

# JOSEPHUS AND JUSTUS OF TIBERIAS

A Contribution to the History of the Jewish Revolt

Inaugural Dissertation

fulfilling the Requirements of the Doctorate  
of the Faculty of Philosophy of the

United Friedrichs University, Halle-Wittenberg

presented by

Heinrich Luther from Schkeitbar

---

Halle a.S.

Wischan & Burkhardt

1910

Supervisor: Professor Dr. Kern

Viva Voce: May 24, 1910

To my Father

---

Translated by Caroline Disler with Martin Fischer and Steve Mason

York University (Toronto)

2006

[NB: Bold numbers in brackets represent page numbers of the original]

## Introduction

The main source for the history of the Jewish revolt is Josephus' work on the Jewish War.<sup>1</sup> Josephus himself participated in the revolt, and was actually in command in Galilee. With the conquest of Jotapata he faced Roman imprisonment, in which he remained for two years. After the accession of Vespasian as emperor he was released from imprisonment. During the siege of Jerusalem he was in the camp of Titus, upon whose orders he attempted several times to negotiate with the Jews. After the city's conquest, he accompanied Titus to Rome where he subsequently lived, occupying himself with literary pursuits. To this literary activity of Josephus we owe the *Jewish War* (published between 75 and 79 CE), the text *Against Apion*, the *Jewish Antiquities*, and his autobiography. As for his writing style, Josephus belongs among those rhetorical authors who are more concerned with the form than with the content of their presentation.<sup>2</sup> This type of author is frequently associated with straining for effect and melodramatic presentation; this is also the case with Josephus. Moreover, since he was not without a certain vanity, whenever he reported on his own activity, he [6] spoke of his deeds with excessive praise. As a result, it is precisely the second and third books of the *War* and the autobiography that suffer most from the shortcomings of rhetorical presentation. These are most evident in the depiction of the siege of Jotapata, where Josephus was in charge [of the defence]. This report fills the greater part of the *War*'s third book and is embellished with all the devices of rhetoric.<sup>3</sup> But the objectivity of his portrayal is further clouded by two other factors. During his command Josephus had to contend with an opposition that tried in every way to force him out of his position; according to Josephus' report, attempts were even made on his life. Therefore Josephus depicted the leaders of this movement with great spitefulness, especially the main leader, John of Gischala. In addition, there is also the following fact: while writing his *War*, Josephus was living in Rome where he was in contact with the emperor Vespasian and his son Titus,

---

<sup>1</sup> Tacitus had also recounted the siege and conquest of Jerusalem at length in the fifth book of his *Histories*. This report, however, has been lost and stops exactly at the point where Titus' army arrives before Jerusalem. Furthermore, in the biographies of Vespasian and Titus, Suetonius provides a few notes about the Jewish War, as does Cassius Dio.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. B. Niese in *Sybel's hist. Zeitschr.* 76, 1986, p. 208 and Alfred Wolff, *De Flavii Josephi belli Judaici scriptoris studiis rhetoricis*. Halle Diss. 1908.

<sup>3</sup> The Jewish soldiers outdo each other in bravery and their willingness to sacrifice themselves; Josephus, the leader, knows how to counter every Roman attack by ingeniously devising new methods of defence.

who had quelled the Jewish revolt. For this reason, in his *War* Josephus pursued a tendency of clearing himself of all guilt with respect to the Romans. This is why his depiction of his own activity creates absolutely no impression that he was the leader of the revolt in Galilee, though he really was. On the other hand, he showed consideration for the emperor Vespasian and Titus. He had only good words for the behaviour of both men; indeed, he even falsely presented the burning of the Temple as an event that occurred against Titus' will, whereas we know from other historians<sup>4</sup> that the Temple was set on fire at the command of the Roman leader.

[7] Josephus' *War* was already considered the main work on the Jewish revolt at that time; according to Josephus' *Life*<sup>5</sup> at least, Titus authorized the publication of the work with his own signature and designated it the authentic presentation of the war. As we hear from Josephus' prologue to this work,<sup>6</sup> however, there were already at that time several authors who had treated this war—whether in a monograph or in the framework of a larger history. Josephus does not mention any by name, but harshly criticizes what he considers their highly unreliable or tendentious presentation. A long time after the publication of Josephus' *War*, Justus of Tiberias published a work about the Jewish War in which he subjected Josephus' work to a harsh critique. He probably demonstrated above all that Josephus, contrary to his own presentation, supported the cause of revolt with determination. He may well have set himself against other shortcomings and inaccuracies in Josephus' work, such as the featuring of his own character. Since this work by Justus has been lost, we depend on more or less secure inferences.

As a response to these attacks by Justus, Josephus wrote his autobiography, which he published as an appendix to the *Jewish Antiquities*, which he had just then completed. That is how it happened that this writing did not become a real autobiography. It provides biographical notes only at the beginning and the end. By far the greatest part is a presentation of his activity in Galilee. Josephus was very concerned to refute Justus' claims, or at least to attenuate them; for this purpose of course he had to go into some detail specifically about the period of his command in Galilee. At the same time [8] he was now trying, on his side, to make Justus look bad. Since it is a biased text, Josephus' biography is to be used as a historical source only with caution. Under these circumstances it should

---

<sup>4.</sup> Sulp. Severus Chron. II. 30 Orosius IX, 5-6, which probably rely on Tacitus' *Histories*. Cf. B. Niese *op. cit.* p. 203 and Schürer, *Gesch. d. jüd. Volkes*, I. 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> edition. p. 631 note 115 and Jakob Bernays, *Chronik des S. Severus* 1861 p. 48-61.

<sup>5.</sup> § 363.

<sup>6.</sup> §1-2

come as no surprise that the reports in this work frequently deviate from those of the *War*, which was written earlier. In most cases the earlier report of the *War* merits preference, but sometimes the *Life's* presentation is the better one. The explanation for this is that in some cases Josephus was forced by Justus' attacks to correct his earlier presentation, which is likewise tendentious. At all those points in the *Life* where Josephus has to concede something that he had told differently or not all in the *War*, one can believe him implicitly as to the matter itself—though in his *presentation* of the event he is not reliable here either. There are cases, nonetheless, where the report of the *War* provides the original [version], in which [cases] it is perfectly clear why Josephus presented the matter differently in his biography. In these cases the *War* is the better source. One must investigate each individual case, therefore, in order to determine which of the two reports is the more trustworthy.

Because scholars have until now underestimated the tendentious character of this part of the *War* and the autobiography, where Josephus reports his own activities, there are widespread opinions today about Josephus and Justus that do not accord with the facts. Nevertheless B. Niese, in the essay cited, did indeed evaluate the two men quite accurately, and the present work is but a development of the thoughts he expressed there. But as Niese wrote in that essay about Josephus and his authorial activity, he naturally described only briefly the relations between Josephus and Justus and the latter's position. Schürer<sup>7</sup> also evaluates [9] Justus correctly in general; but in light of the scope of his work he also could not go into detail about specific questions. Most recently Bärwald, in his dissertation,<sup>8</sup> devotes considerable attention to Justus and Josephus; but since he bases many points on false assumptions, he has often arrived at incorrect conclusions. In the following analysis, then, the positions of Josephus and Justus at the time of the revolt and their relations with each other, as well as the question of Justus' personal outlook, will be considered from a new perspective.

[10]

## 1. The History Leading up to the Revolt

For several years prior to the outbreak of unrest, bitter animosity toward Roman rule already prevailed in Judaea as a result of the suppression by the last Roman governors. The flames of revolt threatened to erupt at any moment. In the end, the efforts of those in

---

<sup>7.</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>8.</sup> *Josephus in Galiläa, sein Verhältnis zu den Parteien, insbesondere zu Justus von Tiberias und Agrippa*. II. Breslau, Dissertation. 1877.

favour of peace, among whom the aristocrats and the high priests were to be counted according to Josephus,<sup>9</sup> and of King Agrippa were no longer enough to hold back the embittered crowd. The Roman cohorts garrisoned in Jerusalem were surrounded, were forced to surrender, and were slaughtered, even though they had been assured that they could leave freely. This was in the spring of 66 CE. The Jews' agitation increased because at the same time the Syrian inhabitants of Caesarea by the sea killed all Jewish inhabitants of the city.<sup>10</sup> This act was a sign of the great hatred between Jews and Syrians and caused a series of revenge attacks by the Jews. As a consequence, the unrest immediately spread over the entire Jewish territory and beyond its borders. The Jews formed various war groups and looted in the Syrian border area; they even attacked larger cities. Josephus<sup>11</sup> mentions Philadelphia, Sebonitis, Gerasa, Pella, Scythopolis, Gadara, and Hippus, cities of the Syrian Decapolis; in addition Kedesa, Ptolemais, Gaba, Caesarea on the sea, Sebaste in Samaria, and the Philistine cities Ascalon, Anthedon, and Gaza. With great exaggeration Josephus maintains that these cities were partly [11] set on fire and partly demolished. The Jews were not at all capable of doing this, especially in such a short time; rather, they limited themselves to plundering the open land and villages. We can detect Josephus' inaccuracy from this: that in the *War*<sup>12</sup> he mentions also Scythopolis among the destroyed cities, whereas in the *Life*<sup>13</sup> he writes that the Jewish attack was repulsed.<sup>14</sup> Moreover, at a later point in the *Life*<sup>15</sup> Josephus also speaks only of plundered villages.

The Syrians, for their part, now sought revenge by killing the Jews who lived among them. This occurred in Scythopolis, Tyre, Ptolemais, Hippus, Gadara, and Ascalon.<sup>16</sup> The Jews were also persecuted in Alexandria<sup>17</sup> and in Agrippa's kingdom.<sup>18</sup> In particular, the *Life* tells<sup>19</sup> of a campaign of the Gadarenes, Baragarians, and Tyrians against John's hometown of Gischala, which destroyed this small city.

Cestius Gallus, the governor of Syria, was now finally compelled to intervene. With a rather large army, to which Agrippa and the other allied kings also contributed troops, he

---

<sup>9.</sup> BJ. II 316.

<sup>10.</sup> BJ. II 457. According to Josephus 20,000.

<sup>11.</sup> BJ. II 458-460.

<sup>12.</sup> II 458.

<sup>13.</sup> § 26.

<sup>14.</sup> The allegedly destroyed cities are also all mentioned shortly thereafter.

<sup>15.</sup> § 42.

<sup>16.</sup> BJ. II 477-478.

<sup>17.</sup> BJ. II 487-498.

<sup>18.</sup> BJ. II 481-483. V. 53-58. After the defeat of Cestius, the Jews in Damascus were killed. BJ. II 559-561.

<sup>19.</sup> § 44. John later rebuilt [Gischala] and fortified it anew. V. 45.

marched against Jerusalem after having Caesennius Gallus suppress the rebels in Galilee.<sup>20</sup> This campaign of Cestius, however, ended in a total defeat, and instead of being quelled [12], the revolt just gained new momentum,<sup>21</sup> because many Jews who had previously supported peace now switched to the rebel party and started to organize the revolt in a systematic manner. For this purpose, they divided the Jewish land into districts—Jerusalem was one by itself—and elected a number of army leaders; for the most part, two or three men were sent into one district.<sup>22</sup> All these army leaders were given the assignment to prepare their respective districts for the arrival of the Romans, for it was to be expected that the Romans would not let the defeat of Cestius pass without revenge.

A new Roman army could not arrive on the spot that quickly, however. Thus, the Romans had to make sure that those Syrian districts that would first fall victim to Jewish attacks were at least somewhat protected for the time being. Granted, there were only a few Roman armed forces that were assigned to this task. Therefore, already prior to the arrival of Vespasian, to whom the command of the Jewish War had been transferred by Nero, several Roman detachments were to be found stationed in Jewish territory or at its borders. Neapolitanus was in Scythopolis<sup>23</sup> with about 500 horsemen<sup>24</sup> and a decurion, Aebutius, was in Gaba in Galilee with 100 horsemen and about 200 foot soldiers to guard the plains of Jezreel and to secure the Decapolis' connection with the coast.<sup>25</sup> Of course there were Roman armed forces also in Caesarea by the sea, the residence of the governors of Judaea; [13] one *ala* and five cohorts (about 3,000 men). These were no legionary soldiers, but rather auxiliary troops, mostly Caesareans and Sebastenes from Sebaste, which was formerly called Samaria.<sup>26</sup>

In addition, Samaria was occupied by small Roman detachments that were dispersed throughout the area. In these areas there probably was not much enthusiasm for the revolt, since relations between Jews and Samaritans had already been strained for a long time. Nevertheless, unrest had broken out once even here, during the siege of Jotapata, although

---

<sup>20.</sup> *BJ*, II 510-512.

<sup>21.</sup> The defeat of Cestius occurred on the 8<sup>th</sup> of Dios (November) 66.

<sup>22.</sup> *BJ*, II 562-568. V. 28-29.

<sup>23.</sup> Scythopolis was the largest city of the Syrian Decapolis. *Cf. BJ*, III 446. The Jewish king Alexander Jannaeus (104-78 BCE) had subjugated the land to the east of the Jordan. *Cf. Schürer op. cit.* p. 285. Pompey later reunified the Decapolis with Syria.

<sup>24.</sup> V. 121.

<sup>25.</sup> V. 151.

<sup>26.</sup> *Ant.* XX 176. *BJ*, II 268. Mommsen, *Röm. Geschichte* V p. 510 note. 1.

it was quickly suppressed.<sup>27</sup> Ascalon also was occupied by one Roman cohort and one *ala*.<sup>28</sup> After the defeat of Cestius the Jews attacked this city, which they had hated from time immemorial, but they just suffered a defeat.<sup>29</sup> Gaza also inclined toward Rome, while Ashdod (Azotus), Jamnia, Lydda, and Joppa were on the side of the Jews.<sup>30</sup>

Moreover, during the revolt Agrippa sent royal troops under his governor Aequus Modius, which were supposed to watch Gamala.<sup>31</sup> Later on he sent another detachment under Sulla's command to cut off supplies from Galilee to the towns of Gamala and Seleucia in Gaulanitis who had joined the revolt.<sup>32</sup> During the winter of 66/67, the Jews used the time remaining until the arrival [14] of a new Roman army in order to prepare themselves for the upcoming war.

Galilee had to expect the first attack. Josephus, who was the military leader in this territory, did not have an easy task. To a certain extent, though, some work had already been done in advance. Already prior to his arrival in Galilee, armed bands had formed and were conducting looting raids on their own initiative, firstly in order to harm the Syrians, and secondly in order to force those who were still undecided to join the revolt. One of the leaders of these bands probably was John of Gischala, for Josephus reports<sup>33</sup> that he had gathered together a gang of 400 men with whom he pillaged all of Galilee.<sup>34</sup> After Josephus' arrival, the revolt was systematically organized. This did not, however, completely stop these self-organized looting raids. During his command, at least, we hear of a certain Jesus,<sup>35</sup> who had a gang of about 800 men around him and who was located at the border of Ptolemais until Josephus took him into his service.

---

<sup>27.</sup> *BJ*. III 307-315. At that time, rebellious Samaritans had banded together on Mount Gerizim.

<sup>28.</sup> *BJ*. III 12.

<sup>29.</sup> *BJ*. III 9-28.

<sup>30.</sup> *Cf. BJ*. II 567. Vespasian later ordered an occupation of Asdod and Jamnia *BJ*. IV 130, while he settled pro-Roman Jews in Lydda and Jamnia. By contrast, Jewish refugees had established themselves in Joppa and from there they threatened the security of the coast as pirates. As a result, the city was razed at the command of Vespasian. *BJ*. III 414-427. Cestius had already punished the city on his campaign against Jerusalem, *BJ*. II 508.

<sup>31.</sup> *BJ*. IV 10. V. 114.

<sup>32.</sup> V. 398. *Cf.* p. 90 of the appendix.

<sup>33.</sup> *BJ*. II 588.

<sup>34.</sup> This is an exaggeration. This violence was directed only against pro-Romans and was undertaken with the best of intentions.

<sup>35.</sup> V. 104-110. Ἰησοῦς ἀρχιληστής.

## II. Josephus' Activity in Galilee and the Opposition that Formed Against Him

### 1. Josephus' Activity

If many incorrect opinions about Josephus' position toward the revolt and his activity as leader in Galilee are in circulation, this can be accounted for by a failure to investigate carefully his activity according to the reports in the *War* [15] and the *Life*, and by the fact that we allow ourselves to be deceived by Josephus' tendency to vindicate himself at every opportunity. Another factor is also important: during his command, an opposition formed against him, which assumed a rather dangerous character and which Josephus depicted, in both the *War* and the *Life*, with great detail and exaggeration. From this [situation] arose the opinion that Josephus administered his office idly, because he was only half-hearted about the cause<sup>36</sup>—an opinion that does not match the facts.

In order to obtain a clear picture of his position toward the revolt and the character of the opposition [against him], we must investigate what Josephus achieved as leader of the revolt in Galilee. Josephus does not give a detailed account of this, for at that time he was indeed an enemy of the Romans, and he wanted to conceal this fact as much as possible while composing his writings. Thus, the *War* contains relatively sparse information about his accomplishments as organizer of the revolt. In later years, however, Josephus supplemented this report in his *Life*, prompted by the attacks that Justus of Tiberias had levelled against him.<sup>37</sup> His attempt to justify his actions in Galilee now placed him in a very tight spot: on the one hand, he cannot deny a series of hostile actions against the Romans; on the other hand, he has the tendency to hide his hostility toward the Romans, even more in the *Life* than in the *War*. This results in a very convoluted manner of expression and frequent contradictions with the earlier presentation in the *War*. Since both presentations are tendentious, we cannot expect that Josephus provided a faithful portrait of his activity. Nevertheless, what Josephus does report on the subject is quite sufficient [16] for us to identify him as head of the revolt in Galilee. On the other hand, there is no danger here that he might have said too much. On the contrary, what was reported probably represents only

---

<sup>36.</sup> According to Bärwald, *op. cit.* p. 42 and 45 and Schürer, p. 608.

<sup>37.</sup> Cf. above p. 7.

a part of his actual activity, for during his later Roman-friendly tendency he probably would have related only what was most necessary about his Roman-hostile operations. There were three determining factors that made him tell this part of the story at all. First, while composing the *War* he could not avoid relating what actually did happen in Galilee. To this was added, second, a certain vanity, which induced him to present his activities in the proper light; that is why in the *War* he narrated with considerable detail the creation and training of an army and the building of fortifications, and above all the siege of Jotapata. Third, he was compelled by Justus' comments to admit to various Roman-hostile operations in the *Life*, about which he had been silent in the *War*.

Among the army leaders who were elected after the Jewish victory over Cestius was also Josephus, who was then staying in his hometown, Jerusalem. He was put in charge of Galilee and the fortress Gamala in Gaulanitis. In the *War*<sup>38</sup> Josephus, in keeping with the state of affairs, characterizes the elected men as army leaders for the war.<sup>39</sup> The defeat of Cestius occurred on the 8<sup>th</sup> of November 65. If we now add the required time for the elections, Josephus' preparations, and the journey to Galilee, he must have arrived around mid-November to assume his new responsibilities.

