power; thus reads War 195, which is based entirely upon the idea of elevating Antipater – Ant. 140 has logically discarded this idea; the accusation remains [intact], but its impact for Antipater must be dropped since Hyrcanus is to be the main character.

5. When Antigonus had brought these serious accusations before Caesar, “Antipater cast away his garment” – according to War 197 – “and showed the multitude of his wounds; he had no need of many words in order to prove his goodwill toward Caesar; the condition of his body has spoken loudly enough while he himself was silent.” The Antiquities, which had already toned down the report about the wounds as much as possible [as noted] above under [paragraph] 3, and above all had divested it of its impact on the future, is merely proceeding consistently when it eliminates the emotional report described just above and replaces it simply with: “he defended himself against each individual accusation” (141).

6. If Antipater is being forced [into the] back[ground] in this way, then it is just the inevitable new conclusion when, rather than as in War 199 where Antipater receives permission, “to rebuild the walls of his hometown”, the Antiquities [instead] allocates this crucial task to Hyrcanus “who requested [the walls be rebuilt]” (144). This discrepancy must be placed together with those touched upon above: Hyrcanus issues orders to Antipater (1), the documents crucial for acquiring assistance stem from [Hyrcanus] (2); Antipater’s injuries lose their significance (3, 5); for it is no longer “for [Antipater’s] own sake” that Hyrcanus acquires the confirmation of his rank (3), there is no longer any mention of an increase in Antipater’s position (4) and therefore the honour of fortifying the “hometown” is taken from Antipater and transferred to Hyrcanus.

In summary, we observe that the War provided a [168] clear conception by deriving the achievements of the Jews from Antipater’s success, which were due precisely to Antipater’s effectiveness. Since the Antiquities now struck out Antipater’s success and nevertheless retained the achievements of the Jews, the entire structure of the narrative must then fall apart. The presentation of the Antiquities is therefore explainable only by the systematic political reworking of the War. That this does not stem from anyone other than Josephus himself follows from [the fact] that we are dealing here with the same shift in political trend as we encountered in the additions to the War etc. Josephus himself has therefore changed, and the consequences of this change are manifest in the new view of the Antiquities. So, what we
have had to establish here, in fact, also corresponds perfectly to the findings gained in chapter III about our writer’s method of working – or, more correctly, reworking.

The end of the report is no different.

According to War 200, Caesar had sent a report to Rome “as evidence of his fair-mindedness and of Antipater’s excellence” so that the honours conferred upon Antipater would be engraved on the Capitol itself. Since in the Antiquities it was no longer Antipater at all now, but rather Hyrcanus, to whom the meritorious deeds [Verdienste] were to be ascribed, and so [to whom] the honours were also to be accorded, and it was he whom Josephus wished to move into the centre [of attention], then the reference to that decree, which had applied to Antipater, must necessarily be omitted. But even here Josephus was not bashful about a piece of information; first of all he transfers, in his manner that we now know so well, the substance of Caesar’s writing in the report (144) from Antipater to Hyrcanus, to whom the privilege of building the walls had been granted, and then, as a compensation for this falsification so to speak, he reports two documents [that are] genuine and inherently valuable but do not at all belong here. Whether the famous senatus consultum 145 - 148 even belongs to this period is quite questionable, as is well known; the resolution of the people of Athens 149 - 155 certainly does refer to Hyrcanus, but has nothing at all to do with the issues that occupied the author. Indeed, Josephus assimilated these documents so inadequately, with respect to content, that he did not espouse the perception that he could have [169] gained from them and even exploited for exactly his own way of thinking. In the Athenian document Hyrcanus is called “high priest and ethnarch” (151). Nicolaus, who from his standpoint pushed Hyrcanus [into the background] and for this reason had narrowed [his activity] from the political arena to [simply] the high priesthood, had only mentioned this [office of high priesthood], and the War followed suit in this (169, 199). How splendidly could Josephus have improved the War by means of these documents and at the same time taken into account his new view of Hyrcanus’ elevation! But he does not go so far; he always amends his War only by individual details, and as a result shifts the political judgment but does not follow through to take definitive advantage of the new sources.

This same observation imposes itself upon us in view of the quotation from Strabo that belongs here (Ant. 138/9). Strabo had reported, with reference to Asinius Pollio and Hypsicrates, that Hyrcanus also had taken part in Mithridates’ march towards Egypt. This is
confirmed by Caesar’s decree [quoted in] Ant. 14.193. Given such witnesses, there can indeed be no doubt that this information is correct. But it probably was once again part of Nicolaus’ trend to remain silent about Hyrcanus’ participation in the campaign in order to elaborate upon Antipater’s meritorious deeds [Verdienste] for Caesar and, with this, indirectly for the Jews. Nicolaus had therefore undoubtedly shifted the story in favour of the Herodians and the War followed him in this. After Josephus had become aware of Nicolaus’ one-sidedness, however, and after he had set himself the goal of reinterpreting this presentation into its opposite, had he been a researcher, from Strabo’s information he could now have included Hyrcanus’ participation from the outset, in his presentation of the Egyptian campaign and in this way he would have had the very best means of pushing Antipater [into the background] and elevating Hyrcanus. Josephus does not go so far here either, however. He quietly retains the structure of the report of the Egyptian campaign from the War and only shifts his political judgment in the manner described above; the material from Strabo, however, is exploited for the presentation just as inadequately as is that from the documents; it is relegated to a note.59

[170] If we review more recent research with the help of our findings, then it generally coincides with the thoughts of Wellhausen, who on page 319 refers to Hyrcanus “as merely the business enterprise with which Antipater was working”. The leadership rested solely upon the latter. Underlying this is obviously Nicolaus’ opinion that has been reproduced in the War. Admittedly, it must be identified as methodically incorrect when the information gathered from the Antiquities that “Antipater, in Hyrcanus’ name, was able to call upon the numerous Jews in Egypt to join Caesar” is included in this overall picture. (Thus Bertholet page 45; H. Holtzmann page 216; Schürer page 344; Renan page 196; Ewald page 528.) This is no tradition, but rather, as we saw, deliberate reinterpretation by Josephus; it is precisely for this reason

59 Their rendition is admittedly quite peculiar. From section 138 one at first receives the impression that Josephus is contrasting the contention of many [people] that “Hyrcanus had taken part in the campaign to Egypt” with his [own] view, to which Strabo’s corresponds. But this impression must be deceptive, because even the witnesses whom Strabo invokes do contend that Hyrcanus indeed participated, and thereby contradict Nicolaus’ report, which Josephus had adopted albeit in attenuated form. Thus the words: μαρτυρεῖ δὲ μου τῷ λόγῳ must mean: in his statement about Hyrcanus’ participation in the campaign, Strabo also agrees with my opinion of Hyrcanus’ significance, which I have entered into Nicolaus’ tradition. Thus Josephus characteristically dwells within the mental world [Gedankenwelt] of his emendations.
that Schürer, along with others, should not have made the statement that it was upon Hyrcanus’ orders that Antipater had brought up the troops to lend assistance. Either Nicolaus must be accepted as the base consistently through to the end, and then one has as a result both the right and the obligation to consider Hyrcanus merely as a company nameplate for Antipater, or else Nicolaus’ absolutely one-sided view of matters must be emphasized from the outset and his basic outlook must be rejected.

Certainly, this last path appears advisable to me, not really because of the specious criticism of someone like Josephus, and even less so because of the “improvements” that he brought to his source in [writing] the Antiquities, but rather because the additional sources [Nebenquellen] contradict Nicolaus with respect to the crucial facts. Once it has been established that Hyrcanus took part in the Egyptian expedition – and this cannot be disputed, cf. page 169 – then the presentation of someone like Nicolaus, [171] who deliberately remained silent about it, can be described only as one-sided and misleading (cf. page 152). It also corresponds to this that Hyrcanus was in no way a dimwit, which would have to be the case if Nicolaus were correct. And what are we to think of a [work of] historiography like that of Nicolaus, which simply remains silent about the most important event of this time, [namely] Hyrcanus’ appointment as ethnarch, because this information would be apt to diminish [the importance of] Antipater’s position. Yet we shall pursue these matters no further; they lead us too far away from our task of establishing Josephus’ development and they cannot be settled in the form of short remarks. May objective research therefore take the result gained from source analysis as the foundation for its examination! This conclusion, however, indicates here too [that] the only genuine tradition exists in the War and in the quotations inserted into the Antiquities. The Antiquities itself provides only a reinterpretation of the material, which is worthless for history but has all the greater significance for Josephus’ development.

9. Herod and the elimination of the robbers

War 201 - 212 = Ant. 156 - 178

The reputation of Antipater and his sons Phasael and Herod, who were now reaching adulthood, was continuing to increase, as the War could logically [relate in the] report to such an extent that he comes to perceive his [own] actual λόγος within them.
following the narratives discussed above. In the *Antiquities* as well, however, this idea is transferred from the *War* even though the premises to this view were lacking here, and Josephus takes his attitude into account only in occasional details. Although Antipater restores the walls “of his hometown” in *War* 201, the words “of his hometown” are deleted in *Ant.* 156 since Antipater is supposed to be a stranger in Jerusalem. But all the stories about the activity of Antipater as such, which were basically laudatory, could not be eliminated since the cohesion [of the narrative] would have otherwise fallen apart. The reworking is applied again to a greater extent only at the point when the antagonism between Hyrkanus and Herod came to a head; because with this Josephus has led once again to the main issue. As is well known, during his tenure Herod, who had been appointed as [172] governor of Galilee, captured and executed the chief of the robbers Hezekiah and his gang. This aggressive action, on the one hand earned Josephus [sic: should be Herod] the thanks of the population who had been freed from the danger of the robbers, on the other hand this resulted in serious complications for Herod, who was called to account for his action. Once again we [shall] compare the two reports in a systematic overview.

1. According to *War* 208, Hyrkanus was consumed by envy of the fame of Antipater’s sons; above all he was tormented by Herod’s successes, and he was incited in the same way by the trouble-makers in the palace in whose way stood “the wisdom” of Antipater and his sons: Above all, how could Hyrkanus suffer Herod to have conducted executions without his command? Hyrkanus becomes more and more bitter against Herod and finally summons him to a trial before him. While the view in the *War* subsequent to this is that Hyrkanus’ measures against Herod are motivated by personal-dynastic reasons, the *Antiquities* makes it out to be a state affair [Staatsaktion]. Hyrkanus’ “envy” is omitted, the “trouble-makers in the palace”, in whose way stood the “wisdom” of Antipater, are deleted. Instead of this, the principal men of the Jews become the actual agents of the movement (163, 165), they also attempt to sway Hyrkanus but do not achieve any real success in their efforts since Hyrkanus was distrustful in the face of such disseminations (165). Now, if Hyrkanus felt no enmity towards Herod, how could it then have come to be that Herod was summoned? – We are provided with the answer in section 168: the mothers of those who had been killed by Herod demanded daily of the king and the people that Herod be summoned before the Sanhedrin for his outrageous deeds. Herod’s behaviour against the “robbers”, which was presented in *War* 209 only in such a way
that the execution of Jews without orders appeared as one of the many arrogations of absolute royal power [committed] by Herod, now acquires an entirely different significance: it is the actual motivation for Herod’s being summoned, of course not before Hyrcanus now, who indeed had been eliminated as a character, but before the Sanhedrin.

[173] 2. If in fact Herod’s offence, which was crucial for the accusation, did not consist in the arrogation of kingly rights, then it was also not directed against Hyrcanus, and the latter would then not have summoned Herod before himself; rather the summons would have to take place before the council that had been aggrieved. Indeed, it goes without saying that the “principal men of the Jews”, who had appeared in the place of the palace gossips, would emphasize precisely those grievances that concerned not Hyrcanus but the law. In War 209 the people of the palace stress that an execution is possible only upon Hyrcanus’ command but in Ant. 167 these thoughts are replaced by the assertion that the pre-condition for an execution is a proper conviction by the Sanhedrin. Accordingly, Herod is no longer to be tried before Hyrcanus, but before the council (168); it is there that the trial takes place (170). The Sanhedrin is decided upon conviction (177) and [Herod] is ultimately released from their power – by Hyrcanus who, after all, bears no animosity towards Herod (177).

3. Consequently, when the dynastic opposition: Hyrcanus - Herod became the political opposition: council - Herod, a serious problem arose for Josephus. The individual [inter]actions between Hyrcanus and Herod, which Josephus had reported, were explained precisely by their mutual antagonism. For example, when Herod brought protective forces [Deckungsmannschaften] along to his summons – but not so many that it would seem that “he intended to overthrow Hyrcanus” – , then Herod is considered to be on the march with these people to Hyrcanus to whose “envy” he had been exposed. The narrative therefore is perfectly suitable to the context of War 210. But in Ant. 169, where the idea was adopted from the War, it stands without rhyme or reason. How then was Herod with his people to become a subject of terror for Hyrcanus who was well-disposed towards him, particularly since he had been summoned not before him but rather before the Sanhedrin? In the insertion, which had been newly formed by Josephus, the protective force [Deckungsmannschaft] is logically considered to be directed against the Sanhedrin (173), but as a result a discrepancy must arise between the outlook of section 169, which had been adopted from the War, and the new view of [section] 173.
Furthermore, in War 211 Sextus Caesar very categorically demands of Hyrcanus that Herod be released – and quite justifiably; because Hyrcanus is Herod’s enemy, therefore [Sextus’] message has both purpose and sense. In the Antiquities, however, Hyrcanus is neither free in any way to decide what to do with Herod, who had been summoned before the council – indeed he frees him only by means of a trick (177) – nor did he require any encouragement from Sextus, since [Hyrcanus] loved Herod so deeply himself. In fact, Sextus’ message does not then play any role either in the widely extensive continuing presentation of the Antiquities; but the account of this [message] has been carried along further as a remnant from the old narrative and has been incorporated into the new view only in a makeshift manner.

And finally. In the War Hyrcanus was inherently distrustful of Herod, the members of his court aggravated his suspicion and to this end they pointed out that Herod had arrogated to himself rights, to which Hyrcanus was entitled, by conducting executions without his command. In the Antiquities the Hyrcanus-Herod opposition was eliminated (page 172 ff.) and replaced by the confrontation between Herod and the principal men of the Jews; therefore these see Herod’s crime in that he had killed the robbers without awaiting the sentencing by the Sanhedrin. This revision is absolutely logical. In Ant. 167, however, both theories are shuffled into each other; because in the one phrase it is implied that only the Sanhedrin may lawfully impose the death penalty, while the final phrase indicates that Herod’s crime consisted in his having conducted the executions without Hyrcanus’ permission as if his assent were sufficient for a lawful sentencing. This contradiction, which had already been identified but not explained by Juster (Les juifs dans l’empire romain, vol.2, 1914, page 128), is the result [of the fact] that Josephus still retained the external framework of the narrative from the War for his new view; thus the progress of the plot remained tied to Hyrcanus’ intervention against Herod; this had to be explained and so a piece of the old [version] remained here, which comes across as a strange intrusion in the new surrounding, and as a result betrays once again that the War is the source of the Antiquities.

4. According to War 210, Herod surrendered himself up to Hyrcanus [175] “upon the advice of his father and since the situation encouraged him to do so”; it was upon his own initiative that he then surrounded himself with protective forces [Deckungsmannschaften] for the purpose of his security. In Antiquities 169 it is different: Herod surrenders himself upon command; by contrast, he implements the security measures “upon the advice of his father,”
who suggests that “he should betake himself to the court of justice not as a commoner, but rather under sufficient protection indeed”. This is then followed by a report concerning these security measures, which corresponds to the War. The Antiquities thus attributes the security measures to the advice of Antipater, admittedly not only these [measures] about which the War had also related, but also Herod’s appearance “not as a commoner”. We do not learn what is meant by this until section 173: Herod appears attired in purple with his head adorned, i.e. he appears with regal pageantry (cf. 489). Now, since section 173 belongs to an insertion, whose essence and extent has already been quite correctly identified by Destinon (page 105), it so follows that it was precisely this insertion that precipitated the reformulation of the text in section 169 as well. Therefore Josephus has reformulated the War for the Antiquities in such a way that he retained the narrative about the security measures, yet he extended them with the supplement, taken from the insertion, that Herod had appeared “not as a commoner.” Since this idea, which was not to be transformed into fact until [Herod’s appearance] before the court, could not already be inserted into a factual report about the preparations, [Josephus] therefore had this [idea] as well as the first announcement about the security measure appear as Antipater’s advice, which also had its model in the War – however, the words τῶν πραγμάτων διδόντων παρρησίαν from the War were no longer of any use now and were deleted. The idea [expressed] in the War[, namely] “in order that it would not have the semblance that he intended to remove Hyrcanus [from his] rulership”, is equally incompatible with the fact of the regal appearance, therefore it was toned down for the Antiquities to a dull “in order that he not appear to Hyrcanus as a subject of terror.” One thus sees, step by step, how the War was the direct model for the Antiquities, which brought a new bias into the view of the War.

Now, this material could not be expanded upon, as in the preceding cases, by means of fragments from Strabo who reported nothing about these [matters]; for this Josephus depended on [176] Jewish sources, which varied extensively in value. Herod’s trial before the Sanhedrin (171 - 176) may not be submitted as evidence that the view of the Antiquities is the correct one in comparison to that of the War; because the report of this [trial] has indeed nothing at all to do with Herod, rather it is the transference of Mishnah tractate Sanhedrin 19a, which deals with king Jannai and his servant, over to Hyrcanus and Herod (cf. Leszynsky, Die Sadduzäer, 1912, page 86 f.). Now, although this expansion became an organic element of the
Antiquities from the outset, which is inextricably connected to its surrounding both in detail and as a whole (cf. page 175), the exact opposite applies to the other insertion 163 - 164; at first it stands in distinct contradiction to its surrounding [text]. The Antiquities has adopted the idea of Antipater’s loyalty to Hyrcanus from the War (Ant. 162 = War 207); both seem to be quite tightly associated. But then it is impossible that Josephus recorded sections 163 - 164 at that same point in time in which it is reported that Antipater, independently and in opposition to Hyrcanus, concluded a treaty of friendship with the αὐτοκράτορες of the Romans and, under his own name, directed the gifts to them, which Hyrcanus had designated for these same Romans. Neither is any use whatsoever then made of the contents of this segment in the subsequent narrative even though it would have yielded highly appropriate subject matter for the attacks of the “principal men”. A reference to Antipater’s action described in 164 would definitely be expected in [sections] 166 - 167, if this segment had already been in existence at that time. Finally, it is in accordance with these factual observations that both paragraphs are enclosed in the manner [so] familiar [to us, namely] by doublets (οἱ δ’ ἐν τέλει τῶν Ἰουδαίων ὀρῶντες = οἱ πρῶτοι τῶν Ἰουδαίων ὀρῶντες) such that the segment [lying] between [these] stands out completely and after its removal the contents that remain correspond precisely to the War. The doublets, however, are particularly indicative in this case because the entire section 163 is simply an awkward patch [laboriously created] in order to effect the transition to [section] 164.

Thus the various sets of evidence [Beweisreihen] are combined and therefore no more doubt can exist that [sections] 163 - 164 are a later insertion into the text of the Antiquities in which section 162 was originally followed immediately by section 165. But the trend [177] of this insertion points perfectly to the time when the Antiquities originated; because the sharpest antagonism towards Antipater and his family is expressed in it. After all, the founder of the powerful position of the Herodians is found guilty of misappropriation. For this reason the origination of this insertion cannot be far removed from the composition of the Antiquities in spirit and therefore also not in time: one can imagine that Josephus – occupied with the elaboration of the continuing text – made the insertion here\textsuperscript{60} around the same time, but at a

\textsuperscript{60} It seems to me quite doubtful that a tradition underlies this insertion. Incidentally, which Roman emperor should we be considering for the years 47 - 46? And from where should this isolated piece of information [have] originated? – Quite probably from the imagination of
point in time when he had already lost direct contact with the surrounding text. At all events, however, sections 163 - 164 have just as little relevance to the relationship of the *Antiquities* to the *War* as do sections 171 - 176; the remaining [text] is nothing other than a systematic reworking of the *War*, which can be recognized everywhere as the direct source.

But it was not the *War* in the form that we have before us [today] that Josephus could use as his base; because this, for its part, was first brought into its current state by later expansions. In fact, the entire perception [represented] by the statement of section 211: ἡγάπα γὰρ Ἡρώδην stands in direct contradiction to its surrounding [text]; to the exact contrary, indeed, the overall presentation of the *War* is based upon the sharpest opposition between Hyrcanus and Herod as we can learn especially from the expressions chosen by Josephus τῷ φθόνῳ (210), τοῖς ἐχθροῖς (211) and τὸν διάφορον (212), which are used [in description] of the relationship of the two characters. On the other hand, the view of Herod’s close ties to Hyrcanus corresponds perfectly to the picture that Josephus projected in the *Antiquities*, and so we find here again almost literally, in fact, the sentence from the *War* that we quoted above: ἡγάπα γὰρ αὐτὸν ὡς υἱόν (170). Since this idea fits into the context of the *Antiquities*, [yet] on the other hand it stands in direct contradiction to the surrounding [text] in the *War*, then the source for this lies in the *Antiquities*: therefore the *War* [178] has been subsequently influenced here by the view of the *Antiquities*, exactly as we inevitably demonstrated for the section concerning Josephus himself in chapter III [above]. Josephus therefore had his manuscript of the *War* in front of himself while he was recording the *Antiquities*; with this [we] have now proven in a completely different manner what we have already had to establish repeatedly, [namely] that the *War* is, in fact, the source of the *Antiquities*. In our passage Josephus attempts once again to transfer the new view of the *Antiquities* retroactively into the *War*.

Finding the margins of this insertion in the *War* was not to be difficult; for the statement, which it concerns, stands in contradiction to its surrounding [text] in another sense as well. In section 212 Herod is determined not to obey a new summons [to appear] before Hyrcanus. This idea really makes sense only if the trial has not yet been settled and for this reason Herod must anticipate being summoned anew. Thus the acquittal conveyed in section 211 subsequent to the statement examined [above] cannot have occurred yet – this belongs to Josephus, who could not do enough at that time to vituperate the Herodians.
the expansion as well. The sentence that Herod thought “[he had] been acquitted against the king’s will” follows directly upon this – yet at the same time it strikes us immediately that διαφεύγειν does not at all mean “to be acquitted” as does ἀποφεύγειν, rather [it means] “to escape”. Therefore this word now stands in the wrong context and belongs in truth to the old segment, according to which [the narrative] read: Sextus Caesar sends people to Ἑρώδην τῆς φονικῆς δίκης· ὁ δὲ καὶ ἄλλως ὄρμησά ἐκεῖνος // διαφυγεῖν, εἰς Δαμασκὸν ἀνεχώρησεν πρὸς Σέξτον. With this [reading], ὁ δὲ receives its grammatically required connection to Herod, and factually we understand only now what the body of guards [Bedeckungsmannschaft] really did: they helped Herod escape. Herod had therefore taken care of himself with intelligent [foresight], since he was, in principle, certainly resolved upon escape as well; as soon as he heard about Sextus’ writing [to Hyrcanus] he then hastened to him in Damascus. When Josephus then changed the roles later on in the Antiquities, and had made Herod and Hyrcanus out to be close friends, he took advantage of this old framework of the War in order to introduce an insertion, which admittedly caused both ὁ δὲ [179] and διαφυγεῖν to acquire interpretations that could then be only partly correct.

A second expansion, which forces itself upon us most compellingly, appears to me to be even more significant, factually speaking. The idea that Herod appeared before the court “not as a commoner, but as a king” surfaces in the Antiquities (section 169 in connection to 171 ff.; cf. page 175). When we now read in War 209: “Herod must be punished in the event that he be not a king but rather still a commoner,” then this idea is very closely connected to this passage of the Antiquities; however, since it stems only from an added segment, then it must be the original [text] and the War [must be] derived from it.

To this [we add] a second [point]: in the same sentence that contains the information just discussed, there is the assertion “Herod must come before the court in order to pay penance to Hyrcanus and the laws of the fathers.” Behind this is the outlook of the Antiquities once again; because it corresponds to this that Herod be brought before the court (εἰς δίκην Ant. 172; transferred from War 209 as ἐπὶ δίκην), whereas within the context of the War lies the personal-dynastic dispute with Hyrcanus and it is he who summons Herod before his tribunal (cf. page 172). Accordingly, the Antiquities had to view Herod’s action as a crime against the laws, which prohibit the execution of those who have not been legally convicted (ὁς κεκώλυκεν ἄνθρωπον ἀναιρεῖν ... ἐι μὴ πρότερον κατακριθείη τοῦτο παθεῖν ὑπὸ τοῦ συνεδρίου
Ant. 167 transferred from War 209: οἱ κτείνειν ἀκρίτους οὐκ ἔφιασιν), whereas in its essence the War includes nothing about a court procedure and sees Herod’s crime in his having killed men without royal command (beginning of 209), and therefore considers Herod’s action as an offence against the king. The phrase ὃν εἴ μὴ βασιλεύς ἔστιν – οὐκ ἔφιασιν (209), which fits organically into the outlook of the Antiquities, therefore stands as a foreign entity within the context of the War. Consequently, it was taken from the Antiquities and the War was expanded subsequently under the influence of the Antiquities here as well. It is then in accordance with this, too, that after the deletion of the questionable phrase, the complete parallel between War and Antiquities in this passage emerges immediately; therefore when Josephus was recording the Antiquities he did not read the questionable phrase [180] in the War; it was inserted only subsequently.

Finally, a third [point]: the sentence in War 209 according to which the palace gossips raise the accusation against the Herodians that to all intents and purposes they already felt themselves to be lords who had deposed Hyrcanus since “Herod has killed so many people against the Jewish law without any command from Hyrcanus” – this sentence is inherently contradictory; because what are the words “against the Jewish law” [to mean]? Factually they are incorrect; for we learn immediately that Jewish law prohibits every execution without judgment by court, so even if the king or the ethnarch commands it. This question, however, does not even interest the palace gossips at all; they wish only to prove that Herod has arrogated Hyrcanus’ rights to himself by conducting executions without [the king’s] command. The question of the legality of the executions is thus completely ruled out; on the other hand it belongs inevitably within the circle of ideas of the Antiquities where this very problem is the sole issue. Therefore the words παρὰ τὸν τῶν Ἰουδαίων νόμον were inserted on the basis of the Antiquities at the same time as the final phrase in section 209 and the insertion at the end of section 211 and beginning of section 212.

