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PREFACE

The present volume is the fruit of an international colloquium on “Josephus between Jerusalem and Rome” that was held at the Pontifical Biblical Institute and the Pontifical Gregorian University in Rome, September 21–24, 2003. It was the seventh in a series of annual colloquia, based on an initiative that was launched in 1997 by Prof. Folker Siegert, Director of the Institutum Judaicum Delitzschianum at the University of Münster.1 To hold such a colloquium within walking distance of the Arch of Titus and of Josephus’ place of work, if he actually lived on the Quirinal Hill, provided a very special ambience for the gathering of over forty specialists from four continents and ten different countries. Geographic proximity certainly raised the participants’ sensitivity to Josephus’ context, though it did not make up for the chronological and cultural distances.

Context is, of course, of utmost importance for understanding a person and his or her work, ancient or modern. This is especially true of the work of Joseph ben Matityahu, better known as Flavius Josephus, who was born and raised in Jerusalem, but seems to have spent the second half of his life mainly in Rome. The tensions and connections between his cultural and religious roots in Jerusalem, his role as a commander in Galilee, and his later career as a writer in Rome are evident in his works. They have been the subject of a number of studies since the 1970s. Certainly his writings cannot be understood without taking into account his precarious role as a person who inhabited these different worlds, sometimes simultaneously. In his works Rome is a central force he needs to reckon with, but also one toward which he maintains a certain ambivalence. On various occasions he refers to the Romans’ fortune and their invincible power over Judea as well as over other parts of the Empire (B.J. 3.70–71; 5.367; 6.399; A.J. 20.70 and passim).

1 The proceedings of the first six colloquia have been published as vols. 2, 4, 6, 10, 12, and 14 in the series Munsteraner Judaistische Studien (Münster: LIT Verlag, 1998–2003). An earlier colloquium had been organized under the auspices of the Italian Association for Jewish Studies (AISG). The proceedings were edited by Fausto Parente and Joseph Sievers, Josephus and the History of the Greco-Roman Period: Essays in Memory of Morton Smith (StPB 41; Leiden: Brill, 1994).
Given this assessment, Josephus is in line with contemporary writers. Plutarch reports that the origin of the city’s name received different interpretations. The first one cited is that Rome’s military might (ῥώμη) provided the city’s name. Josephus employs the same term at least once with an ironic twist. He reports that Gabinius was sent from Rome (ἐκ Ῥώμης) to Syria (57 B.C.E.). Gabinius then rushed to Judea to assist Hyrcanus II, who was unable to withstand the might (ῥώμη) of his nephew Alexander, the son of his brother Aristobulus II. The latter, however, was prevented from carrying out his plans by the Romans (Ῥωμαίοι) who were beginning to make their power felt in Jerusalem. It may be intentional that Josephus does not clarify who these Romans were. Perhaps it was enough for him to show that they were really “the mighty.”

While acknowledging the insuperable might of Rome, not only in the military and political arena but in many cultural spheres as well, Josephus remained connected to his roots. He devoted many years and twenty-seven books to the writing of the history of his people in his two major works, and allotted less space, but equal determination, to a forceful apology of Judaism in the *Contra Apionem* (and to his *Vita*). Yet, if scholarly communis opinio is not mistaken, he did all this in Rome, with and for an audience that was at least to a large extent non-Jewish and (Greco-) Roman. The question as to how he kept these different realms connected is tackled in this volume in various ways and from different angles.

In the essays of this volume it is quite evident that there are many areas of intense discussion, whether it be about the real or intended audience of Josephus, his connections with Rome and Jerusalem, his reliability as a historian, and so forth. There is general agreement, however, that Josephus needs to be taken seriously as an author and not simply as a quarry that may be used as a source of information about the various subject matters he treated.

Therefore, the first section of this volume centers on questions of historiography, putting Josephus the historian in a broader context.
The opening essay by Doron Mendels raises important questions concerning the development of canons of historical writings. In a brief essay, Lucio Troiani discusses the purpose and techniques in Josephus’ composition of the *Antiquitates*. John Barclay, using the *Contra Apionem* as his test case, applies post-colonial theory to the study of Josephus’ strategy of trying to prove the truthfulness of the Judean tradition. Almost as a counterpoint, Fausto Parente, on the other hand, raises some serious questions about Josephus’ reliability as a historian, focusing on some famous incidents in the *Bellum Judaicum*. The other two contributions deal with the question of Josephus’ audience. While Steve Mason emphasizes the Roman context in which Josephus’ works were written and the immediate Roman audience to which they were addressed, Jonathan Price insists on the “provincial” and Judean character of Josephus and his works.

The second section is devoted to literary approaches to Josephus, a relatively new field that in a way had been opened up with numerous studies by Louis Feldman on Josephus’ rewriting of the Bible. Here, instead, the focus is on the specific techniques used by Josephus that link him not only to Greek or Hellenistic historiography and rhetoric, but also to poets such as Pindar, a link explored by Honora Chapman. The rendition of the figure of Saul in Hellenistic garb is examined by Detlev Dormeyer. Tamar Landau subjects the Herod narrative and especially the King’s image in the *Bellum* to a narratological analysis. Jan Willem van Henten concentrates on one of Herod’s speeches in the *Antiquitates*, comparing it to commander speeches in other Greek historians.

In the third section some aspects of the interaction between Josephus’ Judaism and his context are explored. In particular, the brief essays by Tessel Jonquière and Niclas Förster deal with the issue of prayer in a multicultural environment. Paul Spilsbury, taking his cue in part from John Barclay’s post-colonial interpretation, shows how Josephus’ reading and presentation of biblical material was deeply influenced, positively as well as negatively, by the constraints of living at the center of the Roman empire.

The fourth section tackles a variety of historical issues, where it is possible to bring Josephus’ work into fruitful comparison with other contemporary or near-contemporary literary, documentary, and archaeological sources, beginning from the testimony of the Arch of Titus, examined by Barbara Eberhardt. James McLaren, instead, critically analyzes the image of Titus that emerges from the literary
sources. Gunnar Haaland brings us to the time of Domitian and addresses the question of the whether the crushing of the Stoic opposition by the Emperor is reflected in the *Contra Apionem*. Gottfried Schimanowski leads us beyond Rome to Alexandria and the latter’s importance in Josephus, which is certainly inferior to Rome but in no way to be overlooked. Another perspective is opened by Bernard Jackson’s expert discussion of documentary and literary material concerning marriage and divorce in theory and in practice. Here Josephus is an important source that needs to be illuminated by other sorts of evidence, but in turn sheds light on several actual cases. Finally, in a subject area that is fraught with controversy, namely the *Testimonium Flavianum*, Giorgio Jossa provides a nuanced analysis of what might have been Josephus’ intent in introducing Jesus as a victim of Pilate’s misrule.

A last section deals with several aspects of the reception of Josephus, in particular questions concerning the translator of Josephus, ancient and modern. Gaia Lembi discusses several passages where the frequently neglected Latin translation may provide access to early and important textual traditions. Anthony Forte discusses some of the difficulties encountered in faithfully rendering the *Bellum* into English today, and while appreciative of the work of his predecessors, shows some weaknesses in the highly regarded translation by H. St. J. Thackeray. Finally, Folker Siegert discusses the difficult choices to be made in rendering Greek proper names in a modern German translation. Prof. Siegert also offers some concluding remarks concerning the colloquium as a whole, pointing out some of its achievements as well as some areas still open to discussion.