[17] His assignment—to organize the area for the revolt—meant that Josephus travelled around the land rather a lot: to establish contact with distinguished persons, to extend the area of the revolt wherever possible, but most importantly to supervise personally the building of forts. Josephus seems to have gone first to Sepphoris; at any rate, this is the first town in which he reports his presence<sup>40</sup> and there is also an obvious reason for this. The inhabitants of Sepphoris were actually opposed to the revolt for reasons that we shall present below<sup>41</sup>. Josephus probably wanted to try now to win the Sepphorites over to the revolt.<sup>42</sup> From this city he travelled together with his two fellow-envoys to Bethmaus near Tiberias.<sup>43</sup> They were sent there for an assignment that, according to the *Life*,<sup>44</sup> he had received from the authorities in Jerusalem. The palace of King Agrippa was to be destroyed

---

<sup>38.</sup> *BJ*, II 562.

<sup>39.</sup> See p. 71 below for reasons why Josephus makes somewhat divergent statements about his assignment in *Life* 28-29. Moreover, like most of the other leaders, Josephus was assigned two men to support him. *Cf. Life* 29.

<sup>40.</sup> *V.* 30

<sup>41.</sup> See the appendix, p. 83.

<sup>42.</sup> See the appendix, p. 84.

<sup>43.</sup> We do not know why Josephus did not enter Tiberias itself; perhaps this fact is completely fabricated; at any rate it is not entirely free of suspicion.

<sup>44.</sup> § 65.

because it contained animal figures, which was prohibited by the law,<sup>45</sup> and the Jews were extremely angry with Agrippa at that time because he opposed the revolt and was on the side of the Romans. Perhaps they also hoped to acquire money for the war by selling the treasures from this palace. Thus, Josephus asked the council of Tiberias to meet him outside; he attempted to convince them but was initially met with resistance. Finally, the councillors were simply compelled. The implementation was probably to take place somewhat later; for Josephus [18] apparently continued his travels to Upper Galilee.<sup>46</sup> Jesus, the city's archon and also leader of the revolt party, however, forestalled the looting that had been ordered. This caused Josephus, when he heard of it, to hurry immediately to Tiberias to save what he could recover. At least this is what he reports in his *Life*.<sup>47</sup>

From Tiberias, Josephus went to Gischala to see John, who was one of the most active supporters of the revolt and a very energetic personality.<sup>48</sup> Josephus initially was on the best of terms with him, as some passages of the *War* and the *Life* indicate.<sup>49</sup> So when he now went to meet John he obviously wished to speak to him about questions of fortifications, recruitment of soldiers, and distribution of the war's costs. As a native, John knew the situation in Galilee better than Josephus.

After this journey, which we may well regard as an orientation trip, Josephus entered upon his main assignment. First, he had to put together an army; it was to his advantage that Galilee's population was large and willing to fight.<sup>50</sup> In the *War*,<sup>51</sup> Josephus numbers the recruited soldiers at 100,000, which is probably an exaggeration. This number included the occupation forces. According to Josephus,<sup>52</sup> the field army numbered 60,000 men. The cavalry was quite weak with only 350 men, a shortcoming that was rather frequently felt.<sup>53</sup> The personal protection of the leader was in the hands [19] of 600 bodyguards. Josephus also speaks of 4,500 mercenaries, professional soldiers who undoubtedly formed the army's nucleus. Most likely they were predominantly of non-Jewish nationality, since Jews were not allowed to bear arms on the Sabbath—so, for example, refugees from the Syrian territory who, as so often happened in antiquity, took up

---

<sup>45.</sup> Cf. *Ant.* XVII 151-155. *BJ.* I 650-655—a similar case under Herod I.

<sup>46.</sup> V. 64-67.

<sup>47.</sup> V. 68-69. The *BJ* does not mention this story.

<sup>48.</sup> V. 70.

<sup>49.</sup> *BJ.* II 590 and 615. V. 86.

<sup>50.</sup> *BJ.* III 42.

<sup>51.</sup> II 576.

<sup>52.</sup> *BJ.* II 583.

<sup>53.</sup> Cf. V. 397

arms against the people of their own land. Yet there may have been Jews among them as well, who had lived among Syrians but fled once the fighting erupted.<sup>54</sup> Once in the *War*<sup>55</sup> Josephus also refers to refugees from the territory of Tyre who had been paid by John. Josephus' army also included soldiers formerly from Agrippa's army<sup>56</sup> who were probably paid as well. Of course, these could be only Jews from Agrippa's mixed-Jewish territory. It is understood that among the "robbers" whom Josephus included in his army<sup>57</sup> there were primarily Jews who had already been active in the revolt prior to his arrival.<sup>58</sup>

The army was therefore not insignificant as far as numbers were concerned, but it suffered from several shortcomings. First, there was only a short time available for training. This was even more problematic because there was no existing group that the young recruits could have joined, for the Jews were exempted from serving in the Roman army. Furthermore, there was no junior officer corps that could be trained. Moreover, the newly recruited army was equipped with old, scrounged-together weapons. [20] The most severe shortcoming, however, was the lack of discipline. Josephus took great pains to improve this by referring to the example of the Roman army, whose strength lay precisely in its discipline. The structure of the army followed a natural division, from smaller to progressively larger companies.<sup>59</sup>

In light of these weaknesses and the nature of the adversary facing Josephus, it is not surprising that he was not able to achieve victories in open battles with this army; however, the Jews were valiant in their defence of fortresses, as the siege of Jotapata and Gamala shows.

Otherwise, Josephus turned his attention to fortifying cities, villages, and other appropriate points, in which he was aided by the mountainous nature of the region. Both Galilee and the area east of the Jordan known as Gaulanitis, where some places were likewise fortified, were quite mountainous and had an abundance of localities that were, in part, situated atop very steep heights and were ideal for resistance. Josephus was personally in charge of most of these fortifications, partly also at his own expense, as he claims.

Among the cities of Galilee, Tiberias played a prominent role because of its size and

---

<sup>54.</sup> Cf. The persecution of the Jews *BJ*. II 477-478.

<sup>55.</sup> *BJ*. II 588.

<sup>56.</sup> V. 220 and 397. At the beginning of the unrest, Agrippa had sent 3,000 men under his commander Philip to Jerusalem to support the peace party. Cf. *BJ*. II 421. This troop, however, had the support of only one Roman cohort, could not stand against the masses and capitulated. At that time, many may have switched over to the Jewish side completely.

<sup>57.</sup> V. 110-11.

<sup>58.</sup> Cf. above p. 14.

<sup>59.</sup> *BJ*. II 578.

location; it had joined the revolt<sup>60</sup> early on even though it belonged to Agrippa's territory. Therefore it was only natural that Josephus began to fortify this city at an early stage: ἐν ἀρχῇ τῆς ἀποστάσεως δαψιλεία χρημάτων καὶ δυνάμεως.<sup>61</sup>

[21] Josephus' information about the fortification of Sepphoris is not completely clear; but comparison of the diverging reports reveals that the Sepphorites built their fortification themselves with Josephus' permission.<sup>62</sup> Likewise, John of Gischala himself prepared the defences of his hometown, as Josephus narrates in the *War*<sup>63</sup> and the *Life*<sup>64</sup>.

Apart from Tiberias, Josephus fortified another whole series of sites, above all the fortress Jotapata, which subsequently caused the Romans such great difficulties, as well as Tarichaea,<sup>65</sup> Mount Tabor (Itabyrium), Bersuba, Selamis, Kapharekcho, Sogane, and Japha in lower Galilee; in Upper Galilee, Jamnia, Ameroth, Acharabe, and Seph.<sup>66</sup> Finally, the caves at Arbela, west of Lake Genezareth, were prepared for defence.<sup>67</sup> In Gaulanitis there was also the fortification of Gamala,<sup>68</sup> where Josephus increased the natural strength [of the site] by means of underground trenches and passages.<sup>69</sup> The two villages of Seleucia and Sogane were fortified as well.<sup>70</sup>

All these places were provided with supplies and weapons so that an attack by the Romans would encounter rather great difficulties. Of course, it was not possible for Josephus to be present in person at all these installations [22] as they were being prepared at about the same time; but he was in command, and he probably inspected the progress of the construction from time to time.

During this winter Josephus also had the opportunity to test his soldiers in small clashes with the Romans and the royal troops, which he frequently instigated. One of these was a small encounter near Gaba between Josephus and the Roman decurion Aebutius.<sup>71</sup>

---

<sup>60.</sup> This does not mean that all the inhabitants were in agreement with this position.

<sup>61.</sup> This is according to the report in *War* III 465, which has the advantage of being the most factual. In contradiction to this [report] there is another statement of the *War* II 609 and *Life* 142, according to which Josephus intended to fortify Tarichaea, a small town on the south shore of Lake Genezareth, before [fortifying] Tiberias. These last reports, however, are within a suspicious context and are therefore not very believable, as we shall see below.

<sup>62.</sup> Cf. p. 84-85 of the appendix.

<sup>63.</sup> II 575.

<sup>64.</sup> § 45. Cf. p. 11, where the destruction of Gischala is reported.

<sup>65.</sup> Cf. p. 20, note 3.

<sup>66.</sup> *BJ*. II 573-574. V. 188.

<sup>67.</sup> Cf. *BJ*. I 307-314, Herod's attack on these caves.

<sup>68.</sup> Cf. p. 89 of the appendix.

<sup>69.</sup> *BJ*. IV 9.

<sup>70.</sup> *BJ*. II 574. V. 187.

<sup>71.</sup> V. 115-117.

When Aebutius fell back to Gaba, Josephus went on a looting raid in the border area of Ptolemais. Additionally, in Besara he took wheat reserves that belonged to Princess Berenice and moved them to Galilee.<sup>72</sup> He then challenged Aebutius to a battle and when he did not succeed in this, he turned against Neapolitanus, the Roman commander of Scythopolis, who was looting in the area around Tiberias and was stopped by Josephus.<sup>73</sup> Soon thereafter the Syrian governor Cestius Gallus sent a Roman division consisting of two cohorts and one *ala* under the command of Placidus to the Galilean border in order to harass the Galileans. Josephus turned against him and set up a camp facing him. Josephus, who had a significant advantage in numbers—8,000 foot soldiers and 80 horsemen against Placidus' 1,500 men—tried frequently to provoke Placidus into battle, but there were only small clashes because the Roman cautiously restrained himself.<sup>74</sup> At that time, the Sepphorites also showed their true colours since they believed that Josephus was busy with Placidus, and asked Cestius to protect them.<sup>75</sup> As soon as Josephus got word of this, he moved against Sepphoris and took it by storm before the arrival of the Roman protective forces that Cestius had promised. [23] As punishment, Sepphoris was looted by the Galileans, who seized this opportunity to vent their long-standing resentment.<sup>76</sup> When the Sepphorites then turned to Cestius again with a request for help and he sent them infantry and horsemen, Josephus saw himself forced to move against this city once more. He set up a camp at Garis and attacked Sepphoris during one night; he had already taken control of most of the city when he had to fall back again because, according to his narrative, he was unfamiliar with the area.<sup>77</sup>

Some time thereafter there was a fight between the Jewish troops under Josephus and the Roman horsemen, which saw the Jews defeated after a courageous opposition.<sup>78</sup> Then Josephus turned against the royal troops, whom Agrippa had sent under Sulla to fight against the rebels, and who had set up camp close to Julias near the Jordan.<sup>79</sup> At first, Josephus sent Jeremias, a lower ranking officer, with 2,000 men against them; but when he

---

<sup>72.</sup> V. 118-119. This wheat had been moved to Besara from the surrounding villages and apparently may have been tribute [paid] to the princess or the proceeds from some farms.

<sup>73.</sup> V. 120-121.

<sup>74.</sup> V. 213-215.

<sup>75.</sup> V. 373-374.

<sup>76.</sup> Josephus admittedly maintains that he put a stop to their looting and takes the credit for having saved the city with a trick when the soldiers did not follow his order to stop looting. But it is very likely that he fabricated this [story], firstly to show his magnanimity, and secondly out of consideration for the Romans who were Sepphoris' allies at that time.

<sup>77.</sup> V. 394-396.

<sup>78.</sup> V. 397. Josephus advances encirclement as the reason for the defeat.

<sup>79.</sup> Cf. p. 13 V. 398.

could not accomplish much, Josephus himself followed with 3,000 men; therefore a major blow was to be dealt against the royal [forces]. The battle that now took place was successful for the Jews. A personal misfortune was the only thing that hindered Josephus from complete victory; he fell from his horse and hurt his hand.<sup>80</sup> The consequence of this was that Agrippa's troops were able to achieve a small [24] success the next day. But they also did not achieve full victory, because the Jews received support from Tarichaea, which was probably sent by Josephus, who lay wounded in that city.<sup>81</sup>

Meanwhile, it was spring of 67 and Vespasian appeared in Ptolemais, most eagerly awaited by all supporters of peace in the land, especially by the Sepphorites. A legation was sent from Sepphoris to Ptolemais to welcome Vespasian. Upon their request, the Sepphorites now received a stronger protective force of 6,000 foot soldiers and 1,000 horsemen.<sup>82</sup> The infantry was billeted in the city and the horsemen set up a camp in the great plain<sup>83</sup> while Vespasian remained in Ptolemais for the time being. From Sepphoris the Roman soldiers now conducted forays into the surrounding area. This forced Josephus to set up a camp again near Garis, in the vicinity of Sepphoris. He was more restrained against this larger Roman division but did still venture one attack on Sepphoris, which of course failed<sup>84</sup> and only increased the audacity of the Roman forays. Josephus adds μία γὰρ καταφυγή διωκομένοις αἱ ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἰωσήπου τειχισθεῖσαι πόλεις ἦσαν.<sup>85</sup> In the *Life*<sup>86</sup> he mentions another encounter near Garis that he apparently conducted against the Roman troops who were stationed in Sepphoris. After this he withdrew to Jotapata. In the *Life* he only alludes to this and refers for the rest to his account in the *War*. Finally, it must also be mentioned that Josephus even conducted a campaign against the Syrians living in the area; he defeated them and dragged off spoils.<sup>87</sup>

[25] We must therefore regard Josephus absolutely as the head of the revolt in Galilee, and there can be no question of treasonous intentions. Such a possibility is confuted by the fact that he personally led the defence of Jotapata and risked his life there in doing so. Had he really thought about treason, as Bärwald claims,<sup>88</sup> he would have easily found

---

<sup>80.</sup> V. 399-401.

<sup>81.</sup> V. 405-406.

<sup>82.</sup> *BJ*, III 59. V. 411.

<sup>83.</sup> Initially both sets of troops were combined in the camp.

<sup>84.</sup> *BJ*, III 60-61.

<sup>85.</sup> *BJ*, III 63.

<sup>86.</sup> § 412.

<sup>87.</sup> V. 81.

<sup>88.</sup> *Op. cit.* [Bärwald] pp. 42, 45 and 59.

the opportunity to switch to Vespasian's side when the latter arrived. Once Jotapata was conquered and Josephus was taken prisoner, Vespasian treated him as the leader of the revolt and kept him in chains for two years, from 67 to the selection of Vespasian as emperor in 69.<sup>89</sup> Josephus attributed the fact that he was otherwise treated better than a rebel would normally be handled simply to the circumstance that he predicted the future imperial accession of Vespasian, who valued such prophecies. The details of his capture and of this prophecy are not clear,<sup>90</sup> since Josephus has obviously coloured his narrative greatly here; but these two facts [ed. that he led the revolt, and was treated as a rebel leader] remain unshakable.

## 2. The Opposition

In the middle of Josephus' activity of organizing the revolt, an opposition formed against him. It originated with John of Gischala, with whom Josephus initially had a good understanding. Then a rift [26] occurred, which soon turned into open hostility. Josephus attributes this to [John's] thirst for power and his jealousy of Josephus' successes. John made the attempt to force Josephus from his command; in order to gain supporters he first turned to Tiberias, where there was a strong pro-war party. For a while he still tried to deceive Josephus about his intention and cited the use of hot springs in the vicinity of the town as the reason for his visit to Tiberias. At that time Josephus ordered the *hyparchs* of Tiberias<sup>91</sup> to make John's stay as pleasant as possible. This appears to indicate that Josephus still considered John his friend at that point in time, and that the animosity therefore came from John's side.<sup>92</sup> In the *War* Josephus describes John's success, [explaining] that he convinced some to abandon Josephus by false pretences and others by bribery.<sup>93</sup> In the *Life* he recounts that many gladly accepted [John's] invitation,

---

<sup>89.</sup> BJ. III 408. IV 626-628.

<sup>90.</sup> According to Josephus' report the prophecy was fulfilled immediately when he was brought before Vespasian, BJ. III 400-405. Suetonius also relates this in his *Life of Vespasian* 5,6 (edition by M. Ihm, p. 311); he apparently acquired his information from Josephus' *War*. According to Dio 66, 1.4, however, about one year passed between his capture and the prophecy. It therefore seems likely that Josephus intentionally placed the prophecy at the beginning of his imprisonment because his imprisonment was significantly better from that point in time onwards. At any rate, the time is not entirely clear.

<sup>91.</sup> BJ. II 615. V. 86. In the *Life*, Josephus gives this command τοῖς τῆς Τιβεριάδος τὴν διοίκησιν ὑπ' ἐμοῦ πεπιστευμένοις.

<sup>92.</sup> In the *War* Josephus narrates this story only after the incident in Tarichaea when John and Jesus, the son of Sapphias, supposedly agitated against him. This [time-]sequence is not accurate; in fact, the story with the baths belongs to the beginning, as Josephus' friendliness toward John shows.

<sup>93.</sup> II 615.

and especially those who were by nature eager for change.<sup>94</sup> Josephus received reports about John's intentions and then hurried to Tiberias to prevent the Tiberians from joining John.<sup>95</sup> To this purpose [27] he gave a speech at the racetrack, during which John had some of his soldiers attempt to assassinate him. Josephus only had a few armed men with him, while John supposedly had 1,000; however, Josephus was able to save himself by fleeing to Tarichaea.<sup>96</sup> Josephus generously refrained from punishing John, just as he always emphasizes John's wickedness and his own magnanimity in [portraying] their conflict in general. But John continued his efforts; this time, in addition to Tiberias, he appealed to Gabara and Sepphoris; Josephus customarily refers to these three cities always together as his opponents, including Gischala, John's hometown.<sup>97</sup> According to the *Life*, John had little success with this second attempt.<sup>98</sup> The Sepphorites acted in a dismissive manner; the Tiberians merely affirmed their friendship in general; and only the residents of Gabara, where a friend of John was head of the city, joined him, but even they did so only secretly.<sup>99</sup> This movement appears to have received a great impetus through one incident, which is usually described as the Dabaritta affair. According to Josephus' report,<sup>100</sup> a few Jewish youths from Dabaritta had mugged one of Agrippa's officials<sup>101</sup> on his journey through the great plain and brought the loot to Josephus. We do not know how Josephus acted because his statements here do not merit [28] credibility.<sup>102</sup> But this much we do know: as a result of the attack, many Galileans suspected him of being in contact with the [pro-]Roman party.

In relation to this story Josephus reports an incident that is supposed to have happened in Tarichaea. But this report is also unreliable.<sup>103</sup> We may well accept as a

---

<sup>94.</sup> V. 87. We should not be surprised that John did have some degree of success after all; at that time it was not difficult to form a new party among the Jews, as is clearly shown by the later incidents in Jerusalem, during which John likewise played a role as leader of a party. Cf. *BJ*. IV 389-396.

<sup>95.</sup> Of course, only the war party came under consideration, but this was the strongest party of the city.

<sup>96.</sup> *BJ*. II 616-619. V. 89-96.

<sup>97.</sup> Cf. *BJ*. II 629.