According to this, the circumstances here are just like those in the segments of the War addressed on page 74. There we also inevitably established late additions to the War, which originated from the shift in Josephus’ opinion; the same holds for our passage and therefore our most important task is to identify the shift itself and the essence of its origins. Of course this must yield a new building block for our attempt to sketch an outline of Josephus’ inner development. Firstly, however, it is obvious that solely the War may be used as the basis for a
portrayal [of Josephus’ development]; one may discount the War as one-sided or invoke it only with certain reservations – a standpoint with which I agree entirely – but it is fundamentally incorrect when, instead of this, the reinterpretations of his source that Josephus undertook in the Antiquities are invoked as something better. **In our entire part, the Antiquities does not contribute even a single useful segment, to the contrary, what could be useful from the War is reinterpreted [181] into a mixture that no longer has anything whatsoever to do with history.** By this discovery, however, all newer presentations are deprived of any foundation based on source [analysis]; for as far as I examined them, they generally take the Antiquities as their starting point (Ewald 531, Boltzmann 217, Wellhausen, Pharisäer und Sadducäer, page 103 ff., Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte, page 319 f., Réville 94, Renan 198 f., Felten 97, Schürer 348, Bertholet 49, Otto, Herodes 17 f.), and accordingly, maintain that the Jewish aristocracy forced Hyrcanus, half against his will, to drag Herod before the Sanhedrin, who failed in a cowardly and shameful way. In truth these “principal men of the people”, behind whom one has sought the Sadducees, are nothing other than a replacement in the Antiquities for the “gossips at Herod’s court” and the discussion before the Sanhedrin is a replacement for [the discussion] before Hyrcanus.

Josephus did not use some tradition or other in this; for he transfers quite superficially the traits that fit with the view of the War into the picture that he has designed afresh [in the Antiquities] and he does not use the colours that would inherently suit the new picture. Thus he writes in exclusive dependence upon the War, the view[point] of which he simply reinterprets.

Together with this comes the oldest, indeed fundamental, evidence for the assertion that at that time the Sanhedrin alone was entitled by right to impose the death penalty. It is extremely important that Nicolaus was not aware of any of these things at all; on the contrary, he assumes that the king can order the death penalty ([War 1.209]).

Granted, Juster, who has correctly drawn the same conclusion from the internal contradiction of Ant. 167 (cf. page 174), 61 thought (in the place cited [above]) that Nicolaus, who

---

61 Unfortunately he did not pay the corresponding attention to the War; the same internal contradictions exist in it. Only their origination is to be explained differently. The contradiction arose within the Antiquities by virtue of Josephus’ reinterpretation of the narrative of the War, [while] the War was corrupted only later as a result of the new theory of the Antiquities, which was retroactively incorporated into the War. For this reason the two layers can be easily separated from each other in the War, whereas in the Antiquities they have
was not familiar with Judaism, has misunderstood the legal status of the Sanhedrin since
during his own lifetime Herod had unlawfully dismissed this [very] Sanhedrin all but
completely when it came to capital matters. [182] What is correct here is the fact that, in
truth, according to a great number of passages collected by Juster (pages 128 to 129), Herod
and other kings passed a death sentence; but the legality of these sentences has never been
questioned either. Among the many very well-known gravamina of the Jews against Herod (Ant.
16.151; 17.304 ff.), the accusation that he had arrogated the right of the Sanhedrin to impose
the death penalty is not to be found; it corresponds to this that Josephus (Ant. 17.209), in one
of his own additions (cf. War 2.8), designates a conviction pronounced by Herod as “lawful”,
and finally, in order to justify himself, Herod recounted in his commentarii that he had
Hyrkanus put to death after he had presented the evidence of his guilt to the Sanhedrin. With
respect to the accusation of “persecution” that had been raised against him (Ant. 15.174),
Herod [himself] therefore considers it as a moral defence that he exhibited the evidence of
guilt to the Sanhedrin (loc. cit. 173), but thereupon pronounced the death sentence himself.
He therefore did not deem it necessary to substantiate its legitimacy in law; he wishes only to
defend its correctness as regards content against attacks, which he felt were unjustified. So
there is no doubt that in Herod’s time the Sanhedrin was not [allowed] to decide upon capital
matters judicially either. Of course, it does also lie within the nature of the matter that the
Sanhedrin could not acquire its standing as a judiciary authority until the time after the
downfall of the Herodians when “the constitution was reorganized into an aristocracy and the
leadership of the people was entrusted to the priests” (Ant. 20.251).

Admittedly, it is not impossible that the entire status of previous periods has been
attached onto this; for example, one may not refer to the division of the land into five synedria
as reported by Josephus (Ant. 14.91) as evidence for this; because instead of this, they are
named σύνοδοι in the source (War 170) and taxation areas are intended. Nicolaus, however,
probably reported in this very passage that when Gabinius appointed Hyrkanus as high priest
he “entrusted the rest of the administration of the state to the best [people]” so that from then
onwards there existed an “aristocratic [183] constitution”. Therefore even if the name of the

---

62 As a result, the frequently discussed question of whether the Sanhedrin or a family council of
Herod is meant in this passage loses its real significance; their opinion had no judicial value.
Sanhedrin has not been transmitted to us for this time, all the same, the government assuredly lay in the hands of an authoritative body that was configured in the manner of the future Sanhedrin. With the overthrow of the aristocracy by Caesar this authoritative body also had to vanish, and thus the narration in the Antiquities that Herod had been accused before the Sanhedrin on account of his killing the robbers is, in fact, what source analysis has taught us, namely a historical construction by Josephus!

Underlying this construction is the one fundamentally new idea that the robbers were to be killed only after condemnation by the Sanhedrin. This does not represent some sort of intensification of the attitude against Herod; after all, he was equally guilty whether he had encroached upon the authority of Hyrcanus’ position (War) or that of the Sanhedrin (Antiquities). Therefore, was the Sanhedrin perhaps to be elevated in comparison to Hyrcanus and emphasized in its later signification? The downright pathetic role that the Sanhedrin plays in the narrative renders this idea somewhat improbable. We [can] deduce the true reason from another significant new feature: the mothers of those who were killed by Herod besiege Hyrcanus’ temple every day [with the demand] that the murderer of their sons be punished, and Hyrcanus gives in only to them (Ant. 168), and no longer to the palace gossips as in the War. But now, if the mothers of the “robbers” enter the temple of Jerusalem every day and if Hyrcanus hears their pleas, then it is no longer, as once [before], a matter of riff-raff, but rather of Jews and, in fact, of Jewish patriots. Therefore the Sanhedrin must also intervene now; for according to rights that were certainly later in effect, a Jew was to be condemned only by the Sanhedrin. The real reason for the intrusion of the Sanhedrin into the stories about Herod and Hyrcanus lies in the desire to elevate the robbers and to emphasize their patriotic Jewish nature, and the desire to reflect the powers of the Sanhedrin, as they existed in the present, back into the time of Herod is only of secondary importance. The reworking of our passage, understood in this way, stands within another context into which [184] it cannot be placed by us until later; but this much is already obvious now, namely that the Antiquities in comparison to the War demonstrates here as well a progression towards the Jewish national feeling, which indeed goes inevitably hand in hand with a severe distortion of the historical tradition.
10. Herod’s revenge strike

War 212 - 215 = Ant. 178 - 184

Herod, who had been appointed strategos of Colesyria and Samaria by Sextus Caesar, was incensed over the summons although he had escaped successfully, and plans a revenge strike against Hyrcanus. His father and brother meet him before the gates of Jerusalem and persuade him to refrain from his strike – this is the basic substance of the segment that [we shall] address. Since this [segment] stands in close relationship to the problem discussed in section 9 [above], the same shifts must naturally become apparent here as well. While War 212 anticipates the possibility of a renewed summons before the king, instead of this Ant. 178 introduces the Sanhedrin. Then, whereas the schemers in the palace (οἱ πονηροὶ) stand once again as the driving force behind Hyrcanus in the War (212), in Ant. 179 the members of the Sanhedrin are the ones who incite Hyrcanus. While in the War these accusers claim that Herod departed in anger against Hyrcanus (212), which blends smoothly into this context since Herod had fled from Hyrcanus [in that version], this theme must be abandoned in the Antiquities since it was Hyrcanus there who had enabled Herod to flee, and the relationship between the two [men] was in general a close one. In order to find a transition all the same to the continuation [of the narrative], which was to feature the description of Herod’s revenge strike against Hyrcanus, however, Josephus now claims in [section] 179 that the people in the Sanhedrin had attempted to convince Hyrcanus that Herod’s entire behaviour basically was aimed against him. Again one sees that the new bias has been brought into the old structure of the War; the Antiquities does not represent any independent tradition alongside the War, but rather a reinterpretation of this [very] source. Hyrcanus is therefore convinced of Herod’s persecutions now as well, but he can do nothing against this because his enemy was more powerful – thus [185] reads War 212. This idea was again useless for the Antiquities because Hyrcanus was no enemy of Herod, after all; so Hyrcanus did not venture anything against Herod (179) due to his [own] lack of energy and of judgment, which was a theme that has been exploited to excess throughout the Antiquities (page 140).

[Just as] the aforementioned reworkings were the consequence of the views addressed in the preceding paragraph, so we encounter the desire to depreciate Herod in two small [textual] shifts. When Herod is appointed as strategos by Sextus Caesar, the Antiquities retains
this fact, to be sure, but devalues it by adjoining the assertion that he acquired the position through bribery (180); and instead, the thought from the *War*, which deals with the love that the people felt for Herod and with his gradual increase in power (*War* 213), is omitted.

But here as well, the source of the *Antiquities* was not the *War* in the form that we have before us [today]; for [the *War*] itself was once again subjected to expansions under the influence of the *Antiquities*. We detect them immediately wherever the trial, the δίκη, is mentioned. The words κατ’ ὀργήν τῆς περὶ τῆν δίκην ἄπειλης (214), however, are not to be identified as an addition only for this reason, but also because they proceed from the presupposition that Hyrkanus only threatened Herod, and then allowed him to run. But since this presupposition was made only on the basis of the *Antiquities* (cf. page 178 ff.), this group of words must therefore be abandoned. As a matter of fact, Herod’s revenge strike required no further motivation at all as long as Josephus did not enter upon the idea that Hyrkanus basically supported Herod against the Sanhedrin: this thought, however, is suited only to the *Antiquities*. Thus section 214 originally read: καὶ οὐ διήμαρτεν τῆς οἰήσεως· ὁ γὰρ Ἡρώδης // στρατιῶν ἀθροίσας ἐπὶ Ἰέρουσαλήμ ἦγεν καταλύσων τὸν Ὡρκανόν.

A similar expansion in the transition from sections 214 to 215 is connected to the one [just] identified [above]; the summons before the court and the release secured by Hyrkanus are mentioned here as well, and this idea also pervades the subsequent remarks of Antipater, who in this [passage] thinks that Hyrkanus really “subjected” Herod only “to a shadow of a violation”. This is no longer [186] the Hyrkanus of the *War*, who stands in conflict to Herod, who summons his opponent before his tribunal and from whom Herod is able to escape only with the help of troops while Sextus Caesar covered for him – rather it is the weak pushover, Hyrkanus, who very well grants his acquiescence to the summons before the Sanhedrin, but immediately helps the [man] summoned in his flight; this is the Hyrkanus of the *Antiquities*. Therefore the old text of the *War*, which, as we now know, constitutes the only [work] of value to source criticism, then reads as follows, subsequent to the segment that has just been rendered [above]: κἂν ἔφθη τοῦτο ποιήσας, εἰ μὴ προεξελθόντες δὲ τα πατήρ καὶ ὁ ἀδελφὸς ἐκλασαν αὐτοῦ τὴν ὅρμην παρακαλοῦντες καὶ αὐτὸν ἄπειλή καὶ ἀνατάσει μόνη μετρῆσαι τὴν ἄμυναν, φείσασθαι δὲ τοὺ βασιλέως ὕψος οὗ μέχρι τοσαύτης δυνάμεως προῆλθεν. // πείθεται τούτος Ἡρώδης ὑπολαβὼν εἰς τὸς ἐλπίδας αὐταρκεῖς εἶναι καὶ τὸ τὴν ἱσχὺν ἐπιδείξασθαι τῷ ἔθνει.
One sees how splendidly these segments join together; in the intervening segment the Antiquities has then become the source for the War, the late reworking of which is proven here as well: Josephus attempts to portray his new outlook not only in the Antiquities, but since just at that very time he had intentions of producing a new version of his history of the war, he also records [his new outlook] already in occasional comments in his manuscript of the War. Therefore the new War was to serve an outlook similar to [that in] the reworking of the Antiquities.

11. Antipater and Malichus

War 216 - 224 = Ant. 268 - 279

After the long insertion of documents that Josephus provided in Ant. 185 - 267, the parallel narrative recommences with War 216 = Ant. 268, and therefore the phenomena that were observed previously also emerge again immediately. As long as the text is unconcerned with Jewish issues, a transcription of the War is reproduced in the Antiquities; but Josephus’ endeavours to strike at the Herodians repeatedly break through alongside this. The War had distinguished Herod due to the fact that he quickly brought the war contributions over to Cassius (221), but the Antiquities twists the matter by adding that it had appeared advantageous to Herod due to the fact that he quickly brought the war contributions over to the distress of others (274), an idea that had suggested itself to Josephus through the final words of War 221. Even more striking is a second change: according to War 222, Antipater advanced [a sum of] 100 talents and by this means he saved Judaea from Cassius’ resentment; Ant. 276 amends “Antipater” to “Hyrcanus through Antipater” so that Hyrcanus now becomes the saviour who provided the money “from his [own] estate”. [Here] exists basically the same procedure as in Ant. 14.127 where Josephus twists the text of War 187 into the opposite meaning by adding the words “upon Hyrcanus’ orders” (cf. page 166).

As a result, the subsequent report of War 223/4 now became impossible as well: Malichus who had been saved by means of Antipater’s financial help from the death that threatened him (222), forgot this good deed of Antipater and planned an uprising “against the man who so often saved him”, because he “wished to eliminate the one who stood in the way of his disgraceful deeds”. Antipater fears the man’s violence and assembles an army on the
other side of the Jordan. Malichus was indeed apprehended, but thanks to his “impudence” he managed “to fool” Antipater’s sons, who then even arranged a reconciliation with [their father] so that Malichus was saved by Antipater for the second time. This entire report was sympathetic to Antipater to such an extent that the Antiquities had to remodel it substantially in order to be able to use it: after Ἀντίπατρος (War 222) was replaced by Ὑρκανὸν δὲ Ἀντιπάτρου (Ant. 276) it became imperative to delete “the good deeds” (War 223) of “the saviour Antipater” from the Antiquities. Further on, the uprising of Malichus had been directed against Antipater in the War, because he condemned Malichus’ conniving. Of course such a motivation had to be abandoned again and now Malichus initiates his uprising because he believed “that the downfall of Antipater represented the reinforcement of Hyrcanus’ rulership” (277).

Consequently Josephus, who had become anti-Herodian, turns the rebel against Antipater into the defender of the Hasmoneans who were threatened by Antipater! The result of this was that Malichus had to undergo a different evaluation. Just as “the benefactor” Antipater was stripped of his χάρις etc. in the Antiquities [188], on the other hand all the words that were insulting to Malichus, his ἀδικήματα, his ἀναίδεια, his ἐκγοητεύειν had to be dropped. It is quite delightful to follow this textual shift [Textverschiebung] in detail, however, it is more than obvious here as well how the new bias has been retroactively incorporated into the fixed framework of the War: Josephus would be ultimately obliged to whitewash Malichus completely of the accusation of “persecution”, and the remarks in 278 were probably to evoke this impression as well; but on the other hand, the action did have to be retained as such, because it was indispensable for the continuing context. Thus the text of the Antiquities falls apart!

63 I [shall] single out just one additional fact to which false conclusions have been attached. In the War Antipater assembles an army on the other side of the Jordan “for defence against the persecution.” This was naturally too harsh against Malichus for the Antiquities; on the other hand, this here afforded a good opportunity to attack Antipater: “on the other side of the Jordan he assembled Arabs to fight against the Jews.” This is not some independent tradition, as is always assumed, rather it is nothing other than a reinterpretation in order to
12. The Parthians and Antigonus

War 225 - 273 = Ant. 280 - 369

The energy, which Josephus displayed in numerous reinterpretations and reworkings of his source, gradually begins to weaken; obviously he felt increasingly that a true organic whole was not to be attained by now incorporating a contrary view into an established tradition that had been developed from a specific point of view. And from the preceding investigations, where we assessed the results of his painstaking work, we have acquired a slight idea of the difficulties that the author constantly encountered; how much easier it is to dissect a juncture [in the text] than to piece one together! Indeed, Josephus had not ventured a major new cast [of the die], he had not, for instance, reformulated contemporary history and regarded the characters anew, rather he always altered just details and in so doing cast his glance only upon the immediately surrounding [text]. So it was the almost inevitable consequence of such a method of working that it became too much for the author himself, and he switched over to reproducing his source more faithfully. He does indeed insert his documentary material once again in sections 304 - 323, which, however, was not used for a reformulation of the tradition, but for the rest there is nothing noteworthy to be recalled for the presentation of Ant. 280 - 329 in comparison to the source War 225 - 247, and it is only in the following part that we once again find our author at work, applying an “improving” hand to individual traits, in which it is debatable to what extent the reinterpretation was conscious or unconscious in each individual [case].

War 248 reports that by promising 1000 talents and 500 women, Lysanias the tyrant of Chalcis persuaded the Parthian satrap, to whom the administration of Syria had been transferred during the invasion of the Parthians in the year 40, to set Antigonus upon the throne as king. Accordingly, we hear in [section] 268 that during the conquest of Jerusalem the Parthians totally plundered the town while abstaining only from Hyrcanus’ treasures: ἦν δ’ οὐ πλείω Τριακοσίων ταλάντων. Whoever reads this sentence will initially apply the statement automatically to Hyrcanus’ treasures. Thus Harmund translates our passage in his extremely reliable rendition: 64 n'épargnant que les richesses d'Hyrcan, qui ne dépassaient pas trois cents have Antipater appear guilty of fighting the Jews on his own initiative.

64 Published in Oeuvres complètes de Flavius Josèphe traduites en français sous la direction de Théodore
talents. And yet this cannot be correct. In fact, the assertion “Hyrcanus’ fortune did not amount to more than 300 talents” is even a blasphemy that would be a great credit to a Roman freedman (cf. Epictetus Diatr. 1.26.22), but this does not belong in Josephus’ mouth, so the continuation is really crucial: ἐπετύγχανον δὲ καὶ τῶν άλλων οὐχ ὀσίος ἡλπίσαν. Therefore the preceding [text] must have just expressed that they did not receive what they had expected in some point or other, and this can only be that instead of the expected 1000 talents they found “no more than 300”. Therefore this statement refers to the plunder and not to Hyrcanus’ fortune, which does not concern the reader in the slightest within this context. So much for the money.

With regard to the women who were promised, the War relates further on that the Parthians had admittedly not received the women whom they desired above all, but that they nevertheless handed the promised rulership over to Antigonus (section 273). The phrase διημαρτηκότες ἣν μάλιστα ἐπεθυμούν γυναικῶν is also not grammatically unambiguous; according to a narrow interpretation it means: “although they had not received those very women whom they desired above all”; but also possible is the interpretation: “although they had received no women, which they really desired most (i.e. even more than the money)”. The decision [can] be made [on the basis] of another point; for of course this phrase must have somehow been factually clarified within the text, and in fact this occurs in [section] 264: Herod had brought into safety his immediate female relatives, who were at the same time the immediate relatives of Hyrcanus. In this way, the Parthians had been cheated out of those women whom they had desired above all – less so, naturally, for erotic reasons than political, above all in order to obtain a suitable ransom. The War therefore relates that the Parthians received only 300 talents instead of 1000 and that they were refused those women whom they had desired above all.

What happens to this report in the Antiquities? The promise remains in its essence even though it is no longer articulated by Lysias but by Antigonus himself (331). Jerusalem is then plundered by the Parthians in [section] 363 just as in the War; only Hyrcanus’ fortune is spared: “but this amounted to approximately 300 talents”. Here is the first misunderstanding. From the information of the War, which referred to the plunder, [Josephus] now extracts quite

---

Reinach. vol. 5, 1912.

65 Significantly, Harmand was not able to translate καί!
obtusely, even though it is grammatically feasible, the account about Hyrcanus’ fortune, and therefore does the same as Harmund, except that he changes the jarring οὐ πλείω into a harmless ὡς and he leaves out the phrase that has become unusable ἐπετύγχανον δε’ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων οὖχ δοσις ἠλπίσαν, in a manner that is logical and appropriate to his new view. He has therefore drawn consequences from the misunderstanding. – Something similar happened with the women. The phrase [in] War 273 had referred to those women who above all interested [191] the Parthians, but the corresponding passage Ant. 365 overlooks the μάλιστα and extracts from the problematic phrase the meaning – finding a successor in Harmund herein as well – that the women whom Antigonus had intended to give had fled, i.e. all [of them] and not just those whom the Parthians had desired above all. That Josephus did actually envisage it thus in the Antiquities becomes compellingly apparent from section 379 where Herod reports the following to Rome about these events: Antigonus had promised the Parthians 1000 talents and 500 women who were to belong to the principal families, however, he himself rescued these [women] from the hands of the enemy with unspeakable efforts during an escape by night. In truth, this assertion holds only for his next of kin, precisely those whom the Parthians desired most, but now after the original text, War 273, had been construed in the other way, this disintegration [Auseinanderklappen] of the text ensued as an inevitable consequence.

Therefore Josephus constructed the text of the Antiquities anew here due to the fact that he reinterpreted the original text when he approached his War [again] after years [had passed]. This reinterpretation is certainly conscious – at least in the topic of the promise of the women. It clearly shows an intensification in the attitude with respect to Antigonus when he has promised 500 noblewomen to the Parthian satrap, and one must relate to this [the fact] that in Ant. 331 it is Antigonus himself who gives the promise (cf. also 365) whereas in War 248 Lysanias had arranged the affair.66 Josephus’ sentiment towards the man who had promised Jerusalem and its women as plunder to the hordes of Parthians is expressed more strongly in

---

66 The dependence of the Antiquities upon the War is revealed in this as well. In [the War] Lysanias has his position as intermediary and as originator of the whole transaction and we therefore justifiably hear more details about him; on the other hand in the Antiquities, where Antigonus himself is made out to be the agent of the transaction, [Lysanias] has lost nothing but the information about him is dragged along farther (section 330) even though he now has been forced back into a negligible role.
the Antiquities, which shine with Jewish patriotism, than in the War, which is dependent upon Nicolaus. But the main point is that here as well the dependence of the [192] Antiquities upon the War could be proven straight from the reworkings [of the text].

The second discrepancy between the Antiquities and its source within our section is to lead us to another area. A short report about Herod’s flight with his next of kin is given in War 263 - 264. Josephus took this as the basis for his Ant. 353 - 358, but it was significantly expanded by an anecdote, which can already be recognized externally as an insertion by virtue of [the fact] that in it a different situation is presumed in the return march than [is presumed] in the War and in the surrounding pieces of the Antiquities, which have been extracted from the [War]. Namely, here Herod starts his female relatives upon the march and he himself with his servants provides cover for their march. He is therefore not to be found with his female relatives; rather he even defeats his opponents, who are pursuing [him], in several victorious engagements (War 264 = Ant. 358b). It is different in the intervening segment of the Antiquities: here Herod does not provide cover for the march of his [relatives] rather he flees together with them. He even had tremendous fear when his mother’s mule slipped, the entire train could be affected and halted and he therefore wants to kill himself (355 - 357). The insertion presents us with a miserable hunted mass of fleeing women, children and a few men – including Herod – the sight of which evokes the deepest pity from those who see them (354 ff.); defenceless, he exposed himself to his pursuers, whereas the War and correspondingly the bordering pieces67 of the Antiquities, in contrast, reveal to us an orderly withdrawal during which there were even numerous engagements, which were favourable to those withdrawing. Therefore it is clearly demonstrated here as well that the War did not condense some common source, as has always been thought, but rather the Antiquities were expanded by an extraneous addition. It is still particularly significant that Josephus himself sensed what a contradiction there was gaping between the two versions; for in his description of the subsequent strikes that Herod dealt as he marched off [193] [Josephus] of his own accord adds to Ant. 360 that Herod was victorious “not as one who is in the most dire straits, but rather just as if he had prepared himself for the war most splendidly and with the greatest affluence.” This comment,

---

67 It is not difficult to determine the margins of the source to either side; the insertion from the additional source [Nebenquelle] begins with ἐδίωκεν τὴν ἐπὶ Ἰδουμαίας (353b) and ends with ποιούμενος τὴν πορείαν (358b). Both sources were immediately assimilated into each other
which was to patch over the contradiction, in truth exposed it all the more sharply.

Later on we may venture a guess [in answer] to the question from where does the insertion originate; but it should be pointed out already at this point that these are purely personal experiences, which are being reported about Herod, and that one senses clearly that the sympathies of the [the author] who first drafted such a report lay with Herod.

13. Herod in Rome

War 274 - 285 = Ant. 370 - 389

Herod had to continue in his flight before Antigonus who was supported by the Parthians in Jerusalem. He flees to Arabia and to Egypt where he decides to travel to Rome still in the middle of winter in order to gain the assistance of the powerful empire. He reaches Pamphylia and [then arrives] in Rome via Rhodes. The two sources (War 274 - 280 = Ant. 370 - 378) again correspond completely except for one minor incidental detail [Nebenzug]: in Rhodes, which remained battered by the war against Cassius, War 280 relates that Herod, despite his lack of money, built a massive trireme in which he travelled to Italy; Ant. 378 reinterpreted this idea by having Herod rebuild the destroyed [town of] Rhodes despite his lack of money and instead construct only an ordinary trireme, not one [that was] massive. The relationship between the sources is to change, however, when we see Herod arriving in Rome. Here Herod was indeed to acquire the royal crown of Judaea and it is clear, if our remarks are correct up to now, that the shift in Josephus’ attitude towards the Herodians is to be recognized in this policy reversal [Wendepunkt der Politik] whereby the Jews received a ruler who was foreign to their land. Our expectation is not to be disappointed!