This volume and the colloquium that generated it would have been impossible without various forms of support, assistance, and cooperation for which we are immensely grateful. When the question of the feasibility of such a colloquium in Rome was still undecided, and it seemed nearly impossible to get public or private funding for it, Msgr. DDr. Richard Mathes, then Rector of the Pontificio Istituto Teutonico di S. Maria dell’Anima offered his enthusiastic and concrete support. A generous grant from the Anima Foundation provided the basis for starting to plan in earnest. The Diocese of Münster provided additional funding. The colloquium was further supported by the University of Pavia through its Dipartimento di Scienze dell’Antichità. Logistical support and helpful advice was unstintingly provided by Professor Folker Siegert and his staff at the Institutum Judaicum
Delitzschianum. A special thanks goes to the Institute’s Dr. J. Cornelis de Vos, who helped edit the contributions by colleagues Dormeyer, Schimanowski, and Siegert.

The Pontifical Biblical Institute through its Rector, at first the Rev. Robert F. O’Toole, SJ, and at a later stage the Rev. Stephen Pisano, SJ, generously provided the meeting facilities and other amenities for the colloquium. The Pontifical Biblical Institute also gave Joseph Sievers time and encouragement during the preparatory phases. Faculty and staff at the Institute, especially Mr. Carlo Valentino and Rev. Anthony J. Forte, SJ, were most helpful in making the colloquium a pleasant and successful event. The Pontifical Gregorian University welcomed the colloquium participants for a public session and a memorable evening. The secretary of its Cardinal Bea Centre for Judaic Studies, Ms. Flavia Galiani, worked untiringly to take care of many of the logistic details before, during, and after the colloquium, and helped in the preparation of the present volume. Istina Decorte of Incontri Romani took care of accommodations and tour arrangements for the participants. Roberta Ronchiato, a doctoral student at the Pontifical Biblical Institute, provided additional assistance.

The present volume is, of course, primarily the fruit of the labors of each contributor. Both of us edited all the contributions in English and French. The articles in German were edited by Joseph Sievers, Gaia Lembi prepared the index. The whole process, spread over different countries and continents, was certainly made easier by fast and efficient e-mail communication, but it would not have been possible without the excellent cooperation of all involved.

GAIA LEMBI
Pisa and Jerusalem

JOSEPH SIEVERS
Rome

March 14, 2005
ABBREVIA TIONS

In general, the abbreviations used are those contained in Patrick H. Alexander et al., eds., The SBL Handbook of Style: For Ancient Near Eastern, Biblical, and Early Christian Studies (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1999). In addition, the following abbreviations have been adopted:

     Vol. 4: Judean Antiquities 5–7; Trans. and Commentary by Christopher T. Begg (2005)
     Vol. 5: Judean Antiquities 8–10; Trans. and Commentary by Christopher T. Begg and Paul Spilsbury (2005)
     Vol. 9: Life of Josephus; Translation and Commentary by S. Mason (2001)

GLAJJ Menahem Stern, Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism (3 vols.; Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1974–1984)

Niese Flavii Josephi Opera, ed. Benedictus Niese (7 vols.; Berlin: Weidmann, 1885–1895; the so-called editio maior)

PART ONE

HISTORIOGRAPHY
As Josephus scholars we are always amazed about the fact that except for the Hebrew Bible, most of the sources he used for the Antiquitates and Contra Apionem, important as they might have been, vanished in thin air. Well-known historians at their time such as Posidonius, Nicolaus of Damascus, as well as the ones he used in his Contra Apionem, figures like Manetho and Berossus, all have disappeared. Yet the Hebrew Bible that was used by Josephus in his Antiquitates 1–12 was preserved since this was considered as a Jewish holy text. We should then ask: Was the disappearance of sources, which Josephus used for his work, a unique phenomenon? Was it an accidental process that can be pointed out only in Josephus' case? Is it mere chance that Josephus was kept whereas all his sources except for the Bible vanished during later generations?

Let me then surprise you, or perhaps even shock you: The case of Josephus concerning the disappearance of his sources was not unique in antiquity, and should be seen as part of a process that has a bearing on Josephus studies. Since we speak of lost historical works as against preserved works, we are actually occupied with the crucial problem of canon. Can we speak of a historical canon that was created in antiquity? I have studied this issue for the last three years (among other topics), and my conclusions are based on a detailed research that has a time-span of 1000 years, namely from Herodotus to the world of Late Antiquity. This cannot be brought forward within the time limit of my presentation here, but I will touch here only some points that may interest you.

Having said that, can we find a list of preferred historical works at any given time in Antiquity? I know only of a very partial one,

* A more extensive version (reaching Late Antiquity) of this article can be found in my book Memory in Jewish, Pagan and Christian Societies of the Greco-Roman World (London: Sheffield-Continuum, 2004), chapter 1.
from the Hellenistic era (SEG 26.1123). But a list of distinguished authors is not necessarily a canon, and scholars are unanimous in assuming that there never was a canon of historical writings in Antiquity. There was perhaps a list of canonical literary authors, but certainly not of historians. To my knowledge, this question has never been seriously addressed, not even where I would recently have expected it. I would like to make an attempt in this direction.

The term “canon” is a loaded one. The main reason for this is that it has been very often associated with the monotheistic Scriptures. But it also received much attention in the last century from literary critics and musicologists. What is relevant for us here is that a canon is formed gradually and its final shape is defined by later generations. Whether there was or was not a concept of a historical canon in ancient times, what matters to us is the fact that later generations in the world of antiquity had a well-defined concept of which historian was “in” and which was “out,” which period of history was to be remembered and which was to be forgotten. I cannot enter here this problem in detail, but this process brought to a fragmentary picture of ancient history. The historians who entered the modern era are those we may call now canonical.

Nine factors appear to have contributed to the fragmentary nature of our picture of ancient history:

---

1. See recently for the literary canon A. Vardi, “Canons of Literary Texts in Rome” in Homer, the Bible and Beyond: Literary Canons in the Ancient World (ed. M. Finkelberg and G. G. Stroumsa; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 131–152, who takes a list of authors to represent a literary canon. For this problem see also R. Pfeiffer, History of Classical Scholarship. From the beginnings to the end of the Hellenistic Age (Oxford: Clarendon, 1968), 205–9.

2. "Das Kölner Philosophenmosaik." See mosaics from the Rhineland and Mosel valleys from the second century C.E. and later which allude in several cases to "figures of philosophers and poets, or of Muses. One mosaic from Trier, for instance, shows a philosopher, evidently Anaximander, seated beside a sundial; one from Cologne has philosophers and poets identified by name, in Greek: Diogenes, Kleoboulos, Socrates, Cheilon, Sophokles . . . Others draw upon the amphitheatre and circus for their materials: charioteers are especially popular in Trier . . ." Katherine M. D., Dunbabin, Mosaics of the Greek and Roman World (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 79–81.