<sup>98.</sup> In the *War* there is no mention of this second attempt; but this is probably because the story is much shorter there, and it also is not likely, in principle, that John should have been successful right away.

<sup>99.</sup> V. 122-125.

<sup>100.</sup> *BJ*. II 595-596. V. 126-127.

<sup>101.</sup> This is according to the *War*. In the *Life* Josephus mentions the wife of this official.

<sup>102.</sup> In the *War* (II 597) Josephus says that he had the intention of sending the loot to Agrippa; in § 128 of the *Life* [he writes that] he wanted to put it aside for the owner who was a Jew because it was not right that a fellow tribesmen should be robbed by his own people. These are evidently later additions, however. In the *War*, this is a sign of homage [*lit.* "bow"] to Agrippa with whom he was exchanging letters while composing this work; for the thought of transferring the loot to Agrippa is completely impossible. At the time he wrote the *Life*, Agrippa was dead; in that work he wishes to appear as the gentleman.

<sup>103.</sup> The report in the *Life* deviates from that in the *War* at several points. Josephus evidently scaled back the most extreme exaggerations in the *Life*, perhaps due to Justus' polemics.

believable kernel only that Josephus was afflicted by some difficulties on account of the opposition in Tarichaea, from which he somehow extricated himself. In the *War* and in the *Life* Josephus does relate that he saved himself by dividing his opponents, in that he promised the Tarichaeans a fortification. But this statement is not believable, because in the *War*'s third book<sup>104</sup> Josephus reports that he fortified Tiberias before Tarichaea. Since it stands within a factual narrative, this passage merits more credibility than that rhetorically colourful story about his trick in Tarichaea. Perhaps Josephus fabricated the latter story so that he did not have to admit to any possible use of force.

Another event seems to have fuelled this movement's growth: the presence of two prominent non-Jews from Trachonitis, a territory [29] that belonged to Agrippa's area. For some reason they had fled from Agrippa's realm and had found refuge with the Jews. Some fanatic Jews now demanded that these two convert to Judaism, although they did not exhibit any inclination at all. Josephus sided with the two noblemen. Many Galileans understood this as a sign of treasonous relations with Agrippa.<sup>105</sup>

A larger campaign against Josephus now appeared to be more promising. For this reason, John sent his brother to Jerusalem to stir up feelings against Josephus. In the capital he had an influential friend from a prominent family, who was an enemy of Josephus at that time.<sup>106</sup> With his help he was able to convince influential men and some of the government to turn against Josephus.<sup>107</sup> By contrast, the citizens themselves did not want anything to do with John, according to Josephus' narration. The clique of prominent men, whose motive Josephus specifies as envy, sent money to John and ordered four distinguished men to go to Galilee with 2500 armed men, in order to demand an account of Josephus or, should he refuse, to use violence against him.<sup>108</sup>

The high priest Jesus, son of Gamalas, a friend of Josephus, had advised Josephus' father about this plan [30] and Josephus was informed about everything in detail by a letter from his father.<sup>109</sup> He therefore started his countermeasures: he took 8,000 armed

---

<sup>104.</sup> III 465.

<sup>105.</sup> Cf. the speech of the high priest Jesus in Jerusalem, *BJ*. IV 245. At that time the Zealots, under the rule of the same John, had accused the men of this group [*Ordnung*] order similarly of treason.

<sup>106.</sup> *BJ*. II 626. V. 190-192.

<sup>107.</sup> *BJ*. II 627. In the *Life* (195-196) Josephus mentions the high priests Ananus and Jesus, son of Gamalas. At first, Ananus and his supporters were against it but apparently they were won over by presents.

<sup>108.</sup> *BJ*. II 628. In the *Life* (199-200) Josephus relates that John had received 40,000 silver coins from the state treasury; by contrast, the four envoys had been given only 600 armed men, who had been led to Jerusalem by a Galilean, Jesus, and in addition 300 residents from Jerusalem.

<sup>109.</sup> According to V. 204. In the *War* (II 629), though, he maintains that he had known only about the approach of an army, but he did not know the purpose for which it had been sent. That is why he could not set up any countermeasures and that is why the opponents were able to take over Sepphoris, Gabara, Gischala,

men and withdrew to Chabulon at the north-western border of Galilee.<sup>110</sup> He waited here for the arrival of the four envoys. According to Josephus' narrative, these men encountered a poor reception in most places where they were agitating against him.<sup>111</sup> Only four cities fell to the opposition: Tiberias, Gischala, Gabara, and Sepphoris—the very cities that we always find on the opposing side; the city of Sepphoris, however, did not truly intend to do so.<sup>112</sup> When John then joined up with the envoys in Gabara with 3,000 men, Josephus moved to Jotapata with an equally strong force after he had left a representative behind in the camp at Chabulon.<sup>113</sup> The opposition now decided, on John's advice, to summon the discontented in all Galilean cities and villages and report the outcome to Jerusalem in order thereby [31] to effect Josephus' official dismissal.<sup>114</sup> Josephus, however, had the routes watched in order to intercept those messengers and he assembled all available soldiers in Gabaroth.<sup>115</sup> Indeed, he must have had the firm resolve to overpower his opponents without shedding blood.<sup>116</sup> At the same time he, for his part, sent envoys to Jerusalem to have his command confirmed. The opponents' envoys, however, received a friendly welcome in Tiberias where the city's archon promised to operate on their behalf. Tiberias then became the seat of the opposition for some time.<sup>117</sup> Josephus now relates that he was in Tiberias a number of times during this period. The first time he left [the city] again after the hypocritical envoys asked him to;<sup>118</sup> another time he went away again after a blatant trick by his opponents.<sup>119</sup> These are very suspect anecdotes, just like the story about the attack against him that was

---

and Tiberias quickly upon their arrival. He says this, however, only to explain the quick annexation of these four cities, and the accurate statement in the *Life* is to be preferred. On the other hand, one should not believe the assertion in the *Life* that he intended to leave Galilee because he was saddened by the ingratitude of the residents. Here Josephus apparently wishes to resume only the narration of a great manifestation of devotion on the part of the Galileans.

<sup>110.</sup> V. 212-213. Here he faced a Roman division of about 1,500 men, with whom there were some clashes. V. 214-215.

<sup>111.</sup> At first they tried unsuccessfully to lure Josephus into a trap. V. 217-239. In such narratives, however, one must take into consideration the fact that the portrayal of the opposition and that of his own measures are [both] quite coloured.

<sup>112.</sup> Cf. p. 84 of the appendix.

<sup>113.</sup> V. 233-234.

<sup>114.</sup> V. 237.

<sup>115.</sup> V. 242.

<sup>116.</sup> V. 244.

<sup>117.</sup> V. 271-273. Prior to this, Josephus tells the quite implausible story that the four envoys had made the attempt in his camp to steal his soldiers away from him. He evidently does this only in order to demonstrate the devotion of his soldiers and his own magnanimity. He actually lets the envoys travel freely and even protects them from the anger of the Galileans. V. 249-265.

<sup>118.</sup> V. 273-275.

<sup>119.</sup> V. 280-282.

supposed to have occurred in Tiberias.<sup>120</sup> Indeed, Josephus would have been a fool if he had exposed himself to danger so recklessly. In his attempt to portray the wickedness of his opponents and his own cleverness and good nature as well as his magnanimity, Josephus expects too much credulity on the part of his readers here.

Josephus' envoys now return from Jerusalem and confirm his command, while the opponents' envoys receive an order to return. According to [32] Josephus, the citizens were quite indignant about the arbitrary action of that clique of prominent men, which is indeed quite possible.<sup>121</sup> Nevertheless, the opposition continued its antagonism. The Tiberians strengthened their walls and received soldiers in support from John, who was staying in Gischala himself.<sup>122</sup> Thus, Josephus had no other choice but to use force. The two parties clashed in front of the walls of Tiberias and Josephus' opponents were almost victorious.<sup>123</sup> Once Tiberias was conquered, Josephus had the main culprits taken to Jotapata while he sent the four envoys back to Jerusalem.<sup>124</sup> He then installed a new government, a Synhedrium of friends, in Tiberias and issued a decree in which he summoned all of John's supporters to abandon him. Apparently 4,000 obeyed this summons, while the residents of Gischala and about 1,500 ξένοι τινές ἐκ τῆς Τυρίων μητροπόλεως remained loyal to John.<sup>125</sup> The opposition was now vanquished and John remained quietly in Gischala.<sup>126</sup>

Bärwald completely misinterprets this entire development. Without justification, he accuses Josephus of indecision and a vacillating character.<sup>127</sup> He [33] accuses him of pursuing his own petty agenda and of secretly conspiring with Agrippa.<sup>128</sup> In so doing, he makes the remarkable claim that Agrippa was a secret patriot at the beginning of the revolt, and left for Berytus in order to allay any suspicion of his friendliness towards the Jews.<sup>129</sup> In his view, Josephus and Agrippa were in agreement, standing at the apex of the movement against the Romans. Only when Vespasian took over the war did Agrippa change his

---

<sup>120.</sup> V. 290-308.

<sup>121.</sup> V. 309-310.

<sup>122.</sup> V. 317.

<sup>123.</sup> V. 321-330. This shows how strong the opposition was; Josephus supposedly had 10,000 men, even if this figure is apparently exaggerated. But in any case the opposition party was approximately as strong as that of Josephus.

<sup>124.</sup> V. 331-335.

<sup>125.</sup> According to *BJ*, II 625 Josephus issues this decree right after the first attack in Tiberias and 3,000 switch over to Josephus and 2,000 remain with John. But it is more probable that this proclamation was not issued until after the encounter at Tiberias, which Josephus does not mention in the slightest in the *War*.

<sup>126.</sup> V. 368-372.

<sup>127.</sup> *Op. cit.* [Bärwald] pp. 24 and 42.

<sup>128.</sup> *Op. cit.* pp. 42, 43, 51, 59.

<sup>129.</sup> *Op. cit.* pp. 35 and 39.

position.<sup>130</sup> This is very unlikely, however, since Agrippa was always a devoted ally of the Romans. Moreover, Bärwald incorrectly claims that Josephus left his post and passed over to the Roman camp, whereas he was actually captured during the conquest of Jotapata.<sup>131</sup> But even Schürer did not evaluate the opposition quite correctly. He opines<sup>132</sup> that John's mistrust of Josephus was not totally unjustified: Josephus' meek manner of fighting the war must have appeared to John as a somewhat friendly attitude toward the Romans, and Josephus' commitment to the cause would be only half-hearted from the beginning, since he knew the Romans too well to believe in a real victory for the revolt. In this, Schürer did not pay enough attention to the fact that Josephus quite intentionally portrayed his warfare against the Romans as being downright mild, while he exaggerated the strength of the opposition. We believe that we have proven instead, through a depiction of Josephus' activities, that he engaged in the project of the revolt with enthusiasm. Admittedly, it cannot be claimed that he did his job extremely well; perhaps someone else would have achieved more with the available means, [34] but he certainly was not lacking in sincere intention. And the fact that the opposition formed against him is certainly no evidence for a vacillating or even traitorous attitude on Josephus' part. The reasons that Josephus advances for John's animosity—thirst for power and jealousy of his successes—fully suffice as explanations. John's later behaviour in Jerusalem shows that he really was thirsty for power and that he could not tolerate anyone above him. This does not exclude [the probability] that he himself, just as his followers, were convinced that he was a more suitable personality than Josephus to organize the revolt. Finally, in Jerusalem we later have the exact counterpart to this movement in Galilee, in the three parties of John of Gischala, Simon [bar Giora], and Eleazar, who fought against each other with extreme animosity, though in doing so they only sapped the strength of the Jews for the upcoming war.<sup>133</sup> Here the reasons for this conflict were senseless factionalization and personal enmity; this was the same in Galilee for the antagonism between John and Josephus.

### III. Justus of Tiberias

#### I. His Social and Political Position

---

<sup>130.</sup> *Op. cit.* pp. 60 and 61.

<sup>131.</sup> *Op. cit.* pp. 42 and 59.

<sup>132.</sup> *Op. cit.* [Schürer] I. p. 608.

<sup>133.</sup> *BJ.* V 2-26.

In the *Life*, Josephus now has Justus of Tiberias also participating in this opposition. This brings us to the relationship between Josephus and Justus, and the latter's position about which a number of false opinions have been widely circulated, as we have already stated above.<sup>134</sup> That is why this question requires a new investigation. First, we shall examine his social and political position, and it seems most appropriate [35] at the outset to compile what Josephus has reported about Justus. Even though his presentation is rather tendentious, it must still contain some factual elements.<sup>135</sup>

Justus was the son of Pistus and originated from Tiberias. Josephus reports about him that when the unrest leading to the Jewish War erupted, Justus was leader of the party in Tiberias that had assumed an undecided position toward the war.<sup>136</sup> This attitude was not sincere, however, since deep down he rather wished for the revolt as he hoped thereby to attain the leadership,<sup>137</sup> an accusation that, incidentally, Josephus also levelled against John. Therefore, in order to precipitate the Tiberians' participation in the war, he [Justus] delivered a speech in Tiberias, encouraging a revenge strike against Sepphoris. Joining with the other Galileans [the Tiberians] were to punish Sepphoris for its friendliness towards the Romans; then Tiberias would again become the capital of Galilee, as in earlier times. According to Josephus, Justus convinced the crowd as he was a gifted public speaker, and through his knowledge of Greek rhetoric he was far superior to those who would disagree with him.<sup>138</sup> He supposedly coerced many who wished to defy [him]. Therefore they took up arms—Justus assumed the leadership—and moved against Hippus and Gadara, burning the villages that were located in the border areas of Tiberias and Scythopolis. Here Josephus blames Justus for having instigated the Tiberians' [36] participation in the revolt.<sup>139</sup> Later we hear again of Justus when Josephus had the council and leaders of Tiberias come to Bethmaus to gain their consent to the destruction of the palace in Tiberias. Justus also came along with the councillors.<sup>140</sup> After some time, when John attempted to form his own party against Josephus, and turned

---

<sup>134.</sup> See above p. 8.

<sup>135.</sup> Schürer's presentation does not quite hit the mark. On p. 60, (*op. cit.*) he writes that at the beginning Justus participated in the revolt, even if he was forced to do so. Schürer did not recognize that Josephus falsely accuses Justus of hostility towards the Romans.

<sup>136.</sup> V. 36.

<sup>137.</sup> V. 391.

<sup>138.</sup> V. 37-40.

<sup>139.</sup> In a later passage (V. 391) he expresses this even more clearly. At the beginning of the revolt, the Tiberians wanted to remain loyal to Agrippa and not desert the Romans but then Justus convinced them to take up arms.

<sup>140.</sup> V. 64-65.

first to Tiberias for this purpose, Justus and his father were the first to join him.<sup>141</sup> During the course of this movement, Justus apparently participated in the activities against Josephus. When the four envoys, who had come at John's instigation, campaigned against Josephus in Tiberias, Justus then agitated publicly against him according to Josephus' report.<sup>142</sup> Some time later, when Josephus thwarted the attempt of the Tiberians to switch to Agrippa's side, Justus and his father were among the hostages whom Josephus had taken upon this provocation.<sup>143</sup> Josephus reports that he had at first thrown them into prison in Tarichaea, but soon freed them and invited them to dine with him. During the meal he portrays himself as very solicitous toward them. Among other things, he reminded Justus of the harshness of the Galileans who had accused Justus' brother of forging letters and cut off his hands, prior to Josephus' arrival in Galilee;<sup>144</sup> moreover, [he reminded Justus] of the action of the Gamalites who had punished his relatives [37] harshly.<sup>145</sup> Justus, however, repaid Josephus' friendliness with animosity, according to Josephus' statement. In fact, Justus behaved in such a way that Josephus could barely endure his wickedness. Since Justus now feared that Josephus might be overcome by his wrath, he fled to Agrippa who was staying in Berytus at that time.<sup>146</sup> But when Vespasian came to Ptolemais, according to Josephus' continued account, Justus was accused by delegates of the Syrian Decapolis because the villages of Hippus and Gadara had been burnt to ashes under his command at the beginning of the revolt. For this, Josephus could refer to the report in Vespasian's memoirs. Justus was to be punished at that time, but Vespasian left it to Agrippa to punish Justus at his discretion; Agrippa even had the option of executing him. But Princess Berenice supposedly pleaded for him, such that he was treated mildly and was punished only by long imprisonment.<sup>147</sup> In other respects as well, Agrippa is said to have been friendly towards Justus and to have given him many gifts. But this friendliness was not [always] favourable for Justus, for Agrippa was disposed to throw him into prison on two further occasions, and to banish him equally often. Indeed, he even sentenced Justus to death once and spared his life only after Princess Berenice pleaded for him. And when he

---

<sup>141.</sup> V. 88.

<sup>142.</sup> V. 278-279.

<sup>143.</sup> V. 175.

<sup>144.</sup> Josephus writes of the brother (V. 41) that together with Justus he almost caused the downfall of Tiberias. See below p. 45, note 3.

<sup>145.</sup> V. 177-178. 186.

<sup>146.</sup> V. 390.

<sup>147.</sup> V. 342-343.

subsequently entrusted him with the position of correspondence secretary, he found Justus to be unreliable in this as well, and forbade him access.<sup>148</sup> Later on, Justus tried to write a composition about the Jewish War; in fact, he deemed himself capable of this because he was familiar with the Greek language and literature. Due to his animosity towards some and his goodwill towards others, however, he misrepresented the truth; for this reason, [38] his writing may be compared to the forgery of documents.<sup>149</sup> In this work, Justus wished to denigrate Josephus, who now had to defend himself against these attacks. In the process, he would reveal things about which he had previously remained silent. This should not surprise anyone; for a historian must indeed always tell the truth, but he may overlook the errors of his fellow human beings, not out of goodwill towards them, but rather out of friendly consideration.<sup>150</sup>

In Josephus' report about Justus, much has been exaggerated or completely fabricated. In the following [pages] we now wish to explore what can be deemed factual concerning the person of Justus.

That Justus originated from Tiberias and was Pistus' son is also verified by Eusebius<sup>151</sup> in his *Chronicle* and by the chronographer Syncellus.<sup>152</sup> During the revolt, his father was on the side of the peace party; Josephus adds that Pistus, misled by his son, did not agree with this party's position. But this is only an addition resulting from his animosity towards Justus, as is clearly shown by the observation that he makes about Justus: καὶ γὰρ ἦν φύσει πῶς ἐπιμανής.<sup>153</sup> This attitude of his father is interesting with respect to Justus' social position since, according to Josephus, it was especially the wealthy and the aristocrats who belonged to this party.

[39] Tiberias belonged politically to Agrippa, but geographically to Galilee, with which it was closely connected since it had been the capital city of this region for many years.<sup>154</sup> The city's population was made up of Jews and Syrians, but the Jews were the majority. This explains why the city's strongest party was in favour of the revolt. Its leader was Jesus the son of Sapphias, who was also the city's archon. According to Josephus, this party was made up of boatmen, those without means,<sup>155</sup> and utterly

---

<sup>148.</sup> V. 355-356.

<sup>149.</sup> V. 40 and 336.

<sup>150.</sup> V. 338-339.

<sup>151.</sup> II. p. 162. edition by Schöne, namely in the first year of Nerva's reign, i.e. 96 CE.

<sup>152.</sup> P. 655 edition by Dindorf. The note stands at the beginning of Trajan's government, i.e. about 100 CE.