According to War 282, when Herod arrived in Rome Antony sympathized with him, and since he [194] remembered Antipater’s hospitality on the one hand, but on the other he had also become acquainted with Herod’s virtue, he therefore decided to make Herod king of the Jews. The antagonism towards Antigonus, whom Antony viewed as an enemy of the Romans, was also decisive for him, however. When Josephus had become an enemy of the Herodians, he could retain the report mentioned [above] only partly: Antony’s sympathy was admittedly harmless in principle, but in order to discourage any idea that Herod’s character was perhaps and are thus inextricably bound together.
also responsible for this, Josephus adds in the *Antiquities* that Antony’s sympathy was determined by the general consideration that even he who stands at the pinnacle of power is still exposed to strokes of fate. In this way he disengages Antony’s conduct from any interest in Herod and shifts it over to the general human sphere (section 381). The idea that Antony had taken “Herod’s virtue” into account, however, was totally impossible: therefore Josephus deletes the words of the *War* διὰ τὴν τοῦ παρόντος ἀρετὴν and replaces them in the *Antiquities* with the allegation that Antony had allowed himself to be bribed by Herod. This is the same type of reinterpretation that has already been demonstrated by us on page 185. Later on, the *War* had said that Antony was swayed no less by his antagonism towards Antigonus than by his love for Herod, but the *Antiquities* inevitably deletes the “love for Herod” and replaces the “no less” by a “much more”. It ultimately followed logically from the bribery that Herod has aimed at the kingdom from the outset; the final words of section 382 were composed afresh in this sense.

Octavian showed himself to be even more willing to [help] Herod than [was] Antony, as *War* 283 continues; because he recalled Antipater [195] and Caesar’s joint campaigns in Egypt, and their intimate hospitality; but he also recognized Herod’s drive. The idea of “Herod’s drive” was just as intolerable for the *Antiquities* as was that of his “virtue”. It therefore had to be abandoned and was replaced in the *Antiquities* by indicating that Octavian acted for the sake of Antony who had concerned himself so very much with Herod (383). Admittedly, this substitution is really just an *Ersatz*; because it does stand in contradiction to the idea, also adopted by the *Antiquities*, that Octavian was even more well-disposed towards Herod than was Antony; he could really not then possibly have dealt with Herod’s affair for [Antony’s] sake!

---

68 We also encounter this in a factually less important shift. In the *War* Josephus recalls that the same Antony, who has now made Herod king, had previously appointed him as tetrarch. The *Antiquities* transfers this information into the mouth of Herod who promises Antony money if he were to be made king, just as he had previously been appointed tetrarch, so that the impression arises here that the appointment as tetrarch had occurred only through bribery as well.

69 There can therefore be no thought that Antony, for his part, first had to win Octavian over for Herod. Now, if Herod appealed to Antony from the outset despite the “even greater willingness” of Octavian’s disposition, then this is simply the consequence of the actual attitude that Antony assumed in the east. Certainly, [once] in Rome Herod could discover that there was a more powerful [man] besides Antony; but we understand that he sought out Antony first of all.
Here it is once again quite distinctly concrete how the Antiquities simply remodelled the old bias and as a result entered into contradiction with itself. There is no question of another tradition in this, and Josephus’ memory also falls quite short: how well it could have indeed suited him here to introduce the corrections to the Egyptian campaign that we discussed above on page 165 ff.; he missed [his chance], because he always amended the details only and did not create a cohesive picture for himself.

The report about the hearing before the senate in War 284 is transferred smoothly to Ant. 14.384 - 385, which is followed in direct continuation by War 285 = Ant. 388b (end of the senate’s session); since the text of War 284/5 is repeated almost word for word in Ant. 385 and 388 (καὶ δόξαν τούτο πάσι ψηφίζονται. // λυθείσης δὲ τῆς βουλῆς). An insertion has been made in between, however, about which it is externally remarkable that it can be smoothly removed from its surrounding [text]. It can therefore have originated just as easily at the same time as this or later. It is the quite interesting content itself, however, that can alone shed light on this for us.

Josephus claims here that Herod had acquired [196] the crown contrary to his [own] expectations. He actually did not believe it was at all possible that the Romans, who were of course accustomed to bestow the kingship only upon members of the family or clan [Stammesgenossen], would now grant it to him, and he therefore had sought the royal crown for his brother-in-law Alexander. “Herod, however, killed this young man, as we shall recount at some point”. The passage has been quite curiously misunderstood; starting with Ewald (Geschichte des Volkes Israel, vol. 4, page 538, note 4) [and continuing on] to Otto (col. 25), the interpreters explain, “Josephus strove in vain to argue that Herod had wanted the kingdom really only for a Hasmonean”; “Herod is acquitted here of the accusation of having precipitated the deposition of the Hasmonean royal family etc.” Now, it cannot be denied that Josephus himself bears part of the responsibility for this incorrect interpretation by having introduced secondary insertions into the original line of thought.70 But already in light of the

---

70 Josephus has operated of his own accord here and in so doing he interwove two lines of thought. At first he formed the following clear thought: καὶ τοῦτο τὸ μέγιστον ἦν τῆς Ἀντωνίου περὶ τὸν Ἡρώδην σπουδῆς ὅτι μὴ μόνον αὐτῷ τὴν βασιλείαν οὐκ ἔλπιζοντο περιποιήσατο // — οὖ γὰρ ἐνόμιζεν αὐτῷ τοὺς Ῥωμαίους παρέξειν τοῖς ἐκ τοῦ γένους ἔθος ἔχοντας αὐτὴν διδόναι — // ἀλλ’ ὅτι καὶ ἐπὶ ταῖς πάσαις ἡμέραις παρέσχεν αὐτῷ τυχόντι τῶν οὐδὲ προσδοκηθέντων ἀπελθεῖν ἐκ τῆς Ἰταλίας. // Picking up from the parenthesis, Josephus
information about Herod’s execution of young Alexander there can be no doubt about Josephus’ intention, which he pursued with the whole [presentation]. What is mentioning this to [accomplish] other than to denounce Herod? But neither can the entire part then make any sense other than that of censuring Herod, and this censure in Josephus’ mind consists decidedly in [the fact] that Herod was illegitimate. We encounter this illegitimacy of Herod distinctly in the first line of thought that was singled out in the [last foot]note: Herod does not at all dare expect the kingship for himself, which remains open to members of the clan (οὐκ ἠλπίζοντι, οὐ γὰρ ἐνόμιζεν, οὐδὲ προσδοκηθέντων) – he is unqualified to such an extent. And [197] the second line of thought agrees fully in this point, however, it is expanded in that Herod, who is convinced about the utter hopelessness of gaining the throne for himself, pushes forward his young brother-in-law in order to gain the lost land for himself through him. Therefore there is not even the remotest question of whitewashing Herod [here]; on the contrary, he exploits the legitimacy of his brother-in-law, whom he himself later eliminates, for his [own] purposes and the whole part is recorded with the sole purpose of attacking precisely Herod’s legitimacy and conduct.71

That this view of the passage has met the mark is proven by two additional passages, which we [shall] address – in anticipation. While Herod besieges Jerusalem together with the Romans in order to seize possession of the kingship that they had guaranteed to [give] him, Antigonus attempts to defend the interests of the Hasmoneans. Whereas the War is content with a simple ἀντιπαρηγοροῦντες (section 296), the Antiquities independently develops Antigonus’ line of thought into lengthier remarks (403 - 405). Antigonus thereby accuses the Romans of handing the kingship over to the “half Jew” Herod contrary to all justice, “whereas intertwined the second thought into the [first] one: οὖ γὰρ πρὸς αὐτὸν ἀνέβη ταύτην (scl. τὴν βασιλείαν) αἰτησόμενος, ἀλλὰ τῷ τῆς γυναικὸς ἀδελφῷ λαβεῖν ἀξιώσων Ἀλεξάνδρῳ υἱῶνῷ τυχάνοντι πρὸς μὲν πατρὸς Ἀριστοβούλου, πρὸς δὲ μητρὸς Ὑρκανοῦ.´´ τοῦτον μὲν οὖν τὸν νεανίσκον Ἡρώδης ἀπέκτεινεν ὡς κατὰ χαιρὸν δηλώσομεν. Thus arose the current text in its grammatically poor form.71 It is immediately seen that these remarks are incompatible with section 382, exactly where Herod hoped to gain the throne for himself through bribery. Since 382 originated directly along with the surrounding text, it thus follows that [sections] 386 - 388a, which can be easily eliminated, were inserted later. Both passages are directed against Herod in the same way, but the execution of this bias is different and self-contradictory. It is always the same picture: Josephus amends the details, but does not bring himself to [realize] a coherent, large-scale new conception.
according to their conventions they were accustomed to yield the kingship to people from the populace itself.” There is therefore an almost literal correspondence between 386: παρέξειν τοῖς ἐκ τοῦ γένους ἔθος ἔχοντας αὐτὴν διδόναι and 403: δέον τοῖς ἐκ τοῦ γένους οὕτω παρέχειν ὡς ἔθος ἐστίν αὐτοῖς, and it is the same outlook that pervades both passages. Since it is anti-Herodian in 403, so it follows once again that in 386 it is also the opponent of the Herodians who is speaking; because both passages originated under mutual reference and therefore section 404 also picks up then from the broader arguments of 381 ff.: even if one wished to eliminate Antigonus because of his friendly disposition towards the Parthians [198], there were still numerous other legitimate candidates whom the Romans could have appointed as king instead of someone like Herod. This is the answer to Antony’s lines of thought. Now, since the expansion 403 to 405 lies securely within its context, it then follows that Josephus produced the insertion 386 - 388 under its influence; therefore directly subsequent to the first recording (cf. the similar case on page 177).

Finally, the same fundamental considerations appear in section 489. While the corresponding passage of the War simply reports that Antony had Antigonus, who was delivered to him by Sossius, executed for his meanness (section 357), the Antiquities again turns this idea upside down. It is Herod who conducts the immediate execution of Antigonus by bribing Antony, and, in fact, because he fears that otherwise Antigonus might wish to be brought to Rome by Antony and in this way be given the opportunity to present before the Senate [the fact] that “he himself was from the royal family while Herod was a commoner, and that it of course would be proper that his children should become kings on account of their ancestry if he himself had indeed committed an offence against the Romans”. Therefore once again this same idea of Josephus is inserted into the Antiquities; Herod is illegitimate; the legitimate claimants to the throne have been removed.

There can be no doubt about the extremely close relationship of the three passages 386 - 388a, 403 - 405 and 489; they were all first inserted into the Antiquities and borne by the same outlook; therefore hopefully nobody will continue seeing a defence of the Herodians in [sections] 386 to 388a, where the author has intended the exact opposite. But now that there can be no doubt about the bias of the three insertions either, the issue of their origin still requires discussion. Undoubtedly their trend corresponds to what Josephus had in mind in the Antiquities, and therefore the thought suggests itself to view the three segments as nothing
other than such reworkings as we have already detected so often: reinterpretations of the old [text] so that it is provided with a new political trend. And yet this time we do not manage with such a new conception alone; because [199] Josephus introduces new facts into the insertions such as the seven-day duration of Herod’s stay in Italy, his alleged intention of gaining the rulership for Alexander; for this there must be an underlying source, and the trend of this [source] can also be precisely determined. That is to say, even though it was definitely not Josephus’ intention to stand up for Herod in 386 ff., whoever first expressed the idea that Herod wished to gain the kingship for the Hasmonean Alexander, did in fact have the intention of standing up for Herod and of making excuses for him; but Josephus has twisted this view into its opposite in conformity with the trend of the Antiquities. The source appears to be extremely well informed about Herod’s intentions, it mentions his considerations and his expectations in detail and is aware of the exact length of his stay in Italy. Already here, the conjecture cannot be suppressed that it is the same source to which we owe the warm-hearted description in 354 ff.: it is Herod himself who would have made these notes in his memoirs, with which Josephus was acquainted, but whose contents he twisted into their opposite – commensurate with his view.

14. Herod’s return to Judaea
War 286 - 320 = Ant. 390 - 438

After the politically momentous decision had been passed in Rome and Herod had been appointed king of the Jews, he was compelled to assert himself by force against Antigonus, the current ruler of Judaea. Josephus could not bring a lively personal interest to this fighting and its outcome. The presentation of the War was based on Nicolaus and as result was readily sympathetic to Herod, yet in the Antiquities Josephus did admittedly turn against Herod, and for other reasons (cf. page 191) he had persecuted no less [vehemently] the character of Antigonus, Herod’s opponent and made his characterization negative. So when composing the Antiquities he was basically hostile towards both of the parties that were fighting each other: towards Herod because of his illegitimacy, towards Antigonus because of his personal policy that was inimical to the Jews. Out of this peculiar situation there arose ultimately the attempt at a solution that is quite [200] unique to Josephus (cf. page 198): Herod as a half Jew was not
permitted to become king; however, since the Hasmonean Antigonus was just as impossible as a human being, his children should then have received the crown (section 489). In light of such an opinion, it is with a certain suspense that one will examine how Josephus comes to terms in the Antiquities with the problem of the bellicose dispute between Herod and Antigonus. On the whole, Josephus remodelled very little here, even the stylistic execution of the details has hardly been altered; here as well one receives the impression that Josephus’ creative power was somehow weakened; all the more significant are the few small changes that Josephus introduced, namely to the detriment of Antigonus.

While Antigonus besieges the Herodians in Masada, they almost had to surrender for lack of water. In the final night, however, it begins to rain and so the fortress can continue intact. The Herodians are victorious during sallies; at times they are forced back as well. In this report from War 286 - 287, [the version in] Ant. 391 includes that the sudden rain was perceived as a divine sign; therefore God contends against Antigonus. One must bear in mind along with this that immediately following, in the description of the engagements during the sallies [Ausfallsgefechte], the advantages that Antigonus had won now and then according to the War are deleted. – War 304 reported that the watchmen had fled from Sepphoris, in Ant. 414 Josephus specifies that it was Antigonus’ guard detachment, who ran off. Most notably, however, the brief expansion in 418 is connected with this unfavourable view of Antigonus.

The War had related the vacillating attitude of the Roman commander Silo, who admittedly was instructed by the Roman government to support Herod, but who did this only with reluctance since he was bribed by Antigonus. Silo admittedly took part in the siege of Jerusalem (294), however, he created such difficulties over the food supplies that it was concluded that he had been bribed by Antigonus (297). These difficulties were well resolved yet so much time had been lost that the siege could not be brought to an end in the summer. The Roman army moved into winter quarters in Herod’s territory, however, [201] Antigonus once again managed to attract a part of the Roman army to his [side] through bribery (302). Then in the next spring, when Silo and Herod received orders to pacify Judaea first and then to prepare for the campaign against the Parthians, Herod understandably “gladly” dispensed with the assistance of Silo who was so unreliable and sent him to Bassus while he conducted the battle against the Jews by himself alone (section 309). In comparison to this, the Antiquities enriched the presentation by one trait: namely, in the winter quarters food was provided for
Silo by Antigonus only for one month, then Antigonus cleared the surrounding area of all provisions so that the Romans ran the risk of perishing due to starvation; for this reason Silo and the other leaders came to Herod who received them in a friendly manner and delegated his brother Pheroras to provide food for them (418 - 419). Admittedly, this last statement again has a model in War 308 where the supplying of food does not bear upon Silo’s troops, but rather upon those of Herod himself.

The expansion once again does not suit the picture that had been created by the War and consequently adopted by the Antiquities. According to War 302 (= Ant. 412) it was not at all Silo himself but only a part of his troops who changed sides to Antigonus, and it agrees with this that Ventidius (War 309) issued a [joint] order to Silo and Herod for action in common. Indeed they are together and Silo’s betrayal consisted only in that he had supplied Antigonus with a part of his troops. Besides this, it is exactly Antigonus’ intention to enchain Silo to himself through bribery and through any other means possible. The report of [section] 418 totally overthrows this; because here, for no reason at all, Antigonus offends the man upon whose help he is vitally dependent. Josephus himself has sensed that as a result the continued narrative in the form of the War had become untenable; for if Herod separated himself from Silo here, then this was just due to Silo’s inclination towards Antigonus. Now, had these [two], however, had a complete falling out, as Ant. 418 maintains, then Herod would no longer have had any reason at all to dismiss Silo, who had been supportive to him, prematurely against Bassus’ orders. Josephus sensed this fact clearly himself and that is why he deleted the crucial word ἄσμενως (War 309) from Ant. 420 [202], and formulated Bassus’ command somewhat differently in this context. Certainly the most blatant discrepancy was corrected as a result, yet ultimately [it was] amended only superficially still once again; for Herod’s dismissal of Silo, which Josephus required for the broader context, could not be discarded by him and yet it is also only understandable if section 418 were to be missing. It follows here from this as well that section 418 is not some original element of the narrative, which had been condensed in the War, rather that the Antiquities has expanded the old context by [adding] the report of Antigonus’ rancour towards Silo.

One might entertain the question of whether there is an underlying additional source [Nebenquelle] here, and if so, which one it could be. A definitive answer may be difficult to provide, however; at any rate it is significant that the anecdote ends with a trait (provision of
food by Pheroras), which really does not belong to it, rather it has been extracted from the
War. Therefore the only remaining content is the fact that Antigonus evidently provided food
for Silo and his troops for one month, but then cut off his supplies. Now, it is precisely such
issues, which had been addressed shortly before in the War and in the Antiquities: so it would
certainly appear quite probable to me that Josephus invented this trait himself in order to
display the untrustworthiness of Antigonus, who later betrayed even Silo who had supplied
him with troops. On the other hand, it can also not be considered impossible that Josephus had
learned the fact from an additional source [Nebenquelle], and Herod’s memoirs would impose
themselves once again as a probable [candidate] for this; Josephus then would have adopted
just the one fact from this source, but for the rest he would have resorted immediately to his
former context [sc. source].

A much more definitive judgment can once again be made about the relationship of Ant.
434 - 436 to its model in War 317 - 319. According to the War, Antigonus made the attempt to
attract the Roman commander Machairas over to his side by bribery. But [Machairas] did not
go involved in the betrayal out of fear of Ventidius Bassus who had given him the order to
support Herod, and moreover, because Herod bribed him with even greater sums, [203]
however, he still feigned an amicable disposition towards Antigonus in order to betake himself
to Antigonus and spy out his situation in the face of Herod’s counter-betrayal [Widerraten].
Antigonus had received wind of Machairas’ true disposition, however, and locked the town
gates [before] him. Machairas was embarrassed by this failure and became so furious that he
had Herod’s followers, who got in his way, killed as enemies just as if they were Antigonus’
followers. – By contrast, the Antiquities maintains that Antigonus’ attempt at bribery was
successful, and this was exactly why Machairas “left Herod against his advice under the
pretext of intending to spy out Antigonus’ situation” (435), i.e. Machairas really did wish to
defect and in order to be able to absent himself from Herod he used the pretext that he
intended to investigate Antigonus’ situation. Therefore, what was a genuine intention in War
318 (κατάσκοπος ἠθεί), became a pretext in Ant. 435 (ὡς κατασκεψόμενος), because Machairas
had not allowed himself to be bribed by Antigonus there [in the War], and so he performed an
honest act before Herod, whereas here [in the Antiquities] Machairas really was bribed and so
was compelled inevitably to deceive Herod. Antigonus’ conduct on the opposite side then also
corresponds to this; in the War he had previously become aware (προαισθόμενος) of
Machairas’ true intention, that he, feigning friendship, intended to spy on him and because of that [Antigonus] locked the gates [before] him; according to the Antiquities, which maintained that the bribery really was carried out, this could no longer come into discussion; for Machairas’ disposition was truly favourable towards Antigonus. Therefore Josephus changed the προαισθόμενος into a υπιδόμενος for the Antiquities: Antigonus suspected that Machairas’ act before him was not honest after all.

Here once again a new trend has been noticeably incorporated into the report of the War and implemented consistently as much as it was really feasible; on the other hand there is no new material anywhere. Here there can be no doubt either, however, where the correct view has been given: in the War, when Herod advises his faithful Machairas against his intended exploration and [Machairas] is embarrassed in front of him after his failure, then this is all very neat and tidy. But why does Antiquities 435 include [the phrase] παρὰ τὴν Ἑρώδου γνώμην, which has been transferred from the contents of War 318 (μὴ πεισθεὶς ἀποτρέποντι)? This idea is naturally quite absurd since Machairas is performing a false act before Herod there and only needed a pretext in order to get away from Herod. But Josephus required it for the continuation [of the narrative], which indeed had been based precisely on [the fact] that Machairas had not followed Herod’s advice (436). How then was he to have done this, however, since he wished to deceive Herod? How can he, whose objective was totally different from Herod’s, understand in retrospect that Herod had shown him a correct path to this? This is in truth a remnant of the War within the Antiquities. Thus the version of the War is the correct one, and the Antiquities merely incorporated a new bias into the old framework and also implemented it consistently yet in such a way that in one passage it again becomes noticeable that this new bias has been retroactively grafted onto the context of the War; the War is therefore the exclusive source of the Antiquities.

---

72 Otto reasons incorrectly in Herodes, col. 29, note 1. What then was the second source to have reported? In Ant. 435 Otto has overlooked the crucial παρὰ τὴν Ἑρώδου γνώμην.

73 Therefore only the War can come into historical consideration. Obviously Machairas had perched himself upon a fence; admittedly he held true to Herod, yet he still did not obey him [but] undertook the strike. As a result Herod’s distrust was aroused; because Machairas cannot have behaved in the manner recounted in the Nicolaus-War [version] of the incident, [namely] that he also persecuted the Herodians in fury over his failure. Rather, first a measure by Herod against Machairas [must have] taken place, for which the latter then wished to retaliate. Nicolaus has kept silent about this in his well-known bias favouring Herod.
The consequences of the altered view of the *Antiquities* are also brought to bear further on; in *War* 319 Machairas has spared no Jew, rather he treated the “Herodians” as if they were “Antigonians”. Only one who considered Machairas to be a Herodian could speak thus; since this was not done in the *Antiquities*, this formulation had to be abandoned as well; in its place comes the colourless expression that in his fury Machairas killed “friend” and “foe”.

The reason for this reworking is once again very clearly provided in that Josephus wished to have Antigonus’ action judged more unfavourably: in the *War* Antigonus had previously received tidings about Machairas’ true intention, [205] and kept him away for that reason. No one could take exception to his action. It is different in the *Antiquities*. By virtue of [the fact] that Herod’s attempt at bribery is deleted here, Antigonus is the only one to make such an [attempt]. He is successful in this, but for all that he distrusts Machairas without any reason now, battles against him “and as a result manifests his (αὐτοῦ, not αὐτοῦ) true disposition”. This last addition leaves no [room for] doubt about Josephus’ attitude towards Antigonus as he was recording the *Antiquities*: in considering his attitude towards the two parties who were in conflict, to whom Josephus was fundamentally not well-disposed, he deprecated Antigonus more forcefully than he did Herod. But this enmity towards Antigonus applied only to his character, whereas for Herod it was the half Jew and founder of a foreign dynasty who was to be targeted, although he [himself] was able to exhibit decent traits too in his character.

15. *The events up to the siege of Jerusalem*

*War* 321 - 342 = *Ant.* 439 - 464

Herod, who had encountered stronger resistance in Judaea than he was expecting, appeals to Antony who is besieging Samosata on the Euphrates; [Herod] supplies him with troops in order to induce him, on his part, to support Herod more strongly, in which he is then successful. Herod’s march to Antony in Samosata, which is recounted with few words in *War* 321, is described extensively in *Ant.* 439 - 445 with the introduction of a great number of more specific details; there can be no doubt that there is an underlying source for this, however, it is also certain that it is not some common source, which the *War* would have condensed and the *Antiquities* would have reproduced more completely; rather an additional source [*Nebenquelle*]
has been consulted here as well, as is proven by a reworking that became necessary because of the expansion. In the War, Herod received the thanks and the support of Antony due to the fact that he distinguished himself during the assault on Samosata by his outstanding courage and in this way assisted the Romans most vigorously (322). In contrast to this, Ant. 440 ff. has Herod distinguish himself already on the march to Antony to such an extent that Antony, who heard about this, [206] honoured Herod on account of these achievements (446). Then, when Samosata had indeed fallen, the Antiquities, which had anticipated the honours, could do nothing else other than attach Antony’s order to Sossius to support Herod (447) from the later contents of War 327, so that another acknowledgement of Herod would [result] from this.

The additional source [Nebenquelle] used here is characterized once again by precise knowledge about the twists of fate in Herod’s life [Lebensschicksale], his movements during the march, etc.; its sympathies lie with Herod, in short, it is the same trend that we have already had to identify frequently and whose origin will lie in Herod’s memoirs. As regards the factual relationship of this additional source [Nebenquelle] to Nicolaus, in his more succinct presentation the latter obviously transferred the merits, which Herod in truth acquired for himself during the march, to the time directly before the assault; for it is obvious that Nicolaus with his thought πολλοὺς μὲν τῶν βαρβάρων ἀποκτείνας, πολλὴν δὲ ἀποτεμόμενος λείαν has alluded to that very incident, which the additional source [Nebenquelle] Ant 440 ff. has recounted more thoroughly and correctly. So it is then definite once again that the War has not condensed, rather the Antiquities has expanded.

This relationship between the two writings, which we have now proven in countless cases, also exists in that very segment, which Destinon (page 15), who thought he could prove the opposite, wished to present as particularly instructive for his interpretation: now supported by the Romans again, Herod, who wishes to conquer Judaea, assembles 800 allies in Lebanon, – so reads War 329 – draws a Roman legion to himself in that location and marches into Galilee with these [troops]. In contrast to this, Ant 452 mentions Ptolemais in addition as one of their destinations. At first glance, this certainly seems to represent an element of a common source, which has been better preserved in the Antiquities; but one must not consider this discrepancy in isolation; on the contrary, it also forms an element of the systematic reworking of the entire passage. The War builds its report upon the idea that Herod turned against his brother’s murderers in the greatest haste: When he receives the news of his
brother’s death [207], he abandons himself “to his sorrow just for an instant, postpones the 
main part of his lamentations until later and hurries against the enemy, accelerating his march 
beyond his strength” (328). In Lebanon he incorporates allies and Romans into his column [of 
troops] and “without even awaiting just the crack of dawn” he invades Galilee. The Antiquities, 
which for the rest follows the War in this segment, too, including the details, has deleted 
everything that I have just written above. Nothing about postponing lamentations, nothing 
about a march “beyond his strength”, nothing about a continued march “without even waiting 
for day” – instead of this, however, [there are] two words that show that Josephus used the War 
as his basis here as well, but that he wished to remove the nuance of a march that was 
accelerated beyond all measure: in [section] 452 an ἐπειχθείς κατὰ τὴν πορείαν comes in the 
place of the almost passionately retained War 328b, and the entire content is removed from the 
ὅπερ περιμείνας ἡμέπαν εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν ἐνέβαλεν (War 329) in that it is replaced by the ὄρδος 
νυκτός ἀναστάς from which no reader can infer any sense of extreme haste. Lastly, in Ant. 454 
the author has deleted the words ἐν τάχιστα from the source (War 331). Thus Josephus has 
consciously and consistently discarded all those remarks that characterized Herod’s violently 
precipitous march in the War.