5. The discussion here is on a historiographical canon and not on other sources such as archaeology.
1. Roll and codex are vulnerable. Many manuscripts disappeared during Antiquity and the early Middle Ages due to physical reasons such as wars, fires, earthquakes and floods. “Certainly the fact that a work of ancient literature achieved circulation in codex form was no automatic passport to survival”;

2. We can assume that at certain junctures in Antiquity books were banned, as we learn from Tacitus concerning the affair of Cremutius Cordus (Ann. 4.34);

3. Many historical writings from Antiquity have disappeared due to the fact that they were heavily used by later sources. That is, when a source was heavily quoted by a later source, the latter was in many instances more often read than its own sources. We shall see that those historians who withstood “cannibalization” by their users, or continued to be read themselves, did in many instances enter the list of surviving works;

4. It is commonly accepted that summaries and epitomes brought about the elimination of the works they epitomized;

5. In certain cases we can show that when a historian was harshly criticized by others, he lost his status as an independent historian. Even when a great authority praised his source, it is quite likely that the source was forgotten and the great authority used (or read) instead;

6. The Church Fathers as a rule were not interested in the history of the Gentiles (except for a limited use by those who wrote Chronographies); this in itself is a misfortune. In their use of historical gentile sources they frequently caused the effect noted in point 3 above;

7. Certain historians achieved an authoritative position during their own lifetimes, and they usually retained it in ensuing generations. If they survived cannibalization processes (not always emerging intact), they managed to enter the historical canon. We shall see that Polybius survived the process (at least partially); Ephorus and Timaeus did not. They perished, i.e. were cannibalized. In other words, the ability to survive cannibalization and attain popularity became major factors in the preservation of a historical canon;

8. Public libraries were created in the late Republic and later in several places in the Empire. But they, as well as occasional book-

---

shops, did not have an influence on the process of canonization. If a certain book was on the shelves, as Aulus Gellius tells us, but was not reproduced and circulated, it was doomed to disappear. Reynolds and Wilson argue (p. 32) that "the story that the emperor Tacitus (275–6) ordered that the works of his name-sake be copied ten times a year... (H. A. 27.10.3), is almost certainly a fabrication of the late fourth century, but the situation that it implies may not be far from the truth."

9. Historical curricula may have been formulated at schools from time to time, and those would have helped create a canon of historical books. This could have happened in the sixth century, for instance, when the concept of the historian who followed a predecessor with hardly any overlapping in the narrative, was emerging. Perhaps this concept in itself was responsible for the view that the whole of ancient history should be recorded by a succession of historians who narrate defined periods without overlapping. This of course does not mean that such a view was not apparent before the Byzantine period. At all events, as is well known, curricula have a great influence in creating modern literary canons. It may be noted that curricula and collections of fragments according to themes as well as codification processes were extremely popular in the Byzantine Empire.

Our method here will be to examine the "biography" of historical works at various junctures during antiquity. But the problem remains that ancient historians usually do not specify what source they are using. Even if they do (or the source can be inferred from their writings), we cannot be sure whether they used the source directly or took it from an intermediate work. Moreover, a distinction has to be made between the availability of historical texts and the impact they had on later generations. Hence, what counts for my discussion here is not whether the annalists used by the great Roman historian Livy were still circulating as manuscripts here and there, but whether they had any further impact on historical writings after Livy. In this case

9 See Reynolds and Wilson, Scribes, 30.
one has to be cautious since a later historian may have used the
annalists only indirectly through a historian who had already drawn
on them, even without being aware of doing so.

The output of historical writing in antiquity is relatively not very
great. Nevertheless we can examine our available sources and learn
what historians used at certain junctures. In other words, we can try
to assess the reception of historical works by later historians. For
instance, we all know that the histories of Herodotus and Thucydides
had a very long life, and that they became models for the writing
of history. Their reception (by other historians) in antiquity was ex­
traordinary, not so much because they were used as sources by later
writers, but because, like Polybius in the Hellenistic era, they were seen
as models for perfect historiography already during their own times.

But the surprising fact is that with all the processes of selection
and elimination listed above in 1–9, a solid sequential line of histo­
rions in antiquity remains, usually with one “main” historian in each
period. This is the picture we have today and it was probably sim­
ilarly viewed in the sixth century C.E. It is a well-known fact that
some of the historians themselves thought they were continuing where
a famous predecessor had stopped. Polybius continues Aratus, and
Xenophon says that he is continuing Thucydides. Agathias claims
that he is continuing Procopius of Caesarea, and Menander Protector
continues Agathias. This in itself does not of course mean that there
was one historian per period, but it does indicate that there was a
concept of a succession of those considered to have been outstand­
ing historians.

Let me elaborate. When I say that a historical canon emerged
through a gradual process, I mean that several factors, as I have sug­
gested above, contributed to the inclusion and exclusion of historical
works. When I say inclusion and exclusion, I do not necessarily refer
to a process dictated from above. But it was also not merely a mecha­
nical or natural kind of process. The selection “happened” during a
thousand years of the creation of a linear concept of history. When
we decide to use the term canon in this context we must make the
obvious distinction between a holy canon and a secular one. Holy
canons are the Old Testament, the New Testament and the Qu’ran.13

---

12 Marincola, Authority and Tradition, passim.
13 See for instance P. B. Davies, Scribes and Schools. The Canonization of the Hebrew Scriptures (Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox Press, 1998), and the older bibli­
ography cited there.
Secular canons may be of English literature or of modern music. A canon of the latter nature can be easily assessed with hindsight, as Harold Bloom and others have done. They were never announced during the process of creation, and were not a conscious undertaking. In both cases distinguished figures and revolutionary ones had a good chance to get into the pantheon of figures that formed a canon. But in the case of ancient historians, a canon-forming process that stretched over a very long period, mechanical and technical factors were much more dominant. Whereas the canon of modern music and art gives us a more or less reliable representation of what happened in these fields in the twentieth century, the canon of ancient history is extremely fragmentary, and is thus an obstacle to a true perception of a comprehensive history of that period. What we still have of this history is what people had in the ninth and tenth centuries, a picture extremely distorted because of its broken-up nature. But these canon makings share a certain aspect. The group of ancient historians that reached the modern period is a most distinguished one, an astonishing sequence of great historians or revolutionary figures many of whom introduced new historical methods and new genres. Hence, although so many eliminatory factors were at work during the canonization process, it is no accident that we still can read Thucydides, Polybius, Tacitus and Ammianus Marcellinus.

I use the expression "astonishing sequence." Why is there a sequence and why is it so astonishing? Looking back from 900 C.E. one seems to find some sort of rationale behind the grand narrative that emerged concerning ancient history. Or is this a consequence of the fact that we are so used to this picture? This has become our own memory of the period, or rather the sole image we have of it. But it is remarkable that the more important historical periods were those elaborated upon. I shall treat this aspect after a short necessary survey of the evidence.

---

Before discussing the nature of the historical canon of antiquity, let me again emphasize the main factor that brought about the formation of this canon. If we wish to examine the sources used by the surviving ancient writers of history, we would have great difficulty in finding most of them. They had already disappeared during antiquity and certainly towards the Middle Ages. A great deal of this unhappy circumstance was brought about by the fact that if the users of sources happened to be important historians in their own times or even later, it was almost inevitable that the sources they used became "secondary," suppressed, and lost during the course of time. Not every figure that wrote history and was famous in his own lifetime was necessarily respected by later generations. Diodorus Siculus was not the greatest of historians, but he was influential because he was an innovator within the genre of universal history, and contributed to the intellectual life of the first century B.C.E. as a collector of sources.\(^\text{15}\) He is a good example of what I have just observed. He drew on an amazing number of sources in many of his predecessors for Books 1–5 of his *Bibliotheke*. All these disappeared in the course of time and it was only the *Bibliotheke* that was influential. He became as it were a substitute for Ctesias, Hecataeus of Abdera, Megasthenes, Ephorus and Timaeus (used in his later books), a kind of reader's digest. The same holds true of the great biographer Plutarch, the larger part of whose historical sources have also vanished, except for those that were already canonical when he used them: historians such as Herodotus, Thucydides and Polybius.