<sup>153.</sup> V. 33-34. ἐπιμανής, not ἐπιφανής as in the mss. M and W; one cannot say πῶς ἐπιφανής.

<sup>154.</sup> It was first given to Agrippa by Nero.

<sup>155.</sup> V. 66.

insignificant people.<sup>156</sup> In reality this was not at all the case, and Josephus suggests this only to divert the reproach of rebellious intentions from the Jewish people as such over to the Jewish rabble. Actually, distinguished people also belonged to this party, as is amply illustrated by the fact that the city's highest official was the leader of the party. And since the religious element played an important role in the revolt, even many prominent Sadducees and Pharisees also filled leading positions, as demonstrated by the example of Josephus himself. But as Tiberias was not an exclusively Jewish city, it is not surprising that in opposition to the war party stood a peace party, which, although not comparable in number, still was not without some influence. This party is the reason why there were two attempts during Josephus' command to switch over to Agrippa, that is, to the [pro-]Roman party, which Josephus prevented both times.<sup>157</sup> The Jews who were sympathetic to Rome also belonged to the peace party. Josephus states that the peace party was composed of the affluent, though he could not make this claim without qualification. Then of course there were also elements that vacillated between war and peace, which Josephus designates as the third party.

[40] Furthermore, we must note that during the revolt Justus' relatives assumed an attitude that was sympathetic to the Romans. In fact, when the fortress wanted to join the revolt and unrest erupted in the city as a result, the Gamalites punished members of Justus' family: a certain Chares, his brother Jesus and his wife, one of Justus' sisters.<sup>158</sup> A part of the population, including Justus' relatives, did not want to join in this shift. From his relatives' attitude one may draw some conclusions about Justus' own position. Incidentally, this information from Josephus is noteworthy for yet another reason. Namely, we discover here that through his sister Justus was a relative of Agrippa's general, Philip; for Chares was a relative of Philip, the son of Jacimus, and Justus' sister was married to a brother of Chares, as we learn here. So Justus had quite aristocratic relatives, which allows certain conclusions to be drawn about his own social position.

In terms of Justus' own attitude during the revolt, the following statements from Josephus' previously mentioned report are of some importance. When the Jewish general had the councillors and leaders of Tiberias come to Bethmaus shortly after his arrival in

---

<sup>156.</sup> V. 35.

<sup>157.</sup> *BJ.* II 632 ff. 645. V. 155 ff. 381 ff.

<sup>158.</sup> According to V. 186 Chares, Justus' sister and her husband were killed. According to V. 177-178 only Chares was killed; the other two were beaten. According to *BJ.* IV 18, however, this Chares still takes part in the defense of Gamala during the siege by the Romans and dies just before the conquest due to a wound or an illness (*BJ.* IV 68). Thus, the statement about his murder by the Gamalites is questionable; Josephus' report is at the least inaccurate.

order to gain their consent to the destruction of the palace in Tiberias, Justus also appeared with the councillors. These men, however, did not agree with Josephus' intention and gave their assent only under pressure. From this statement, we can conclude that Justus belonged to the pro-Roman [41] councillors.<sup>159</sup> The second noteworthy statement made by Josephus is as follows.<sup>160</sup> During the course of preparing for the revolt, when the Tiberians made the attempt to switch over to Agrippa they were prevented from doing so by Josephus, and Tiberias was forced to provide a number of hostages. According to Josephus' report, Justus and his father also were among these [hostages]. But these prisoners could be only pro-Roman men. Evidently Justus participated in the Tiberians' plan at that time, perhaps even as its author.<sup>161</sup> Finally, an established fact is Justus' flight to Agrippa while preparations for the revolt were still underway, which clearly indicates connections with Agrippa, a supporter of the [pro-]Roman party. Of course, he did not flee out of fear of Josephus, as Josephus maintains. At that time Josephus was definitely not his enemy; otherwise Josephus would have named him among his opponents in the *War*, whereas Justus does not appear at all in this work. The approximate timing of his flight can be determined. According to Josephus' information,<sup>162</sup> Justus had joined Agrippa in Berytus before the siege of Jotapata.

When did Agrippa stay in this city? To answer this question, we must indeed go back a bit further. In the winter of 66/67, after the death of Cestius Gallus, Nero entrusted Vespasian, who at the time was staying in Achaëa, with the command of the Jewish War.<sup>163</sup> In fact, Josephus says that Titus, whom Vespasian had sent to Alexandria in order to assemble troops there, had travelled from Achaëa [42] to Alexandria unusually quickly, given the winter conditions.<sup>164</sup> Vespasian himself went by land over the Hellespont to Syria<sup>165</sup> where he [either] arrived in the winter of 66/67 or perhaps not until the beginning of 67. Agrippa was waiting for him with his army in Antioch.<sup>166</sup> After integrating the remaining support troops into his army,<sup>167</sup> Vespasian moved by forced

---

<sup>159.</sup> V. 65.

<sup>160.</sup> V. 175.

<sup>161.</sup> So also, Bärwald *op. cit.* p. 58.

<sup>162.</sup> V. 357.

<sup>163.</sup> *BJ.* III 8.

<sup>164.</sup> *BJ.* III 64.

<sup>165.</sup> *BJ.* III 8.

<sup>166.</sup> *BJ.* III 29.

<sup>167.</sup> *BJ.* III 68.

marches toward Ptolemais.<sup>168</sup> Thus, Agrippa was present in the headquarters ever since the arrival of Vespasian. In the case of Antioch we heard precisely this; furthermore, his presence in Tyre<sup>169</sup> and Ptolemais<sup>170</sup> is also attested. He also seems to have taken part in the campaign in Galilee in the circle around Vespasian; at least he was with the Roman army when it stood before Tiberias,<sup>171</sup> and he was likewise present at the siege of Gamala.<sup>172</sup> Thus, we have reason to assume that he was also present in Vespasian's camp during the siege of Jotapata, since it would have been his duty as an allied king. This is even more probable because at that time the unrest in his realm had not yet been settled.<sup>173</sup> In any case, it is not absolutely certain. Therefore Agrippa's stay in Berytus<sup>174</sup> falls most likely prior to Vespasian's arrival in Syria, i.e. during the winter of 66/67 or at the beginning of 67 at the latest. Josephus' preparations for the revolt and his defeat of the opposition also took place throughout the winter of 66/67; accordingly, it was probably already in the middle of the preparations for war [43] that Justus went to Berytus, perhaps in December 66 or January 67.

The three above-mentioned facts about Justus' conduct during the revolt stand in stark contrast to the remaining descriptions of him, where he appears as a keen supporter of the war. If we consider Josephus' tendency to try to damage Justus in response to his attacks wherever he could, then it is clear that Josephus distorted the facts whenever he presented Justus as a zealot. By contrast, the truth of those data that show Justus in connection with the [pro-]Roman party is corroborated precisely because they fundamentally run contrary to Josephus' tendency, and in some cases Josephus may have mentioned them only because Justus himself had referred to them in his own history of the war. This can be maintained in particular concerning Josephus' remark about Justus' presence among the councillors of Tiberias.

Justus' leadership during the campaign against the Syrians does not contradict our assertion in the slightest, and certainly does not substantiate an anti-Roman disposition on the part of Justus.<sup>175</sup>

---

<sup>168.</sup> *BJ.* III 29.

<sup>169.</sup> *V.* 407.

<sup>170.</sup> *V.* 410.

<sup>171.</sup> *BJ.* III 453.

<sup>172.</sup> *BJ.* IV 14.

<sup>173.</sup> *BJ.* III 443.

<sup>174.</sup> *Cf.* *V.* 49. Agrippa already goes to meet Cestius in Berytus.

<sup>175.</sup> *V.* 42. Justus' leadership is certain because Josephus invokes the memoirs of Vespasian, *V.* 342 for the correctness of his statement. Moreover, this expedition is without question identical with the Jewish campaign against Hippus and Gadara about which Josephus speaks in *BJ.* II 459 without mentioning Justus'

In the first place, this was really only an act of retaliation for the Jews who were murdered in Caesarea. At that time before Cestius' campaign, it was not possible for Justus to foresee that this unrest would be the beginning of a major war. The fact that he was chosen as the leader of this expedition indicates only that he had a prominent position in his hometown, and the fact that he accepted this choice [of leadership] shows that he was deeply distressed about the murder of his own people. [44] According to Schürer<sup>176</sup> Justus took part in the revolt under the pressure of the circumstances. Everything factual that we know about him, however, contradicts this.

Therefore Josephus falsely made Justus out to be a supporter of the revolt, and the incorrectness of his presentation can be recognized from several other facts as well. For instance, Josephus connected Justus' campaign against the Syrians to a speech in which Justus prompted his fellow countrymen [to engage in] a revenge strike against Sepphoris—a speech that Josephus pulled entirely out of thin air. Most notably, the outcome [of the speech] was not a strike against Sepphoris but rather the expedition against Hippus and Gadara. Moreover, at that time the Galileans did not have any reason at all for a revenge strike against Sepphoris, since the attack against the Syrians occurred prior to Cestius' campaign. [It was] during this [campaign that] the Sepphorites first incurred the wrath of the remaining Galileans by their reception of Caesennius Gallus. And finally, Justus hardly spoke Greek in Tiberias, and yet Josephus plainly wants to explain Justus' success exclusively through his knowledge of Greek rhetoric. Additionally, [the assertion] that he used force [to convince] those who were reluctant is probably just defamation because the mostly Jewish population in Tiberias did not need any coercion. The allegedly hostile intentions of Justus toward Sepphoris supposedly turned the Romans against him, because the Romans probably treasured Sepphoris as the only city in Galilee that had remained loyal to them.

Moreover, not much can be made either, of the role that Josephus ascribes to Justus in portraying party matters. This already becomes evident in that Josephus makes him leader of the undecided elements at this point,<sup>177</sup> while he later portrays him entirely as an active supporter of the revolt.<sup>178</sup> This contradiction may well be [45] explained in that Josephus had designated Jesus, son of Sapphias, as leader of the war

---

name.

<sup>176.</sup> *Op. cit.* [Schürer] I p. 49.

<sup>177.</sup> V. 36.

<sup>178.</sup> *Cf.* V. 88 and 279.

party in his previously written history of the war.<sup>179</sup> Now he could admittedly have mentioned him along with Jesus—as he indeed did later on.<sup>180</sup> But then it would have easily looked as if Justus had played a subordinate role, and such an impression was to be avoided. So Josephus now extricates himself by making Justus out to be the leader of the middle party, but adds that he only belonged among the undecided elements superficially, while inwardly he wished for the revolt. As the reason for this he alleges that Justus had hoped to attain the command in Galilee. This also seems to be a [mere] suspicion, since the leaders of the revolt were decided upon in Jerusalem, and his assertion is further weakened in that he claims that John also aspired to the command.<sup>181</sup>

Incidentally, the incorrectness in the presentation of Justus' political attitude is apparent also in the following fact. [46] In the two passages concerning Justus' alleged participation in the opposition against Josephus, it appears exactly as if his name had been added only retroactively. The first instance is when John of Gischala is trying to recruit supporters against Josephus in Tiberias.<sup>182</sup> The second passage reports Justus' supposed involvement in the activities against Josephus when those four envoys were campaigning against him in Tiberias.<sup>183</sup> On one occasion when Jesus, the city's archon, declared that the leadership of the revolt should be taken from Josephus and transferred to the four envoys, Justus allegedly stepped forward, endorsed these words and tried to persuade certain members of the crowd. This is the only thing that Josephus can report about an activity on the part of Justus on behalf of the opposition.<sup>184</sup>

From this it arises that Justus did not take part in the opposition at all; indeed, this also follows from Josephus' credible statements that place Justus in connection with the [pro-]Roman party.

---

<sup>179.</sup> BJ. III 450.

<sup>180.</sup> Cf. V. 279.

<sup>181.</sup> Through the following remark about Justus and his brother, Josephus also attempts to arouse the impression that both had been fanatically inclined. In V. 41 he says that Justus along with his brother had almost brought about the downfall of Tiberias as he would later explain in greater detail. By this Josephus evidently means that the two brothers had brought about the participation of the Tiberians in the revolt, which almost brought about grave consequences for Tiberias. Justus' zealous activity, however, is indeed a fabrication by Josephus; and we evidently have an unfounded suspicion here as well. This is probably also why he expresses himself so vaguely and promises to report about it later, which he fails to do. In another passage of the *Life* 177 he states that the Galileans had cut off this brother's hands because they accused him of forging letters, and this story is just as puzzling; that is to say, here as well Josephus fails to indicate the grounds for the punishment. Therefore, we do not know what this matter, which occurred prior to the war, concerned.

<sup>182.</sup> V. 87-88.

<sup>183.</sup> V. 279.

<sup>184.</sup> Compare to this the fact that Justus is not mentioned at all in Josephus' *War*.

Justus' flight to Agrippa has already been mentioned. We do not know exactly where he was during the war; indeed, for some time he was in prison.<sup>185</sup> In any case, as Josephus attests, he was not in Galilee.<sup>186</sup> He probably returned to Tiberias after the subjugation of this area at the end of 67; provided that his imprisonment had ended. He likely first joined the king's service after the conclusion of peace; at any rate, as is clear from Josephus,<sup>187</sup> he was not in the king's company when the latter took part in the campaign in Galilee at the headquarters of Vespasian, and in the siege of Jerusalem in Titus' entourage. [47] The office that Justus occupied with Agrippa was that of correspondence secretary.<sup>188</sup> Josephus argues, to be sure, that Agrippa stripped him of this office because of his carelessness, and then banned him.<sup>189</sup> Perhaps this fact is true, but it is noteworthy that Josephus does not say anything more precise about it, and in this passage he generally made statements about Justus' alleged wickedness that are obviously exaggerated, if not entirely invented. For it is not really believable that Agrippa would have entrusted Justus with the confidential post of correspondence secretary after so many bad actions as [those] listed by Josephus. That is why the office of secretary to Agrippa must certainly be considered Justus' actual job.

In [occupying] this post Justus naturally lived in Agrippa's residence, which was in Caesarea Philippi, or in the Phoenician city Berytus, where Augustus had established a military colony and where Agrippa enjoyed staying.<sup>190</sup> On the side he occupied himself with literary activity, for he had put his completed work aside for 20 years and only published<sup>191</sup> it after the King's death, which occurred before 93; therefore, it had been composed during the period between 70 and 73 CE.

According to these observations it is quite evident that we cannot consider Justus a zealot, as do Grätz<sup>192</sup> and Hausrath.<sup>193</sup> For, at that time when religious and political issues were intertwined, [48] it was understood that a zealot, which actually means someone who is zealous especially for the law, was above all an enemy of the Romans. Wachsmuth<sup>194</sup> does not evaluate Justus correctly either when he describes him as a true patriot, for indeed this

---

<sup>185.</sup> Cf. V. 343.

<sup>186.</sup> Cf. V. 357.

<sup>187.</sup> V. 357-358. Cf. Tacitus, *Hist.* V.1 where he reports of Agrippa's presence before Jerusalem.

<sup>188.</sup> The τάξις ἐπιστολῶν. According to this, he had the same position as Suetonius who was also acting as a writer, occupying the office of *magister epistularum* for Hadrian.

<sup>189.</sup> V. 355.

<sup>190.</sup> Already Agrippa's father; both of them, especially Agrippa I, greatly beautified Berytus.

<sup>191.</sup> V. 359-360.

<sup>192.</sup> *Geschichte der Juden*, III<sup>3</sup> p. 524. According to Grätz, Justus was the main instigator behind in the Galilean revolution.

<sup>193.</sup> See: Sybels *historische Zeitschrift*. XII 296.

<sup>194.</sup> Introduction in his *Studium der alten Geschichte*, p. 438.

is nothing other than a zealous attitude. Nor is Bärwald's view to be endorsed: he considers Justus a zealot, but not one who could be put next to someone like John of Gischala.<sup>195</sup> John was a zealot for reasons of nationalism, whereas Justus' motive was local [city-centered] patriotism.

Let us look briefly at the reasons that led Bärwald to his opinion. He says that Justus and his party were characterized by a strong love for their city, proud as they were of its privileges. Now, because these privileges would have been violated by Josephus, Justus participated for some time in the opposition against Josephus as party leader in Tiberias.<sup>196</sup> The reasons upon which Bärwald bases this assertion are not tenable, however. The Tiberians were supposedly angry with Josephus because he had prominent Tiberians scourged during that incident in Tarichaea. But it is not clear at all from Josephus that these men were actually Tiberians.<sup>197</sup> Secondly, Josephus does not say anything about this being the reason for the estrangement between the Tiberians and him[self]. Thirdly, the entire story about this incident is highly suspect, as has been indicated above.<sup>198</sup> For his second reason, Bärwald argues that the Tiberians were dissatisfied with Josephus because of the late construction of their wall; but it must be said that according to a reliable passage in the *War*<sup>199</sup> Tiberias was fortified right at the beginning. According to Bärwald, Justus then participated for some time in the opposition against Josephus out of his love for [49] Tiberias, but withdrew when Josephus remained victorious. Of course Bärwald also noticed that Josephus did not mention Justus in the *War*.<sup>200</sup> He explains this quite correctly [by saying] that Josephus did not originally credit Justus with the significance that he had later on as an author.<sup>201</sup> But Bärwald is mistaken when he states shortly thereafter that Justus played no minor role during the revolt, but rather was important to all Galilee. In reality, Justus certainly did not have this [important] role in the Jewish War, at least not as a zealot; only in the *Life* did Josephus insert him next to the zealots and leaders of Tiberias, while in reality he belonged to the [pro-]Roman party or at least had close ties with it. Schürer's<sup>202</sup> judgements about Justus are essentially the same.

---

<sup>195.</sup> *Op. cit.* [Bärwald] p. 24.

<sup>196.</sup> *Op. cit.* [Bärwald] p. 55-56.

<sup>197.</sup> *BJ.* II 610. V. 145.

<sup>198.</sup> P. 28.

<sup>199.</sup> III 465.

<sup>200.</sup> *Op. cit.* [Bärwald] p. 22.

<sup>201.</sup> Without a doubt Josephus would have mentioned Justus in his *War* if he had known that Justus was to become his literary rival later on.

<sup>202.</sup> *Op. cit.* [Schürer] I. p. 60.

## 2. Justus' Writings.

As mentioned before,<sup>203</sup> Justus composed a work on the Jewish War in which he attacked Josephus. This work is not preserved, and what we do know about it is almost exclusively to be found in Josephus' *Life* where he polemizes against his opponent's work. In addition, it is cited by some historians and lexicographers, who indeed for the most part rely on Josephus. Eusebius<sup>204</sup> [50] makes mention of the work in this way, totally dependent upon Josephus. Suidas also cites it;<sup>205</sup> according to this, Justus treated the events among the Jews in greater detail than did Phlegon and Dio, who touched upon them in digressions of their works, as the religious historian Philostorgius stated. Jerome<sup>206</sup> also means Justus' history of the war when he says: ἐπιχείρησεν καὶ τὴν ἱστορίαν τῶν πραγμάτων τούτων ἀναγράφειν. This is shown by his manner of expression, which literally reproduces a passage of the *Life*,<sup>207</sup> where the subject is Justus' history of the war. The entry in Suidas' lexicon for the word Ἰουῆτος has been copied literally from Sophronius. Finally, [Justus'] history of the war is also cited by Stephanus of Byzantium, who states in his geographic lexicon under the word Τιβερίας; ἐκ ταύτης sc. πόλεως ἦν Ἰουῆτος ὁ τὸν Ἰουδαϊκὸν πόλεμον τὸν κατὰ Οὐεσπασιανοῦ ἱστορήσας.<sup>208</sup>

In addition, Justus wrote a *Chronicle*, as we learn from Photius.<sup>209</sup> [Taken] by itself, it would also be conceivable [51] that this referred to the same work, therefore that the Jewish War had been covered in this chronicle.<sup>210</sup> But this assumption is not possible for

---

<sup>203.</sup> P. 5. Cf. Schürer, *op. cit.* p. 59-62. These parts also contain the references to Justus and his authorial activity.