Now, the insertion into the Antiquities of the words: “he came to Ptolemais” belongs to 
this series of changes as well. Because another [change] goes hand in hand with this: namely, 
in the War Herod marches through the mountains of Lebanon and there he receives the allies 
who “lived around the mountain”. In the Antiquities, on the other hand, Herod in his march 
reaches the area across from (κατά) Lebanon and he gathers the allies from there. In the War, 
therefore, the march proceeds from Antioch straight through the mountains of Lebanon to 
Galilee, whereas the Antiquities specifies the usual march route along the coast: Antioch - coast 
into the heights of Lebanon - Ptolemais - Galilee. In the War everything is accordingly thought 
[to have occurred] in the greatest haste; the Antiquities has erased this haste. So now there is no 
longer any possibility of doubt: the reaching of Ptolemais can not at all [208] be a part of the 
common source, which was better preserved in the Antiquities, rather it belongs exclusively to 
the overall view as it is held here by the Antiquities in comparison to the War; therefore 
Destinon’s thinking must be changed into its opposite.

There are basically two possible answers to the question of why Josephus came to 
replace the presentation of an accelerated march undertaken with complete fervour
straight through Lebanon with a narrative that had Herod march at normal speed along the coast and arrive in Galilee via Ptolemais. For one, Josephus could have obtained the information that the march actually proceeded via Ptolemais from an additional source [Nebenquelle] – perhaps Herod’s memoirs – and this could have prompted him to infer an absence of haste. But such an inference is not typical to Josephus’ nature, as I clearly see it, and he truly would not have used an additional source [Nebenquelle] in order to insert Ptolemais as a point along his march route [Marschpunkt]. In truth we are directed to the second possibility for the explanation; because the elimination of the haste is connected not only factually with the new march route but also with [the fact] that Josephus describes the execution [Vollzug] of Herod’s revenge upon Antigonus in the Antiquities completely differently than [he does] in the War. Here in section 336 it reads: “when the fight had broken out, the other parts [of the army] maintained their position somewhat indeed, but Herod, in remembrance of his murdered brother, putting his life at risk in order to take revenge upon those who were responsible for the murder, quickly subdued those who were facing him and then turned against those who were still maintaining their position, and chased them all in flight.” Ant. 458 makes this into: Herod, clashing with his opponents, “is victorious in the fight and, avenging his brother, he follows those fleeing into the village while killing them.” Bearing in mind alongside this that, quite to the contrary, the Antiquities otherwise enhances rhetorically, yet there is no doubt that here Josephus wishes to reduce [the impact of the text]. Hence it is then also understandable when Josephus describes Herod’s measures to punish his brother’s murderers differently [right] from the start; the great fervour that pervades the War here, the haste with which Herod advances against Antigonus through the mountains [209] at night in the fog, the fury with which he throws himself upon the murderers with no consideration for his [own] life, these are all discarded; only a weak reflection is left over in the Antiquities. No longer is there any mention of a march through the mountains, Herod follows the normal military road through Ptolemais. Therefore Josephus [himself] has come to a new view of the events, and he was not influenced here by an additional source [Nebenquelle]!

But this new view consists substantially in a new shading of things; Herod’s revenge strike remains, but all fervour is removed from it, and this is explained by Josephus’ rethinking [as] addressed in section 14. Whereas the War stood unilaterally behind Herod, the Antiquities
did admittedly still give Herod preference later on in the comparative evaluation [of Herod and Antigonus], but this signified merely the choosing of the lesser of two evils and therefore all passion for Herod had to be discontinued.

After a bloody struggle the fight was settled in Herod’s favour; his exhausted friends lay down to rest while Herod himself went for a bath accompanied only by one slave, as War 340/1 recounts. Before he enters the bathhouse one of the enemy in full armour dashes suddenly from the house, then another and another, [and] finally a greater number. These people had run from the battle in full armour into the bathhouse in order to hide. When they now caught sight of the king, however, they attempted to run by him, trembling, even though he was unarmed (γυμνός), and that is why they rushed to the exits. Since nobody else was there who could have seized the people, and Herod was content to have suffered no harm, the people were all able to escape. Ant. 462/3 shifts this situation. While in the War we are to imagine Herod still outside the baths when the people attempt to run by him, in the Antiquities he is already sitting in the water (περὶ λουτρὸν ἦν 462, λουομένου 463). Why? because when Josephus approached his text again in order to produce the Antiquities, he no longer interpreted βαλανεῖον as bathhouse but as bathwater, and because he accordingly takes γυμνός in the sense of “naked” (463), but in War 341 it simply means “unarmed”, in accordance with the situation. After βαλανεῖον had lost the meaning of bathhouse, it now still had [210] to be explained first which house it then was, in which the soldiers had hidden themselves and in which Herod [Ed.: German mistakenly reads ‘Josephus’] was bathing. Thus arise εἴς τι δωμάτιον (462) and ἐν τῷ οἴκηματι (463). The overall view is ultimately shifted by the reinterpretation: in the War, where Herod, who was out of the water, was not in any additional danger, Josephus was required to explain how it came to be that the opponents escaped after all; in the Antiquities on the other hand, where Herod was sitting in the water and could not threaten the enemy, he tried to justify how it came about that Herod was saved. We see the well-known picture of Josephus’ method of working: the entire scene was logically reinterpreted consistently, the adjustments are mutually dependent. The reinterpretation is factually insignificant from a political point of view, but for the history of the text it is very informative: Josephus is induced to reformulate the text by his differing conception of the words γυμνός and βαλανεῖον. This case is identical to that discussed in section 12. The sole historical source for the anecdote is, of course, the War. Otto’s note in column 30 is to be
corrected accordingly.

16. The conquest of Jerusalem

War 343 - 357 = Ant. 465 - 491

After his decisive victory over Antigonus, Herod advances to Jerusalem and conquers the town after a rather lengthy siege. The report about this, as it is given in Ant. 14.470 - 481, coincides substantially with War 347 - 353, but differs in comparison by a series of details that must be investigated collectively. In the first instance, the comments [in] 476b - 478 have no model antecedent in the War where, rather, the information about the scaling of the walls by Sossius is directly followed by the account about the battle in the town (350). The part of the Antiquities lying in between deals with the length of the battle for the “first” and “second” wall (40 and 15 days respectively), then it relates that Herod, in order to malign Antigonus, alleged that the latter has had some of the temple halls set on fire. After the fall of the outer temple and the lower city the Jews fled into the inner sanctuary and the upper city. Since they were lacking animals for the daily offerings, they had requested of [211] Herod that [he grant] these same [animals] entry, and he made this concession to them with the assumption that they would now surrender. But since they did not do this, but rather they continued to fight for Antigonus, so Herod took the town by force.

There can be no doubt at all now that here we have an insertion into the Antiquities, and not some condensation of a common original text in the War. The evidence is supplied by [the fact] that we already find the fate of the town sealed in [section] 476a with the scaling of the town walls; by contrast, the expositions about the Jews’ offerings hark back to the past, and consequently, in order to effect the continuation the author must again first create the doublet in 478 προσβαλὼν κατὰ κράτος εἴλεν τὴν πόλιν to the [phrase] in 476 ἀναβαίνουσιν δὲ ἐπὶ τὸ τεῖχος. The insertion is based on good tradition, as is evidenced by the details about the length of the battle for the two town walls. But it is precisely these details that stand in direct contradiction to the account of War 351 that the battle for Jerusalem lasted five months; and precisely because Josephus himself also deemed these two sets of information to be incompatible, he deleted the information about the five months from the Antiquities where he interlaced the details from the new source about the battle for the two walls, [which lasted] 55
days altogether. Both changes therefore stand in a mutually dependent factual relationship, and Josephus, who deleted the chronological details of the *War* from the *Antiquities*, has for once proven himself to be the better critic here than the modern scholars who wish to unite both sets of information.

A few further details also belong to this very same source as the insertion 476b ff., by which Josephus enriched the narrative of the *War* in the *Antiquities*. Firstly, the chronological note in [section] 473: θέρος τε γὰρ ἦν and the statement in [section] 475 that it was a Sabbath year so that the inner town was in dire straights due to lack of grain. Finally, the information that the fall of the city occurred “in the third month on the Day of Atonement” (487) belongs to this as well; it does not originate from the *War* either, rather it stands in obvious contrast to this, whereas it matches the chronology of the insertion perfectly; for if the two walls were fought over for 55 days then it adds up quite well that the town fell in the third month, because after that the upper town still remained to be conquered. So we see how all the details agree amongst themselves: when the siege began, it was summer ([section] 473); the battle for the two town walls lasted 55 days, the upper town fell in the third month of the siege on the Day of Atonement, i.e. the third of October. Accordingly [the siege] had begun in July when it was certainly summer and everything was dried out. This system fell short only in the one point: in *Ant.* 465 Josephus had transferred the information from *War* 343 that the siege had begun “after the end of winter” and surely by this the author meant perhaps March or April. Therefore only in this one passage set apart, in which Josephus had essentially extracted one piece of information too many from the *War*, there exists the rupture in the *Antiquities*, which consequently obviously combined two sources with each other. The chronology of the one source (*War*) reads: march to Jerusalem after the end of winter ([section] 343), beginning of the siege, fall of the town after five months. The other chronology records: beginning of the siege in July, fall of the town on the third of October in the third month of the siege. Only these two systems are available to the researcher and the decision [between the two] can result only from an assessment of the sources themselves. Without doubt, the exhaustive details of the

---

74 It is incomprehensible to me how one could think to interpret the words τῷ τρίτῳ μηνί in such a way that they would mean the third month of the Olympiad. For a start, one should point out passages in which historians have divided whole Olympiads into months. This attempt at interpretation was really only a makeshift [solution] [*Notbehelf*] because one always had the fifth month from the *War* in mind while reading the *Antiquities*. 
supplementary source [Zusatzquelle] already lie in its favour but reaching the final decision may be possible only by another means.

Aside from the chronological details, the insertion is, in fact, remarkable because of its bias. Admittedly, it is quite obvious that this [bias] is against Herod; indeed it does say about Herod that he maligned Antigonus for political reasons, [alleging] that he had set the halls in the temple on fire (476), and that [Herod] gave the sacrificial animals at the request of those besieged not out of some [sense of] piety but because he hoped that the town would then soon surrender (477). But one sees clearly that behind this bias is the direct opposite [one]. The admission of the animals into the besieged city was of course originally reported as a proof of Herod’s piety, and Herod’s allegation that Antigonus has set the halls on fire originally sounded quite positive. One can still grasp how things have been twisted to produce the current bias. For the time being, it is immaterial whether these contortions are to be ascribed to Josephus himself, who did after all deliberately incorporate an anti-Herodian view into the work, or to an intervening source [Zwischenquelle] that was used here; but one thing that seems to me to be absolutely certain is that the origin of the tradition integrated into the addition is given nowhere else than in the memoirs of Herod himself. Only there could Herod have raised the accusation against Antigonus, which is now denounced as maligning; there Herod, glorifying himself of course, had narrated for the Jewish public that he had provided the possibility for the besieged Jews to present their offerings. There can be no doubt that the

---

75 W. Otto (col. 33, note) has reservations about the date [being] the Day of Atonement and believes that this tradition originated in circles inimical to Herod, who wished to incriminate the king with the accusation of an attack against the town on this holy day. If this were really the case, then Josephus would not have hesitated to repeat this charge (Ant. 14.65 ff.). As regards significant military incidents occurring on the Sabbath or on holy days, which we encounter elsewhere in the tradition as well, there does exist in part a chance [of this occurring], determined by the laws of probability [Wahrscheinlichkeitsrechnung], among the innumerable military incidents about which we actually hear. In addition, however, an interesting psychological process may have played a part here. Military incidents that fall on a Sunday have a far stronger emotional impact on us; of those days of battle, which I have experienced, no weekday [battle] has remained stuck in my memory, by contrast, I know of many Sunday [battles] even though these [Sundays] were not able to be celebrated as such. In my [army] battery Sunday was considered as a dies ater with the consequence that in our memories [Gedächtnismaßig] even things that did not at all occur on such a day were now transferred to Sunday. Therefore, as far as there is an error [possible] here, it could be [due] more to naive reconstruction than to deliberate falsification.

76 Cf. the parallel narrative 14.25 ff.
accumulation into one passage of two stories that are not in principle related to each other ultimately originates from the interests of Herod, who recounts to the Jews that Antigonus has set the halls of the temple on fire, while he himself, in spite of the war, granted everything to the Jews for the performance of the cult ritual.

[214] As a matter of fact, we have already been able to detect the traces of Herod’s memoirs in a great number of passages with great probability, and it is understandable that these proofs support each other mutually. It is of course not said by this, however, that Josephus himself has looked at this work; an indirect use would also explain the facts in the same way; having said that, it has become clear to us that the reinterpretation of the narratives available to Josephus corresponds perfectly to the bias of the Antiquities and can therefore derive from Josephus [himself].

While Josephus took the conclusion of the battle for Jerusalem verbatim from the War so that the Antiquities acquires the value of the oldest manuscript, he attached an observation of his own accord at the end (489 - 491), in which we encounter his true sentiment. Here the downfall of the Hasmoneans is illuminated from the most diverse aspects, and Josephus stands entirely on the side of this “noble house, distinguished because of its lineage as well as its high priesthood and its meritorious deeds [Verdienste] on behalf of the people”. In contrast to this, the Herodians are from lowly circles, they are commoners and as such they had to obey the king. It is the same view, which disposed Josephus to [effect] the change [discussed] in section 8, which had him make the pessimistic observation in sections 77/78 (cf. page 162 ff.), and which ultimately also induced him to turn the self-sufficient Antipater of the War into one of Hyrcanus’ tools who only executed the orders of this master! (cf. page 166 ff., 187). Therefore, as much as Josephus is [215] well-disposed to the Hasmoneans in comparison to the...

---

77 In this series we can now also include the report [mentioned] on page 138, which was separated from [those discussed in] section 10, but which concerned the past of the Herodians. The tradition provided there, which does not originate from Nicolaus, is essentially well-disposed towards the Herodians: Alexander’s appointment of Antipater I as governor of all Idumea proves this. A disapproving colouring, however, enters the context in that the main value of the obviously commendable service, which is later attributed to Antipater, namely winning the Arabians, Gazaites, and Ascalonites over to King Alexander’s cause, is eliminated by ascribing this success to alleged bribery of these tribes. So here as well the inherently favourable picture has become clouded by additions. Ultimately, there also seems to be no doubt to me in principle, that we may expect such particulars in the memoirs of the king. Their factual reliability is not to be dismissed lightly.
Herodians, yet he still blames the Hasmoneans for their [own] downfall; the intolerable dispute in their house has caused their collapse. This conflict was inflamed by Antipater, whom Josephus particularly hates for this reason; no less, however, has Antigonus forfeited all sympathy due to his raging against the Jews. Thus it happens that Josephus, as he was recording his Antiquities from a pious Jewish standpoint, evidently disapproved of the Herodians on account of their profane origin, but still showed no sympathy for the last scions from the Hasmonean house; because the greatness that their predecessors had achieved for the Jews has been trampled into the dust by these unworthy successors.

17. Final observations

The preceding investigations have led us, from two aspects, to new views of Josephus’ method of working. For one, we saw that Josephus used the War as the basis of the Antiquities, and for another, we established that when Josephus was working on the Antiquities he allowed himself to be led by definite political tendencies in such a way that he incorporated a new bias into the material that he had acquired. While the second finding lies completely beyond the hitherto customary mode of examining sources and therefore understandably could not be detected [before], it is another matter with the first result. Here a researcher as prudent as Destinon allowed himself to be swayed by one observation of the stock of facts to [make] the statement that Josephus did not have his presentation of the Jewish War before his eyes when composing the Antiquities; both reports were extracted independently of each other from the same sources (page 12), and Schürer (page 83, note 16) essentially follows this view. Admittedly, Niese (Historische Zeitschrift, New Series, vol. 40, 1896, page 218 ff.) and his student Drüner (Dissertation, Marburg, 1896, page 51 ff.) have rejected this assumption and came to the conviction that Josephus used the War as the basis for the Antiquities, however, – influenced by Destinon’s evidence – they made this correct idea worthless by adding “when Josephus [216] composed the later work he resorted, besides this, back to the same source that he had used as the basis for his presentation of the War”.

Now, Destinon’s evidence is based on a fallacy. What is actually worth discussion is quantitatively minuscule, and this in a text of about 40 pages! Of this diminutive amount, the greater part is textual criticism and therefore does not come into consideration for our
question. *Ant.* 457 reads ἐπὶ τὸν Πάππον correctly, where the parallel passage offers the corrupted ἐπὶ τὸ στρατόπεδον (*War* 334), directly following this the *War* reads περὶ τὴν παλομένην Κανᾶ κώμην, the correct name results from *Ant.* 457: περὶ κώμην Ἰσάνας καλομένην. In both cases there are obvious scribal corruptions in the *War.*

As deliberate reworkings by Josephus in the *Antiquities* we have already identified *Ant.* 14.277 compared with *War* 223 (cf. footnote, page 188), section 452 compared with *War* 329 (cf. page 206 f.f.). I detect the same process in *Ant.* 275 compared with *War* 221. The latter [text] relates that Cassius “has sold” the residents “of Gophna and Ammaus, and of two others among the number of smaller places” because the imposed war tax could not be paid. By contrast, the *Antiquities* says of the towns ἦσαν αἱ δυνατῶταται Γόφνα τε καὶ Ἀμμαοῦς, πρὸς ταύταις δὲ Λύδδα καὶ Θάμνα. This passage appears as one of the main proofs for the theory of the common source in Destinon (page 14 f.), and yet one grasps the contrivance [involved] quite clearly here; for there is no doubt that Lydda exceeded the other localities named by Josephus in importance; after all, he himself designates Lydda as κώμη πόλεως τὸ μέγεθος οὔκ ἀποδέουσα (*Ant.* 20.130), and that this place definitely exceeded Gophna and probably also Ammaus in importance and size is beyond doubt to anyone who examines the evidence in Schürer, vol. 2, page 230, note 32 ff. Gophna, Ammaus, Lydda, and Thamna are equally the capitals of four toparchies and also for that reason it is totally impossible that the common source of the *War* [217] and the *Antiquities*, which is presumed, would have named two of these capitals – and, for all that, certainly the lesser important ones – and remained silent about the others. In truth, Cassius sold Gophna and Ammaus and another two places of lesser importance, whose names were not mentioned precisely for that reason. In the *Antiquities* it seemed inappropriate to Josephus that two names were not mentioned while two others were given and therefore he added the two missing [names] from the list of toparchies; because *War* 3.55 afforded him precisely the material that was necessary for the addition. Here Gophna is followed by Acrabeta Θάμνα πρὸς ταύταις καὶ Λύδδα, Ἀμμαοῦς. Here we have the origin of the information; the group of words in boldface is transferred into *Ant.* 275 in the exact equivalent formulation. Therefore the researcher may abide exclusively by the material of the

---

This passage was damaged in the earliest codex [*Urkodex*] of the *War*. There are 28 letters between the two errors, and after 54 more letters there is another corruption; a proper amendment was probably made in between. Josephus’ στίχος included approximately 26
War here as well: however, it is interesting that there is still an after-effect of the differentiation of the War in the Antiquities as well: the singling out of two places as δυνατώταται only makes sense if they alone are named. The entire reason for this is lacking, however, when the entire series is included.

Ant. 83 may be similarly influenced by stylistic motives; the source – War 161 – lists as fortified places Ἀλεξάνδρειόν τε καὶ Ὑρκανίαν καὶ Μαχαιροῦντα πρὸς τοῖς Ἄραβίοις ὅρεσιν, whereas this last added phrase probably was to apply exclusively to Μαχαιροῦντα. The author, whom we encounter in the Antiquities [and] who has greater stylistic skill, senses the awkwardness of this structure, which he attempts to eliminate by appending geographic details to the other places as well. With Alexandrium he is easily successful; indeed he had recounted shortly before (section 49) that Alexandrium is located near Coreae; he has no such knowledge for Hyrcania so he deletes the place, and the new structure arises in the Antiquities: Ἀλεξάνδρειόν τε ὥχυρου τὸ πρὸς ταῖς Κορέαις ἔρυμα καὶ Μαχαιροῦντα πρὸς τοῖς Ἄραβίοις ὅρεσιν.

But over and above these particulars discussed here, the entire problem has indeed been placed upon a new foundation by means of the second result that we have acquired: Josephus is no mechanical copying machine, but a human being who has brought along his wants and his feelings into his narrative of the past. We shall not yet deal with the ultimate psychological reasons for these processes; in this context we are satisfied with having produced the evidence that the same shifts, which we have established among the administrative report - War - Life, are repeated right here between the War and the Antiquities. And they have been caused by the same process: around the year 95 Josephus faces the events differently than [he did] before the year 80, he has undergone a development that has brought him closer to the Jewish national outlook. Granted, Josephus did not manage to forge this new personal conviction of his into a coherent new structure; far from it. He calmly uses his old War, which held a totally different view, as a basis, and wherever he had no intention of letters.

79 The manuals [Handbücher] should be amended accordingly, because [their authors] have fallen for the seemingly more comprehensive yet truly less valuable text of the Antiquities. The broader conclusions of Schürer (vol. 2, page 234) also fall apart as a result. We shall never be able to determine what the two “smaller” places were, since Nicolaus remained silent about their names.
changing the content he copied it partly literally and partly such that a slight paraphrase was produced. This stylistic reworking did not remain consistent throughout, Josephus reworked the beginning of the book in a more intense manner stylistically speaking; later on he became noticeably depleted and copied more literally. And something similar happens to the contents.

Josephus retains the old framework from beginning to end but he incorporates a new trend into it. He presents the various pictures anew for this purpose, and in so doing he makes an honest effort to think these new pictures through consistently in the details; but the author is burdened by the model so that he cannot extricate himself from its pressure. So all these new formulations then still clearly betray their origin from a writing [based on] an opposite bias and as a result also form a counterpart to our War. Moreover, Josephus did not make the attempt to refurbish the entire old text from a uniform point of view; rather he was content to reformulate the individual pictures as such and to remove from each one that trait, which no longer seemed appropriate to him. The result is that the Antiquities is lacking all uniformity of execution, and that it is absolutely impossible [219] to characterize a personality on the basis of this work; the only thing that we can deduce from these reworkings is the political bias that Josephus wished to express in detail by the reworking, and it is indeed this, which interests us above all. But also with these factual reworkings the same thing happened to Josephus as did with the stylistic [reworkings]. His power began to weaken progressively; in the first part of the book Josephus is tirelessly at work impressing the new trend upon almost every sentence; later on he follows his model much more closely. Therefore, when our investigations, which were to identify the reworkings, gradually lose somewhat in extent, they still as a result provide an exact portrayal of what Josephus has accomplished. Evidently he fully sensed the formidable difficulties occasioned by the incorporation of a new trend into the old framework – he did, after all, constantly stumble in the process; therefore he contented himself at the end with showing his new view to its best advantage in a few outstanding points while he calmly transferred other [material straight] from his source. Thus his work was to be deprived of all balance.

This impression of imbalance is heightened by the fact that Josephus included even more insertions into his work during its composition; at present I am thinking less of the additional sources [Nebenquellen] (documents, Strabo, etc.), which should be dealt with collectively, than in fact of such segments in which Josephus once more brings his political
convictions to the fore with full insistence (cf. page 176, 198); because it is these passages that demonstrate more than ever how actively the new outlook continued to affect Josephus. But the author was not satisfied with this either; the manuscript of the War, which lay right before him on his writing table, was likewise supplemented by these new ideas; it is most notably the story of Herod that now undergoes the influence of the Antiquities in several passages (209; 211/12; 214/5). Josephus, who was planning a new reformulated edition of the War at that time (Ant. 20.267), therefore did the same here as in the segment War 2.602 - 208, which concerned him personally: with this he began to incorporate his new outlook into his older writing as well. So intensely did Josephus experience his new political conviction, [namely] that of the Jews with their national aspirations.

[220] Under all these circumstances, Josephus was surely quite glad upon completion of his 14th book when he could lay hold of a source that did not exhibit the [same] trend [that was] sympathetic to Herod, as the one that had been adopted in the War from Nicolaus. A quick glance showed long ago that the changeover from book 14 to book 15 is connected to a change in sources; because right at the beginning of the 15th book Josephus takes hold of a source as his own underlying basis, which has nothing to do with his War or with Nicolaus, and which features a much more objective standpoint in comparison to the one-sidedly favourable illumination of Herod by Nicolaus. Within the frame of our line of argument it is at any rate not insignificant that this change in sources coincides exactly with a changeover from one book to the next [Buchwechsel]; because here also it is apparent that no one other than Josephus himself effected the change. Herod’s biography, upon which Josephus based book 15 ff. while only occasionally including additions from the War, has not been preserved in its original [form] and therefore a comparison, like that made in book 14 in order to uncover Josephus’ method of working, cannot be readily extended to these parts. That the subjective element and Josephus’ personal activity are not to be underestimated here either is shown, for one, by the remodeling of the War in this biography of Herod, by the insertion of Jewish legends, which Josephus wove into the segments extracted from the biography of Herod just as [he did] into the parts extracted from the War, and finally, by the very personal comments about himself and his attitude to the Herodians as stated, for example, in 16.183 ff. Therefore in-depth investigation will probably be able to reveal the personal colouring of many factual reports by Josephus in books 15 and 16 as well, even if the source is not available. At any rate,
we are not in such a favourable position with Josephus who always amended only the details, as [we are] with Polybius, for example, where we can identify the preliminary stages in a completely different manner, thanks to the clarity and uniformity of his thinking.