This phenomenon of a "main\(^\text{16}\)" text using other texts that then become secondary and disappear in the course of time was, I believe, quite common in antiquity. In fact this happened also in the case of the Hebrew Bible. All the written sources of the "historical" books of the Bible have vanished (and the oral ones have been forgotten) since the Bible became the authoritative text. Another example comes from music: J. S. Bach drew on compositions of his predecessors, embedding them in his own music, and many of the works he used have vanished, obscured by his great renown.\(^\text{16}\)


Let us now examine in more detail how a historical canon emerged in antiquity. Since I am writing here for Josephus scholars, I will not go beyond Josephus’ era. Needless to say that this survey is an extremely important background for Josephus studies since if one looks at the list of historians Josephus mentions, one immediately finds many figures that I will mention in the following. I will concentrate on two lines of historiography which Josephus was aware of, the Greek one and the Roman one.

The *History* of Herodotus is decidedly the first full account in Greek from the ancient Greek world. His main theme is the conflict between the Persians and the Greeks during the years 500–479 B.C.E. Therefore it is remarkable that Herodotus remains our only source for this period, although many historians, the *logographoi*, such as Hecataeus of Miletus whom Herodotus used, but also people like Xanthus and Charon as well as Hellanicus, were already writing on various geographical and historical themes in the Greek East before his time and during it. None of those historical monographs have survived except for references and quotations in later authors. Nicolaus of Damascus may have used the *Lydiaca* of Xanthus for Lydian history, and Dionysius of Halicarnassus as well as Strabo may still have known some of the *logographoi* (Thucyd. 1.21; Strabo 2.6.2.; 12.3, 21). In the sixth century C.E. Stephanus of Byzantium may still have used Hecataeus of Miletus’ *Periodos Ges*. It is however extremely unlikely that he saw the original, and it is quite clear that this whole group of local histories written before Herodotus, during his time, and later, has disappeared.

If we go on towards the years 479–404 B.C.E., we are astonished to realize that for the very important period of the *Pentecontaetia* (479–431 B.C.E.), the peak of Athenian democracy and empire (the so-called Delian League), no full and linear historiography has survived. We have only the somewhat problematic introduction of Thucydides to his *Peloponnesian War*, but this coverage of the years 479–431 is extremely condensed and concise. Thucydides no doubt used written sources for the history of that period but they are all lost. The historians called *Atthidographers* who wrote local histories in the fourth and third centuries B.C.E. (the *Atthis*) probably provided

---

information about the *Pentecontaetia* but they, like their forerunners the *logographoi*, disappeared possibly due to heavy consumption by later historians. Ephorus used them extensively, whereas Pausanias perhaps saw some of them. Hence, as a result of the transmission process, and the situation in which Herodotus and Thucydides became so influential, very few narratives of this crucial period are preserved in western culture. Thucydides' account in eight books of the Peloponnesian War between Sparta and Athens and their allies during the years 431–411 B.C.E. survived. Thucydides did not complete his undertaking and the last years of the war, 411–404/3, remained uncovered by him. He himself used mainly oral material but also written sources, some acknowledged (such as Hellanicus) and others unacknowledged (Herodotus, Antiochus of Syracuse, etc.). From 411 B.C.E. (where Thucydides stopped his account) we have Xenophon's *Hellenica*. Except for Thucydides and Xenophon all the sources for this war had disappeared. The popularity of both Thucydides and Xenophon never really faded.

Xenophon was aware that Thucydides' unfinished account of the Peloponnesian War needed a continuation. His *Hellenica* carried the history on to 362 B.C.E. with a focus on Sparta's role. Xenophon remains the only source for that period, other contemporary sources having disappeared. However, a fragment of an unknown historian referring to the year 396–395 B.C.E. was discovered in 1906 in the sands of Oxyrhynchus in Egypt. Ephorus of Cyme's (405–330 B.C.E.) vast work in 30 books was, according to Polybius, the first universal history. But it is lost. Ephorus narrated events in East and West from the return of the *Heraclidai* to 340 B.C.E. (the siege of Perinthus). The reception of this work by later historians in antiquity was enthusiastic and it had a great impact on the writings of later figures. Ephorus was used by Polybius, Strabo, Nicolaus of Damascus, Plutarch, Josephus and others. Diodorus Siculus paraphrased him extensively, and this is why we still have a good narrative for fourth-century Greece. Although Ephorus, or quotations from him, were still quite current in Late Antiquity (Stephanus of Byzantium, Suda), it seems that the

---

extensive quarrying of his work by later historians was slowing down already during the first century C.E. The bits of Ephorus preserved in Felix Jacoby's collection of Greek fragments confirm this assumption. Ephorus was thus gradually forgotten because those who used his work, historians such as Diodorus, Strabo or Plutarch, were read extensively or exclusively by later generations, and he sank into oblivion.\(^\text{21}\)

Another prolific historian whose loss may be lamented is Theopompus of Chios. His *Hellenica* in twelve books and his *Philippica* in fifty-eight books recounted the history of the years 411–336 B.C.E. Perhaps the fact that he "consistently falsified the evidence and engaged in wholesale invention," as claimed by some scholars,\(^\text{22}\) demoted him from the historical canon. If he was used at all extensively, he was probably devoured, like Ephorus, by later historians, and was most likely already lost before the first century C.E.

Timaeus of Tauromenium (356–260 B.C.E.) underwent a fate similar to that of Ephorus of Cyme. His *Hellenica* in twelve books and his *Philippica* in fifty-eight books recounted the history of the years 264 B.C.E., and included Roman history. He dealt with the history of the West with a focus on Sicily. It is probably not an accident that Polybius started his history in 264 B.C.E., where Timaeus finished. Here again we may assume that the distressing disappearance of Timaeus' history was caused *inter alia* by the vast use of it by later historians who were read instead. Perhaps he made it into a contemporary canon, but was then lost since later accounts gradually substituted for the original Timaean history. He was used by a wide number of historians, both Greek and Roman, such as Agatharchides, Fabius Pictor, Posidonius, Strabo and Plutarch. Diodorus Siculus drew on him extensively concerning Sicilian affairs (Books 4–21), and Polybius used him as well. In addition to a very extensive use of his history (with no acknowledgement), Polybius' critical stance towards Timaeus probably took its toll and harmed Timaeus' stature as one to be kept in the pantheon of great historians.\(^\text{23}\)

Let us stop here for a moment and look back from our viewpoint in 900 C.E. What emerges is that the historical narrative of

\(^{21}\) Rightly G. Schepens, "Jacoby's FGrHist," in *Collecting Fragments. Fragmenta Sammelb.* (ed. G. W. Most; Göttingen: Vanderhoeck and Ruprecht, 1997), 145 (but Gresham's law cannot be applied here since many of the better works were preserved).


the time-span from the Persian wars until the rise of Alexander the Great was preserved in Herodotus and Thucydides of the fifth century B.C.E., and Diodorus Siculus of the first. Surprisingly enough, as if someone in Byzantium during late Antiquity had planned a historical curriculum, a more or less linear line of history (with all its lacunae) was preserved until the present day. Was this an accidental process? I doubt it. As commemoration was designed in the course of a long process, it presumably omitted some unwanted periods.