<sup>204.</sup> *Hist. eccl.* III 10. Eusebius used V. 40 and 336 and quotes V. 361 to 364 literally.

<sup>205.</sup> *Lexicon s.v.* Φλέγων. This could, however, also refer to the *Chronicle*, another work of Justus. Indeed, the citation is not quite certain as the name of the concerned author is corrupted ( has been transmitted) but Valesius' conjecture Ἰουῆτον seems most likely, in principle.

<sup>206.</sup> *De viris illustr.* Chapter 14, translated into Greek by Sophronius.

<sup>207.</sup> § 40.

<sup>208.</sup> Stephanus acquired his information from the work of Herennius Philoperi πόλεων καὶ οὐς ἐκάστης αὐτῶν ἐνδόξους ἦνεγκεν. B. Niese referred to this in his dissertation *De Stephani Byzantini auctoribus*, Kiliae 1873. Cf. Christ, *Gr. Litt.*<sup>4</sup> p. 832.

<sup>209.</sup> *Biblioth. cod.* 33 p. 6. ed. Bekker. Ἀνεγνώσθη Ἰουῆτου Τιβερίως χρονικόν, οὗ ἡ ἐπιγραφὴ Ἰουῆτου Τιβερίως Ἰουδαίων βασιλέων τῶν ἐν τοῖς στέμμασιν. Οὗτος ἀπὸ πόλεως τῆς ἐν Γαλιλαίᾳ Τιβεριάδος ὠρμαῖτο. Ἄρχεται δὲ τῆς ἱστορίας ἀπὸ Μωϋσέως, καταλήγει δὲ ἕως τελευτῆς Ἀγρίππα τοῦ ἐβδόμου μὲν τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς οἰκίας Ἑρώδου, ὑστάτου δὲ ἐν τοῖς Ἰουδαίων βασιλεῦσιν, ὃς παρέλαβε μὲν τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐπὶ Κλαυδίου, ἠὲξήθη δὲ ἐπὶ Νέρωνος καὶ ἔτι μᾶλλον ὑπὸ Οὐεσπασιανοῦ, τελευτᾷ δὲ ἔτει τρίτῳ Τραϊανοῦ, οὗ καὶ ἡ ἱστορία κατέληξεν. Ἔστι δὲ τὴν φράσιν συντομωτάτος τε καὶ τὰ πλεῖστα τῶν ἀναγκαιοτάτων παρατρέχων. . . . Καὶ τὴν ἱστορίαν δέ, ἦν ἐκεῖνος ἔγραψε, πεπλασμένην τὰ πλεῖστά φασι τυγχάνειν, καὶ μάλιστα οἷς τὸν Ῥωμαϊκὸν πρὸς Ἰουδαίου διέξεισι πόλεμον καὶ τὴν Ἱεροσολύμων ἄλωσιν.

<sup>210.</sup> For example, Josephus could have dealt with the war in his *Antiquities* as well. But as he had written the *War* earlier, he continued the *Antiquities* only up to the outbreak of the unrest.

other reasons. In fact, in one passage of the *Life*,<sup>211</sup> when Josephus speaks about the beginning of the revolt, he states with respect to the work of his opponent: ἐπεχείρησεν καὶ τὴν ἱστορίαν τῶν πραγμάτων τούτων ἀναγράφειν. Thus, he characterizes it as a history of the war. Furthermore, we know that Justus discussed the Jewish War with considerable thoroughness; as we shall see more precisely later on, he had gone into [great] detail. Such an extensive presentation of the war, however, was not possible in his chronicle, which had been kept quite short, as Photius explicitly stated. Therefore, in the following [discussion] we shall distinguish two works by Justus, the history of the war and the chronicle.<sup>212</sup>

According to Photius<sup>213</sup> this *Chronicle* contained a history [52] of the Jewish kings from Moses to Agrippa II who were attested in the genealogies.<sup>214</sup> According to Photius it was written in a terse presentation, which has to do with the large time span the work covers.<sup>215</sup> In this work, Justus had arranged Jewish history by the Greek calculation of time. In fact, the chronographer Syncellus<sup>216</sup> says, in citing a passage from the preface to Eusebius' *Chronicle*, that Justus made Moses and Inachus contemporaries.

Photius states that the chronicle extended up to the death of Agrippa, who died in 100, which is not correct, as we will demonstrate below. From this one might possibly conclude that the *Chronicle* was published in 100. In that case, Photius would have confused the year of publication with the year of Agrippa's death, with which the *Chronicle* was concluded. Photius' information is of great importance to us.<sup>217</sup> From it we learn not only that Justus was also otherwise active as an author, but we also hear that at least the *Chronicle* was still being read in the ninth century.<sup>218</sup> This seems to prove that Justus enjoyed a certain popularity as a historian, and that he was accorded some importance; and

---

<sup>211.</sup> § 40.

<sup>212.</sup> Bärwald, *op. cit.* p. 63 note 1, indeed holds that it cannot be proven whether the writing in which Justus attacked Josephus was identical with the chronicle mentioned by Photius, or whether it had been a specific accusatory composition directed against Josephus. Because of the different nature of a chronicle and a history of a war, however, we may not in any case identify them with one another. It is not necessary to assume that there was a specific accusatory composition, since Justus' allegations would find a natural place in his history of the war. Schürer *op. cit.* I p. 59 also makes a distinction between the chronicle and the war history.

<sup>213.</sup> *Op. cit.* [Photius] p. 6.

<sup>214.</sup> Schürer (*op. cit.* p. 62) correctly rejects the translation "history of the crowned Jewish kings," as this is self-evident for kings. Here *stemma* has the meaning "genealogy" as found in the old chronicles, for example, in that of Eusebius.

<sup>215.</sup> Bärwald *op. cit.* p. 21 makes unjustified conclusions about the inner worth of Justus from the succinct writing style.

<sup>216.</sup> Ed. Dindorf p. 122. Cf. also pp. 118, 228 and 280 where the same quotation of Eusebius is used, and p. 116 where Josephus and Justus are named together with some Greek historians.

<sup>217.</sup> So also, Niese *op. cit.* p. 226 note 4.

<sup>218.</sup> Photius lived around 850 CE. Cf. Krumbacher, *Geschichte der byzantinischen Literatur*, p. 223.

since Eusebius and Philostorgius both mention Justus, it follows that he was being read in Christian circles. [53] Evidently Photius himself read Justus' chronicle and judges it from his own knowledge. On the other hand, he probably did not read his history of the war, and what he knows of Justus' personality he takes from Josephus' *Life*. That is why he is cautious when he states: τὴν ἱστορίαν δέ, ἣν ἐκεῖνος ἔγραψε, πεπλασμένην τὰ πλεῖστά φασι τυγχάνειν, καὶ μάλιστα οἷς τὸν Ῥωμαϊκὸν πρὸς Ἰουδαίους διέξεισι πόλεμον καὶ τὴν Ἱεροσολύμων ἄλωσιν.<sup>219</sup>

Schürer<sup>220</sup> considers Justus' *Chronicle* to be a chronicle of the world. He bases this upon a passage in Diogenes Laertius,<sup>221</sup> where an anecdote of Plato is reported, which Diogenes found ἐν τῷ στέμματι of Justus. The story is as follows: during Socrates' trial Plato mounts the podium and wants to deliver a speech on behalf of his teacher. Because he was still very young, the judges shouted κατάβα, κατάβα. Schürer rightly argues that this anecdote could not have been in the compact chronicle of the Jewish kings. He assumes therefore that Justus' *Chronicle* was a world chronicle and, just like the chronicles of Castor and Africanus, in large measure it comprised king lists, which certainly could be called στέμματα. He conjectures that Photius only possessed a part of the entire work, [54] namely the "history of the Jewish kings listed in the genealogies", while Diogenes had a different στέμμα and thus a different part of the entire work. It is impossible, however, that the anecdote about Plato could have been in a world chronicle, as these chronicles were kept short by nature and usually registered only the most important historical facts. Photius attests that Justus' chronicle was also composed in this way. Since Diogenes Laertius found it in one of Justus' works, we must assume that there was a third work by Justus that contained the anecdote about Plato. The name of this work could very well have been *Stemma*, not with the meaning of "list" as above, but rather with the original meaning of "band" [or "laurel-wreath"] or "diadem". Such book titles were common at the time.<sup>222</sup>

---

<sup>219.</sup> In his characterization of Justus there is an interesting allegation: he did not relate anything about Christ and his wonders. Josephus did not mention Christ in the course of his narrative either. He only mentioned him casually once in *Antiquities* XX 200, where he reports about James' stoning: τὸν ἀδελφὸν Ἰησοῦ τοῦ λεγομένου Χριστοῦ . . . παρέδωκε λευσοθησομένους. To be sure, the so-called Testimony of Christ [AJ 18.3-64] had been inserted in the *Antiquities*' text at an early point, but most scholars now consider this to be spurious. Thus, Josephus did not recognize Christ's highly significant activity and it is noteworthy that the other Jewish historian of that time, Justus, passed over the Lord in silence as well.

<sup>220.</sup> *Op. cit.* [Schürer] I p. 59.

<sup>221.</sup> II 5.

<sup>222.</sup> Plin. *Natural History*, Preface 23. Cf. also Clemens Alexandrinus' title στρωματεῖς, carpets, and that of Julius Africanus κροστοί, embroidery. Compilations of similar book titles can be found in Gellius' introduction and in Birt, *Das antike Buchwesen*, p. 116 ff, 291-293, 297, 310-314.

In addition to Justus' history of the war, Jerome<sup>223</sup> also refers to *commentarioli de scripturis* (ὑπομνήματά τινα περὶ γραφῶν in Sophronius' translation), which are not mentioned otherwise. Perhaps he means by this the literary historical work *Stemma*, which we have taken to be Justus' third work.

### 3. Determining the Date of Justus' History of the War.

The time of composition of [Justus'] history of the war is very closely connected to that of the βίος of Josephus, given that the latter is a riposte to that work by Justus. Most scholars are of the opinion that the *Life* was published shortly after 93/94, after the publication of the *Antiquities*.<sup>224</sup> Schürer<sup>225</sup> [55] disagrees with this and maintains that it was not composed before 100. He bases this proposition on that passage of Photius<sup>226</sup> where the latter says that Justus' chronicle extended up to the death of Agrippa, who died in the year 100, and also on Agrippa's coins, which allegedly extend up to the year 95.

Evidence can be drawn, however, from Josephus' *Antiquities* and his *Life* that Agrippa II was already dead when the *Antiquities* was published in 93/94; therefore Photius must have been mistaken. In fact, in the *Antiquities* we find a characterization of Agrippa and his family that is in some points so unfavourable and so divergent from the narrative in the *War* that we must assume that it was not composed until after Agrippa's death. Schürer<sup>227</sup> concedes the divergence of the presentation but explains it as the result of a quarrel between Josephus and Agrippa II. This assumption is very unlikely, however, since Josephus always placed great value on maintaining good relations with kings and important people. Josephus must have invested all the more in his friendship with Agrippa, because the king enjoyed great favour among the Romans as a result of his help in the Jewish War, as the enlargement of his territory shows.<sup>228</sup> There is also no obvious reason why Josephus and Agrippa should have had a falling out, for they both fostered the same political attitude and, at least for the time when Josephus published the books of his *War*, it can be proven that they were on the best of terms.<sup>229</sup>

---

<sup>223.</sup> *De viris ill.* chapter 14.

<sup>224.</sup> B. Niese *op. cit.* p. 226. Wachsmuth *op. cit.* p. 448.

<sup>225.</sup> *Op. cit.* [Schürer] I p. 88 note 20 and p. 599.

<sup>226.</sup> *Biblioth. cod.* 33 p. 6, edition by Bekker.

<sup>227.</sup> *Op. cit.* [Schürer] I p. 599 note 47.

<sup>228.</sup> *BJ.* VII 97. Schürer *op. cit.* I p. 594-595.

<sup>229.</sup> V. 365-366. Agrippa's two letters to Josephus show their friendly relations.

Despite a favourable evaluation overall,<sup>230</sup> Josephus attributes to [56] Agrippa's father a few unflattering traits. He depicts him as a squanderer, a reveller,<sup>231</sup> and as corruptible;<sup>232</sup> he would hardly have written this during the son's lifetime. Moreover, in the *War*<sup>233</sup> Josephus says that Agrippa I began the construction of an enormous defensive wall in Jerusalem. If this had been completed, the later siege by the Romans would have been rendered completely ineffective; but Agrippa's death prevented completion of this work. According to the *Antiquities*,<sup>234</sup> however, the Syrian governor told the emperor Claudius about Agrippa's construction of the wall and Claudius gave the order to refrain from building it, since he saw questionable ambitions in it. Finally, in the *War*<sup>235</sup> Josephus reports only that the descendants of Alexander, the uncle of Agrippa I, ascended to the throne of Greater Armenia. To this he adds in the *Antiquities*,<sup>236</sup> however, that they had abandoned Jewish practices from childhood and taken up pagan customs.

Now of course, the *War* narrative is expanded in the *Antiquities* by means of many additions; but the reason for the divergence can also be that when Josephus wrote the *Antiquities*, he no longer needed to be considerate because Agrippa II had already died. The assessment of Agrippa I in the *Antiquities* is thus not necessarily proof of this work's publication after the death of Agrippa II. What Josephus says about Agrippa II himself, however, he could not possibly have written while the king was still alive; he would not have dared. Josephus makes the following statements about him and his relatives. Just like his father, Agrippa II completely drained<sup>237</sup> a [57] Jewish colony in Batanea<sup>238</sup> (even though he did allow it some privileges), which had flourished under Herod I and his successor, Philip. This colony, of the so-called Babylonian Jews, offered protection to the local Jews as well as to the Babylonian [pilgrims] who came to offer sacrifice in Jerusalem; Josephus openly brought forward the accusation against both of these kings that they had repressed the development of the colony and had thereby done the Jews a disservice. From the following words of Josephus, however, it becomes perfectly clear

---

<sup>230.</sup> *Ant.* XIX 331.

<sup>231.</sup> *Ant.* XVIII 145-146.

<sup>232.</sup> *Ant.* XVIII 153-154.

<sup>233.</sup> II 218-219.

<sup>234.</sup> XIX 326-327.

<sup>235.</sup> II 222.

<sup>236.</sup> XVIII 141.

<sup>237.</sup> *Ant.* XVII 26-28. Herod I had set up this colony to protect his land against the predatory Trachonites, in that he had granted a Jew from Babylon, who had come across the Euphrates with 500 armed men, [the right] to develop the land without paying taxes.

<sup>238.</sup> Batanea was an area east of the Jordan, which belonged to the king's territory.

that Agrippa was already dead. For Josephus continues in that passage: παρ' ὧν Ῥωμαῖοι δεξάμενοι τὴν ἀρχὴν τοῦ μὲν ἐλευθέρου καὶ αὐτοὶ τηροῦσιν τὴν ἀξίωσιν ἐπιβολαῖς δὲ τῶν φόρων εἰς τὸ πάμπαν ἐπίεσαν αὐτούς.<sup>239</sup> This can mean only that with the death of Agrippa II this colony fell into Roman hands. Schürer<sup>240</sup> does not accept this and argues that the Romans had taken this area from Agrippa while he was still alive. The expression that Josephus uses here contradicts this, however: in the case of a land-seizure he could not have talked about receiving it. And besides, he surely would have mentioned it explicitly if the Romans had really taken Agrippa's colony.

It is not possible either that the following details were written while Agrippa was still alive. Josephus mentions without reservation the suspicion<sup>241</sup> that Agrippa's sister Berenice had an illicit relationship with her brother. [58] He even says that she left her husband δι' ἀκολασίαν, ὡς ἔφασαν, and he does not conceal that another sister of Agrippa likewise left her husband.<sup>242</sup>

Moreover, while Agrippa was still alive, how could Josephus have dared to report<sup>243</sup> that Costobar and Saul γένους μὲν ὄντες βασιλικοῦ καὶ διὰ τὴν πρὸς Ἀγρίππαν συγγένειαν εὐνοίας τυγχάνοντες had a gang of unworthy men in their service, and that they were arrogant and violent against all who were weaker?<sup>244</sup> And in his presentation of Agrippa II's government Josephus emphasizes that he had more time for the pagans than for the Jews; indeed, the king stole from the Jews to decorate a pagan city lavishly and to present gifts to its population.<sup>245</sup> This increased the hatred of his Jewish subjects toward him.

Again in the following narrative, which indicates how little Agrippa was loved by the Jews, the king plays no praiseworthy role. In his palace in Jerusalem, Agrippa had a large building constructed. From here one had a wonderful view of the city and could also observe the activities in the Temple, which Agrippa often did. This was contrary to custom, however, and so the Jewish aristocrats had his view of the Temple blocked by [building] a wall. The matter made it all the way to the emperor, who decided for the

---

<sup>239.</sup> *Ant.* XVII 28.

<sup>240.</sup> *Op. cit.* [Schürer] I p. 598, 599 note 47.

<sup>241.</sup> *Ant.* XX 145.

<sup>242.</sup> *Ant.* XX 146-147.

<sup>243.</sup> *Ant.* XX 214.

<sup>244.</sup> These two aristocrats are also mentioned once in *BJ.* II 556, but without reference to their violent character.

<sup>245.</sup> *Ant.* XX 211-212.

Jews.<sup>246</sup>

Moreover, Josephus emphasizes that Agrippa violated the religious prescriptions of the Jews by allowing the psalm singers among the Levites, at their [own] request, to wear linen clothes just like the priests, and the [59] Levites who performed the Temple services to learn the hymns and psalms.<sup>247</sup> This course of action by Agrippa must inevitably result in punishment.<sup>248</sup> There is no doubt that by this Josephus means the destruction of the Temple and advances the opinion that it was a divine judgment because Agrippa had violated the religious rules; his words clearly express how very much Josephus himself, an aristocratic priest, had been enraged by this enactment of the king. Of Agrippa's contributions, however, he reports nothing more than [the fact] that he had Jerusalem paved with white marble.<sup>249</sup>

There are other facts that support our assertion. At the end of *Antiquities*,<sup>250</sup> Josephus says: γένους μὲν ὄντες βασιλικοῦ καὶ διὰ τὴν πρὸς Ἀγρίππαν συγγένειαν εὐνοίας τυγχάνοντες . These words show that Justus' writing containing the attacks against Josephus had already appeared and that Josephus had already occupied himself with repudiating them in his βίος . For the words contain a protestation of his love for truth, just as in his *Life* he invokes the testimony of Vespasian, Titus,<sup>251</sup> and Agrippa.<sup>252</sup> But he would only have a reason for this if his love for truth had been challenged, which Justus just did.