With the death of Herod this source ran dry and Josephus thereupon resorted once again to his War, which he remodelled in a manner similar to the one we have demonstrated for book 14. We shall not address these matters in detail [221]; because numerous researchers have pointed out these shifts, although they wrongly assigned them to Josephus’ source. This mistake has been eliminated by us probably for good; it is no one other than Josephus who has introduced a new bias into the report of the War.

**Chapter VI. The documents in Josephus’ writings**

There are essentially two opinions about the provenance of the tremendously important documents in Josephus’ [writings]. Niese (*Hermes* 11, 1876, page 466 ff.) assumes that in the speech that Nicolaus of Damascus delivered before Agrippa, when [the king] stayed in Asia Minor, in favour of the Jews [living] there, prompted by their dispute with the various city communities (Josephus, *Ant.* 16.31 - 57), reference was also made to older Roman documents that were located in the Capitol (section 48); he [Niese] surmises from this that the documents disclosed by Josephus, which were likewise stored in the Capitol (14.266), had already been collected by Nicolaus and had been extracted from the latter’s work by Josephus. By contrast, Willrich (*Judaica*, 1900, page 40 ff.) would have the collection brought together by King Agrippa I when he spoke before Caligula in support of the Alexandrian Jews. Both opinions implicitly make the correct assumption that the documents were to serve apologetic purposes. No one stressed this more exactly and clearly than Josephus himself, especially [in] 16.174 - 178: his historical work will preferably fall into the hands of the Greeks; therefore he wishes to show by means of the documents how the Jews have been able to carry on their worship unmolested under the protection of the authorities. He mentions these matters more frequently in order to free foreign peoples of their preconceptions about the Jews etc. For this reason the very quoting of documents in Josephus’ [writings] is placed in the [same] category [as] the quotations from pagan authors. We have seen that Josephus supplemented the tradition of the
War by means of a variety of material, but never does he in any way cite a Jewish source by name, since it is completely irrelevant to the mind of the Greeks assessing his statements whether these stem from Josephus or from another Jew. [222] It is totally different, however, when he can quote a pagan author as key witness. For this reason [writers] such as Strabo, Nicolaus and Livius are mentioned by name, and of the way in which they would be invoked for these documents Josephus says in Ant 14.68, “[the fact] that this is no empty encomium of our piety, rather the pure truth, is attested by all the narrators of Pompey’s campaign, among whom Strabo, Nicolaus and Titus Livius are to be cited.” Therefore Josephus does not cite for the sake of some kind of historical - philological meticulousness, but rather because he requires pagan sources in order to attract the pagan readership upon whom he is counting, by means of these [sources].

When we have realized in this way that a passage such as 14.68, which gives a reason for citing Strabo, is identical to [a section like] 16.174, which justifies the insertion of documents, then it must be designated from the outset as mistaken to separate both groups of quotations by a sharp division. Rather, there is no doubt that the same man, who incorporated the pagan authors into his work for apologetic purposes, inserted the documents for precisely the same reason. Since Josephus did the former, therefore the latter also stems from him. In fact, only an incomprehensible prejudice could have Otto and Hölscher fail to recognize that in 16.174 ff. a personal confession has been offered by Josephus. In this regard, the earlier researchers such as Niese etc. have assessed matters much more correctly.

With the realization that only Josephus himself inserted the documents, nothing has been said about their origin of course; Josephus could either have come across these documents gathered within a work or [he could] have gathered these documents himself first. Considering the disdain with which Josephus’ personal work has been regarded, it almost goes without saying that the first path has been taken, and especially Niese’s way of thinking has met with great approval, because it commended itself by its uniformity to such an extant that Niese himself repressed his reservations, which had to have imposed themselves on him in the face of the fact that, among others, the documents in 16.162 ff. and 172 ff. are younger than the conflict that should have occasioned the gathering of these documents. And yet one cannot fail to appreciate that it is precisely by means of these [223] two documents, which are elements within an entire series, that Niese’s conjecture is disproved despite all the probability that may
in principle be inherent in it.

Niese’s opinion, however, is disproved no less by a second observation. The lengthy speech, which Josephus has Nicolaus of Damascus deliver before Agrippa in the interests of the Jews (16.31 - 57), as is well known, comes in its basic form from the historical work of Nicolaus, who felt the human need in this [work] to place his own character in a suitable light by emphasizing his achievements. In particular, however, there can be no doubt that the passage that concerns us from this speech (section 52 ff.) originates from Nicolaus’ historical work. Here he points Antipater’s meritorious deeds [Verdienste] out to Agrippa, [indicating that] when Caesar invaded Egypt [Antipater] had supported him by land and by sea. “Is it necessary to examine only now ... how many, and what kinds of gifts each single man has received, is it necessary to mention only now the letters that Caesar wrote to the Senate and to emphasize that Antipater received public honours and citizenship?” With these words reference is made to the outlook, as we encounter it in War 1.200, and it is established that this part as well comes from Nicolaus. Both findings thus happily complement each other and prove irrefutably that Nicolaus, as lies well within his nature, has emphasized the meritorious deeds [Verdienste] of Antipater and the honours that he received for them.

On the other hand, in the passage of Ant. 14.143, which corresponds to War 1.200, Josephus completely rejected this outlook, eliminated the mention of the documents in Antipater’s honour, and in his place he moved Hyrcanus into the foreground (cf. page 168). Both documents 14.145 ff., however, which likewise belong to the series of documents of Josephus, are very closely connected factually to this emphasis on Hyrcanus. They therefore stand in pronounced contrast to Nicolaus’ presentation and justify Josephus’ particular view instead of that of Nicolaus. Therefore Niese’s combination is based on a false premise and as a result it has been stripped of its seemingly inherent probative force according to this aspect.

And yet – [224] who could deny that the reference “to the decrees of the senate and to the documents in the Capitol”, as it is made in Ant. 16.48 within Nicolaus’ speech, is pronounced in regard to those documents, which Josephus mentions in his work as “such Senate decrees and Capitol documents”? Indeed, Niese was perfectly correct in this, only it follows from what we have now established that this reference to the documents within Nicolaus’ speech cannot be from the latter, rather they must be due to an expansion of Nicolaus’ material. Consequently, if we cast a glance at Nicolaus’ speech then it certainly can be determined immediately where
and how it was amplified by Josephus.

In section 50 Nicolaus switches over to proving that the Jews rightfully (δικαίως) enjoyed the marks of favour, in which they shared from the part of the Romans, and as evidence for this he mentions the character of those like Herod (-51) and Antipater (-53) with the conviction that this material will suffice to prove that the Jews were honoured “by virtue of their meritorious deeds [Verdienste]” and therefore should be able to count on a continuation of these tokens of favour (54). This proof, in which the supposed loyalty of the Jews towards the Romans naturally played a particular role, is definitely separated at the beginning of section 50 from the preceding segment in that the author plans as a new clause “however, so that we prove that we have received all this rightfully as well, etc.” In complete contradiction to this clear structure, however, section 48 already specifies exactly what is dealt with only [later] in section 50 ff.: the contention that the loyalty of the Jews towards the Romans was the reason that they were accorded preferences by these [Romans]; and with factually quite parallel form section 48 even reads: δῆλον ὡς μετὰ πεῖραν τῆς ἡμετέρας εἰς ύμᾶς πίστεως ἔδοθη, which is not reported in the correct place until section 51 with the words: ποία δὲ πίστις ἔστιν, which is not reported in the correct place until section 51 with the words: ποία δὲ πίστις ἔστιν. In just this same section 48, however, the reference to the senate resolutions and the documents in the Capitol is to be found; therefore the same must hold for this as for the untimely comment about the loyalty of the Jews: it is based on an insertion.

In reality, the line of thought of the text that was originally taken from Nicolaus can be easily [225] regained if we approach the text from another angle. At the beginning of [section] 47 the Jews express the urgent plea to Agrippa that they did not want to be prevented from keeping their laws, they did not want to be deprived of “what is theirs” and they request that they not be oppressed by the Greeks in those points in which they for their part do not oppress the Greeks: καὶ γὰρ – thus continues the author – οὐ δίκαια μόνον ἐστίν ἀλλὰ καὶ ὑμῶν δεδόμενα πρότερον. What is the subject here? Factually, something that the Romans have granted, and so the resolutions of the Romans are then also referred to in connection with this. But formally this is impossible; because everything from the preceding [text] that [can] be considered as subject is something that is peculiar to humans, completely independently of the Roman conquest: it is custom, religion, conventions; it is τὰ ὄντα, everything innate to us. Josephus himself leaves no room for doubt about this; because in section 49 he contrasts exactly those τὰ μὲν ὄντα, which the Romans came across everywhere and which they
“preserved” for people, to another [set of attributes] in comparison, which they “conferred” of their own accord. And it is only with this that the transition to the gifts of the Romans has been located. So it follows anew that something is reported in the problematic segment, which should come only later according to the plan, and it follows above all that by this premature insertion, an element is intended as subject in the phrase καὶ γὰρ οὐ δίκαια ... , which is not grammatically possible, since up to now there has been no mention of gifts from the Romans. Therefore the end of 47 and 48 is eliminated as an addition and then, in effect, we gain a clear train of thought: “Agrippa, we beg you for help, so that we are not prevented by the Greeks from observing our traditions, so that they leave us our customs and so that they do not oppress us in [ways] in which we do not oppress them; // for not only to us but to all people have you left their traditions, but you have added even greater benefits etc.” Therefore the reference to the decrees of the senate and the documents of the Capitol is an addition\(^80\) that Josephus has inserted into the report about [226] the speech, which was taken from Nicolaus – and this is what is significant within our context. Therefore if we established above that Josephus, directly in contrast to Nicolaus, inserted the documents for Hyrcanus, that he therefore cannot have [taken] them from Nicolaus, then this finding is now fully confirmed. Niese, for his part, quite impressively drew a connection between the passage Ant. 16.48 and the bundle of documents, however, we have now learned that Nicolaus is not the source for this, as Niese thought, but that Josephus himself has inserted this passage as opposed to Nicolaus. It is therefore Josephus, in reality, who placed the documents into his work; they have nothing to do with Nicolaus.

As is well known, Ritschl (Rheinisches Museum 28, page 599) was the first to point out the fact that the greater part of the documents in the text were inserted downright senselessly, they are for the most part not connected to the Antiquities in any way and they are without order and connection to each other; on the basis of an incorrect equation of names [the dating of] documents has been incorrectly assigned by centuries, etc., and what may be said in individual passages about the insertion of documents is nothing other than what can be educed from the documents themselves (Niese, loc. cit., page 473). Hence it follows for the nature of the source, from which Josephus has obtained the documents, that it cannot have

---

\(^80\) Another of Josephus’ additions to Nicolaus’ line of thought is in sections 43 - 44, as an examination of the contents and the surrounding [text will] prove.
been a *historical* work with documents; for in such a work, from which Josephus then would have extracted the documents, these would have been distributed throughout the historical narrative and naturally, if this source could also have made some error, then of course traces of the historical narrative should have been preserved in Josephus, who took such great pains to provide introductions to the documents. For this reason as well Nicolaus is completely ruled out, apart from [the fact that] it is generally debatable to what extent the literal reproduction of documents can be considered compatible with the style of Nicolaus’ historical works.

Josephus has thus found the documents purely as documents, and I now ask which work of literature could have included a collection of pure documents without any connecting text? There is absolutely nothing the like; an ancient book has a literary function, however this is never fulfilled by a disjointed accumulation [227] of documents. The only collection of documents from antiquity, about which we know something, Craterus’ ψηφισμάτων συναγωγῇ offers an extensive connecting text (cf. Krech, de Crateri ψηφισμάτων συναγωγῇ, *Dissertation*, Greifswald, 1888, page 6); and wherever documents have been produced for decisions of legal issues, just as their historical-judicial interpretation forms the main reason for their quotation so also [it forms] the main subject matter for examination – this is known by everyone who has acquainted himself with the resolution of unsettled disputes by means of inscriptions, and furthermore lies so much at the heart of the matter that it hardly requires specific evidence. As a result, however, the possibility of deriving Josephus’ knowledge from some sort of [legal] case records is also eliminated, and through this consideration Willrich’s conjecture is settled in the same way as has already occurred with that of Niese.

Josephus could find plain documents, without commentary, virtually only in archives, or obtain them from such places, and therefore there can be no doubt that he himself was actually the first basically to have produced the material, which was to provide his work with an incomparable importance for us; thus whatever Josephus pronounces about his documents, [i.e.] that he obtained them from the archives, is completely substantiated by the manner in which he deals with them. In the critical passages he explains that even the kings of Asia and Europe had acclaimed the Jews in documents but he feared that many [people] in their enmity towards the Jews would not trust such documents since they are not [to be found] everywhere
and are not erected in public places, but were preserved only among Jews and some barbarians. This discrepancy, however, is impossible for the documents of the Romans; for they are erected in the public places of the towns and are even engraved still now upon bronze tablets in the Capitol; when Julius Caesar granted Alexandrian citizenship to the Alexandrian Jews he even imparted this to them upon a bronze tablet. I shall construct my proof from this evidence (Ant. 14.186 - 188). After Josephus then reproduced the documents, he concludes the collection – completing the above line of thought [228] — by indicating that he has reproduced only a selection from the wealth of documentary material of the Capitol and the bronze inscriptions, since he is of the conviction that this suffices for a basic appreciation of Rome’s attitude towards the Jews (ibid. 265 ff.). According to Josephus’ explicit testimony the documents [in] 14.144 ff. were likewise to be found in the Capitol. Josephus lived in Rome during the years when he was composing the Antiquities; is there then anything more natural than that he obtained the documents there, which he believed he could exploit for his purposes? No one can doubt that the material was indeed available in the Capitol, not only because Josephus tells us this explicitly, but also because everyone could have easily found him guilty, should he have lied. And are we to assume here that he, who had for example scrutinized closely what Strabo recounted about the Jews, should have foregone [the opportunity] in Rome of examining this invaluable material in the Capitol? And if Josephus has handed down to us many documents in a mutilated condition [and] if he did not disclose others at all, then we may consider this to be the consequences of his difficulty in reading such documents.

Josephus probably sent for other material directly from the Jewish communities in the east; close connections did exist in the diaspora, and surely it was easy for Josephus to obtain these documents. In this point I therefore agree totally with Schürer, who (page 86, note) likewise considers Josephus [to be] the one who collected the documents. Perhaps some document or other may have become known to him from a literary source, but this changes nothing in the overall view: Josephus has obtained the documents themselves from the archives and inserted them into his work, in which it so happened that he stumbled almost constantly. Nevertheless, he was proud of his accomplishment, as is suggested by his repeated reference to this.

81 As an example I offer Inscription 5, Priene no. 37.
Certainly it is not the pride of a document researcher that animated Josephus by virtue of the fact that he could insert this important material into his work, rather [it is] the satisfaction of an apologist who invokes the pagans in order to prove the value of Judaism. And herein lies the [229] significance [that is] crucial for Josephus’ inner development. We remember that when Josephus was composing his War he was to all intents and purposes following along in the wake of Roman politics; the writing was basically a glorification of Rome’s unassailable position of power. Here in the Antiquities a personality who feels differently is speaking to us. The disapproval of the Herodians who were not pure Jews, the incorporation of Jewish legends, the insertion of the list of high priests, in short, the entire reworking, which we have demonstrated, in the spirit [that is in accordance with that] of Jewish circles reveals that Josephus has drawn nearer to nationalistic Judaism. And along this line one must logically include the exploitation of pagan writers and pagan documents; Josephus has acquired them in order to defend Judaism against all attacks on this basis. Therefore, in the Antiquities Josephus offers a historical apologia for Judaism, just as he was to compose a systematic defence of Judaism in the writing against Apion a few years later. When one considers that Josephus had placed himself absolutely in the service of Roman politics even during the great war, that he had composed his War a few years later for the sake of the emperors and Agrippa, then this break with this past of his is certainly a far-reaching one; every individual reworking has ultimately become evidence for this inner development.

But we could even establish that these precipitated still more consequences; not only did the Antiquities take on a new nationalistic Jewish colouring compared with the source provided in the War, but Josephus now again in reverse has transferred his new view of matters back to the War in the guise of additions. Therefore it was his intention to dissociate the War as well from his one-sided pro-Roman attitude and to endow it with a more nationalistic colouring. Under these circumstances, it is of quite extraordinary significance that Josephus expresses frankly at the end of Ant. 20.267 that he intended to offer a renewed portrayal of Jewish history during the war and afterwards. In view of the additions to the War based on the Antiquities, which we have demonstrated, we can argue with all certainty that Josephus was impelled to this intention of his, not by some development of new sources, rather [230] by the new view of matters that he had reached. The War, which had up to now been composed in the Roman spirit, was to be replaced by a nationalistic
Jewish reworking. And if we furthermore keep in mind his additional literary program as it was floating before the eyes of Josephus after the completion of his Antiquities, then we find here [that he intended to write] exclusively books, which concern Jewish beliefs, Jewish law, etc. (Ant. 20.268); this is the mental world [Gedankenwelt] in which the former betrayer of the Jewish people and the narrator of the Romans’ triumph over Jerusalem was now living! And since Josephus had consequently evolved into an apologist for Judaism, he gathered from pagan sources everything that he could make use of for this purpose; however, this would be in the first instance the documents, which were to prove what esteem the Jews enjoy everywhere.82

Chapter VII. A basic methodological question

The preceding and concluding chapters are intended primarily for those researchers who are concerned with Jewish-Hellenistic history and literature, and it is my belief and hope that I have been able to make new illustrative and source material [Anschauungs- und Quellenmaterial] available to them. But the path by which we arrived at these new insights lies a far stretch from the major highway, and when I knowingly trod upon it for the first time nearly ten years ago, guardians of scholarship imperiously ordered me to turn back. Under these circumstances I certainly consider it imperative that in this chapter[231] I not only address the limited circle of Jewish-Hellenistic researchers alone, but also enter into discussion about this with the historians and the classical philologists, as opposed to those for whom I believe I have found this new method of research. As a result, however, the other chapters of this writing acquire their relevance [extending] beyond the circle of Josephus researchers,

82 The question of when Josephus incorporated the documents into the Antiquities is to be touched upon only briefly. It has already been recognized long ago that they could be easily disassociated from their surrounding [text] and we have already learned, moreover, that Josephus actually did insert supplements into his completed Antiquities until after the year 100. The possibility that Josephus obtained the documents later exists without a doubt; on the other hand, Josephus has expanded his source by the insertion of documents, which would even explain why the text falls apart. For the time being I see no way of deciding this issue; within the frame of Josephus’ mental development, however, the documents do belong absolutely to the era in which the Antiquities originated.
they provide the material from which I endeavour to prove the correctness of my mode of
examination [Betrachtungsart]. Indeed, I shall go another step farther. The detailed discussions
about the “Dabaritta affair” (pages 57 to 79), for example, or about “John of Gischala in
Tiberias” (pages 79 to 90) etc. are justified far less by their subject matter, which may seem
fairly insignificant even to specialists, than by the treatment that we accorded them. And
therefore I might request that even the researchers, who are very far removed from the
subject matter per se, form an impression of my mode of examination [Betrachtungsart] from
the treatment of this [subject matter].

In comparison with any kind of dogmatic prejudice it must be stressed that the manner
and method according to which we are to examine a text may be gained only from the text
itself, and there is only one presupposition that we must make, [namely] that the author of a
text is a rational being similar to us ourselves. Without this psychological presupposition any
engagement with a text would certainly be an impossibility; however, no one will doubt, nor
has anyone doubted that this presupposition in truth is rightly constituted: whenever only
language or logic seemed violated, then either the tradition was deemed faulty and amended
according to the context, or an interpolation has been assumed or other interventions applied,
which were to refashion the text in such a way that a rational being is speaking to us. Without
a doubt, this practice is fully justified in countless cases, however, it is just as certain that these
minor methods specified here are not capable of refashioning the text to one that is reasonable
in all cases. I still remember from my student years how no work has exercised such a lasting
influence on me in this aspect as F. W. Ullrich’s Beiträge zur Erklärung des Thukydidès. It endowed
me with the understanding [232] that it is not done with the external methods of textual
criticism, rather a genuine understanding of literary texts is made possible only when we bear
in mind their author’s conditions of life and creativity. A first-class scholarly feat is
represented by Ullrich’s evidence, which has not yet been refuted up to now, that in some
passages of Thucydides [the phrase] ὡδε ὁ πόλεμος refers to the Archidamian War, whereas
elsewhere it signifies the entire Peloponnesian War, and by the realization gained from this
[evidence, namely] that Thucydides continued to evolve in his views about the nature and
duration of the war he was describing. It very well continued to have an effect in Thucydidean
research, but on the other hand it has not been brought to fruition in the manner that it
should perforce have been.
Who in fact can deny that what Ullrich has extracted by means of painstaking interpretation is a phenomenon that should actually have imposed itself upon us a priori? As a man in the prime of life, Thucydides, experiences the horrific struggle of his hometown, he experiences victories and defeats with it, his relationship to Athens is shifted by his own exile – and are we actually to assume here that he would have continued to drag his conception of the course of events, which he had entertained during his first recording just at the beginning of the war, impassively and callously right through to the end? The Thucydidean text can be understood only from the internal disintegration of the old recordings by means of the new perceptions that Thucydides had gained. The question of what is perhaps to be ascribed to the ineptitude of an anonymous [hand] in the editing of the text seems to me to lose some of its significance in view of this.

Polybius experienced a fate similar to that of Thucydides. In the year 167 he was deported as a hostage to Rome where he entered into very close contact with Roman nobility and under its influence he became an admirer of the powerful empire, whose glory he immediately decided to proclaim. Large portions of the work have survived to our day, which were recognized to have been recorded before the beginning of the war against Carthage, i.e. before 150. A few years later, as the world looks on, Polybius experiences the devastation of his homeland by the Romans. And once again – is it not in principle perfectly self-evident for every sensitive human being that Polybius became a different [person] under the effect of such events, of which I single out only the most important? And furthermore, since he became another [person], that he also arrived at another conception of the historical events and powers? In the year 1912, when I was summarizing the individual interpretations of my “Polybius” into a concluding chapter based on this point of view, I truly did not suspect, then, that a few years later the formidable World War was to display the correctness and the psychological truth of my Polybius analysis to me within my [own] character, and I ask everyone who bears a sensitive heart within, I even ask Eduard Meyer himself, who in the year 1913 even heaped scorn and ridicule upon me because I was of the opinion that Polybius was not born as the pragmatist whom we now encounter [him to be], but rather that [Polybius] has managed to come to his serene history only by dint of a long life replete with changes and impressions; I ask Eduard Meyer if he really emerged from this World War devoid of any impressions for his historical conception?
Certainly we are not all influenced in the same way by the same events; moreover, certain fundamentals are idiosyncratic to us by nature and they are also brought to bear under the most stupendous impressions of the outside world in such a way that they sometimes become fully evolved only by means of these effects. If it is correct, however, that a person is a product of his ancestry and his environment, then it follows necessarily that by means of an alteration of this environment the person becomes another, and all the more so indeed the more strongly the environment is altered. And since historical conception is contingent upon the subject who perceives, as is well known, so a historical conception must change as well along with a change in the feelings of a person, of course not in areas that are inwardly foreign and immaterial to us – nor does this bear upon historical issues at all here, rather upon antiquarian ones – but in cases where we indeed excite a historical impression within ourselves, where we philosophize historically. Voltaire, who had at first seen his ideal in Louis XIV, worked new biases into his second edition of *Le siècle* \[234\] *de Louis XIV*, not because new sources became available to him, but rather because he developed a more sceptical view of Louis XIV on account of his antireligious sentiments that had increased in the meantime. Whoever considers history to be not a collection of antiquarian details, but rather life and present time, knows that history must be dependent upon the changing attitudes of its narrators.83

Although [scholars were] further removed from such ideas earlier, I certainly no longer fear any disagreement on this point today from researchers who are to be taken seriously; on the other hand philological criticism has raised the objection that it would not be possible to extract, from a single extant text, an inner development such as the one that I have [attained from my] reading of Polybius. I have replied to these objections in detail in an exhaustive treatment of Polybius' tenth book, which appeared in *Hermes*, and I would like to refer to this essay herewith. Methodologically [speaking], however, it is of enormous satisfaction to me, in fact, that we have been able to prove categorically the

83 I am speaking here only about serious characters, and not intending, for example, those completely unrelated monotonies of Burnet who changed his historical narrative from one edition to the next according to the constellation of the moment (Ranke, *Analecten zur englischen Geschichte*, page 291 ff.), or of Johannes von Müller, who skipped over the legend of Gessler's hat in his first adaptation of Swiss history, but later included it in consideration for the public. Fueter, *Geschichte der neueren Historiographie*, page 406.
correctness of my analysis of Polybius by means of [my investigations of] Josephus on the basis of two parallel texts. That is to say, by this fact the foregoing investigation becomes a decisive reinforcement to everything that I have presented in my Polybius.

As a start, the comparison between the War and the Life permitted the realization that even the things experienced by Josephus himself had been presented by him in a varying manner and in such a way, in fact, that the basis of the experiences was left, however, this basis was trimmed and embellished in various different ways. It was possible to demonstrate precisely and in complete detail that Josephus was not in the slightest provided with new factual knowledge, rather he merely shed a new light upon the existing material, which he retained linguistically as well [235], however, as a result he still caused the events as such to appear differently. This objective fact described here can simply not be explained by the previous methods of source criticism: both texts are dependent upon each other – and yet they are not; there has been no influx of new sources – and yet the illumination is different. The solution to this problem is provided only in that Josephus himself did indeed retain the narrative, however he wished to endow it with a different colouring, i.e. Josephus' objective has changed over the years. One would almost be inclined to shrink from introducing this insight as a methodological innovation to historical scholarship, which has after all recognized and described the intellectual and political development of leading personalities in numerous cases – and yet precisely what one has been accustomed to consider as something almost natural otherwise, has been eliminated among historians from the outset. How significant it is, indeed, that Eduard Meyer accused me of making Polybius out to be a falsifier because I expected of him that in later years he would have provided a new presentation of events that he had previously reported differently. The reason for this immense misunderstanding is given in [the fact] that the so-called objectivity of history has been valued far too greatly and this in turn lies [in the fact] that history has been confused with antiquarian details [Antiquaria], whereas in truth the latter simply provides the material for the former. A historical researcher is not someone who establishes facts, but someone who brings past life into his [own] living awareness, and for this reason we cannot at all be too exhaustively acquainted with a historian upon whom we come to depend as a source.