But let us return to fourth-century Greece and the histories of Alexander the Great. The anabasis of Alexander was an event that changed the world and had an enormous impact during its own time and for many generations to come. But the histories written during Alexander's lifetime and some decades later are all lost. This was partly due to the fact that this amazing chapter, revolutionary in the history of antiquity, was "picked up" by later historians. Again, it was Diodorus Siculus in Books 18–20 who used Hieronymus of Cardia for the account of Alexander (and on to 272 B.C.E.). Hieronymus was also used by Plutarch, Arrian and Justin. Yet Hieronymus, who was considered an excellent historian, was lost, and so were Ptolemy, Aristobulus and Cleitarchus, also important Alexander historians. They were extensively drawn upon by Plutarch and still by Arrian 150 years later. Even the Vulgate history of Alexander the Great, used by later historians and by Curtius Rufus who wrote in Latin in the first century C.E., sank into oblivion. In other words, we see again that a significant period of ancient history covered by distinguished contemporaries, who were then used extensively by later generations of historians, is lost in its original form. The reception of the first historians of Alexander was so "perfect," that their accounts were actually embedded within later ones and thus altogether disappeared as independent sources. Since the later accounts almost never mention their sources it is usually extremely difficult to know where one source starts and where the other ends (Ptolemy and Aristobulus in Arrian are almost impossible to detect).

Let us now enter the third century B.C.E., still in Greek history. Some parts of the later "primary" Diodorus Siculus have disappeared, for instance the crucial section on the successors of Alexander the

---

Great, the Diadochi (323–285 B.C.E.). Unfortunately we do not have a linear historical narrative of the greater part of the third century, from 300 down to 242 B.C.E. Here we are in deep trouble. Phylarchus wrote a history starting in 272 B.C.E. (approximately where Timaeus left off) and going to 220/19 B.C.E., “continuing Hieronymus of Cardia and Duris of Samos.”25 Here we can detect a fate similar to that of Ephorus and Timaeus. Phylarchus was extensively used by Plutarch (in his Agis and Cleomenes; Aratus and Pyrrhus) and by Polybius (who as in the case of Timaeus, but for different reasons, criticized him severely in the second book of his Histories). In spite of his popular style Phylarchus was extensively used even by the Latin Pompeius Trogus. We can attest that perhaps the most important sections of the history of Phylarchus were “devoured” by Plutarch. The “residue” of this history, not employed by later historians, was simply ignored and lost. If one could read Plutarch why would he or she need Phylarchus?

The history of the second century B.C.E. was much better preserved by later generations than that of the third. Polybius of Megalopolis wrote elaborately about the years 220–146 B.C.E. He himself declares that he decided to continue from the point where Aratus concluded his history of the Achaean league, in 220 B.C.E. (4.2).26 Polybius drew on many written sources for the third century, historians such as Duris of Samos, Ephorus, Timaeus, Aratus and Phylarchus. It seems that none of these historians “made it” into a preserved canon, formed almost by a process of natural selection. They gradually turned into secondary sources whereas Polybius remained the main and prominent source (at least in part). No doubt an important reason for Polybius’ entering the pantheon of historians was that he was innovatory and wrote about a unique topic (Roman imperialism, which would be an urgent issue for many centuries to come). Polybius even managed to push aside an important writer of his generation, Agatharchides of Cnidus, whose history of the third century and the beginning of the second disappeared, probably at an early stage of transmission. By the time of Photius in the ninth century only Agatharchides’ book on the Red Sea was still popular.27

26 Walbank, Polybius, and Marincola, Authority and Tradition, 98.
A similar fate overtook historians who wrote in Greek about Roman history of the third century B.C.E. Polybius used Fabius, Silenus and Sosylus, as well as Cincius Alimentus and others. All of them were lost in the course of time and did not enter the preserved canon of historians in later periods.

When we reach the first century B.C.E., still in Greek history, we should speak of Posidonius of Apamea whose work covered the years 146–80 B.C.E.\textsuperscript{28} His history is lost in its entirety, and only fragments have been preserved through later historians as well as other literary writings. Posidonius, like Ephorus and Timaeus, was used extensively by later historians such as Strabo and Flavius Josephus. Many of the fragments were preserved by the great collector Constantinus Porphyrogenitus in the tenth century. This in itself is interesting. It may be accidental, but may also reveal the position Posidonius had as a literary figure in later generations (perhaps he was less important in historiography proper than we used to think).\textsuperscript{29} But he was extensively used (again without acknowledgment) by many figures such as Athenaeus, Plutarch, Strabo and Flavius Josephus, to name only a few. The most extensive user was Strabo. Gradually (this could have taken hundreds of years) Posidonius turned into a secondary historian and only his users kept their canonical status.

We may end this section with Plutarch.\textsuperscript{30} The story of the emergence of main texts of historical narration and the loss of any other competitive narrative is repeated here, as part of the long and complex process that resulted in a fragmentary picture of ancient history. Whereas Phylarchus was forgotten as an independent historian, Plutarch remained as the narrative of Agis and Cleomenes, etc. The same may apply to Plutarch’s use of Strabo’s Histories, also lost, for his Lives of Sulla, Lucullus and Caesar.

What picture emerges for the Roman Republic? Here I will be even briefer. It seems that the only two linear historical narratives


\textsuperscript{29} On Posidonius see recently K. Clarke, Between Geography and History. Hellenistic Constructions of the Roman World (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999), pp. 129–92, who comments that “it is clear that we are dealing with one of the most influential intellectual figures of the Hellenistic world. But there is a curious disparity between the tiny fraction of his work to survive and the great reputation which has become attached to him.” (p. 130)

concerned with the Republic to survive antiquity are those of Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Livy; not accidentally, I believe, one is in Greek and the other in Latin. The two surviving collections of biographies concerned with figures of the Roman Republic are similarly in Latin (Nepos) and in Greek (Plutarch).

Livy, who wrote the *Ab Urbe Condita* starting with the foundation of Rome and ending with his own life-time in the first century B.C.E., usually followed one main source in each section of the narrative. He used many of the annalists, and in many instances we can show whom he used where. The number of historians he consulted is remarkable: from Valerius Antias and Licinius Macer through Claudius Quadrigarius, Q. Fabius Pictor, Polybius, Posidonius and many others. It would not be an exaggeration to say that 95% of the sources he used were lost, some still during the late Republic and early Principate. Even parts of Polybius’ sections concerning the East that Livy used have disappeared, though this was probably only during the Byzantine period. Some of the annalists who were still read in Livy’s lifetime did not enter the historical pantheon and were embedded in later authorities. It is unfortunate that the important last books of Livy’s history, covering the years 167 to Augustus, have vanished. Be that as it may, Livy’s grand history of the Roman Republic became the main and only authority in Latin that entered the Middle Ages.

But an alternative history of the same period was written in Greek by Dionysius of Halicarnassus. His *Roman Antiquities* start with mythology and end with the first Punic War (264 B.C.E., where Polybius continues). We can say about him the following: 95% of the sources he used, such as many of the annalists, have disappeared altogether; the second half of his *Roman Antiquities* has vanished (Book 11 is still preserved in a fragmentary form in the excerpts of Constantinus Porphyrogenitus and in a Milan Epitome). Dionysius himself composed an epitome of his work (which Photius still saw, cod. 84), and another one may also have existed. The entire work has thus suffered a partial loss.

---

Of this particular time the historical canon preserved only two monographs, Sallust's *Bellum Catilinae* and *Bellum Jugurthinum*. Yet Sallust's grand history, which began in 78 B.C.E. and which he did not complete, is lost. Perhaps because it was so heavily used by later historians we still have many fragments of this work. He was “cited more often than any Latin prose author, Cicero alone excepted.”34 However, he was not an innovator in the field of historiography, and his picture of the Late Republic is quite distorted. His history did not make it into the preserved canon of important historical works. We should of course mention Caesar’s *Commentaries on the Gallic Wars* and his unfinished *Civil Wars*, which cover the years 58 to 52 B.C.E. It is not surprising that these accounts by Caesar, who was considered a master of Latin, survived the process of canonization. Caesar went into the historical memory of later generations as a unique example of great achievement in Roman history during a period of decadence and fall.