Josephus then continues:<sup>253</sup> ἐπὶ τούτοις δὲ καταπαύσω τὴν ἀρχαιολογίαν. He adds a conclusion in which he promises [60] to write three more works if God should give him the time to do so: a synopsis of the Jewish War, a later Jewish history from the year 73 onwards, which he had not yet treated,<sup>254</sup> and a work about God, his nature and the laws. The autobiography, however, does not belong together with these three planned works; it belongs rather to the *Antiquities*.

However, Josephus did not fulfill these intentions of his; for, in addition [to the *War* and *Antiquities*] we have only his two-volume work, which is commonly called Κατὰ

---

<sup>246.</sup> *Ant.* XX 189-191. 193-195.

<sup>247.</sup> *Ant.* XX 216-217.

<sup>248.</sup> *Ant.* XX 218.

<sup>249.</sup> *Ant.* XX. 222.

<sup>250.</sup> *Ant.* XX 266-267.

<sup>251.</sup> V. 361.

<sup>252.</sup> V. 362 and 365-366.

<sup>253.</sup> *Ant.* XX 267.

<sup>254.</sup> The *Antiquities* cover the time from the world's creation to 66 CE, the *War* from 66 to 73 CE.

Ἀπίωνος.<sup>255</sup> This writing, however, does not have anything to do with the announced works, but is rather an *apologia* for Judaism. Schürer<sup>256</sup> estimates that this last writing was published after 93 and Wachsmuth<sup>257</sup> sets the date a bit later, to about 95 CE. On the other hand, Schürer argues that the *Life* was published only after the year 100. But it would indeed be curious if Josephus, after completing the writing *Against Apion*, would not then in the years 95-100 have resumed the plan that he had mentioned at the end of *Antiquities*, but instead should have written the autobiography, and that because of an external provocation. It is more likely that the βίος was written immediately after the *Antiquities* and was published together with it. The following facts also support this: δέ connects the *Life* to the *Antiquities*, Ἐμοὶ δὲ γένος ἐστὶν οὐκ ἄσημον ..., which is unthinkable for an interval of several years (94-100 according to Schürer), especially if the writing *Against Apion* had been published in the meantime. Moreover, at the conclusion of the description of his life,<sup>258</sup> [61] Josephus counts this work as part of the *Antiquities*. Additionally, the βίος is connected to the *Antiquities* in all manuscripts, with a single exception.<sup>259</sup> Finally, Eusebius quotes a passage from the *Life* with the observation that the words stand at the end of the *Antiquities*.<sup>260</sup>

The following argument is decisive for this issue, however. Josephus dedicated his *Antiquities* and the *Life* (incidentally, also the writing *Against Apion*) to a certain Epaphroditus.<sup>261</sup> Schürer<sup>262</sup> holds that this was the grammarian who lived in Rome around that time.<sup>263</sup> There was, however, another freedman of Nero by the name of Epaphroditus in Rome at that time.<sup>264</sup> In Schürer's opinion, this freedman and secretary of Nero could not have been Josephus' friend, since he was executed by Domitian in the year 95 CE,<sup>265</sup> whereas the *Life* was not written until after 100. Thus, it must have been

<sup>255.</sup> The title is not definite. Cf. Schürer *op. cit.* I p. 89 and Niese *op. cit.* p. 230.

<sup>256.</sup> *Op. cit.* [Schürer] I p. 89.

<sup>257.</sup> *Op. cit.* [Wachsmuth] p. 448.

<sup>258.</sup> V. 430. σοὶ δ' ἀποδεδωκώς κράτιστε ἀνδρῶν Ἐπαφρόδιτε τὴν πᾶσαν τῆς ἀρχαιολογίας ἀναγραφὴν ἐπὶ τοῦ παρόντος ἐνταῦθα καταπαύω τὸν λόγον.

<sup>259.</sup> Cf. Niese's edition, volume I *Prolegom.* p. V ff.

<sup>260.</sup> *Hist. eccl.* III 10.8. [sic] ἐπ' αὐτοῦ [sic] τῆς ἀρχαιολογίας τοῦ τέλους. Schürer mentions these last four facts, but for reasons that we will deal with later, he still argues that the *Life* was published after 100.

<sup>261.</sup> *Ant.* preface 8 and V. 430.

<sup>262.</sup> *Op. cit.* [Schürer] I p. 80 note 8.

<sup>263.</sup> Suidas, *Lex. s.v.* Epaphroditus. Ἐπαφρόδιτος, Χαιρωνεύς, γραμματικός, Ἀρχίου τοῦ Ἀλεξανδρέως γραμματικοῦ θεραπεύς, παρ' ᾧ παιδευθεὶς ὠνήθη ὑπὸ Μοδέστου, ἐπάρχου Αἰγύπτου, καὶ παιδεύσας τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ Πετηλῖνον ἐν Ῥώμῃ διέπρεψεν ἐπὶ Νέρωνος καὶ μέχρι Νέρβα.

<sup>264.</sup> Tacitus, *Ann.* XV 55, Suet. *Nero* 49; Cassius Dio LXIII 29. Suid. *Lex. s.v.* Epaphroditus.

<sup>265.</sup> Domitian had him executed, because he had assisted Nero to commit suicide and he wanted to deter all others from ever providing the same service for him: cf. Suet. *Nero* 49, Suet. *Dom.* 14, Dio LXIII 29.

the grammarian, provided that he lived until the beginning of Trajan's reign [i.e., 98 CE]. According to Suidas,<sup>266</sup> however, this grammarian [62] lived to see only Nerva's reign. But this passage in the preface of the *Antiquities* also proves that Nero's freedman is intended.<sup>267</sup> Here Josephus says:<sup>268</sup> ἦσαν δέ τινες οἱ πόθῳ τῆς ἱστορίας ἐπ' αὐτήν με προύτρεπον καὶ μάλιστα δὴ πάντων Ἐπαφρόδιτος ἀνὴρ ἄπασαν μὲν ἰδέαν παιδείας ἠγαπηκῶς, διαφερόντως δὲ χαίρων ἐμπειρίαις πραγμάτων, ἅτε δὴ μεγάλοις μὲν αὐτὸς ὀμιλήσας πράγμασι καὶ τύχαις πολυτρόποις, ἐν ἅπασι δὲ θαυμαστὴν φύσεως ἐπιδειξάμενος ἰσχὺν καὶ προαίρεσιν ἀρετῆς ἀμετακίνητον. τούτῳ δὲ πειθόμενος ὡς αἰεὶ τοῖς χρήσιμον ἢ καλὸν τι πράττειν δυναμένοις συμφιλοκαλοῦντι. It is clear that the words enclosed in quotation marks do not refer to the grammarian but rather to Nero's secretary. The words τύχαις πολυτρόποις perfectly fit his career, from a slave to an official of Nero and then later of Domitian; and [the words] μεγάλοις πράγμασι ὀμιλήσας fit a personality who occupied a place in public life; by contrast, they hardly fit the grammarian's quieter activities as a scholar.

Finally, Josephus' address to Epaphroditus,<sup>269</sup> κράτιστε ἀνδρῶν Ἐπαφρόδιτε, proves that it is the official who was intended, for this is the way that highly placed personalities were addressed and the emperor's freedmen were often influential people.<sup>270</sup> This is also true for this Epaphroditus who had been one of Nero's confidants, and, as we know from Epictetus, he was also a very rich man.<sup>271</sup>

[63] By contrast, the address κράτιστος does not at all suit the grammarian, who was an ordinary freedman<sup>272</sup> and to whom a certain taint of slave-status always clung, even in later life. Josephus, who belonged to the highest nobility and had good relations with the imperial court in Rome, would hardly have dedicated his works to such a man. Nero's secretary was executed by Domitian in 95, which proves that the publication of the *Life* occurred before this year.<sup>273</sup>

The publication of the *Life* before 93/94 [ed. 96?], namely while Domitian was still

<sup>266.</sup> Suidas, *Lexicon* s.v. Epaphroditus. Ἐπαφρόδιτος, Χαίρωνεύς, γραμματικός, Ἀρχίου τοῦ Ἀλεξανδρέως γραμματικοῦ θρεπτός, παρ' ᾧ παιδευθεὶς ὠνήθη ὑπὸ Μοδέστου, ἐπάρχου Αἰγύπτου, καὶ παιδεύσας τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ Πετηλῖνον ἐν Ῥώμῃ διέπρεψεν ἐπὶ Νέρωνος καὶ μέχρι Νέρβα.

<sup>267.</sup> Niese *op. cit.* p. 230 already believed this and his opinion is further supported here.

<sup>268.</sup> *Ant. preface* 8.

<sup>269.</sup> V. 430.

<sup>270.</sup> Consider the role that the freedmen Narcissus, Pallas and Callistus played under Claudius.

<sup>271.</sup> Cf. Dessau, *Prosopographia imp. Rom* II, 36, 51 and Pauly-Wissowa, *Realencyklopädie* under Epaphroditus 1. Epictetus, *Dissertationes* 1. 26, 11 ed. Schenkl. Frontin *de aquis* II. 68. The *horti Epaphroditiani* that are mentioned here probably belonged to this Epaphroditus.

<sup>272.</sup> Cf. above p. 61 note 6.

<sup>273.</sup> Dessau *op. cit.* p. 36, 51 also considers Nero's freedman to be Josephus' benefactor.

alive,<sup>274</sup> is confirmed by the conclusion of the *Life*.<sup>275</sup> Here Josephus says: διαδεξάμενος δὲ Τίτον Δομετιανὸς καὶ προσήυξησεν τὰς εἰς ἐμὲ τιμὰς· τοὺς τε γὰρ κατηγορήσαντάς μου Ἰουδαίους ἐκόλασεν καὶ δοῦλον εὐνοῦχον παιδαγωγὸν τοῦ παιδός μου κατηγορήσαντα κολασθῆναι προσέταξεν, ἐμοὶ δὲ τῆς ἐν Ἰουδαίᾳ χώρας ἀτέλειαν ἔδωκεν, ἥπερ ἐστὶ μεγίστη τιμὴ τῷ λαβόντι· καὶ πολλὰ δ' ἡ τοῦ Καίσαρος γυνὴ Δομετία διετέλεσεν εὐεργετοῦσά με. . These words were obviously written during Domitian's reign;<sup>276</sup> it is impossible that they were written during Trajan's reign, which would be the case if the *Life* had been published after 100. For with this exaltation of Domitian, Josephus would not only have offended Trajan, the ruling emperor, but would have opposed the opinion of the entire public, who felt as [if they had been] liberated by Domitian's assassination as [they would] from a nightmare.

Schürer bases his contrary opinion first on the testimony of Photius.<sup>277</sup> Indeed, Photius says that Justus' *Chronicle* extended up to the year 100, the year in which Agrippa died; [64] because the *Life* presupposes the king's death,<sup>278</sup> it could have been written only after 100. But we have proven from other facts that Agrippa was already dead in 93/94, and that the βίος had been published already under Domitian. Thus, Photius was mistaken.<sup>279</sup> Furthermore, Schürer does not consider the autobiography to be the realization of the plan mentioned at the end of the *Antiquities*. But this is not at all what it was meant to be, rather, it is named there together with the other announced writings.<sup>280</sup> Thirdly, Schürer calls upon Agrippa's coins,<sup>281</sup> which according to him extended into the year 95 CE; therefore Agrippa must have been alive at least until that year. In this instance, however, the coins have minor probative force<sup>282</sup> as there are

<sup>274.</sup> V. 429.

<sup>275.</sup> See also Dessau *op. cit.*

<sup>276.</sup> Niese *op. cit.* p. 227 had already alluded to this fact.

<sup>277.</sup> *Biblioth. cod.* 33 p. 6.

<sup>278.</sup> V. 359.

<sup>279.</sup> Tillemont, *histoire des empereurs* II., note XLI, already is of the opinion that Agrippa died before Domitian and that Josephus wrote his *Life* while Domitian was still alive and dedicated it to Nero's freedman Eparhroditus. But his assumption that in the text of Photius Τραϊανοῦ has been copied incorrectly from Τίτου or Δομετιανοῦ is not likely.

<sup>280.</sup> Admittedly, Josephus did not write the three other writings, rather, he obviously deemed it more important first of all to defend Judaism against accusations in his writing *Against Apion* (*cf.* Schürer *loc cit.* I p. 89); and so it came to be that they were never composed at all.

<sup>281.</sup> *Op. cit.* [Schürer] I p. 586 note 1; 588 note 7 and 597 note 43. Regarding the coins, see Eckhel, *Doctr. Num.* III.; Mionnet, *Description de médailles* V 570-576.; Suppl. VIII 280 f.; Madden, *History of Jewish Coinage* 113-133 and *Coins of the Jews* [sic] 1881 p. 139-169; De Saulcy, *Étude chronologique*; Mommsen, *Wiener Numismat. Ztsch.* III 1871.

<sup>282.</sup> Niese *op. cit.* has already referred to this. Mommsen *op. cit.* p. 455 says: the grave breach of the [conventions of] official titles (on Agrippa II's coins) proves that [the knowledge of] the people in Galilee was not current with [respect to] the government of this world.

inherent inaccuracies. For example, a coin from Agrippa's 29<sup>th</sup> year<sup>283</sup> bears the inscription [65] of Vespasian even though he was already dead then in the year 85 (the coin is calculated by the era [starting in the year] 56). Moreover, there are coins from the 14<sup>th</sup> year of Agrippa's reign (year 70 according to the era [starting in] 56) that bear either the inscription of Vespasian or Titus or even Domitian. Thus, in that same year of 70 Agrippa had coins with the names of all three Flavians issued, even though only Vespasian was emperor at the time. Yet another inaccuracy is that the coins from Agrippa's 26<sup>th</sup>, 27<sup>th</sup> and 29<sup>th</sup> year (the years 82, 83, and 85 according to the era [starting in] 56), which were therefore issued after the death of Vespasian and Titus, do not include the title *Divus*; and on the coins from Agrippa's 23<sup>rd</sup> to 35<sup>th</sup> year with Domitian's inscription, the titles Σεβαστός, and even Αὐτοκράτωρ on some, are missing.

Secondly, it is rather remarkable that the coins extend only up to the year 95, even those calculated by the later era [starting in the year] 61. How is it to be explained, however, that no coins survived precisely from the years 95-100, if Agrippa really did live until 100 CE? And thirdly, Schürer can arrive at the year 95 only if he bases [his calculations] on the era [starting in the year] 61; however, Agrippa's coins are dated according to two different eras, one from the year 56 and one from of the year 61,<sup>284</sup> without our being able to determine which era has been applied in each individual case. If we take the era of 56 for the latest coins from Agrippa's 35<sup>th</sup> year, then for those coins we arrive at the year 91 CE. This earlier era must be applied here, since we know from other facts that Agrippa was already dead in 93/94.

#### 4. Form and Content of Justus' Lost History of the War.

We can form an idea of the content and composition style of Justus' history of the war partly from Josephus' direct [66] testimonies and partly from indirect vestiges. Justus vaunted himself and his abilities as an author, most likely in the preface to his work.<sup>285</sup> Incidentally, this was probably not completely unjustified as he was Agrippa's secretary, and the nobility normally appointed only those people with a good writing style to this position. In addition, there is another account in the *Life* from which it appears that Justus had made the claim in his work to have presented the Jewish War better than his

---

<sup>283.</sup> Cf. Schürer *op. cit.* I p. 597 note 43.

<sup>284.</sup> Cf. Schürer *op. cit.* I 588 note 7.

<sup>285.</sup> Jos. V. 340 Ἰοῦστε δεινότατε συγγραφέων τοῦτο γὰρ ἀρχεῖς περὶ σεαυτοῦ.

predecessors.<sup>286</sup> At first glance, this might indeed seem somewhat pretentious; but if an author embarks upon a subject that has been treated quite often, then it stands to reason that he justify this [by arguing] that he could do this better than his predecessors. And in fact, Justus indeed could avoid the errors made by his predecessors. From this passage, then, it follows that Justus had concerned himself with his predecessors, at least with Josephus, whose work on the war he criticized in detail.

From the references just mentioned above, one might draw the conclusion that Justus' entire work was composed in a rhetorical manner. That was indeed the prevailing taste of the period in general, and Justus does not appear to have made an exception to this. Thus, Justus' work was presumably similar to Josephus' work of the same name, and probably also exhibited the shortcomings of rhetoric writings: emphasizing form over content, pathos, exaggerations, and occasional [67] distortions. One falsehood can even be identified: that Tiberias was basically friendly toward the Romans.

Regarding the content of the work, Josephus states that Justus presented several matters differently than Vespasian did in his memoirs.<sup>287</sup> By this, Josephus wants to cast doubt on Justus' credibility. The adduced fact is in itself by no means a proof for this, however, for memoirs of wars led by the author himself usually are not without one-sided presentation, as Caesar's commentaries also demonstrate. It is probable that the remark about this divergence from Vespasian's records was at the same time to serve the purpose of bringing Justus into disfavour in the eyes of the ruling Caesar, the Flavian Domitian.

We then learn that Justus brought the accusation against Josephus that he and the Galileans were to blame that his hometown Tiberias took part in the revolt against the Romans and the king.<sup>288</sup> The purpose of this allegation was to blacken Josephus' name somewhat, for, as we saw earlier, a strong party in Tiberias actually wanted the war.<sup>289</sup>

Regarding the scope of Justus' work, we learn that it included the siege of Jerusalem.<sup>290</sup> We know this because Josephus polemized against Justus to the effect that he could not have described the siege with accuracy, since he had not been present there.<sup>291</sup>

---

<sup>286.</sup> V. 357, Josephus says: θαυμάζειν δ' ἔπεισί μοι τὴν σὴν ἀναίδειαν, ὅτι τολμᾶς λέγειν ἀπάντων τῶν τὴν πραγματείαν ταύτην γεγραφότων αὐτὸς ἄμεινον ἐξηγγελκέναι.

<sup>287.</sup> V. 358. τοῖς γὰρ Καίσαρος ὑπομνήμασιν ἐναντίαν πεποίησαι τὴν γραφήν.

<sup>288.</sup> V. 340. πῶς οὖν ἵνα φῶ πρὸς αὐτὸν ὡς παρόντα Ἰουστε δεινότετε συγγραφέων τοῦτο γὰρ αὐχεῖς περὶ σεαυτοῦ αἴτιοι γεγόναμεν ἐγὼ τε καὶ Γαλιλαῖοι τῇ πατρίδι σου τῆς πρὸς Ῥωμαίους καὶ πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα στάσεως;

<sup>289.</sup> Cf. p. 26.

<sup>290.</sup> V. 358.

<sup>291.</sup> This allegation is not readily justified even if it must be admitted that autopsy is valuable. For, Josephus himself was also not present at all the events that he described. Certainly, in his description of the

Finally, the last of [68] the direct testimonies: Justus left his completed work lying [unpublished] for twenty years and published it only after the deaths of Vespasian, Titus, and Agrippa.<sup>292</sup> Josephus probably knew this from Justus himself, who would have stated it in the preface.