But I believe that yet another reason – half unconscious – deters researchers from
appreciating the inner development of historians and, along with this, the possibility of a varying presentation of the events by one and the same person: it is the realization that indeed an element of uncertainty is hereby introduced into that source criticism, which wishes to draw conclusions about the books used from extant works. Let us take for example the [hypothetical] case that Josephus’ War were lost to us, but had been [236] rewritten by some other extant anonymous author. Up to now, one would categorically resist ascribing this anonymous author’s view to Josephus since one glance at the Life would seem to display the impossibility of such a supposition; and yet the fact would rightly exist. I do not deny that apparently definite results of source criticism could be overthrown by our findings, and that on the other hand unexpected new possibilities may open – I think of Appian, for example. The historian – regarded as a source too – has lost the rigidity that has been [considered] inherent [to his profession] up to now; he must not [necessarily], but may have had different views of matters at different points in time.

But this does not hold only for the individual historian, it holds for each individual work of history – and this is the second finding, which is even more momentous. In precisely those three works by Josephus, which we have dealt with in greater depth, we have determined that it is only through reworking that they have assumed the form in which they appear in our manuscripts. The self-portrayal came into existence only later on the basis of a text that had lain in Josephus’ writing desk for decades and then had even undergone a first expansion at that point when the War was being constructed based upon it. This result is immutably established and no torrent of phrases will be able to assert itself against such a discovery, which has been drawn from serious source criticism. Research will perhaps also settle for this more easily; [nobody] will wish to challenge [the concept of] reworkings of older manuscripts for new purposes and functions, and indeed [the case] here is actually that the Life as such is a uniform new book, which has simply taken over an extensive old manuscript and enriched it with a beginning and a conclusion as well as some additions in the middle. Nevertheless, this case can already make us aware of a phenomenon, which is somewhat remarkable to us even by itself, and which will gain in importance more than ever later on: Josephus adhered to his old manuscript downright slavishly when he was formulating the Life. A writer, who nowadays wished to address the same subject matter after thirty years, but from a different point of view, would probably take out his old draft too, but he would still adapt it
to his new [237] views in such a way that a source critic [Quellenkritiker] would perhaps suspect that an old draft was remodelled here but it would be virtually impossible to identify exactly the junctures where old meets new in almost all cases. A self-contained whole would thus be produced; but Josephus does not pursue this objective; had he intended to create a new work, then he could have done something similar in the Life as he actually did in the War, where he faced his old text with such freedom that a new one arose. So in the Life Josephus intended only to republish the text of the old administrative report therefore he furnished it with additions, whereas the War represents a new work, which was based upon the administrative report as [its] source.

To be sure, this procedure adopted by Josephus in his Life hardly has any analogy in modern literary practice; analogies are found more frequently in antiquity and this is what matters to us above all. As is well known, Xenophon used the materials of his Hellenica in order to compose a panegyric of Agesilaus, which for long stretches is nothing more than a literal borrowing from the Hellenica. To be sure, Xenophon’s political viewpoint remained the same, yet stylistically the Agesilaus falls apart since the introduction is formed in a far more rhetorical manner than the narrative, which was copied verbatim from the Hellenica. If someone were to demand that I answer the question why Josephus depends on his administrative report to such a slavish degree in his Life that he transfers it verbatim and only provides it with a new introduction and conclusion and supplements the middle respectively, then I would counter with the question, why then did Xenophon do the same thing?

We owe an equally apposite parallel to Demosthenes. A few months after he had delivered his speech “On the Chersonese”, this Attic orator and pamphleteer did not shrink from replicating the second part of the Chersonese speech in his 4th Philippic verbatim and furnishing it only with a new introduction and some additions here and there. There can be no doubt here either that what was actually occupying Demosthenes during the publication of 4 Philippic was [contained in] the substance of the added segments, i.e. above all, his attitude towards the theorika. Nevertheless, he [238] retained the old text of the Chersonese speech, which had been delivered under other circumstances, and the consequence is that 4 Philippic has acquired an unclear structure, which has also been fully grasped in its peculiarity by A. Körte, to whom
we owe an excellent treatment of the speech (*Rheinisches Museum* 55, 1905, 388 ff.).\textsuperscript{84} Xenophon und Demosthenes may be sufficient in order to clarify that phenomenon in its literary peculiarity, which we encountered in relationship to the administrative report and the *Life*: the old manuscript is taken out, used word for word as the basis and furnished with only a few additions; however it is these additions which actually matter to the authors.

If one is entitled to speak of a type of new edition of a text already in such cases, then this expression is definitely appropriate when we cast a glance at the third methodologically important phenomenon, namely the additions to the *Antiquities* and to the *War*. To a certain extent, these represent the methodological intermediate stage between the phenomenon considered up to now and the circumstances we encountered in the *War*: After the year 100 the *Antiquities* was stripped of its old conclusion and, in place of this, [it] acquired a transition segment, which had the function of leading over to the *Life*, which at that time was generated as a whole in order to form the conclusion to the *Antiquities*. The difference with respect to the new editions considered up to now is therefore first [of all] only a quantitative one in that the newly appearing [substance] almost disappears in comparison to the mass of retained material; as a result, however, the essence of the matter is also shifted: Xenophon created the *Agesilaus* out of the *Hellenica*, from his Chersonese speech Demosthenes created the *4 Philippic*, which was quite different, and Josephus [created] the *Life* out of his administrative report – but the *Antiquities* still remains the *Antiquities* even now. In those works a new [writing] arose from the use of old manuscripts, here the old is developed further through additions; the former could be designated as a *verbatim* use of earlier preliminary work, and the latter as a new edition of a [239] work that had already been completed earlier. Josephus, however, reformulated his *Antiquities* not only by means of the subsequent incorporation of the *Life*, as demonstrated in chapter I, after it had already been published years previously; demonstrably later additions based on new sources have been included (page 45 ff.) as well in a few passages in the midst of the narrative, while for other sections such as the documents, for example, we were compelled to leave [the question] open whether they originated at the same time as their surrounding

\textsuperscript{84} Both the *Agesilaus* and Demosthenes’ *4th Philippic* have been declared inauthentic. I mention this only briefly since no one will likely wish to embrace such an opinion any longer today. The athetesis, however, does indeed prove how alien this phenomenon of ancient literature discussed above strikes us [to be], although L. M. Hartmann recently did something similar in his Roman history.
It is in the *War*, however, that we most clearly encounter this last-mentioned phenomenon of a subsequent expansion of a text in the midst of the narrative and without any influence on the general structure of the work. We have proven on page 68 ff., particularly 76 ff. that in *War* 2.602 - 608 there is an addition, which dates from the time when Josephus, animated by hostility towards Agrippa, composed the *Antiquities* and quite independently from this we have discovered that the story of Herod’s trial (*War* 1.209 ff.) was affected by expansions, which were created on the basis of the *Antiquities*, *i.e.* dating likewise from the time around 93/94 (cf. page 177 ff. and 185 ff.). If one bears in mind that right when Josephus was composing his *Antiquities* on the basis of the *War* with the reinterpretations that we demonstrated in chapter V, he had his copy of the *War* lying before him, then there is no doubt that he inserted amendments into it in order to lend expression to his new trend in these additions. And, as if to make our chain of evidence irrefutable, so to speak, Josephus tells us himself in the year 93/94 that he plans to provide a renewed presentation of the *War* and of the [period of] time following it (*Ant.* 20.267). A renewed treatment of the *War*, however, signifies nothing more to Josephus than taking out the old manuscript and enriching it with additions. We were able to demonstrate conclusively two of these additions intended by Josephus, *they are the traces of the renewed treatment embarked upon by Josephus, for which I have no other expression than that of νέα ἔκδοσις; in German, “of the second edition”.*

I am very well aware that I am stepping into a hornets’ nest with such an assertion. Yet I admit that I am refreshed by this, and certainly happier than ever about the principle implemented in my *Polybius*: we explain the contradictions within the individual works by the gradual evolution of the texts, and no one other than Josephus [in person] corroborates this for us with his own words that he himself intended to republish his old work. It is obvious that he did this in order to voice his new view of the historical events. As we have repeatedly stressed, from the friend and admirer of Rome whom we encounter in the *War* he became a man who is proudly conscious of his Judaism and wishes to provide a historical apologia for it: the *War* was to be published anew from this standpoint; the additions demonstrate a view [that is oriented] more [towards] nationalistic Judaism in comparison to the [original] basis, and yet they represent only the beginning of the work that Josephus later
abandoned (cf. pages 33 ff. and 270 ff.).

It is a pure coincidence that the inner development of Polybius displays a certain parallel to this but it is no coincidence that the literary issue appears in both authors in a similar way. It follows from our evidence that we do not possess the *Antiquities* as it was completed and disseminated [in] 93/94 and that we do not have the *War* in the form in which it was recorded between the years 75 and 79; and it goes without saying that we do not possess the administrative report, which we actually had to recover first, in its original version; rather, after all three of these works had been published\(^85\) Josephus continued to work on them, to reformulate and expand them, and we have received the stock of Josephus’ writings [*Schriftenbestand*] in that form to which they had been ultimately brought by the author. We do not possess some subsequent collection of works published by Josephus, rather we possess the transcripts of those copies which had been lying upon Josephus’ writing table until after the year 100 CE, so probably until his death.

\[241\] Here appears now once again a peculiarity of the publishing technique of antiquity; as a start the author probably brings his work to a certain conclusion, but since the edition does not represent a one-time fixed entity as [it does] by our printing [technique], the author was intent on keeping his work up to date in order to be able to make it available for transcription at any time. One must but clearly imagine the case of what [would have] happened if around 95 CE some person requested a copy of the *War* from Josephus. In such a case we would only be able to refer [this person] to the printing [Druck] from the 70s, but Josephus had continued to evolve and in the year 95 [would] offer his client a different version. The rigidity, which we connect with the concept of “book”, is largely absent in ancient historiographic literature. How does it actually happen to be then, that most of the greatest ancient historians only wrote a single work? It is not that they exhausted themselves in the process [and stopped writing], but rather they have incorporated their entire later development into the one work and therefore have constantly reshaped this [work].

This development is influenced partly by inner processes, external politics etc. and partly by the influx of new sources. When Eduard Meyer talked himself into [believing] that

\[^{85}\] Josephus attests to the earlier publication of the *War* (*e.g.* *Life* 361; *Contra Apionem* 1.50), since he gave the writing to Vespasian to read; the [earlier publication] of the *Antiquities* follows from its old conclusion 20.267 - 268. The administrative report was of course to be remitted to
Polybius had half a library resting on his writing table before himself while he was recounting Hannibal’s War, then this is fundamentally wrong; at first he probably always based the individual parts on one source alone, however, new sources and new insights likely continued to pour in for him afterwards. His work, no less than that of Josephus, did not arise by means of a simultaneous interspersion of various sources, but rather by means of taking one source as a basis and subsequently inserting new sources and a new view, respectively. And if today I have outgrown my Polybius in one respect, then this did not happen in the direction that my critics were hoping, rather I have, to the contrary, perhaps not considered the origination of the text with sufficient fluidity there. Our task is therefore not systematic [analysis] but historical stratification [Zergliederung] of the texts and the path to this, wherever external aids [can] not intervene, is the internal analysis of the text starting from the sole [242] premise that the writer was a rational being.

Due to the condition and manner of ancient tradition such external aids must necessarily be lacking; in this respect medieval source criticism is in a much more favourable [position] since it has at its disposal manuscripts, which stand directly in contact with the authors. Therefore from here one could expect a clarification of the problem that is occupying us, and this hope was not to be deceived. My colleague Vigener most kindly showed me the world chronicle by Ekkehard of Aura, the various versions of which provide such an astonishing exemplification of what I maintain in my Polybius and Josephus that I [shall] briefly assemble the main facts in the conviction that everyone who is engaged in historical works and their origination can draw the greatest benefit from this.

When in the year 1106 Ekkehard of Aura decided to compose a world chronicle up to that year, he based it upon the Chronicle by Frutolf of Michelsberg (Breslau, Neues Archiv 21, page 197), [which was] written in a spirit [that was] absolutely loyal to the emperor. This Chronicle had continued up to the year 1101, yet Ekkehard adopted his source only up to the year 1099, and enriched it with a supplement encompassing the years 1099 - 1106. In contrast to Frutolf, Ekkehard took the side of Henry IV’s sons and the papacy. He lent distinct expression to this attitude of his in the supplement that he created, whereas in the parts that were dependent on Frutolf he subscribed to [Frutolf’s] political view and changed these [parts] only in a few points (cf. Karl Gold, Dissertation, Greifswald, 1916, page 41). Thus it could happen

the authorities in Jerusalem.
that within the same work the statement: *Chuonradus filius imperatoris — patri rebellare infamatur* (under the year 1093) can be found in the part adopted from Frutolf, while within Ekkehard’s own creation [the text] reads about this same man: *vir per omnia catholicus et apostolicae sedi subjectissimus* (under the year 1099). Here we remind ourselves of the fact that in Josephus’ *Antiquities* under similar conditions a varying evaluation of Herod was expressed: one was extracted from the source, the other reflected Josephus’ true opinion.

[243] Ekkehard did not stop with this work that is so internally contradictory, which exists in a manuscript in Jena and was designated by Waitz as version B. When the rulership of Henry V had been secured, [Ekkehard] reworked the history once again with the obvious intention of completely excusing Henry V’s action against his father; this is why the image of the old emperor is now painted with the darkest of colours, since an inner justification seemed possible only in this way. The old stock of facts is thoroughly corrected in a methodical way to such an extent that the opposite picture of Henry IV now emerges. We remember how Josephus methodically reworked his old administrative report for the *War*, and the *War* for the *Antiquities* and we sense the complete parallel. But it goes even further; that is to say, in the meantime the *Chronicon* of Sigebert of Gembloux appeared and Ekkehard took advantage of it by interweaving information from it into his [own] work. Thus the additional sources [*Nebenquellen*] grow into the work in a secondary manner just as we inevitably determined for Polybius and Josephus. This book of Ekkehard, which has been reworked to such an extent, exists before us in three versions that differ from each other (C, D, E). C is destined for Henry V and was presented to him with an effusive dedication at the earliest [in] 1114; in the meantime Henry V had followed in the footsteps of his father’s politics and for this reason it was absolutely impossible to vilify this father to the son, who had become similar to him, in the same manner as had occurred in version B. The history for the years 1105 and 1106 is therefore formulated afresh, aspiring to a generally calmer tone with respect to Henry IV. – We remember how Josephus formulated the *War* for Agrippa.

Versions D and E begin with a prologue bearing a similar attitude towards Henry V, Ekkehard gazes upon the emperor, filled with inner devotion; however, the attitude in Germany sharpens progressively against him; Ekkehard now again revises the old parts and supplements his historical work by degrees up to [the year] 1125. When he arrived at that point he had become an outright opponent to Henry V, who was attacked most fiercely with
vicious words. Thus the same versions, which begin with an [244] eloquently praise of Henry V, conclude with an epilogue execrating the emperor.

It cannot be denied that in Ekkehard’s writings just as many political views can be detected as there are versions of his work. In this case they are arguably determined more by the change in Henry V’s political attitude than by a transformation in Ekkehard who supported the papacy and for this reason was compelled to change his attitude towards Henry V (cf. Gold in the dissertation mentioned on page 242). But this distinction has no bearing on the problem with which we are occupied; rather this meets with its perfect parallel in the various phases of the formulation of Ekkehard’s work: Henry IV is judged favourably in the parts adopted from Frutolf, in version B he is attacked severely, in C there is again a milder perception; Henry V is celebrated as the agent of a new era in B and C, and the first parts of D and E, at the end he is accursed. Do such facts not remind us of the evolution of someone like Josephus who in the *War* tweaked history for Agrippa and Titus, who in the *Antiquities* held himself at great distance from them, only to invoke them again after all as his witnesses after the year 100? Is it not again something similar if Polybius was devoted to the Romans up to 150, if he experienced the personal catastrophe in 146 from which he was ultimately saved by Stoic philosophy and pragmatism?

Ekkehard’s manuscripts can teach us even more. We have many versions of the work, to be sure, but certainly not all; behind versions D and E there must be another, which did not include the conclusion that stood in opposition to the prologue (Wattenbach, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter bis zur Mitte des dreizehnten Jahrhunderts*, vol. 2, page 193). But ultimately both these versions contain traces of the entire preceding development, which we are able to detect externally due to the preservation of the other manuscripts. Now, imagine if version A of Frutolf and versions B and C of Ekkehard were not preserved, and only D and E existed, then we have the parallel to the ancient texts of [authors like] Josephus and Polybius. Just as the traces of Ekkehard’s entire development are still available now in D and E, so also the history of [their] works can be [attained] from a reading of the text of Polybius and Josephus. The text of Polybius and [245] Josephus resembles versions D and E; by means of criticism we step beyond them to the older versions; Frutolf’s A and Ekkehard’s B and C demonstrate that our analyses of Polybius and Josephus are fundamentally valid and therefore necessary.
At any rate, with Josephus we have the advantage that we have still received two parallel versions externally as well; on the other hand, as a thinker and a human being he is on an inferior level and was not able to work more on a grander scale. Precisely this is the advantage with Polybius. With him we may lay each word upon the scale and in this way he makes up for the disadvantage that we have acquired only one version directly from him. Considered externally, the analysis of Josephus is easier, internally [the easier] is that of Polybius. The former springs more [easily] to the eye, the latter takes root all the more deeply the more one contemplates this profound and noble man. Therefore the analysis of Josephus did not move me personally in the [same] way as [did] that of Polybius; its value lies mainly in the verification of the methodological correctness of my new mode of examination [Betrachtungsart]: I do not [come to] understand texts systematically, but rather [by departing from] the [hi]story of the author; or conversely: texts must supply material to us in order to construct the inner biography of the writer.

Chapter VIII. The course of Josephus’ career

Whoever examines the available literature about Josephus in works of reference and textbooks will detect that the positive details of the author about himself preserved in his works are used exclusively as a basis for his biography. Some [details] from this material may in fact be consulted without objection; so, for example, there is not the slightest reason to call into any doubt the date of birth that he has disclosed (37/38 CE). But in other points greater restraint would certainly be called for; we [need] only consider his Autobiography, which is particularly heavily consulted by nature, but about which we were compelled to prove that within it exists an old nucleus [that has undergone] considerable reworking, such that directly false details could be identified in fairly large quantity. Can we have confidence in such a source, [246] in such an author, where we cannot directly prove the error or the falsification with our resources? I refer to only one point. We have seen that Josephus, [in response] to the attacks of Justus of Tiberias, endeavours to prove his suitability as historian by virtue of [the fact] that he stands entirely within the living tradition of Judaism and therefore has nothing in common with the chatter of the Greeks who strive to outdo the truth by means of elegant
speech (chapter II.1). Indeed, the *Life* serves this purpose exclusively (*Ant.* 20.263 ff.), and when it is therefore introduced by a presentation of Josephus’ ancestry and the course of his education in the various Jewish schools, among which he ultimately joined the Pharisees (*Life* 1 - 12), then this entire material is provided only in order to be able to save his own work from Justus by virtue [of the fact] that Josephus is proven to be the preserver of Jewish tradition in comparison to the Hellenizing Justus. So a very obvious bias is inherent in this information, and wherever Josephus has a bias he is in the habit of not dealing very precisely with the truth. One will not be able to detect easily the details of how far truth and fiction have been intermingled in *Life* 1 - 12; however, one should indeed be aware that despite the apparently superb testimonial [value] of just this material, which is indiscriminately taken as a basis [by those who] faithfully retell everything [according to] Josephus, it is absolutely the most unsound and unreliable.

Compared to such unsound evidence and compared to the biographic essays based upon it, I believe that by the explanations in this book I have demonstrated that a totally different material can be provided, admittedly only indirectly, yet still with a more compelling line of argument. During the various periods of his life Josephus presented the things that he experienced as well as the earlier history of the Jews and Romans in a totally varying fashion, not on the basis of any new sources but rather because he himself had gained a different view of things. *Josephus’ inner development is truly reflected in these different views and so from the different [247] conceptions of things we obtain the material with which we can embark upon a genuine portrayal of Josephus’ life.*

Admittedly, we may not contribute anything about Josephus’ youth in this manner for we can trace the impressions that he acquired about the outside world only from [the point] where his literary activity began. Then, however, the material flows in rich abundance and even if this first attempt still remains incomplete, it is yet to be hoped that further research, which will adopt these paths, will be able to bridge the gaps.

In Jerusalem Josephus held a prestigious position when his political career began in the 26th year of his life: in the year 64 he was sent to Rome on a diplomatic mission and he undoubtedly fulfilled his mission to the satisfaction of those who had commissioned him; for he had barely returned to Jerusalem when a new and particularly important responsibility was entrusted to him. In Galilee the armed masses had evolved into a great danger for the
authority of the government in Jerusalem; these [masses] combined people who were borne by an intense Jewish nationalism and others for whom the unrest was merely a welcome excuse for sweeping through regions [while] plundering and looting. Today’s widespread term “national Bolshevism” would perhaps best characterize the nature of these people in whom Josephus, just like those who had commissioned him, could see nothing other than “robbers” at that time. The government in Jerusalem could not permit these masses to remain active; the intense national opposition of the robbers to all things Roman threatened to bring the Jews into a permanent conflict with Rome, just as the robbers had, in fact, already repeatedly become the cause for the Romans to intervene with armed force whereby the moderates and above all the government in Jerusalem suffered as well. The population of Galilee had to be protected no less, and finally the government could not tolerate it that armed bands were active in the land where the government itself did not have an army at its disposal; it could be abolished at any moment by these robbers. This situation prompted the government in Jerusalem to send Josephus to Galilee with [248] two other priests, so that they [would] convince the robbers to lay down their arms (cf. page 103 ff.).

The legation of the three priests reached Galilee safely and attempted to act in accordance with the mandate of the government in Jerusalem. They view the robbers as the enemy and take the position that one must stand up for the Romans in the battle against the robbers; a common interest united the Jewish government and the Roman state. It was all the more understandable, however, that the robbers did not consider voluntarily laying down their arms, therewith renouncing the means to power over which they alone had control; under such circumstances Josephus’ two colleagues returned to Jerusalem, but Josephus, whose unscrupulousness we first detect here, does not join them. He had called on John of Gischala during his travels with the legation (Life 70 ff.) and had seen in him what position an energetic leader could bring himself to once he abandoned the paths of legality; he was tickled by a similar craving for power and it was simply a matter of finding an appropriate way of seizing hold of the power.

Josephus was not shy. Wherever such bands of robbers were active, they were willing to negotiate through money, and the money could be raised if the Galileans were promised protection from the robbers in exchange. So the Galilees paid the fees to the robbers, who thereupon, for their part, entered into dependence on Josephus and placed themselves at his
disposal for these fees paid by the Galileans. In so doing Josephus was clever enough to oblige
the robbers at the same time to refrain from any attack on the Romans (Life 78). Thus the one
substantial concern of the government in Jerusalem was eliminated and also the second fear
was silenced, at least for the time being: granted, the robbers were not disarmed but Josephus
still could report to the government that he kept them firmly in hand. It was therefore more [a
matter of] posing the question of what trust could the government place in their envoy; if he
was playing an honest game then there was no more threat of danger from the robbers for the
time being; but Josephus did not have in mind that he wished to become a puppet in the hands
of the government; he was tantalized by the [249] craving for power and he knew that
Jerusalem could afford him no resistance (cf. page 109 ff.).

Fear of the robbers secured him dominance in Galilee; as soon as he did not pay over
the fees, the bands would invade Galilee, and it was known what this signified. So the Galileans
then followed Josephus’ leadership apparently willingly, happy to be released from their
misery (page 111 ff.) and Josephus meets with opposition only from a few characters who feel
threatened in their own status by Josephus. In the first instance it is John of Gischala who calls
for battle against the tyrant, but the inhabitants of the localities where he spreads his agitation
against Josephus follow him only reluctantly; and the ranks close together behind Josephus
time and again. Admittedly the Tiberians reject him, but the inhabitants of Tarichea appreciate
him all the more and their example is imitated in Galilee. So nothing remained for the
opposition other than to appeal to Jerusalem; in fact, the government in Jerusalem was
compelled to step in as soon as it had become clear to them that Josephus shamefully deceived
the trust that they had placed in him: he was to have disarmed the robbers but he actually
availed himself of their power in order to establish a tyranny for himself in Galilee. To be sure
he had taken care as a precaution not to allow himself to be controlled by the robbers – his
behaviour towards the Romans was perfectly correct –, but the opposition in Galilee saw to it
that those in Jerusalem received notice of his ambitions: Josephus was dismissed.

But he was already too firmly entrenched in his power for the dismissal to be
enforceable. Josephus himself claims that the Galileans had stood behind him so manifestly
that the legation, which was to dismiss him, could not enforce this mandate. Of course, at the
same time the Galileans referred exclusively to their concern that the robbers would invade
their land after Josephus’ departure. Therefore it really was this relationship of Josephus to the
robbers that ultimately tipped the political scale. They simply could not risk dismissing Josephus since as a result they would lose their only means of keeping the dangerous robbers under control. So the government in Jerusalem was finally compelled to accept the situation that Josephus had brought about by force: they endorsed him henceforth as strategos of Galilee. Yet the opposition certainly had no intention of falling silent, written charges against Josephus were released from Galilee, however he responded to the grievances in his administrative report, which we reconstructed in chapter IV and the main substance of which we have rendered here: Its purpose was to elaborate the particular merits of Josephus in the pacification of Galilee and to explain his rise [to power] in such phrases as were inevitably inoffensive. Josephus was a rebel who had been successful; and it is probably their bad conscience, which disposed such characters repeatedly throughout history to portray their rise [to power], whereby the historically crucial points are mostly concealed or intimated only in a veiled form. One [should] remember, if the small may be compared to the great, the Monumentum Ancyranum or Caesar’s Bellum civile. Josephus wishes to prove that he protected Galilee from the robbers and he even tells us in the form of suggestions how he managed to do this. That he himself, however, in this way turned himself into the tyrant of Galilee in opposition to his government, we learn only through the grievances of the opponents to whom Josephus has responded. He could truly be satisfied with his achievement; he was not yet thirty years old but he had seized the strategia of Galilee for himself.