Before we leave the Republic we should return for a moment to Diodorus Siculus. He was, together with Livy and Plutarch, one of the most important "consumers" of ancient sources. Diodorus himself was not used so much by later historiography,35 but was partly excerpted by Byzantine scholars. The parts of the *Bibliotheca* that have reached us in their entirety are Books 1–5 and 11–20. And again the same story is repeated. Diodorus used an astonishing amount of sources, most of them now lost. To name only a few: Hecataeus of Abdera, Ctesias (one part preserved by Diodorus and another by Photius), Cleitarchus, Megasthenes, Agatharchides, Dionysius Scythobrachion and Matris of Thebes.36 He also used Ephorus, Duris, Hieronymus of Cardia, Erathosthenes, Posidonius and Polybius (some of which were used also by Josephus). This is an impressive list of sources, and when we look carefully at it we can conclude the following: First, almost all of them have disappeared. The only sources that Diodorus used and that have survived are Herodotus, Thucydides and Polybius. Second, the books of Diodorus, or some of them, were still available in the ninth and tenth centuries, and disappeared later.

---

34 See *Cambridge History of Classical Literature* vol. 2 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 269.
In certain instances, the methods of Byzantine excerptors may well have had the same effect as cannibalization. We should also mention here Velleius Paterculus who wrote an outline of history, a genre discussed in my recent book mentioned above.

When we enter the era of the Roman Empire, and start with the first century C.E., we find two Latin authors of great stature, Tacitus and Suetonius. Both were active at the end of the first century and the beginning of the second. Suetonius did not write a linear (annalistic) history, but a sequence of twelve biographies, starting with Caesar and ending with Domitian. Suetonius had an enormous impact on the genre of biography in the following centuries. His innovations and high standards brought about his inclusion in the preserved pantheon of great historians from antiquity. Again, the sources that he drew upon have not reached us. The same can be said about Tacitus. Both his Annals and Histories (incomplete) cover the first century C.E. from Tiberius to the year 70. It is quite clear that Tacitus follows the convention of antiquity, and usually does not mention his sources. The ones he notes in his account of Nero are Fabius Rusticus, Cluvius Rufus and Pliny the Elder’s long history of Germany, but all these are lost. In his Germania Tacitus drew upon Posidonius who has been lost, as were the twenty books of the Bella Germanica by Pliny the Elder. Tacitus’ Germania in fact replaced his predecessor’s work on Germany. For our purposes it is important to emphasize that all three accounts that we still have of the Julio-Claudian dynasty, Tacitus, Suetonius and Cassius Dio, drew on one “hostile source written under Caligula.”

This common source has altogether disappeared. Here we should also mention the Epitome of Roman History by Lucius Annaeus Florus (75–140) who wrote a summary of the history of Rome from the foundation of the city down to Augustus. He used a great deal of material, mainly Livy, but also Sallust and Caesar, as well as others. His work gained enormous popularity and served as a school-book until the seventeenth century. The reason for his popularity, one may guess, is that his Epitome was a summary, a reader’s digest, that could be read easily and did not pose a threat to the great histories he used. The latter had already gained canonical status.

---

To conclude: from the first century c.e. and the beginning of the second, we have three Latin historical narratives, Tacitus, Suetonius, and Florus. Their sources for the history of the first century have been lost. To my mind it is not accidental that the three are of three different genres, history, biography and epitome.

Hence, we have answered our question: Is the disappearance of Josephus' sources a unique phenomenon? It is not. Moreover, Josephus entered the canon of historians not only because the Church was interested in him, but also because his status as an innovative "national" historian required a firm position within this canon. It remains a fact that whereas Josephus entered the canon, most of his pagan sources vanished for ever.
En 93–94 apr. J.-C., l'historien hiérosolymitain Flavius Josèphe finit d’écrire une œuvre monumentale en vingt livres, les *Antiquités juives*. L’œuvre parcourt l’histoire juive des origines du monde jusqu’à l’empire de Néron. Dans le proème, l’auteur explique qu’il a maintes fois été saisi d’hésitation et de crainte pour réaliser une œuvre aussi importante et audacieuse. Cependant, l’aide et l’encouragement de quelques personnes désireuses de connaître l’histoire ancienne lui auraient permis de bien surmonter ces inquiétudes. Josèphe se dépeint comme une personne étrangère à l’hellénisme et à la langue grecque, et il demande à plusieurs reprises au lecteur d’être indulgent et compréhensif envers lui quant au style et à l’expression littéraire.1 L’historien moderne, qui s’efforce de reconstruire le cadre historique dans lequel l’œuvre mûrit, s’interroge sur l’identité et sur la catégorie de lecteurs qui pouvaient être la plus intéressée par ce qu’il définit «l’histoire ancienne». Il se demande où naissent les *Antiquités juives* et dans quel cadre de référence culturelle celles-ci doivent être situées.2 Au cours des dernières années du premier siècle apr. J.-C., selon le témoignage de Pline l’Ancien, Jérusalem n’existait tout bonnement plus; les adulateurs de cour célébraient César, régnant avec bonheur, répandre avec féroce les flammes sur la ville sainte.3 Une guerre longue et


3 *GLAJJ* 468–81 no. 204, esp. 471, 477–78 = Pline l’Ancien, *Nat* 5.70; *GLAJJ*
cruelle—celle des Juifs de Palestine contre Rome—avait impressionné pendant presque une décennie (66-74 apr. J.-C.) l’opinion publique et Tacite exprime bien, dans l’excursus sur le Judaïsme contenu dans le Ve livre des Histoires, l’exaspération suscitée par la résistance tenace des révoltés. Josèphe témoigne en personne de l’état de prostration et d’abandon qui circula parmi les vaincus, ainsi que des représailles inflexibles des légions de César contre les survivants. La chaîne des suspicions et des rancœurs, les épurations qui y succédèrent, s’élargirent à la Diaspora; à Cyrène, un révolté repenti, du nom de Jonathan, avait exposé notre historien au dédain et à la suspicion des bien-pensants. La récente guerre avait néanmoins suscité la curiosité publique. Il était compréhensible que l’on entendit connaître les origines et la civilisation d’une nation qui, pendant presque une décennie, s’était trouvée sur le devant de la scène politique internationale. Ainsi que l’écrit Tacite, «la colère était accrue par le fait que les Juifs étaient les seuls à ne pas céder». Cependant, à la différence d’autres précédents auteurs indigènes d’histoires nationales, Josèphe doit exposer l’histoire, non pas d’une nation, mais d’une civilisation (ce qu’était le Judaïsme dans les années 90 de notre ère) disséminée dans différentes nations, enracinée depuis des générations dans le tissu social et culturel des villes d’appartenance. Il ne s’agit pas d’écrire, selon les canons littéraires grecs courants, une ethnographie, c’est-à-dire une monographie sur un peuple non grec. Sa tâche est beaucoup plus complexe et articulée. Écrire au monde grec, en 93–94 apr. J.-C., une histoire du Judaïsme depuis ses origines jusqu’à l’époque contemporaine signifie écrire une histoire composite de rencontres et de syncrétismes avec chacune des civilisations environnantes; par conséquent, une histoire qui implique directement ce même monde grec. L’historien ne doit pas uniquement parcourir les phases marquantes du peuple délimité par la terre de Juda, en discutant d’us et de coutumes particulières; il doit aussi tenir compte de l’histoire séculaire de communautés implantées depuis des générations sur un sol étranger, par