Justus' history of the war contained a description of the Jewish War, in which Justus probably followed a [time] sequence according to the events of the war. In fact, the Jewish War is divided into three segments: the conquest of Galilee, the subjugation of the Jewish territories outside Jerusalem, and thirdly, the siege and storming of the capital. As a fourth segment one could add the complete conquest of the rebels, and the unrest in Egypt and Cyrene. In the first part Justus naturally dealt with the subjugation of Galilee, and he indeed seems to have covered this section in particular detail. This is also likely because Josephus had deliberately presented this time period rather briefly<sup>293</sup> and not very objectively in his history of the war. Because Justus had criticized his opponent's work, he was indeed obliged to enter upon the details as well. In this segment he had also described the siege of Jotapata.<sup>294</sup> We do not have any more detailed information about the other parts of the work; [69] if anything, we learn only that Justus had described the siege of Jerusalem.<sup>295</sup> He probably did not conclude with the conquest of the capital but likely also treated the aftermath of the war in Judaea, Egypt, and Cyrene, which Josephus had at least also described.<sup>296</sup>

Given that Justus attacked Josephus in his work and continually occupied himself with the latter's presentation of the war, one might perhaps conclude that he generally wrote with a certain animus against Josephus.

Along with the direct testimonies there are also indirect ones that permit conclusions concerning this work of history. In the first place, it can be established that Justus probably prefaced his work with a foreword. Here he seems to have emphasized his credibility and stated that he had distanced himself from all flattery; as proof of this he

---

two sieges of Jotapata and Jerusalem, as an eye-witness he had an advantage over Justus. Josephus was also best acquainted with the events in Galilee, since he held a leading position there. But he loses some of this advantage because of his consideration for the Romans.

<sup>292.</sup> V. 359.

<sup>293.</sup> The detailed description of the siege of Jerusalem is to be compared to this. Perhaps Josephus described the siege of Jotapata in such detail in order to conceal the intentional brevity of his portrayal of the events in Galilee. Certainly this is also connected to the fact that here he himself was the defender; and the description of sieges, in general, provided rhetoric authors with a rich field of expression.

<sup>294.</sup> Cf. V. 357.

<sup>295.</sup> V. 358.

<sup>296.</sup> In the 7<sup>th</sup> book of the *War*. These events cover the years 71-73 CE.

would have adduced the publication of his work after the deaths of the great men treated in it.<sup>297</sup> On this occasion he probably engaged in some attacks on other authors who allowed themselves to be influenced by favour and disfavour. At the time, this was a common and not unjustified accusation.<sup>298</sup> It seemed logical [70] to strike Josephus a blow and to allege that he published his work while the participating emperors, Vespasian and Titus, were still alive, in order to benefit from their favour for the flatteries that it contained.<sup>299</sup> That Justus emphasized the late publication of his work seems all the more likely because Josephus takes up the circumstance of late publication by Justus and uses it to arouse suspicion about his rival's work, and to turn his own early publication to his favour.

We can conclude the following about Justus' polemical style against Josephus. Justus indicated that in his *War* Josephus did not correctly present the role that he had played in the Jewish revolt, that he had not been somewhat friendly toward the Romans, but rather had been a determined supporter of the revolt. We see this first in the differing statements Josephus makes about his election in the *Life*. Here<sup>300</sup> he names the leaders of Jerusalem as the ones who gave the mandate, whereas in the *War*<sup>301</sup> he stated that he had been elected by the Jews who had returned home after the defeat of Cestius. Admittedly, these two statements do not completely rule one another out; we do not actually know the mode of election that was used to choose the leader,<sup>302</sup> but all the same, he obviously distinguished the authorities intentionally as those who gave the mandate in his biography. Furthermore, [71] the differing description of the purpose of his mandate, which Josephus provides in the βίος, is obviously connected to Justus' polemics. As a result he has placed himself in a certain contradiction to his own earlier presentation. While according to the *War*<sup>303</sup> he had been elected as the military leader of the coming war, in the *Life*<sup>304</sup> he states that he had

---

<sup>297.</sup> Pliny the Elder actually allowed his history to be published only after his death. In the case of Justus, the reason for the late publication may well have been his desire to avoid the allegation that he had tried to flatter the emperors.

<sup>298.</sup> Cf. the preface of Tac. *Hist.* I.1. A preface had been customary for quite some time. Herodotus already includes a preliminary note, even if he states only quite generally that he recorded the deeds of the Hellenes and barbarians, so that they may not be lost to posterity. In the case of Thucydides the preface already has a more personal note. He points to the fact that he started to collect material for his history at the very beginning of the Peloponnesian War. Later, the prefaces assumed a greater scope. Now the author dealt with his predecessors, mentioned his goals, etc. Cf. Josephus' preface to the *Antiquities* and to the *War*; and Pliny's long preface to *Nat. Hist.* Cf. A. Wolff, *De Flavii Josephi belli Judaici scriptoris studiis rhetoricis*. Halle, Diss. 1908. p. 4.

<sup>299.</sup> As a matter of fact, Josephus commemorated these two emperors only in laudatory terms.

<sup>300.</sup> V. 28.

<sup>301.</sup> II 562.

<sup>302.</sup> Josephus supplements the above statements of the *Life* in two later passages (65 and 341) by mentioning the κοινὸν τῶν Ἱεροσολυμιτῶν, the council and people of Jerusalem, as the ones giving the order.

<sup>303.</sup> II. 562. στρατηγούς ἀπεδείκνυσαν τοῦ πολέμου πλείονας.

<sup>304.</sup> V. 29. πείσοντας τοὺς πονηροὺς καταθέσθαι τὰ ὄπλα καὶ διδάξοντας, ὡς ἔστιν ἄμεινον τοῖς κρατίστοις

been sent to Galilee in order to convince the bad elements to lay down their weapons. Those able to bear arms should rather place themselves at the service of the government, which had decided to have weapons ready in preparation for the future, but to wait for the time being and see what measures the Romans [would take]. That is why he had summoned the bravest “robbers”<sup>305</sup> with the intention of taking away their arms from them. When he saw that this was not possible, he persuaded the Galilean people to pay fees to them in order to protect their goods from being robbed.<sup>306</sup> Then he had the robbers swear that they would leave the land and not return until they were called or they received no pay. Josephus also ordered them not to engage in battle either with the Romans or with the Syrians living in the surrounding area.

It is striking, too, that in the *Life* Josephus names fellow envoys<sup>307</sup> whom he did not mention in his *War*. It is not enough to explain Josephus’ naming them by pointing to the *Life*’s more detailed description, because even here Josephus has them play such a subordinate role that he could have just as well [72] omitted them [entirely]. One must therefore probably ascribe [the fact that] they were mentioned to a rebuke by Justus, who had most likely designated it as arrogance on Josephus’ part that he had spoken only about himself in his *War*. Certainly, there is no doubt that Josephus had been elected as the actual leader of the revolt. But he had been assigned two men who were to stand by him as advisors; indeed, from a passage in the *Life*<sup>308</sup> we might perhaps even infer that Josephus had to acquiesce when his two advisors were against him. Incidentally, Josephus seemed to have had another specific reason to pass over his associates in silence in his *War*, that is to say, they returned to Jerusalem prematurely, and Josephus gives self-interest as the reason for their departure.<sup>309</sup> When they had gathered a lot of money in Galilee from the tithes that they received as priests, they had wished to return to the capital city. He allegedly convinced them to stay, however. A few paragraphs later<sup>310</sup> he then simply reports their departure. When he alleges selfishness as their motive, this does not sound quite believable. He himself therefore probably had something to hide.

The remaining points are connected with Josephus’ activities in Galilee. Justus had

---

τοῦ ἔθνους αὐτὰ τηρεῖσθαι· ἔγνωστο δὲ τούτοις αἰεὶ μὲν ἔχειν τὰ ὄπλα πρὸς τὸ μέλλον ἔτοιμα περιμένειν δὲ τί πράξουσιν Ῥωμαῖοι μαθεῖν.

<sup>305.</sup> By these “robbers,” zealots are to be understood.

<sup>306.</sup> V. 77.

<sup>307.</sup> V. 29. πέμπουσιν ἐμὲ καὶ δύο ἄλλους τῶν ἱερέων καλοῦς κάγαθούς ἄνδρας, Ἰώζαρον καὶ Ἰούδαν..

<sup>308.</sup> V. 73. κἀγὼ μόνος ἠττώμενος ὑποδύς τὴν ἡσυχίαν ἤγαγον. Cf. above p. 16. note 2.

<sup>309.</sup> V. 63.

<sup>310.</sup> V. 77.

illustrated Josephus' anti-Roman attitude firstly through the destruction of the palace in Tiberias, which had been conducted upon his instigation. With good reason, Josephus had not said a word about this in his *War*. Now he found himself compelled by Justus' account to treat what was for him an awkward fact in his *Life*.<sup>311</sup> As far as possible he now tries to justify himself, [73] but what he offers by way of exoneration actually looks more like excuses. Thus he asserts that his encouragement of the destruction was [motivated by] an express order of the authorities in Jerusalem; the destruction itself occurred during his absence and against his wishes. He even claims that when he received word of the destruction he hurried to Tiberias and saved valuable pieces from the contents of the royal residence for Agrippa. But how does this accord with the fact, which he himself must concede, that he first forced the city's council to give its approval for the destruction?

Justus likewise proved Josephus' hostility toward the Romans from his preparations for war and leadership in the war. In the *War* Josephus had indeed stated that he built forts and trained an army,<sup>312</sup> but he told this above all in order to illustrate his achievements. For we do not generally get the impression that he was the leader of the revolution, which he actually was indeed, but rather instead of this we hear almost exclusively about internal feuds. As proof for his assertion, Justus referred to Josephus' campaign against the Syrians who lived in the surrounding area. Josephus must admit to this in the *Life*,<sup>313</sup> and also that he sent a part of the booty to his relatives in Jerusalem. By the way, this undertaking shows particularly clearly that Josephus really was the head of the revolution in Galilee; we owe our knowledge of this important fact entirely to Justus' notice.

If Justus illuminated Josephus' political attitude here, so he also appears on the other hand to have offered criticism of Josephus' military measures against the Romans. Thus he probably said that Jotapata could have stood longer, or that Josephus failed to provide the necessary attentiveness or energy. In fact, Josephus emphasizes at one point that Jotapata [74] and many forts were conquered by force and that many Galileans died in the battle.<sup>314</sup> And in another passage of the *Life*<sup>315</sup> he accuses Justus to the effect that he could not have described the siege of Jotapata correctly, given that he was with Agrippa in Berytus. And since all of the defenders of the fortress fell in the battle, it follows that Justus could not have known what the Romans underwent during this siege, or what they had done to the

---

<sup>311.</sup> V. 64 ff.

<sup>312.</sup> *BJ*. II 562, 569 and 572-584.

<sup>313.</sup> V. 81.

<sup>314.</sup> V. 350.

<sup>315.</sup> V. 357.

Jews, or what Josephus contributed personally.

Finally, in the βίος Josephus noticeably shifted [the timing of] the Tiberians' first attempt to switch over to Agrippa, which is probably also a consequence of Justus' polemic. According to the report in *War*, this first attempt occurred after Josephus was able to master his opponents, but Josephus thwarted it by guile.<sup>316</sup> After a few days Tiberias did secede again<sup>317</sup> and was then looted as punishment; however, the stolen goods were soon returned to the inhabitants. In reality, it is not likely that Josephus acted so mildly, and Justus must have indicated this. In the *Life* account,<sup>318</sup> however, he narrates the first defection of the Tiberians even before he had subdued the opposition. This is a twisting of the facts because at that time the war party was still in power in Tiberias, as is shown by the circumstance that the city had been chosen as the seat of the opposition right at that point in time. Josephus evidently wishes to mislead the reader in this way in order to hide his anti-Roman attitude. Secondly, he also deviates from the *War* in that [he writes] in the *Life*<sup>319</sup> that he supposedly protected the city from all punishment during the second defection by persuading the Galileans [75] to delay the punishment. Of course, the report in the βίος should be dismissed as an adjustment.

The remaining facts that allow us to draw conclusions about the content of Justus' history of the war are connected to the period of internal feuding. In his description of this movement in the *War*, Josephus had discussed his opponents with consummate hatred, especially his main enemy John of Gischala, who appears as a person of terrible character, even as a robber and blood-thirsty monster.<sup>320</sup> Justus had rightly objected to this and showed that Josephus had been on the best of terms with this very man at the beginning of the revolt, as Josephus himself betrays in a passage of the *War*.<sup>321</sup> Because he could not now deny that he had cooperated with John for some time, he tried to gloss this over and explain it in the *Life*.<sup>322</sup> That is why he asserts that at first John was a supporter of peace and tried to hold back those of his countrymen, the residents of Gischala, who wanted war. This, however, is a fabrication. For, according to Josephus' own portrayal in the *War* and in the *Life*, John acted as a zealot both before and during the revolt to such an extent that any

---

<sup>316.</sup> *BJ*. II 632 ff.

<sup>317.</sup> *BJ*. II 645.

<sup>318.</sup> *V*. 155 ff.

<sup>319.</sup> *V*. 387-388.

<sup>320.</sup> *BJ*. II 587. δι' ἐλπίδα κέρδους φονικώτατος and ληστής γὰρ ἦν μονότροπος.

<sup>321.</sup> II 590. ἐπεὶ δὲ τὸν Ἰώσηπον ὁρῶν αὐτοῦ σφόδρα χαίροντα τῷ δραστηρίῳ.

<sup>322.</sup> *V*. 43.

early peaceful attitude on his part is unthinkable. But now Josephus had to explain how the peace-loving John did end up participating in the revolt and eventually even became one of the main leaders. So we hear that the Tyrians, Gadarenes, and Baraganians had made an attack against Gischala in which [the town] was conquered and burnt.<sup>323</sup> John [76] was so enraged by this disaster for his hometown that he placed himself at the head of his people and engaged in a battle with the enemy.<sup>324</sup> From then on, he was an active supporter of the revolt.<sup>325</sup>

The reality was probably more as follows. From Josephus<sup>326</sup> we learn that the Jews also retaliated against Tyrian Kedesa in revenge for the Jews killed in Caesarea by the sea. It is easily possible that the residents of Kedesa and their neighbours, namely the Tyrians,<sup>327</sup> in turn sought revenge and attacked the closest [town], Gischala. However this clash might have occurred, it was not in any case the initial reason why John became a supporter of the revolt, as Josephus claims. He therefore must have had a reason to diverge from the truth and without doubt this should be sought in Justus' criticism.<sup>328</sup>

This is also clear in the way that Josephus diverges from his earlier presentation in the following two cases. The first point concerns John's construction of the wall [77] in Gischala. Josephus had reported in the *War*<sup>329</sup> about this to the effect that he gave John permission [to build the wall]. John took advantage of this opportunity and lined his pockets with large sums of the money that the rich citizens had to hand over for the construction [of the wall]. This was defamation, however, for the costs of the fortification, or at least a part thereof, had been covered rather by John's sale, with Josephus' permission, of grain reserves that belonged to the Roman emperor.<sup>330</sup> Justus drew attention to this.

---

<sup>323.</sup> V. 44.

<sup>324.</sup> V. 45.

<sup>325.</sup> There are indeed a number of objections to the narrative of this campaign, and it is likely that Josephus portrayed many things differently from the way they occurred in reality. Thus, it is striking that the Gadarenes were supposedly present during this venture, although their city was separated by a considerable distance from Gischala by Lake Genesareth. Moreover, Josephus relates that John armed all his people; therefore here, all of a sudden, he is the leader of a band of rebels, while [Josephus argues that] John was allegedly moved to participate in the revolt only as a result of this attack. But since there is a lacuna in the text here, we must abstain from drawing any conclusions.

<sup>326.</sup> BJ. III 588.

<sup>327.</sup> The Tyrian territory stretched from the sea almost to the river Jordan.

<sup>328.</sup> B. Niese *op. cit.* p. 228 also assumes that Justus had described Josephus as a friend and comrade of John.

<sup>329.</sup> BJ. II 590.

<sup>330.</sup> This grain, the σῖτος Κάισαρος as Josephus calls it, was part of a tax, *tributum soli* or *agri*, that the Jewish territory had to pay to the Roman emperor and that could also consist of payment in kind. Cf. Schürer *op. cit.* I p. 511. It had already been collected but because the unrest had already erupted it could not be brought to Italy for further transport or it was supposed to remain where it was for the war.

Josephus cannot deny that he gave this permission, and now he attempts to talk his way around it. So in the *Life*<sup>331</sup> he asserts that he refused John's request for permission to use that grain, so that he could keep it for himself or the Romans. John then turned to the envoys and gained their assent by bribing them; Josephus himself, however, had to relent. But this story has been adjusted. As Josephus was an enthusiastic supporter of the revolt at the time, he had no reason to refuse John's request. Once the war had been decided upon, what was more logical than to confiscate the grain and use it for purposes of the revolt? Josephus absolutely did not think of keeping it for the Romans at that time. Therefore what Josephus states about the bribery of the envoys is likewise a fabrication. We may assert with confidence that the reason for this divergence from [the report in] the *War* again lies in Justus' criticism; for Josephus would not, of his own free will, [78] have mentioned an event so unfavourable to himself as the use of imperial property.

With the other report of the βίος that likewise clearly shows an attempt to repudiate Justus' presentation, the situation is as follows. The Jews in Caesarea Philippi had issued the request to John that he sell them oil for domestic use, since, due to their hostility with the Syrians, they did not want to buy any oil from them because it was "impure".<sup>332</sup> Galilee was very rich in oil, however, and just then had enjoyed a particularly good harvest.<sup>333</sup> John then satisfied the request of those Jews after having acquired Josephus' permission for this.<sup>334</sup> In his *War*, Josephus now presented it as if John had sold oil to all Jews living in Syria and made a large profit in this manner. But this was an exaggeration, as already emerges from the fact that the great distance made the transportation not worthwhile. Justus must have drawn attention to this and consequently in the βίος Josephus mentions only the Jews in Caesarea Philippi.<sup>335</sup> The statement in the biography is naturally the correct one; in principle, a precise detail is to be preferred over a general statement, especially in this instance where it is clear that Josephus has exaggerated intentionally in the *War*.

Furthermore, Justus must have said that Josephus did not have any right at all to accuse John retrospectively of despicable profiteering for selling this oil, since he did indeed give him permission. This again occasioned an addition in the *Life*, in which Josephus claims that he did not grant the permission voluntarily, but out of fear of being stoned by

---

<sup>331.</sup> V. 72-73.

<sup>332.</sup> Cf. *Jos. Ant.* XII 120 where the same misgivings of the Jews are expressed.

<sup>333.</sup> *BJ.* II 592.

<sup>334.</sup> *BJ.* II 591.

<sup>335.</sup> V. 74-75.

the people.<sup>336</sup>

[79] Justus also accused Josephus of using violence and being guided by thirst for revenge in his suppression of the opposition, and he was able to prove his accusation through Josephus' own *War*. In fact, Josephus had reported there<sup>337</sup> that once when an opposition mob had gathered in front of his house, behaving in a threatening way, he had by means of deceptive ploys lured their leaders and respected men into his house and beaten them bloody. Evidently Josephus had only recounted it out of vanity, because he had considered himself very brave. It is not at all the issue whether the story actually happened thus. As a result of Justus' accusations, Josephus now presented the event considerably more mildly in the *Life*. Here, it is only the most "impudent" one who is punished by beatings and the loss of one hand.<sup>338</sup> Most importantly, Justus forced Josephus to admit that he had suppressed the opposition by force.<sup>339</sup> In several passages of the *War*<sup>340</sup> Josephus emphasizes how wrong it is to shed compatriots' blood [*Bürgerblut*] and that he overcame his opponents without using force. Suddenly in the *Life*<sup>341</sup> we now hear that during the suppression [of his opponents], compatriots' blood did indeed flow, and that both parties met in a clash before Tiberias, in which Josephus remained victorious only with some difficulty. This admission was certainly not easy for him, even if it was to be acknowledged that he had been forced to use violence in order to maintain his position. Here also we can definitely see how Justus' polemic influenced the presentation of the βίος and how in this way our knowledge of the events is expanded in a most welcome way. [80] In this sense, Justus' attacks had their benefits.