When Josephus was composing the War a few years later, he projected a very different picture of his first activities in Galilee; now he knew what he could not yet suspect during the composition of his administrative report, [namely] that directly from the turmoil in Galilee, which he had portrayed in his administrative report, arose the war, which was to lead to the destruction of Jerusalem, and that the first blow of the Romans was to strike him as strategos of Galilee. From this new knowledge of things Josephus now decided in the War not to deny his entire activity in Galilee, but indeed to present it in such a way as if he had been sent to Galilee from the outset as strategos for the Roman War (2.568). He accordingly shifts the beginning of the Jewish-Roman War to an earlier time [251] in such a manner that those events, which according to the administrative report had no connection whatsoever to the war, which was indeed still unknown then, henceforth fell within the framework of this war. Thus the War acquires the semblance that the opposition in Galilee was directed against the legal
commander, whereas in truth it was really aimed against the man who exploited his status as Jerusalem’s envoy in order to turn himself into the tyrant of Galilee.

We readily understand that Josephus felt the possibility of relocating the turning point, which marks the beginning of the war, to an earlier time. Since the 40s it was brewing persistently, and the battles between Jews and Romans did not cease at all. From this state of affairs it follows that Josephus could not have had the feeling in the year 66 that he stood in a new era of Jewish-Roman relations, however, we understand no less that from a retrospective view he [later] included the events of this year within the period of the great war. Any periodization of history is possible only from a certain distance and Josephus had not acquired this [distance] until the war was over. In fact, even for the modern historian it is not easy to identify the beginning of the war. If one generally follows the view of the War, then one should bear in mind that classifying [the beginning of the war] in the year 66 along with [the War] is in contrast to the feelings of the Jews, who still had no idea that they were standing in this war.

With this we encounter a second problem that is even more important. If Josephus had no idea that the Jews were at war with Rome when he entered Galilee and even for a considerable time later, then those events, which according to the War caused the war, and which occur before Josephus was posted [there], cannot have had the significance that the War assigns to them. After all, in the old administrative report Josephus’ mission, which was later on considered to be against Rome, is understood to be aimed against the robbers. With this, however, the question arises of how the Great War then actually may have come about after the year 66. The War, of course, fails to answer [the question] and when Josephus comes to speak about these same things later on in the Life, he is living within the realm of perceptions [Vorstellungswelt] of the War [252] and glides over this key problem with a meaningless: “not long afterwards” (section 407). Nowhere do we obtain a real answer to this question, therefore, and only a combination can fill this gap in our historical outlook.

We are assuming that Josephus did not just shift the beginning of the war, but that he wished at the same time along with this to have his own status as he entered Galilee perceived differently. Both shifts are interdependent: that is to say, if Josephus went to Galilee as strategos then the beginning of the war must precede this, and vice versa; so a personal motive of Josephus was decisive for shifting the beginning of the war, which brought about a deliberate falsification of facts [with respect] to the issue of his status in Galilee. Consequently,
he wished to cover something up and what he wished to cover up is revealed exactly by the nature of the falsification: the beginning of the war was shifted to an earlier time and Josephus was made strategos against Rome from the outset, since in truth his role at the outbreak of the war was not so unobjectionable as it then would inevitably appear had the war erupted long ago. The falsification in the War is explained solely if Josephus, in truth, was blamed for the war during his activity in Galilee, and if he wished to deny this later.

Josephus had realized a complete success by the recognition of his status in Galilee on the part of the government in Jerusalem; but it has already been noted that he owed this success only to the robbers standing behind him and it was an almost inevitable consequence that the robbers, for their part, were aware of their power with respect to Josephus as well. Jerusalem was not capable of doing anything more against them; this had been clearly proven by the last events, and Josephus stood or fell with these [robbers]. Under these circumstances we understand it when the robbers, now for their part, made demands on Josephus and we can have no doubt about the nature [of these demands]: the slogan of the predominant nationalists was “battle against Rome” and it is well known that they held sway. They forced Josephus, who was now totally dependent upon them, [253] to bear the banner of the revolt against Rome. After he had become a rebel against Jerusalem and had forced his recognition [by Jerusalem], he was compelled to organize the defection from Rome!

Only now do we understand the shifts in the War: Josephus wishes to clear himself of the heavy guilt with which, in truth, he has burdened himself; therefore he claims that the dice for war and peace had been cast long ago, he had already been sent by Jerusalem as the commander against Rome. But his old administrative report proves him a liar and shows to the contrary what a good measure of guilt falls upon Josephus’ [shoulders]. Granted he was only swept up into a pre-existing movement, but instead of combating this as he had been instructed, he exploited it for his own purposes until he was finally swept away by the movement itself.

Josephus leads the rebellion in Galilee and the Romans turn against him as the actual leader: it is well known that he was surrounded in Jotapata and was captured by Vespasian. It is no less definite that he now betrayed the movement, which he himself had led, and that he
managed to make his personal peace with Vespasian and Titus. Evidently it was desirable to them to keep the leader of the rebellion in hand; and from the outset Josephus appeared prepared to allow himself to be played in the service of Roman politics. On the other hand, however, the course of the war also teaches that after the defeat of Galilee, the Roman commanders did not directly continue to advance their attack, and it is reported to us believably that they hesitated in the hope that they Jews would bleed themselves to death in internal turmoil. From this it follows that the Romans actually faced a unified movement only in Galilee at first, and that it is totally incorrect when Josephus allows the impression to arise in the *War* that the war had already erupted before his posting and he himself departed for Galilee merely as one of the commanders with a specific mandate. If this had been the case, then the Romans would also have encountered a unified movement throughout the Jewish territory and would have defeated these one by one, which they were in a military position to do. [254] As matter of fact, things were completely different; to be sure, there were “robbers” everywhere and nationally spirited Jews, but they at first exerted a decisive influence only in Galilee due to Josephus’ politics; here was the focus of the rebellion, which had to be extinguished by the Romans for that reason. When this had occurred, Vespasian’s task would have basically been settled; but the robbers now continued their agitation in other areas and they eventually managed to ignite a new second rebellion, as it were, in Jerusalem. The bloody events, which happened in Jerusalem during the winter of 67/68, brought out the rebellion movement in that place for the first time; the government was forcibly coerced by the zealots and it appeared once again here as well that it was not in the position to gain control of the warmongers without a means to power. Not until these events were the Romans induced to resume the war, and so the interval in Roman belligerence is explained from [the fact] that we are basically dealing with two movements, which admittedly are ultimately traced back to the same people: the one movement is the rebellion in Galilee under the leadership of Josephus contingent upon his relationship with the robbers; the other is the rebellion of the zealots in Jerusalem, which did not break out until later.

From this course of events it is explained historically as well that in the year 66 Josephus could have had no idea that he stood within a great war against Rome; however, the modern historian also must from now on beware of following the perception of the *War* [and]

---

86 The parallels with the Galatians are obvious here as well.
viewing the Great War as a [single] uniform era beginning in the year 66. Josephus’ rebellion in Galilee follows the earlier movements of the robbers; it was first concluded with Josephus’ defeat; only then did the zealots continue their agitation in Jerusalem with such success, that a new rebellion arises there as well, which the Romans were compelled to overcome. The Jewish tradition that the government in Jerusalem is completely innocent [with respect] to the rebellion is absolutely correct, and Josephus, who generates the impression in the War, that already in 66 the government had sent him to Galilee as an organizer of the rebellion against Rome, is perpetrating a monstrous falsification of history in order to cover up [255] his own guilt, because even if there were two movements that we must separate in time, still the second [movement] was a consequence of the first, and Josephus therefore meets with a good part of the blame that Jerusalem was destroyed.

Nothing in this is changed either when he allowed himself to be misused during the siege of Jerusalem [by trying] in the name of Titus to talk the town into a voluntary surrender. He had no success with this attempt, but an indirect consequence would have been the demoralization of the defendants; however, as a result he himself must have lost what sympathy remained [for him] in Judaea. The moderate circles detested him; after all, he had so shamefully deceived the trust, which had been placed in him when he was sent to Galilee, that he first joined the robbers whom he was to disarm, that he turned himself into the master of Galilee by means of these [robbers], and that he now organised the rebellion against Rome after he had exacted the recognition of the government. The zealots, however, could no less forget that he allowed himself to be pushed [around] and that he committed the worst [deed] by acknowledging the rule of the Romans and by operating on their behalf. There was no place for Josephus among his compatriots; the Roman emperor could take advantage of him all the more [easily]. After all, he really had [Josephus] entirely in his power after [Josephus] had lost the ground from under his feet in his homeland.

Josephus, the organiser of the rebellion, was appointed to recount the history of the rebellion – but to recount it in the Roman spirit. The book receives the title of “The Jewish War” and indicates already by this that it is a Romanoid [Römling] who is standing behind the work (cf. 98 ff.); Titus and Vespasian and their protégé Agrippa were to take pleasure in the work, the fighters on the Roman side were to be reminded of their achievements by this book. But there is still more. At the borders of the empire unrest was threatening to break out among
the Parthians just at that time; the Roman garrisons had to be strengthened; one stood at the eve of serious events. What could be more effective here than if a man who had organized a great rebellion himself, was to provide testimony about the futility of such an undertaking? The Roman emperors made the material available to the Jew, [256] which he required for his literary propaganda. Time and again it is brought to the awareness of the reader that any resistance to Rome is madness, but nowhere is it expressed more clearly than in the long speech, which is placed in Agrippa’s mouth in 2.345 to 404. Josephus had already presented the first book to his patrons and had obtained complete approval for it (Life 365); no wonder that from now on material was made available to him in flowing abundance. Josephus had already completed the first recording of the second book as well when one of the most important documents was delivered to him, the survey of the allocation of troops in the Roman empire. Its unique value and also its derivation from official documents have long been recognized. But what is this document doing in the “Jewish War” if its function was not to make literary propaganda? More and more it was recognized to what advantages Josephus’ pen could be exploited; thus he became the officiosus of Roman politics.

Josephus, for his part, had to consider how such a document was to be accommodated within his history; for the historian in antiquity there could be no doubt that only a speech afforded the possibility for this, and Agrippa imposed himself as speaker; in fact, he did stand behind the Roman government and had attempted to operate in accordance with them. Josephus himself had already recounted that Agrippa attempted to reassure the Jews in a meeting, who had wished to send a legation to Nero [in complaint] against Florus (War 2.342), however, because of that [attempt] he had almost been stoned (406). 87 Here the place was

87 Arguably, no detailed evidence is required in order to recognize that Josephus first attached the text [of section] 406 directly to the beginning of 344. Agrippa’s professed second speech is a faint reflection after the long address that preceded [it]. The discussion about the deployment of Roman troops disrupts the cohesive context. The original text read: Ἀγρίππᾳ δὲ τὸ μὲν χειροτονεῖν Φλώρου κατηγόρου ἐπίφθονον, τὸ περιδεῖν δὲ Ἰουδαίους εἰς πόλεμον ἐκριπισθέντας οὐδὲ αὐτῷ λυσιτελὲς κατεφαίνετο· προσκαλεσάμενος δὲ ἐπειρᾶτο πείθειν τὸ πλῆθος ὑπακούειν Φλώρῳ μέχρις ἀντ’ αὐτοῦ πέμψει Καῖσαρ διάδοχον· πρὸς ὃ παροξυσθέντες ἔβλασφήμουν εἰς τὸν βασιλέα etc. In order to insert the new material, Josephus shaped the text in this way as we now read it. The expansion was thus carried out later, but it stands absolutely within the viewpoint of the War, it is therefore certainly much older than the Antiquities. Expansions in direct connection to the first recording are also proven for the Antiquities [cf.] page 219.
provided to have Agrippa [257] grandly display the impossibility of a war against Rome by unfolding the entire evidence before the readers. It is clearly seen that Josephus was working in the Roman spirit and for that reason precisely he celebrates in the same way the clever policy of Agrippa, the friend of the Romans.

On the other hand, as far as his own person was concerned, Josephus attempted to conceal his own guilt for the war cleverly from his Roman patrons by asserting that the decision about the war had been made already before his departure for Galilee and [that] he had been sent there as commander by the Sanhedrin. As a result his person is ruled out, he was [simply] an agent of the government. Of course, Josephus admits that the Sanhedrin, of its own accord, did not want the war either, but rather was coerced into it by the robbers; therefore, what first befell only him, [namely] that he had to concede to the robbers, and what came upon the Sanhedrin only later, he now has happen to the Sanhedrin from the outset. By means of this chronological shift he became free of all guilt. With full energy, however, he distances [himself] from the robbers, to whom he certainly owed his great achievements, though also his downfall, and precisely this represents a further reason for him to flatter Agrippa. I recall briefly the formulation that the Dabaritta affair attained at that time: Josephus falsifies the story in such a way that it would gain the appearance that he had made the greatest sacrifices for Agrippa, indeed he himself almost suffered death (page 62 ff.). Naturally, under such circumstances Josephus’ relations to the most important towns of Galilee could also not be portrayed in [such] a manner as was commensurate with the truth and as Josephus himself had recounted in his administrative report, which he used as a basis for this part of the War. Tarichea, which had truly been very attached to Josephus, is shaken off by Josephus; after all, [the town] had undergone a terrible destruction [at the hands] of the Romans (War 3.462) and Josephus could not compromise himself with such company; conversely, Josephus had met with persistent opposition in Tiberias; but when the Romans moved in front of Tiberias during the war, [258] this town voluntarily opened its gates and was treated leniently for Agrippa’s sake (3.456 ff.). Josephus could not stand back here either; his old enmity towards the Tiberians is denied just as shamelessly as the heartfelt friendship with the Taricheans (page 91 ff.). Josephus reveals himself here with complete lack of character, and the War is perhaps his most deeply dishonest writing; and it is not as if Josephus had later improved himself morally, but the circumstances were such that he adopted a standpoint later, which resembled his old
politics more [closely] so that he could forego these outrageous falsifications, which he believed he had to effect in honour of Vespasian, Titus and Agrippa.

Satisfied as the Romans, at least, were with their protégé’s work, his own compatriots could feel only the deepest outrage for the man who betrayed and renounced his own past, his friends and his homeland for the sake of his new employer [Brother]. They tried to destroy him and his status; already in the year 73 after the suppression of the Jewish revolt in Cyrene, [Josephus] was accused by those captured there of having been their mentor (War 7.442 and 447 f.) who had pushed them into rebellion. This was of course a blatant lie; for Josephus was happy at that time to be permitted to live securely among the Romans, and Vespasian also saw through the lie, but it certainly was malicious that the captives could allude to [the fact] that Josephus, who has done something similar to [what] they themselves [had done], was enjoying imperial favour in Rome. As long as someone like Vespasian and Titus remained alive, the Jews could expect no success against the favourite of the Roman court. Scarcely had Titus died, however, when they again risked [another] onslaught against the hated apostate with the prospect of greater success. Josephus (Life 429) reports to us only briefly the fact that after Domitian’s ascension to the government a charge against him was raised by the Jews; significantly, he does not disclose to us in what it consisted, however, we cannot possibly be in any doubt about the mind [set] that is plainly speaking from such a charge of the Jews: the new emperor should know with whom he was dealing, that Josephus had been guilty of high treason, that he had instigated a rebellion against Rome, [259] and then, received into favour by Vespasian and Titus, he attempted to deny his past with his pen. The Jews had no success with the direct charge, if we may trust Josephus’ information, and yet he noticeably lost the imperial favour; with all of Domitian’s antagonism towards the activity of his father and brother it ultimately went without saying that Josephus lost his support at the imperial court (cf. page 31 ff.): he had been dismissed as officiosus.

Once again Josephus stood before a serious catastrophe in his life: in light of the charges hurled at him by the Jews he could not be in any doubt that his compatriots were not disposed to receive him with grace; he had offended them too grievously. In this situation, Josephus, adaptable and unscrupulous as he was, developed a connection to Epaphroditus and his circle. Epaphroditus was a publisher in a grand style: he supported economically weak characters, as they were all too prevalent in the [field of] literature at that time as well, and in
exchange he placed their books on the market. That his business was no mean one is proven by
the wealth that Epaphroditus left behind. Josephus, who had perched himself upon a fence and
was out of the question both as Roman officiosus as well as for the Jews, finds a foothold on
neutral literary terrain. In Rome the demand for books about Judaism was naturally not slight
during these years; we know how the great Roman literature was concerned with the Jews and
through the fall of Jerusalem this interest was again aroused. The Roman stepping through the
Arch of Titus, likely required clarification about this peculiar people whose sacrificial
implements were illustrated here. So the publisher Epaphroditus then takes Josephus under
his protection as an authority in the field of Judaism and supports him during the composition
of the Antiquities by granting [him] an external means of livelihood (Ant. 1.8; cf. page 30 ff.).

As a result Josephus was definitively released from his association with Roman politics,
and after he had gained [his] new protector there was no reason to seek a connection with it
again. Thus his true Jewish convictions could be voiced again, without which the composition
of a work such as the Antiquities is not conceivable. [260] The period of Josephus’ life, which
had begun with his captivity in Jotapata, had come to an end when he lost his association with
the emperor after Domitian’s ascension to the government and he gained a politically neutral
protector in Epaphroditus. From this Roman period of Josephus we have the War, in whose title
“Jewish War” it is already externally settled once and for all that the account had been
presented from the Roman standpoint. The Jewish Antiquities shows us, in contrast to this, the
Jew who, free of all external fetters, stands up for the history of his people. I believe that the
release from the association with the Roman emperors is sufficient to explain fully Josephus’
new disposition; only Josephus’ character, which I have admittedly assessed as very low, has
me pose the question of whether he did not also expect a certain rehabilitation with respect to
his compatriots by forcefully emphasizing his Jewish point of view. Egoism and a natural sense
of nationalism could henceforth go hand in hand and no longer needed to clash.

Only from the errors of modern source criticism can it be explained that this extremely
important change in Josephus’ nature has not been recognized. The Jewish Antiquities is
considered as a whole [to be] a work of Jewish apologetics; it combines calm historical
narrative with sections whose sole purpose is to defend the position of the Jews, which was
under attack, and to prove the esteem that the [Jews] have enjoyed among distinguished
people. Inwardly the work is borne by pure Jewish tradition; Jewish legends, lists of Jewish
high priests are incorporated into it and whatever could perhaps appear objectionable to a non-Jew is explained and excused by its peculiarity. Nowhere do we encounter this genuine Jewish spirit so tangibly, however, as in the reworkings, which Josephus effected on his source. Josephus had prefaced his history of the war with an introduction, for which he used Nicolaus of Damascus as source. This also is characteristic of the Roman period of the author, that he used a work as the basis, which blatantly took the side of Herod who was so despised among the Jews. In the Antiquities Josephus could no longer be satisfied with such a view; since he is writing as a Jew from now on, his [261] opposition to the Herodians had to be elaborated above all. Of course, he could not have based book 14, decisive for our discovery, on new sources; he must use the base provided to him by his War, but twist its view into the opposite. [From a] source analytical [perspective], this reworking is one of the most interesting sections that I have ever encountered, and by virtue of this the extensive discussion that we have dedicated to it (page 128 - 221) is justified; as far as Josephus did not consult complementary additional sources [Nebenquellen] – and these can be completely identified – these parts of the Antiquities are worthless for the investigator of Jewish history, but irreplaceable for an understanding of Josephus’ inner development, which from now on sets itself in pronounced opposition to the Herodians and stands up for the legitimate Hasmoneans. Everything is subordinated to these ends and as a result the history is falsified in a manner and way that has no parallel.

Basically, it is a matter of the same procedure that Josephus adopted in the War with respect to his administrative report, and the personal attitude is shifted only insofar as the War is also inwardly false as a whole, whereas the apologetic of the Antiquities corresponds to Josephus’ inner convictions; therefore [from a] human [perspective] the Josephus of the Antiquities may seem closer to us than [the Josephus] of the War, even though his work in both writings was falsifying to an equal extent. Josephus has falsified the history of the past as a nationalistically sensitive [nationalempfindender] Jew, even less so could he pass by the present. It has been noticed already for a long time that the view about the regnancy of Agrippa I and II that Josephus reveals in the Antiquities stands in stark contrast to the presentations that the War has developed. Here both Agrippas are favourably judged, yet the Antiquities disapproves of these rulers just as vehemently. In the complete isolation from which this question was being considered, one wished to draw the conclusion that Agrippa II, who had been a patron of
Josephus after all, had died when Josephus recorded his spiteful attacks in the *Antiquities*. (Thus, most recently Luther, page 55 ff., where the individual proofs [can be found] as well.) In truth, Agrippa was still alive in the year 93/94, but Josephus had likely disassociated himself entirely from his Roman past, and as a result he also had to undertake a thorough alteration in his attitude to the Herodians. In this respect the shift in the evaluation of someone like Agrippa is simply a link in a long chain, and once again it is shown how pernicious it is for scholarship [when] one wishes to explain an individual fact where really only a [thorough] grasp of the entire personality can afford us information.

Josephus probably understood that the *Antiquities* as a whole – in no way just the evaluation of Agrippa, for example – would inevitably incur the displeasure of this circle; he had once written [in a way that was favourable] to them, but his break with his Roman past also had to loosen the tie that connected him to the Herodians. In this spirit he wrote the letter of denial [Absagebrief] to his old patron in the *Antiquities*: “I, as a Hasmonean and a priest, may proclaim only the absolute truth; Nicolaus of Damascus might be forgiven if he has falsified history for love of the Herodians; I, however, may not do this; the closest relations connected me to numerous descendants of Herod, but the truth is more important to me, even [though] I may provoke the wrath of these gentlemen as a result” (*Ant.* 16.186 - 187). Here everything that we need to know is stated: Josephus once had the closest bonds with Agrippa and – we may add – for that reason he wrote in the spirit [of these close bonds] just like Nicolaus [did], so that he too may be allowed the same forgiveness for his past as was [Nicolaus], but as priest and Hasmonean, which he now feels himself [to be], the truth must come before all [else] for him; the wrath of someone like Agrippa no longer affects him. Therefore he was alive, of course, when Josephus wrote such words. One should, however, beware of wishing to view Josephus’ words as greatness with respect to Agrippa, when he [takes the] liberty of openly parading before the king’s throne here as well; in truth Josephus, here under Epaphroditus’ protection, is paving the way for himself, which should lead him back to his compatriots [Volksgenossen]; Agrippa had nothing more to offer him ever since [Josephus] had concluded the break with Rome, and his power was too insignificant for him to have been able to take revenge upon the writer who now had betrayed him in the same was as [he had] once [betrayed] his

---

88 How significant it is indeed that the references to Roman discipline are now eliminated (page 159).
people.

Josephus fully sensed the profound difference between his old *War* and the new *Antiquities*; from [the perspective of] his new view, the *War* could not be left in its old state, this book too had to be transferred over from the Roman to the Jewish atmosphere. Immediately subsequent to the *Antiquities* completed in 93/94 he consequently plans a new adaptation of the *War* and its continuation into the present (Ant. 20.267); the *War* ended with the year 73, since then twenty years of Jewish history had elapsed, which demanded an exposition. Above all, however, the *War* was to be produced afresh as such; Josephus, who hurled a sentence such as *Ant*. 16.187 at Agrippa, was no longer interested in the approval of Agrippa and the Roman emperors as [he had] once [been]; a new document had to be created for the fame and glory of Judaism, which would represent a worthy sequel to the *Antiquities*. Josephus had already begun the preparatory work for this new edition of the *War* when he produced the *Antiquities*. The additions in *War* 1.209 ff. (cf. page 177 ff.) obviously originated during the elaboration of the *Antiquities* itself, but Josephus did not rest with this; the information concerning him personally soon acquired a new formulation as well. The attack against Agrippa (*War* 2.602 - 608), which cannot at all be surpassed in its harshness, originated at that time (page 69 ff., page 78). When Josephus here voices the statement in an address to the Galileans about his relationship to Agrippa: “never will I deem your enemy to be my friend”, then it presents the same sentiment here as in *Ant*. 16.187. Josephus does not content himself merely with developing a new view of the Herodians; rather, to a certain extent he provokes antagonism to them and especially to Agrippa. This is calculated [to have an effect] on his Jewish readership, however. Josephus cannot at all satisfy himself in his disapproval of Agrippa, since by it he hopes to find the way back to his compatriots: one may well forgive him for his literary past, but the curse of his political action weighed perhaps even more heavily upon him; it was he, after all, who was primarily to blame for the turmoil in Galilee, and even if he had been able to fool the [264] Roman public that he had been sent to Galilee as *strategos*, in Jerusalem they knew better, that it was he himself who had placed himself at the head of the robbers. In an extremely interesting addition"* Josephus attempts to cleanse himself of the accusations in this

---

89 The addition that was to produce a special impact is to be found immediately in the first chapter. After the customary censure of the previously available literature about the war, Josephus explains that he is placing before [vorlegen] the inhabitants of the Roman *imperium*
sense as well: Josephus makes excuses for those Jews[265] who dared to rebel, by indicating that Rome’s situation at that time was exceedingly vulnerable. The Celts and the Germani were in sedition, after Nero’s death everything was full of unrest, many wanted to become emperor, the soldiers demanded only changeover in order to be able to acquire plunder (War 1.5); so the political system among the Romans was faring poorly; conversely, however, the Jews [had] never possessed such means of power and financial resources as [they had] in this time so that they could even hope that the entire east would fall to them, and the Jews on the other side of the Euphrates would rise up [in revolt] with them (section 4). And what the Jews wished for was what the Romans in truth feared. This entire view is historically impossible; the rebellion had indeed already been in progress for two years before the turmoil erupted after Nero’s

the text in the Greek language, which he had sent earlier to the Upper Barbarians; this is followed in [sections] 4 - 5 by extensive evidence that the upheaval [caused] by the war was immense, and in section 6 the thought, which had been interrupted above, is resumed by the statement: “since I deemed it inappropriate that the truth be disregarded in such matters, and that thanks to my activity the Parthians etc. are well informed about the war, [and] that, by contrast, the Greeks and Romans know nothing about it.” This section 6 is actually impossible in isolation since it is missing a main verb; as it therefore belongs factually to section 3, so it also is not to be separated from it formally: the ἡγησάμενος from 6 belongs to προυθέμην in section 3. In his translation (page 2, note 3) Harmand also voiced the conjecture that sections 4 and 5 are a later addition. But the margins of this insertion as established by Harmand, who examined the section without any knowledge of the issues that are occupying us, cannot be correct; because section 6 cannot have followed upon the closing words of section 3 since there is no connection between the participles. In truth, we must extend the insertion. When Josephus expresses the thought at the beginning of section 3 that he intends to produce a translation of his Aramaic original for the inhabitants of the imperium then it must be directly followed by its continuation “since he considered it foolish that only the Parthians, but no Romans, learn the truth”. We can identify exactly the point of intersection [Schnittpunkt] between the old and the new; because as the text of section 3 reads now, τοῖς κατὰ τὴν Ῥωμαίων ἥγεμονίαν is dependent on ἀφηγήσασθαι, the infinitive, on its part, [is dependent] on προυθέμην, which therefore must mean “I intend to”. ἀφηγεῖσθαι τινι by itself can absolutely not be said of an author who “intends to recount something to the inhabitants of the imperium”. Rather, the word order already teaches us that the dative is dependent on προυθέμην: “Josephus is placing before the Romans – this is what προτίθεσθαι actually means – that [writing] in a Greek translation, which he has sent to the barbarians in the Aramaic language.” Therefore the division point lies between πρότερον and ἀφηγήσασθαι and the original text reads: προυθέμην ἐγὼ τοῖς κατὰ τὴν Ῥωμαίων ἥγεμονίαν Ἐλλάδι γλώσσῃ μεταβαλὼν, ἀ τοῖς ἰνω βαρβάροις τῇ πατρίῳ συντάξας ἀνέπεμψα πρότερον //, ἄτοπον ἡγησάμενος περιδεῖν πλαζομένην ἐπὶ τηλικούτοις πράγμασι τὴν ἀλήθειαν καὶ Παρθοὺς μὲν etc. Now it also becomes clear how ἐγὼ in section 3 [comes to] be separated from Ἰωσήφος; both segments belong to different eras. Likewise, the awkward ὡς ἔφαν (section 4) betrays the
death along the Rhein, in Gaul and in the empire; nor has Josephus himself ever referred to these incidents in his narrative, it is a deliberate attempt to mislead the readers. But which ones? Truly not the Romans, about whose state [Staat] a scathing judgment is passed here, which stands in direct contradiction to Agrippa’s speech, therefore the Jews [were to be misled]. Excuses are now made before them for the “innovators” who no longer bear the dishonourable name of “the robbers”. Josephus then also bears no misgivings at all about underscoring his own participation in the war against Rome here; certainly with this he wishes above all to emphasize his precise knowledge of the events in order to derive his qualification as a historian from it; but by contrast to a parallel passage such as *Contra Apionem* 1.48, for example, he skips over his connection to the Romans here. Obviously he is determined to elaborate his Jewish standpoint.