---


exemple Alexandrie, Rome, Babylone. À la différence des Égyptiens ou des Babyloniens, les Juifs de l'époque des Césars ne sont pas un peuple ni, surtout, une culture circonscrits dans des limites géographiques traditionnelles. Ils constituent une civilisation et une culture composite, faites de communautés implantées depuis des générations dans une zone qui s'étend de l'Italie jusqu'aux pays situés au-delà de l'Euphrate. Un témoin sous cet aspect impartial, tel que Porphyre de Tyr, admet que la loi juive s'est étendue jusqu'aux confins de l'Italie «après Gaius César ou, du moins, durant son empire». Les Juifs contemporains des *Antiquités juives*, parlent des langues différentes et ont des us et coutumes différents. Philon d'Alexandrie, Josèphe de Jérusalem, Luc d'Antioche s'accordent à penser que les grandes fêtes de pèlerinage annuelles étaient une occasion unique de rencontre et de connaissance réciproque. Des historiens anciens comme Tacite et Dion Cassius identifient le Judaïsme à une culture et à une civilisation internationale. Selon la vision de l'historien latin, «des pires individus», dans leurs patries respectives d'appartenance, continuent de mépriser les religions natives. Selon Dion Cassius, le terme «Juifs» s'applique «aussi aux autres hommes, ceux qui observent strictement les lois, bien qu'originaires d'autres pays». C'est pour cette raison que, dans la littérature néo-testamentaire, le terme «Juif» finit par ne plus désigner une identité ethnique. Luc définit comme étant «Juif» aussi bien Apollos, né à Alexandrie, qu'Aquilas, né dans la province du Pont. Écrire l'histoire du Judaïsme, dans les années 90 de notre ère, signifie écrire une histoire qui touche la connaissance

---


6 *Sed ne dicant, inquit (scil. Porphyrius), lege iudaica vetere hominum curatum genus, longo post tempore lex Judaearum apparuit ac viguit angusta Syriae regione, postea vero prorepsit etiam in fines Italos, sed post Caesarem Gauum aut certe ipso imperante* (*Adversus Christianos* = Augustinus, *Epistulae* 102.89; *GLAJJ* 2:481, no. 465h).


8 Tacite, *Hist.* 5.5.1: *Nam pessimus quisque spretis religionibus patris tributa et stipes illuc congrerebant*. *GLAJJ* 2:19, 39. Ce ne sont pas des gentils attirés par le Judaïsme, comme veut l'opinion courante, mais (vraisemblablement) des citoyens d'origine juive. C'est n'est qu'ensuite (5.5.2) que Tacite envisage des *transgressi in morem eorum*.


et le cœur des lecteurs depuis les confins de l'Italie jusqu'à la Mésopotamie; cela signifie parcourir les phases d'une culture multilingue et aux provenances les plus variées qui accueille en son sein des traditions «bibliques» tout autant que babyloniennes; romaines tout autant qu'alexandrines; épphésiennes tout autant que corinthiennes. Une histoire qui n'est pas circonscrite au cadre de la Palestine, mais élargie à toutes les aires géographiques dans lesquelles sont présentes des communautés consistantes. L'on pouvait rencontrer, dans tous les recoins de la Méditerranée, des personnages curieux de connaître l'histoire ancienne, comme par exemple, Epaphrodite, à qui sont dédiées les Antiquités juives: des personnes possédant une culture composite et multiforme, des personnes bien intégrées dans la vie institutionnelle et intellectuelle des villes d'appartenance, mais qui se souviennent de leurs propres origines et de leur propre adhésion à la «citoyenneté d'Israël». Sous cet aspect, les épîtres de Paul, en particulier celles aux Corinthiens et aux Romains, avec le rappel à la descendance commune d'Abraham et à l'histoire collective telle qu'elle est fournie dans les Saintes Écritures, pourraient constituer une mine d'indices pour reconstruire la phisonomie et l'articulation de communautés de la Diaspora grecque. Influencés comme nous le sommes, dans la caractérisation historique du Judaïsme antique, par la phisonomie dessinée dans le Nouveau Testament, d'une part, et par le témoignage de la littérature rabbinique, d'autre part (en particulier dans les traités de la Mishna), nous nous plaisons à imaginer le Judaïsme contemporain des Antiquités juives de Josèphe comme étant hermétique au contact extérieur, et monolithique. Il est comme renfermé dans une cloche de verre, substantiellement imperméable au monde extérieur et inaccessible. Des siècles de vie citadine passés en commun avec des concitoyens, par exemple d'Ephèse ou d'Alexandrie ou de Rome, finissent par être effacés dans une perspective, pour ainsi dire, confessionnelle. Car le Judaïsme antique est couramment perçu comme un phénomène religieux avant d'être un phénomène historique. Sur la base du Nouveau Testament ou, mieux, d'une interprétation du Nouveau Testament et sur la suggestion de la littérature rabbinique, nous avons l'habitude de restreindre l'identité juive antique aux catégories de stricte observance (nous pourrions dire, à ces groupes désignés comme «orthodoxes»). En conséquence, nous identifions avec certitude la catégorie, attestée par les sources

11 Par exemple, Rom 4:1; 1 Cor 10:1–4.
anciennes, des «craignant Dieu» à des gentils attirés par le Judaïsme. Ainsi qu’en témoignent les restes de la littérature juive en langue grecque de cette période, la culture juive antique s’exprime sous des formes variées et articulées et ne refuse à priori pas des contacts et des influences avec des genres littéraires et historiographiques courant dans la patrie respective d’appartenance. Par exemple, des citoyens d’origine juive d’Éphèse doivent avoir considéré Héraclite comme une gloire de la patrie et nous possédons des indices qui nous indiquent que, dans les milieux juifs de culture grecque, une recherche d’us et traditions bibliques dans les poèmes homériques (que l’on peut définir comme étant la Bible des grecs) a été tentée. Je pense à des grammairiens et stylisticiens comme Cécile de Calacte. Des citadins implantés depuis des générations dans la cité grecque étaient éduqués tant aux lettres grecques qu’aux Saintes Écritures. Un certain Alexandre, qui parle à l’assemblée extraordinaire d’Éphèse, tel qu’il est décrit par Luc dans les Actes des Apôtres, représente bien le caractère de la présence juive dans la ville grecque: il vit et parle comme une personne quelconque. Dans chaque ville, avec les «archontes de la synagogue et les archisynagogues des Juifs» pouvaient coexister des écoles plus ou moins indépendantes des institutions publiques de chaque communauté. L’école de Tyrannus à Éphèse ou la maison de Tite, à Corinthe, attestées par les Actes des Apôtres, indiquent la nature composite et multiforme de la culture et de l’intellectualité juive citadine, qui ne s’était pas nécessairement identifiée à la synagogue. L’empereur Tibère, durant sa retraite temporaire à Rhodes, demande à être admis dans l’une de ces écoles qui, selon le triomphalisme de Philon, pullulaient sur le sol grec. Il est difficile de douter que la lettre de Claude aux Alexandrins présuppose un haut degré d’activisme des communautés juives locales: César rappelle aux Juifs de la métropole que la ville ne leur appartient pas.