Furthermore, Justus must have asserted that Josephus used violence against women and that he lived immorally. Josephus' words<sup>342</sup> show this, when he says that he left every woman untouched; for such an assurance would be quite curious<sup>343</sup> without a prior accusation referring to [such behaviour].

Finally, he accused him of being corruptible. Josephus opposed this by protesting that he rejected every act of bribery and did not even accept the tithes to which he was

---

336. V. 76.

337. *BJ*. II 612.

338. V. 147.

339. V. 327.

340. II 620, 623, 630, 645.

341. 327.

342. V. 80. Cf. V. 259.

343. Cf. B. Niese *op. cit.* p. 228.

entitled as a priest.<sup>344</sup> Regarding the accusation of corruptibility, Justus could have asserted that Josephus was careless in the duties of his office because he had been bribed by the Romans or by Agrippa. He could have tried to demonstrate this, for example, by Josephus' behaviour toward Sepphoris, which he deliberately let fall into the hands of the Romans.<sup>345</sup> Such a claim stands in fundamental contrast to Justus' normal tendency to portray Josephus as an enemy of the Romans. But since he had a general animosity toward Josephus, he might as well have spoken about treason too. As proof of his assertion he might have referred to the presence of two aristocrats from Trachonitis who had brought money for bribes along with them. At least, Josephus does respond to this matter in detail,<sup>346</sup> which might however be because he also wanted to show his liberal character.<sup>347</sup> If Josephus talks about money that he [81] did not accept because he was not in need of it,<sup>348</sup> he might have meant money that rich Galileans offered him because they wanted to be spared from contributing to the cost of the war.

If we look back once again, we see that Josephus diverged from the truth rather often in his *War*. As a consequence, can his *Jewish War* as a whole be put into question as far as its value as a historical source is concerned? No, because Josephus had reasons to present the facts differently only when he reported about his own actions and experiences, if we ignore his rhetorical style and one-sided praise of the emperors. Also related to this is the fact that the distortions that Justus adduces against Josephus, as far as we can judge, were all concerned with his activities in Galilee, which are described only in a part of the second and the larger part of the third book. In the portrayal of these actions of his, Josephus certainly omitted, changed, or distorted some things. But one also has to consider that he was constrained in a number of ways by his personal consideration for the Romans and for the emperor, whose client he was. He was no historian who held the truth above all else, and there was enough [material] for another historian to feel induced to criticize his presentation. Justus did this, though not because of a love for the truth, for he did not keep his own work free of distortions. His attacks were prompted much more by literary rivalry. Whether these accusations by Justus had negative consequences for Josephus we do not know, for the *Life* contains the last information we have about Josephus. But this much is certain, that Justus' allegations, supported by evidence, must have created an extremely

---

<sup>344.</sup> V. 80.

<sup>345.</sup> Cf. B. Niese *op. cit.* p. 228 note 2.

<sup>346.</sup> V. 112-113. 149-154.

<sup>347.</sup> Bärwald *op. cit.* p. 51 takes, without justification, the presence of these aristocrats as proof that Josephus was bribed by Agrippa.

<sup>348.</sup> V. 80.

bad impression with the reigning emperor Domitian, [82] who was a decided enemy of the Jews.<sup>349</sup> It is in fact not impossible that Josephus was removed [*gestürzt*] by Domitian. Similarly, we lack information about Justus' end. Yet he probably lived beyond 100 CE, since he published his chronicle in 100, as one can assume on the basis of Photius' statement.<sup>350</sup>

Ultimately, if we take a look at Josephus' and Justus' characters, alongside a degree of difference we see a considerable resemblance. Both originated from well-respected Jewish families, were educated in literature and active as authors, and assumed a friendly attitude toward the Romans, but with the difference that Justus was amicably disposed toward the Romans from the beginning, whereas Josephus was initially a decided enemy of the Romans and first became a friend of the Romans through his relationships after his captivity. This difference in their original political attitudes is most likely to be explained [by the fact] that Josephus originated from an important priestly family based in Jerusalem, whereas Justus' home was Tiberias, which, with its mixed population and Syrian neighbours, had many more connections with the Romans.

[83]

#### Sepphoris (Appendix to Page 17)

In earlier times, Sepphoris was probably as positive toward Jews as any other Galilean city. This changed, however, with the death of Herod I. At that time, unrest erupted in Jewish lands, caused by gang leaders who were striving for the crown. At the same time, a certain Judas also gathered such a mob in Sepphoris, armed them, and arrogated to himself power over Galilean territory.<sup>351</sup> Varus, the governor of Syria,<sup>352</sup> suppressed this and other uprisings; on this occasion, Sepphoris was destroyed and its residents became slaves.<sup>353</sup> Then, after Herod's death his son Herod Antipas received Galilee and reconstructed Sepphoris in a particularly lavish manner,<sup>354</sup> made it a city, and named it *Αὐτοκρατορίς* after Caesar Augustus. The city's friendly attitude toward the Romans appears to date from this point in time onwards. Perhaps Herod Antipas also settled many non-Jews in the new foundation, as Galilee's population was generally quite mixed. At that time, Sepphoris was also Herod Antipas' residence as well as the capital of Galilee. Admittedly, the tetrarch later established a new residence in Tiberias, and from then on

---

<sup>349.</sup> Schürer *op. cit.* I p. 660.

<sup>350.</sup> *Bibl. cod.* 33. p. 6.

<sup>351.</sup> *BJ.* II 56.

<sup>352.</sup> The same one who was later killed in the Teutoburg forest.

<sup>353.</sup> *BJ.* II 68.

<sup>354.</sup> Josephus (*Ant.* XVIII 27) calls it the pride of all Galilee.

Tiberias was the capital until Nero conferred it on Agrippa II. At that time, Sepphoris reassumed its former grandeur. The Sepphorites then displayed their friendship for the Romans for the first time during Cestius' campaign in the spring of 66 CE. At that time they welcomed Caesennius Gallus, who was supposed to suppress the rebels in Galilee, and in the process they ensured [84] that the other cities in Galilee remained calm, which made Caesennius' task significantly easier.<sup>355</sup> In so doing, however, Sepphoris drew the ire of the nationalistic Galileans who had it in mind to punish the city for its friendly attitude toward the Romans. That was just during the period when Josephus arrived in Galilee. It was his first act in his new sphere of operations that he figured out how to thwart this intention of the Galileans.<sup>356</sup> In fact, he wanted to win the Sepphorites over to the revolt<sup>357</sup> by treating them with consideration, for he had realized that the Jewish cause would be significantly advanced if this fortress-city were affiliated. For this reason he also allowed the residents to interact freely with the hostages whom Cestius had taken from the town, who were located in Dora on the Phoenician coast.<sup>358</sup> How important it was to Josephus to win over this city we can discern from [the circumstance that] he travelled to Sepphoris immediately upon his arrival [in Galilee].<sup>359</sup> At that time, then, the Sepphorites appear as allegedly having decided in favour of the revolt, since otherwise they had to fear the revenge of the Galileans, while help from the Romans could not yet be expected. We can identify their attitude at the time from the statements that Josephus makes about the construction of the fortifications in Sepphoris, even if they are not totally clear. That is to say, in the *Life*<sup>360</sup> Josephus lists Sepphoris as one of the cities that he fortified himself. In the *War*<sup>361</sup> he likewise reports that before Sepphoris defected from the Galileans, he provided it with ramparts. And in a different passage in the *Life*<sup>362</sup> he states that the Sepphorites prompted him to build fortifications. [85] They deceived him in this matter, however, for they were afraid of Jewish attacks; in their hearts they were actually sympathetic to the Romans. The report in the *War*<sup>363</sup> now stands in some contradiction to this, in which he states that the Sepphorites had built a fortification for themselves, as they had a wealth of money and were enthused about the war. These statements, however, can be easily reconciled. The

---

<sup>355.</sup> BJ, II 511. By the way, Cestius also used hostages to ensure the loyalty of the Sepphorites. Cf. V. 31.

<sup>356.</sup> V. 30-31.

<sup>357.</sup> Cf. above p. 17.

<sup>358.</sup> V. 31.

<sup>359.</sup> V. 30. At least, Sepphoris is the first city where he reports his presence. Cf. above p. 17.

<sup>360.</sup> § 186.

<sup>361.</sup> III 61.

<sup>362.</sup> § 347.

<sup>363.</sup> II 574.

Sepphorites expressed enthusiasm for the war at the beginning of the revolt, but [this was] feigned only as long as they could not count on Roman protection. At that time, they obtained Josephus' permission to fortify themselves, and because he gave them the permission, it is with a certain justification that he can also speak of his fortification. We should not really draw the conclusion from Josephus' manner of expression in that passage of the *War*<sup>364</sup> that Sepphoris was truly at times a sincere supporter of the revolt. Actually, Josephus' manner of expression is merely imprecise and it should have read that they were *allegedly* enthusiastic for the war. This is proven by the explicit statement in the *Life*<sup>365</sup> where he talks about the Sepphorites' betrayal, which further proves the rest of their stance.

When we later find the Sepphorites on the side of the opposition against Josephus,<sup>366</sup> this is no doubt to be explained in that, by participating in this movement, they hoped to weaken Josephus, the organizer of the revolt. A zealous attitude, such as that held by the opposition itself, was quite foreign to them. Moreover, Josephus seems to have made the attempt to win Sepphoris over for his party. At least we hear that he stayed in this city for a second time.<sup>367</sup> The Sepphorites were not pleased with his presence, [86] however, and they tried to get rid of him by having an attempt made on his life. Josephus' account of this story is somewhat suspect, but this much remains confirmed, namely, that he actually was in Sepphoris but indeed not as a welcome guest.<sup>368</sup>

Of course the Sepphorites joined John of Gischala's party before seeking Cestius' help, precisely because they could not yet count on Roman protection. This proves that John very quickly became antagonistic toward Josephus. After some time the Sepphorites broke away from the opposition and declared themselves amenable toward the Romans on whose side they had stood inwardly from the beginning.<sup>369</sup>

In any case, Josephus hampered an appreciation of this thoroughly understandable attitude on the part of the Sepphorites in the *Life* in that he claims here that the Sepphorites had not taken part in the opposition against him;<sup>370</sup> indeed, at a later passage in the *Life*<sup>371</sup> he actually states that the Sepphorites had sent back the four envoys who wanted

---

<sup>364.</sup> II 574.

<sup>365.</sup> § 347

<sup>366.</sup> *BJ*. II 629. V. 203.

<sup>367.</sup> V. 104-111.

<sup>368.</sup> The Sepphorites convince a gang leader, Jesus, who was to capture Josephus for a reward. But Josephus somehow gets wind of this plan and, for his part, now captures Jesus; Josephus releases him, however, and takes him into his service.

<sup>369.</sup> *Cf.* above p. 22.

<sup>370.</sup> V. 124.

<sup>371.</sup> § 232.

to win them over to the opposition. This, however, is confuted by the explicit statement in the *War*<sup>372</sup> and an observation in the βίος<sup>373</sup> where the Sepphorites are imposed upon to provide John of Gischala with support troops. And in the *Life*, Josephus had the Sepphorites' actual disposition in mind, which admittedly was entirely sympathetic to the Romans.

[87]

---

<sup>372.</sup> II 629.  
<sup>373.</sup> § 203.

## Gamala (Appendix to Page 21)

Gamala was located in the area of Gaulanitis; thus it belonged to Agrippa's territory. In Gaulanitis the population was made up of Jews and Syrians, as follows from the fact that after the blood bath in Caesarea the Jews also undertook a revenge strike against this area.<sup>374</sup> On the other hand, the greater part of the population must have been Jewish because during the course of the revolt [the territory of] Gaulanitis as far as the village of Solyme did join the rebels.<sup>375</sup> Circumstances were similar in Gamala; the predominant part of the inhabitants were Jewish,<sup>376</sup> as emerges from the following fact. When Varus or Noaros,<sup>377</sup> Agrippa's governor, persecuted the Jews in the king's realm and especially focused on the Babylonian Jews in Ecbatana in Batanea,<sup>378</sup> the Jews there left their colony, which had been founded by Herod I, and moved to Gamala, where they were welcomed. Thus, they regarded Gamala as a place of refuge for Judaism. The governor's actions almost caused Gamala to join the revolt already at that point. But Philip the son of Jacimus was able to prevent the Gamalites from taking this step by reminding them of Agrippa's friendly government and the Romans' power.<sup>379</sup> [88] This Philip had been the leader of the troops that Agrippa had sent to Jerusalem to support the peace party in Jerusalem,<sup>380</sup> but which had to surrender to the rebellious population [there]. Philip's life was endangered at that time because a particularly fanatical revolutionary leader demanded his death, but Philip escaped successfully.<sup>381</sup> He arrived just in time to preserve the Gamalites' loyalty to Agrippa. This was before Cestius' campaign.

If the Gamalites still remained on Agrippa's side at that point, this was partly due to

---

<sup>374.</sup> BJ. II 459.

<sup>375.</sup> V. 187.

<sup>376.</sup> Earlier on we learn that in the year 6 or 7 CE a certain Judas of Gamala incited the people to occasionally rob Quirinius. *Ant.* XVIII 4.

<sup>377.</sup> In the *Life* he is called Varus, in the *War* Noaros.

<sup>378.</sup> This persecution occurred at the same time in various Syrian cities and was a consequence of the antagonism between Jews and Syrians, which was provoked in particular by the revenge strikes of the Jews, of which we spoke above. (above p. 10)

<sup>379.</sup> V. 60-61. Bärwald did not present Philip's activity correctly. He says (*op. cit.* p. 38) that Philip pressured Gamala to join the revolt on the order of Agrippa and that Gamala joined the revolt from the beginning. This is exactly the opposite of what Josephus says (*op. cit.* p. 37). Then Agrippa and Philip changed their position and the Gamalites killed his relatives in revenge for this betrayal on the part of Philip (*op. cit.* p. 39). In this [statement] he relies on the Tyrians' indictment of Agrippa and Philip. But that was really only an indictment that remained entirely without result. Philip was to have presented himself before Nero regarding the allegation that he had abandoned the Roman cohorts in Jerusalem, and surrendered the royal troops without cause. But Philip was not to encounter this Caesar alive again. V. 407-409. Because Nero had died in June 68 and Philip's indictment occurred in spring 67, about one year had therefore passed before Philip started his journey.

<sup>380.</sup> BJ. II 421.

<sup>381.</sup> V. 46-47.

the circumstance that the king recalled Varus and replaced him with Aequus Modius. Despite this, the Jews must definitely have counted on the fortress joining the revolt when they elected their leaders for the war, for according to the *War*<sup>382</sup> Josephus received the command not only over Galilee but also over Gamala. Against expectation, however, it seems that this annexation [of Gamala] had not yet taken place when Josephus arrived in Galilee; for soon after his [89] arrival Josephus requests new measures for dealing with Gamala from the Synhedrium in Jerusalem.<sup>383</sup> But he received the decision that he was to remain and take care of Galilee. When Philip left the city, however, and went to see Agrippa in Berytus in order to counter false rumours that had been disseminated about him, then Gamala seceded.<sup>384</sup> Now indeed, under the leadership of a certain Josephus, the zealots secured participation in the revolt, and they did not shy away from violent measures in the process. According to Josephus' narration, some pro-Roman Jews were punished then.<sup>385</sup> The zealots were met with resistance from the Babylonian Jews who did not want anything to do with the revolt, and this resulted in a dispute between them and the nationalistic Jews.<sup>386</sup> At the same time the Gamalites turned to Josephus with the request to fortify their city. Thus, Gamala did not join the revolt until Josephus was already active in Galilee, thus in the winter of 66/67. Of course Josephus happily complied with their requests and strengthened the fortress, such that it appeared even stronger than Jotapata.<sup>387</sup> He likewise fortified Seleucia and Sogane, two villages in Gaulanitis.<sup>388</sup> When Gamala seceded, it is probable that the remainder of Gaulanitis up to Solyme did so as well.

Agrippa now made an effort to regain the territories that had seceded, but he was successful only with Seleucia and Sogane;<sup>389</sup> Gamala stood strong. He therefore instructed his governor, Aequus Modius, to compel Gamala. According to the *War*,<sup>390</sup> this officer besieged Gamala for seven months to no avail, so probably from March to [90] October 67, when the siege by the Romans started. But this was more of an observation [than a siege], because according to the *Life*<sup>391</sup> the royal forces were too weak for a complete encirclement, which was also made more difficult by the mountainous nature of this area.<sup>392</sup> Even

---

382. II 568.

383. V. 62.

384. V. 182 and 185.

385. V. 177-178. 186. Cf. above p. 40.

386. V. 177.

387. *BJ*. IV 9-10. Cf. above p. 21.

388. *BJ*. II 574. V. 187.

389. *BJ*. IV 4.

390. IV 10.

391. § 114.

392. Cf. the description of Gamala *BJ*. IV 5-8.

Vespasian and his much larger army were initially unable to surround the fort completely.<sup>393</sup>

Agrippa later sent a certain Sulla with the assignment of occupying the roads to Seleucia and Gamala in order to cut off their supplies from Galilee.<sup>394</sup> At that time, therefore, the residents of Seleucia were still on the side of the rebels. When Josephus now states in his *War*<sup>395</sup> that Agrippa was able to win back Seleucia and Sogane through negotiations, this is not accurate; rather, a certain [amount of] pressure was applied to Seleucia as well. Gamala shared the fate of the Galilean rebel cities: it was besieged by Vespasian, conquered on November 10<sup>th</sup> 67, and its population was completely annihilated.<sup>396</sup>

[91]

### Author's Biography

I, Heinrich Luther, a Protestant by confession, was born on June 25th 1883 in Schkeitbar near Lützen, a son of the pastor Johannes Luther and his wife Ernestine, née Sichel. I attended first the village school in my hometown, and then the Latin secondary school in the Franconian Foundations in Halle, where I passed the qualifying exams in autumn of 1903. After serving as a one-year volunteer in Tübingen, I attended the University of Göttingen for three semesters and after that the University of Halle where I passed my *viva voce* exam *cum laude* on May 24<sup>th</sup>, 1910.

In Göttingen I heard the lectures of the following professors: Blaß†, Busolt, Dittenberger†, Droysen†, Ebbinghaus†, Fries, Husserl, Kern, Lehmann, Leo, Niese†, Robert, Schwartz, Stein, Uphues, Wackernagel, and Wissowa. For one semester I participated in the pedagogic seminar with privy councillor Fries and in the archaeological seminar with privy councillor Robert. For one semester I was a member of the second division of the philological seminar and for three semesters a member of the history seminar.

I am indebted to privy councillor Niese, by whose inspiration and under whose friendly supervision this dissertation has been produced; unfortunately he was taken from us by a sudden death. I also offer many thanks to Professor Kern, who took over the supervision after Professor Niese's death, for the friendly suggestions he gave me, as also for his kind review of the proofs.

---

<sup>393.</sup> BJ. IV 12.

<sup>394.</sup> V. 398. Cf. above p. 23.

<sup>395.</sup> BJ. IV 4.

<sup>396.</sup> BJ. IV 83.

At this point I would like to express my warmest gratitude to all my teachers who have encouraged my education, in particular privy councillor Wissowa.