The designation of Josephus as priest serves the same double purpose. In the first edition of the *War* Josephus did not make any use of his priestly status (2.568); but in the *Antiquities* he did indeed consciously parade his Hasmonean ancestry, and attacked the Herodians on this basis, and we remember in addition that in the later years of his life Josephus even derived his suitability as a historian again from his priestly lineage and status (page 34). An exhaustive study of the *War* will surely be able to identify even more traces of Josephus’ action on his manuscript in those years [266] in which he had committed himself to the new adaptation of the *War* as a particularly important objective; for the direction that Josephus had stumbled upon would not be abandoned so quickly by him again. The patronage of Epaphroditus remained intact, as far as we can actually track Josephus, and so he was lacking every reason, indeed even any possibility, to re-establish his connection to Rome. Conversely, the *Antiquities* had met with the approval of Epaphroditus, for it was he who also motivated [Josephus] to the new writing against Apion, in which he now attempted a systematic defence corresponding to the historical apology of Judaism that was provided in the *Antiquities* and was being planned for the new edition of the *War*. Truly Josephus made an honest effort to clear away his guilt towards Jewry [*Judentum*]; unfortunately we do not know to what extent [the Jews], on their part, responded to these efforts; for Josephus, preserving Epaphroditus’ patronage remained a goal later on and this certainly has us suspect that he had not been completely forgiven.

addition. The dating of this same [segment] follows from what was noted in the text.
So the year 100 drew near; after the appearance of the *Antiquities* Josephus had worked diligently as well; he inserted the documents perhaps only later, he set about [composing] the writing against Apion and adjusted his old *War* for the new edition. Filled with hope, Josephus could look forward to his future, then he was dealt the severest blow that was conceivable: Justus of Tiberias entered into literary competition with him and brought along talents that were lacking in Josephus; a brilliant style commended his work to the public, and Justus, filled with derision, did not tire of looking down on the miserable scribe [Scribenten] Josephus in his introduction (chapter 2.1). And with his attacks Justus did make an impression on Epaphroditus as well, to whom Josephus tries to defend his work.

One should picture what Josephus had at stake. When he had lost his association with the Roman court after Domitian’s ascension to the government, it was Epaphroditus who took him in and enabled his literary existence. Epaphroditus, however, required an authority in the field of Judaism for his business, and then – threatening this deep relationship – Justus stepped in between with his writing. If this gained the approval of Epaphroditus, then [267] Josephus’ livelihood was finished; swinging between his connection to Rome and his Jewish past, he found a foothold on the neutral terrain of Epaphroditus; and this was to be pulled out from under his feet. Now it was no longer a matter of politics for Josephus, now he was compelled to salvage his literary honour from the outrageous attack and preserve Epaphroditus’ trust in him.

He downright assails him with [statements of] defence; in the middle of the writing against Apion, in a passage where it has neither sense nor purpose at all, he defends himself and attacks Justus most viciously. Granted, Justus may be superior to Josephus stylistically, but Josephus has secured authorities for himself for thorough stylistic revision [Durcharbeitung]; educated Greeks have read his work with pleasure and, most importantly, the factual accuracy in [the work] of Josephus, who fought in the war, is beyond all doubt. This is corroborated by the leaders in the war, whose judgement Josephus invokes again now: Vespasian and Titus have accorded him [their] approbation; and from the series of educated Greeks he singles out “the admirable King Agrippa”(1.51). Has Josephus swung around yet again and drawn nearer to the Herodians? The idea is out of the question, Agrippa was dead, but now it is also no longer a matter of politics at all, but of literary combat. In this, however, Josephus willingly accepts the testimony of the man whom he had smothered with flattery [gelobhudelt] in the *War*, [only]
then to denounce him as his enemy. Certainly, we [can] easily believe that Agrippa had once spoken out in praise of the War, and this authority was now doubly valuable. Admittedly Justus had maliciously sought to forestall such an appeal [to Agrippa’s opinion] by discrediting Agrippa’s testimony (Life 367), it was all the more necessary for Josephus to underscore [Agrippa’s] authority. To this is added a second [point]: Justus of Tiberias had lived and written in pronounced opposition to Agrippa; and since he had remained in his homeland he could not risk publishing his work before Agrippa’s death (Life 359). In principle, this did not in any way mean that the book was mendacious: [quite] the contrary. But Josephus, who now wishes above all to salvage his [own] book, again twists things [to imply] Justus had feared exposure by Agrippa, and sets himself in contradistinction to this [since] he had submitted his work to Agrippa and [268] his relatives – they are the same ones as [those in] Ant. 16.187 – and had received an appreciative letter from him.

So it is the fear for his work that has prompted Josephus to invoke the authority of Agrippa, who had died in the meantime. He could not do this if he were still continuing to think of his Jewish audience, for whom he had included the most severe attacks against Agrippa in his work a few years previously; he did it in view of Epaphroditus, in other words, Josephus has devoted himself entirely to literature and it was all the more necessary to salvage his lifework. The defence in the writing against Apion was only brief and it did not suffice to refute Justus completely. Most notably, the latter had not attacked only the War but also Josephus’ Antiquities and this blow had to strike Epaphroditus’ protégé quite differently indeed; for the War did not directly concern Epaphroditus, but the Antiquities [did]. Here it was essential to prove [his] true qualification.

The idea that was important here is already suggested in Contra Apionem. Josephus is a Jew of the purest blood and he is a priest by descent, so that he is abounding in the spirit of Jewish scholarship (C. Ap. 1.54). As a Jew he is distinguished in contrast with the Hellenizing smooth talker, Justus of Tiberias; as a priest by descent he has a command of the holy literature like no other [man has], and therefore no one is so capable as he [is] of portraying the Antiquities of Jews. But what is only briefly suggested here requires a presentation of the evidence [Beweisführung]; the simple assertion that he is ἱερεὺς ἐκ γένους and that he has attended the Jewish philosophical schools did not suffice without proof, since it was being disputed by Justus (Life 8). So by Justus’ attack, Josephus was forced to recount his and his
family’s past and to incorporate this report into the work, which, on the one hand, was at the most risk, and which, on the other hand, was the best one to be reinforced precisely by this proof of priestly lineage. For this reason the Antiquities is expanded by the addition of the self-portrayal. In a transition passage (Ant. 20.259 ff.) he refers once more to his achievement, stressing that no one else could write such a work as he [did]: [269] for Jewish scholarship has nothing to do with the smooth talking [Schönrederei] of the Hellenes; every slave has a command of the Greek language, but what matters with such a work is the knowledge of the law and of the Holy Scriptures; only few [men] have this [knowledge] by virtue of their education; therefore it is quite necessary that Josephus tell about his ancestry, his education and his path of life.

With this reasoning, the transition to the Life is effected; however, this Life does in truth provide even more than what was projected here: Josephus presents his entire life also in such a way, which in principle has nothing to do with his suitability as historian of the Jewish Antiquities. He does this because Justus had intertwined his polemics against the War and the Antiquities together so [much] that even Josephus could not separate the two. For this reason he interweaves the idea that Justus had been his political opponent from the outset into the self-portrayal. So it became obvious why the latter was now persecuting him; it was in revenge for [the fact] that Josephus as governor of Galilee had put him back in his place. Thus, if at a ripe old age Josephus was driven by the necessity of his defence against Justus to portray the course of his career, then he was not lacking in material. Admittedly, the War with its Roman bias could not be used, now that it was quite important to emphasize Judaism; but during his governorship in Galilee he had sent an administrative report to his superiors, in which he had defended his administration. And, differently from the War [written] later on, he had not denied his Jewish convictions there; it sufficed if the idea that Justus had barred Josephus’ path absolutely everywhere was now woven into this old writing. This was the reason for which such foolish insertions had been included, as we described in chapter II.3.

All the same, even this repulsion of Justus cannot yet totally clarify for us the goals that Josephus pursued in the Life. Among the segments, which the author had added to the old administrative report, are the narratives examined on page 43 ff., which deal with the Babylonian Jews. With the first glance one can [already] see that in principle they do not belong in the Antiquities; for [270] Josephus has nothing to do with these incidents. These
segments, however, do indeed form the continuation to the insertions in the *Antiquities*
discussed in the place cited; they originate from the same source and they follow each other
smoothly. So this here concerns material, which Josephus had gathered after the completion of
the *Antiquities*, in order to extend the history of the Jews factually and – this is significant –
extend it further [in time]. The stories about the Babylonian Jews, as they now stand without
any purpose in the *Autobiography*, were intended for a history of the Jews in the *War*. But
Josephus did not place them there, nor could he, since he indeed entertained a plan for a new
edition of the *War*, though he had not put it into execution because Justus’ work had appeared
in the meantime (cf. page 33). And within this same group of materials belongs a segment,
which is in direct connection to this (*Life* 43 - 45): John of Gischala, who [was] once so scorned
because he had created difficulties for Josephus in Galilee, and who [was] attacked so severely
in the *War* because Josephus, the Romanoid [Römling], viewed him as a warmonger, is showered
with praise here; it is the same attitude that characterizes the insertion *War* 1.4 - 5; Josephus
stands entirely behind national Judaism in his feelings.

If Josephus now partly absorbed the material destined for the new edition of the *War*
into the *Autobiography*, then it follows that he not only abandoned the plan for the new edition
of the *War*, but also that the *Autobiography* was in some manner to represent a substitute for
the new edition of the *War*. And only with this, finally, is the *Autobiography* now historically
explained: its entire existence is completely motivated by Justus’ attack. The latter had made
the new edition of the *War* impossible by dint of his [own] brilliantly written presentation of
the war, therefore Josephus relinquished [his plan] and in its stead he used the old
administrative report to write the defence of his lifework, which had become necessary.
Whatever new material he had gathered for the new edition of the *War* is inserted into this
“Autobiography”. Thus emerges an inorganic [Ed.: i.e., disjointed] work that evidently was
produced in a great hurry in order to respond as quickly as possibly to Justus’ outrageous
attack.

In so doing Josephus attaches particular importance to his [271] priestly descent and
profession, and he then significantly emphasizes this when he defends the *Antiquities* (*C. Ap.*
1.54; *Ant. 20.282*), whereas in fending off the attacks on the *War* he refers to the testimonies of
the Roman emperors and Agrippa (*C. Ap.* 1.50 ff.; 56; *Life* 360 ff.). Now, Justus had just contested
Josephus’ descent from priests (*Life* 6; cf. *Ant.* 20.262), and if, conversely, Josephus proves the
authenticity of his genealogy in his defence of the *Antiquities* then it follows that Justus had repudiated it in order to attack the *Antiquities*. From this it also becomes obvious why Josephus emphasizes time and again that it is his priestly profession that enabled him to translate the Holy Scriptures precisely (*C. Ap. 1.54; Ant. 20.264; Life 9*), and in a similar vein, Josephus emphasizes his outstanding academic education thanks to which he excelled in his knowledge of the law already as a lad (*Life 9*). Therefore Justus had contested the accurate translation of the Holy Scriptures by Josephus, and if the latter, in turn, in a segment originating from that time (*Life 418*) points out that after the fall of Jerusalem Titus permitted him to bring along the Holy Scriptures upon his request, then this also belongs to the same context: evidently Justus had objected that in Rome Josephus did not even have at his disposal the holy books that he had supposedly translated.

The individual details, which Josephus provides in all these segments that were recorded at the same time about his priestly descent, about his academic education and knowledge of the law, about bringing along the Holy Scriptures to Rome, must of course be received with the necessary precaution since a specific intention underlies them. But Justus’ attack interests us even more than [does] this defence by Josephus. How then does [Justus] come to making the allegation that Josephus is not the chosen interpreter of the Holy Scriptures, which were not [even] available to him in Rome? A glance at the *Antiquities* does indicate that it can be traced either directly or indirectly by way of the Jewish-Hellenistic academic school of Alexandria (Hölscher in Pauly-Wissowa, 1959) to the LXX, and that [*272*] Josephus’ work contains basically nothing but what Hellenistic-Jewish scholarship had taught, there is no doubt possible in this. Therefore when Justus nevertheless attacks the *Antiquities* on account of its inadequate linguistic knowledge, then he is doing this because he is turning himself into the mouthpiece of a movement that is directed against the LXX and against Hellenistic Judaism. This discovery is certainly of incalculable significance; for with this, Justus’ attack enters into a parallel with the activity of Jewish orthodoxy, newly awakened right at that time, whose most important manifestation is the production of a new Greek translation of the Bible by Aquila, which has the purpose of bestowing upon the Greek-speaking Jews a Bible text that follows the sanctioned Hebrew text exactly. The Hebrew authority is now recognized and valued to a far stricter degree, and even the Greek-speaking
Jews must yield to it. Aquila was active in the first third of the second century; his translation met a need, which must have asserted itself earlier, i.e. right at that time when Justus began his attack on the Antiquities that was based on the LXX. There is no longer any doubt: Justus has made use of the mood of Jewish orthodoxy, which had become powerful, in order to [deliver a] crushing attack on Josephus’ Antiquities.

And as a result our image of Josephus’ major opponent is also brought to life. Justus, a resident of the strongly Hellenized town of Tiberias is, as was natural, imbued with Greek education in his youth quite differently than was Josephus, and from that [time] onwards he retained complete mastery of the Greek language until the end of his life. But Justus, who had remained in Tiberias, experienced the transformations that Judaism underwent differently than Josephus, who had defected from his people. The fierce opposition in which he stood to Agrippa is well enough substantiated, and therefore he could have only scorn and ridicule for the author of the War, but also for the [author] of the Antiquities; because what Josephus had rendered was by no means in accordance with the view of the Jews; the Antiquities was thus based on a foundation that Judaism no longer recognized, to say nothing of the War. Due to his training in Greek culture, Justus felt the inner vocation of presenting genuine Judaism in its historical development to the pagan world. Unlike Josephus, he could write Greek; unlike him, Justus, who had remained true to his people, knew what they wished to have recognized as genuine tradition. The attack, which Justus directed against Josephus upon this basis, was quite serious indeed.

Josephus can have no other rejoinder but that since his youth he has been an expert on the law – we can believe this of him, but the law that he had learned in his youth was that of Hellenistic Judaism; he was indeed a priest, – but since his capture he has lost all contact with the priesthood of the Jews. He was living in Rome and was basking in the favour first of the emperors and then of Epaphroditus. At the time when he was composing the Antiquities he had not yet developed any sense for the far-reaching internal movements, which were to take hold of the Jews around the turn of the century and stamp them for all time; indeed the reaction did not begin to take hold until the first thirteen books of the Antiquities, which dealt primarily with this, must have been completed, [which had happened] already quite a while before 93/94; so these books, which were composed in Rome, are still borne entirely by the spirit of Hellenistic Judaism and the LXX. But when the work actually appeared it must have already
been almost obsolete; for soon after 100 Justus can venture an attack to which Josephus basically can have no rejoinder, factually speaking; therefore he places the argument on a personal level. Of course he liked to dwell on [the fact] that this same Justus, who claimed to have a monopoly on Greek education, acted as the conveyor of pure Jewish tradition, and he liked to stress his own Judaism time and again in contrast to him; only he forgot in the process that Justus, who had learned his Greek in his youth, had always remained true to his people, whereas he, who had acquired a Greek education only late, had broken off his association with the Jewish priesthood since he was living in Rome as officiosus and later as Epaphroditus’ man of letters. And all reference to schools etc. was of no help when it was pointed out to him that his work was not based on the Hebrew Bible, as the Jews now demanded.

Epaphroditus, the publisher of the Antiquities, required [274] an account. Josephus assails him over and over again, he tries to prove his ability to discredit Justus politically and literarily; and yet we can say historically that it was the latter who was right; the future belonged to Jewish orthodoxy, to the Hebrew Bible, not to the LXX, not to Hellenistic Judaism, not to the Antiquities. Josephus, who was around 70 years old, sees the catastrophe overtaking him; if Epaphroditus now shakes him off on grounds of Justus’ attacks, [and if] he deems the Antiquities as something worthless like [Justus does], then the last things remaining to Josephus, [namely] literary fame, or more, his [very] literary existence, are taken [from him]; because his major venture of the Antiquities was a failure, it was not the book documenting Judaism [Urkundenbuch des Judentums] that it was intended to be, and should have been. And yet, the versatile [Josephus] still had one last resort remaining [to him]: granted the LXX was henceforth rejected as a book of the Jews, but in part [it was] rejected precisely because the Christians have turned it into their holy [own] book. The time was no longer to be far off when Jews and Christians quarrelled with regard to the LXX; the Antiquities was not lost if it were to be transferred over to Christianity. Just like the LXX was to be preserved only through, and in conjunction with, the New Testament, which presupposes it everywhere, [so] Josephus could save his Antiquities from oblivion only by supplying it to the Christians. Pangs of conscience did not exist for Josephus; he had betrayed his people long ago after he had deceived his government; he viewed Agrippa one minute as his patron, the next minute as his ferocious enemy; John of Gischala was a villain to him one minute and the next, a hero; today he cursed what he had worshipped yesterday if only his own interests were thus served. No
wonder that he now did something seemingly outrageous in order to salvage the Antiquities, which seemed doomed. [He] has the Christian creed dictated by a Christian and he inserts it into Ant. 18.63 - 64.

This and only this is signified by the interminably treated and just as often mistreated testimony of Christ, the so-called Testimonium Flavianum. Torn away from the context of Josephus’ personality and activity, it has always been investigated solely with respect to its authenticity, and no one has yet entertained the question of what the testimony then [275] means historically, and every passage, even every interpolation, does indeed have its [own] historical background. To this, however, the answer is that it means that the work intended by a Jew as the book documenting Judaism [Urkundenbuch des Judentums] no longer belonged to the Jews but to the Christians. This change, however, set in directly after the completion of the Antiquities, when Justus’ attack occurred, i.e. in Josephus’ lifetime. And this business-oriented and unscrupulous Josephus was to stand by and watch this calmly? He was to have tolerated the threatening destruction of his work? Whoever has grasped Josephus’ personality along with us can hardly even take such a thought into consideration. But it is still good that we can adduce the philological proof that indeed no one other than Josephus has inserted the Testimonium.

The author of the passage is a Jew and it accords with this that he speaks about the Jews as “our” people and [that] the Christians are placed in contrast to this. But he is just as obviously Christian, or better, he gives such a presentation of Jesus’ activity that, if he felt it inwardly, he can only be a Christian. When Harnack believed that from the wording of the entire passage he detected a tone that was slightly dismissive of Christianity, then this impression is indeed subjective and cannot at all stand up to the conclusion of Norden, who attested the Christian sacred facts [Heilstatsachen] so compellingly, that only a Christian can be behind the passage. So herein lies the problem: a Jew reports quite plainly the Christian sacred facts and as far as the profession of Christianity is in question, he of course does this using] expressions that are suited to Christianity. But even here the Jew betrays himself again.

In the phrase οὐκ ἐπαύσαντο οἱ τὸ πρῶτον ἀγαπήσαντες [the verb ἀγαπᾶν is commonly translated by “to love”; but this is incorrect. If the author had intended to say: “those who had loved him initially, did not stop (continuing to do this)”, then we would have to wonder that there was no talk at all of loving in the report of Jesus’ beginnings, [which states] they have
“received the truth with pleasure” and as a result Jesus gained followers. Conversely: by the continuation of the love nothing would be stated about the[276] continuation of the truth to the uninitiated, and yet that was a presupposition for the existence of the Christians by the time of Josephus. Another [point] is almost more important in my [opinion]: Josephus substantiates the problematic phrase by the fact of the resurrection. Now indeed, one cannot possibly explain the continuation of the “love” by the fact of the resurrection – it is completely independent of this – from another aspect, however, the resurrection does form an absolutely essential element of the Christian “truth”. In principle, the relation of the concept of the Messiah to Jesus seemed to be settled by virtue of the crucifixion; if his followers did not now stop viewing him as the Messiah after all, as one should actually expect, then this requires a reason. It is provided by the author – in accordance with the Christian view – by the reference to the fact of the resurrection.⁹⁰ Therefore it is not the continuation of the “love” that is explained by the γὰρ phrase, rather a reason is given for how it comes to be that the disciples did not stop acknowledging the truth despite the death, i.e. ἀγαπᾶν must factually resume ἡδονῇ δέχεσθαι from section 63, as we already had to deduce formally. Precisely this meaning, which we have postulated as inevitable, can be attested in Josephus. When Alexander calls upon the Jews to take part in the war and guarantees them freedom to practice their religion in exchange, πολλοί τὴν σὺν αὐτῷ στρατείαν ἠγάπησαν (11.339). By contrast, let someone show us Christian authors who use ἀγαπᾶν in such a sense. Here the case is even more compelling than the peculiar use of ἡδονή, to which Harnack had referred. If one could actually still use the excuse here [that] “the interpolator knew his author” then this excuse is impossible with respect to ἀγαπᾶν, since this usually means “to love” likewise in Josephus.

If traces of his own personal language use appear even here where Josephus ranges perforce within Christian terminology, then this applies more than ever[277] where he tells about the appearance of Jesus; in fact, we can demonstrate such a striking parallel to this, that every objection must fall silent.⁹¹ In a context that is quite harmless for our problem, Josephus

⁹⁰ Cf. H. Holtzmann, Neutestamentliche Theologie, vol. 1², page 432: “In the opinion of the community, the resurrection signifies a cancellation, emanating from God, of the death sentence passed by men, thus the vindication of the one who has been put to death unjustly.” This is exactly Josephus’ thinking – Whoever deletes the phrase ἐφάνη γὰρ, disrupts the context.

⁹¹ I am currently concerned only with explaining the passage historically; I [shall] not enter
relates [in] 17.328 how the false Herod gains followers after his landing: οὐκ ἦτοχεί καὶ τοὺς τῇτε Ἰουδαίος ἀφ’ ὁμοίας ἀπάτης προσαγαγέονται. From where did this come? αἴτιον δὲ ἦν τῶν ἀνθρώπων τὸ ἡδονὴ δεχόμενον τοὺς λόγους. Are these not the analogous concepts? Is the author at work here not ranging within similar formations of thought [Gedankenbildungen]? Since Jesus was a διδάσκαλος ἰδιακολος ἀνθρώπων τῶν ἡδονῆς τάλης ἔχασθαι καὶ τοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ ἐπηγάγετο.

The details of the situations are different, and the [similarity] does not touch every word either – that would bespeak a copyist – rather, it is obvious that here one and the same author is speaking to us, who is portraying two parallel incidents from a similar basic outlook [Grundanschauung].

Indeed, the idea of the Christian interpolation emerged basically only because it was considered impossible that a Jew could have composed the Testimonium. But precisely that which appeared impossible ensued for us as an inevitable consequence from Josephus’ character and course of life; [just] as he once wished to make his Antiquities palatable to the Jews by his attack on Agrippa, so he now could salvage this, his great lifework, all the more by virtue of supplying it to the Christians. Josephus did not become a Christian as a result, but by virtue of inserting into his work what the Christians wished to have recognized as the substance of their belief, he has made it possible for the Graeco-Roman readership to continue reading the work even though it had become unusable as a Jewish [writing]. And so the theologian should not view the Testimonium as a Jewish testimony about Christ, but indeed as a document that can indicate to us the way in which the Christians around 110 CE wished to have Jesus’ activity presented. By means of the fixed point in time that we can determine for the Testimonium – it can be a matter only of a range of about 10 years, [278] so that we enter approximately into the time of the correspondence between Pliny and Trajan – its formulation of the Christian sacred facts [Heilstatsachen] is perhaps suitable for becoming the corner stone of further research.

Not long afterwards Josephus must have died; his work, however, was preserved, perhaps not the least precisely because of the Testimonium. It was this that endeared the Antiquities to the Christians; so in the final battle it is Josephus, after all, who remained the victor over Justus, who inevitably spurned it for its entire way of thinking and who also had no upon all the details.
cause to bend before the Christians, to whom the unscrupulous Josephus had sacrificed himself with nary an afterthought.