12 G. Jossa, I gruppi giudaici ai tempi di Gesù (Brescia: Paideia, 2001), 176-86.
15 Ac 19:9; 1 Cor 16:19; Suetonius, Tib. 32.2; GLAJJ 2:111–12; Philo Alexandrinus, Spec. 1:320–323; 2:62–63.
16 CPJ 2, no. 153.85–95.
Le Judaïsme cosmopolite et international imaginé par les *Antiquités juives* vit dans le climat politique particulier des années 90 apr. J.-C. Selon un témoignage de l’auteur chrétien Minucius Felix, le monde judaïque s’interrogea, depuis l’Italie jusqu’à la Mésopotamie, sur les raisons de la catastrophe de l’an 70 apr. J.-C.17 Et ce, d’autant plus que la Diaspora resta indifférente, à cette occasion, aux raisons des rebelles de Judée (*BJ*. 1.5). Une histoire politique du Judaïsme d’époque hellénistique et romaine, comme le sont les *Antiquités juives*, ne pouvait ne pas être influencée par ce climat psychologique qui consiste en une progressive prise de distance des autorités de Jérusalem, après le règne d’Hérode et de ses successeurs, de l’hellénisme et de la collaboration qu’une partie de la Diaspora avait offert en son nom. Après l’activisme d’Hérode le Grand, qui avait promu d’intenses échanges avec la Diaspora utilisée comme base de départ de sa politique extérieure, ce que les auteurs évangélistes définissent comme étant le régime «des Juifs, des scribes, des Pharisiens et des Grands-Prêtres» avait redimensionné les ouvertures précédentes. Le Judaïsme traverse la phase du repli sur lui-même lorsqu’il récupère une pleine identité contre la menace de l’intégration. Ainsi qu’un passage de l’Évangile de saint Jean semble le mentionner, le Judaïsme le plus helléniste, celui qui n’avait pas entièrement renié la réforme de l’an 167 av. J.-C., celui qui avait été si envahissant sous le règne d’Hérode et qui avait concouru à sa stabilité et à ses fastes, devint toujours plus étranger à Jérusalem et aux «Juifs» (Jean 7:35). Ce n’est pas un simple hasard si, dans ce climat, Josèphe «liquide» toute la littérature parabiblique en grec en la considérant peu crédible.18 C’est justement dans ce climat que mûrit la ré-élaboration des *Antiquités juives* à propos du cadre politique du Judaïsme d’époque hellénistique et romaine. Notre historien entend s’opposer à un certain esprit conformiste de présentation des événements du passé. Il se propose

17 Minucius Felix, *Oct.* 33.2-4: *sed Iudaëis nihil profuit, quod unum et ipsi deum ari
taque templis maxima superstitione coluerunt: ignorantia laberis, si priorum aut oblitus aut inscius
posteriorum recordaris. Nam et ipsi deum nostrum—idem enim omnium deus est—quamdiu enim
eum caste innoxie religiosque coluerunt, quamdui praeceptis salubribus obtemperaverunt, de pau-
cis innumerati facili, de egentibus divites, de servientibus reges; modici multos, inermi armatos, dum
fugunt insequentes, dei iussu et elementis adnitentibus obruerunt. Scripta eorum relege vel si Romanis
magis gaudes—ut transeamus veteres—Flavi Iosepi vel Antoni Iuliani de Iudaeis require: iam
scies nequitia sua hanc eos meruisse fortunam nec quidquam accidisse quod non sit iis, si in cont-
tumacia perseverarent, ante praedictum.

18 L. Troiani, “Gli autori giudaico-ellenistici e la Settanta,” *Annali di Scienze Religiose*
ouvertement de libérer l’histoire du régime des hérodiens de la chape conformiste et de l’oléographie des présumés «écrivains de régime». Le traumatisme de l’an 70 apr. J.-C. ainsi que les précédentes décennies agitées avaient montré que l’interprétation de l’époque hérodiennne fournie par les contemporains n’était pas satisfaisante. Fort de la leçon offerte par les événements successifs, Josèphe veut préciser à quel point l’œuvre d’Hérode a fait verser de larmes et de sang. L’imposante activité du secteur du bâtiment, l’audience concédée à des aventuriers de tout bord provenant du monde grec, la ténacité déployée pour flatter César et les Romains et pour mépriser les coutumes nationales constituent le leitmotiv de la narration historique de la période. Josèphe appartient à la classe dirigeante, identifiée par les auteurs des Évangiles dans les «scribes, Pharisiens et Grands-Prêtres» qui, après avoir pris ses distances vis-à-vis des concessions faites par Hérode à l’hellénisme, avalisa comme unique et possible histoire, celle du Judaïsme unifiée par l’observance de la «loi de Moïse». Pour cette classe dirigeante, les jours d’Hérode avaient fait revivre ceux d’Antioche IV de Syrie, caractérisés par une dévaluation systématique des coutumes nationales. Dans les Antiquités juives, Hérode et ses descendants sont montrés du doigt comme un exemple de désertion des coutumes nationales: les concessions répétées faites aux modes étrangères, l’avilissement de la «constitution nationale» («qui devait rester inviolée») constituèrent le tragique préambule de cette féroce opposition populaire qui se déclencha sous les procurateurs romains et qui fut à l’origine de la tragédie de l’an 70. L’essence du Judaïsme, pour cette classe dirigeante, fut identifiée dans l’adhésion à la loi; sa survie, confiée au respect de cette condition. Seul un état théocratique pouvait garantir l’intégrité du Judaïsme, qui s’étendait

de l'Italie jusqu'à l'Iran, contre le danger des forces centrifuges. À l'époque de Josèphe, l'identité juive pouvait s'ajouter à un conglomérat de cultures. Ainsi que l'affirmera le philosophe Épictète, l'on entendait des Juifs parler et se comporter exactement comme des Grecs.\textsuperscript{20} Un poète satyrique latin, Perse, expose à la risée du public les scrupules pour la «vie juive» d'un anonyme aspirant à l'édilité, probablement d'origine juive.\textsuperscript{21} Paul semble connaître des membres des communautés juives d'Éphèse et de Colosse qui sont devenus étrangers à la «citoyenneté d'Israël» (Eph 2:12 ; Col 1:21). Il s'agissait, par conséquent, de repenser et de parcourir l'histoire à travers la ligne maîtresse de l'observance de la loi. Peut-être n'existait-il pas d'autres voies pour réduire à une exposition historique un phénomène si complexe et articulé tel que l'était le Judaïsme avant l'affirmation d'une identité chrétienne spécifique. Et ce n'est pas un hasard si, dans le Nouveau Testament, le même terme désigne non pas déjà une réalité ethnique, mais une sorte de «manifeste» pour rappeler la nation à l'unité contre l'érosion et la dissipation de sa propre identité.

1. Writing Judean History in Rome

To write Judean history in Rome at the end of the first century C.E. was, for a Judean, a fraught procedure. Quite apart from the practical and literary challenge in composing an extended historical project, a set of complex political hurdles faced any would-be Judean historian. To write contemporary history, that is, the background and course of the Judean War, was to enter highly sensitive terrain in which Judean pride and imperial self-image were at stake and potentially in conflict: scholarship continues to examine (and variously evaluate) Josephus' success at negotiating the challenges of this task, which are evident throughout his *Bellum Judaicum* (explicitly in B.J. 1.1–16; C. Ap. 1.47–56; implicitly throughout).¹ To write the early history of the Judean people (their "ancient lore," ἀρχαὶ ἱστορία) might appear to be a safer and an easier task, but in fact it raised a set of cultural problematics quite as awkward as the politics surrounding the *Bellum*. Josephan scholars have made considerable inroads in analysis of the formal and stylistic features of the *Antiquitates Judaicae*, its pervasive "Hellenisation" of Judean figures and its adaptation of the biblical story to fit the tropes, themes, narrative conventions and authorial standpoints typical of Graeco-Roman historiography.² Rather


² L. H. Feldman's numerous essays on this topic are collected in his *Josephus's Interpretation of the Bible* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998) and *Studies in...*
less attention has been paid to the problem of which Josephus himself is conscious in the preface to the *Antiquitates* (A.J. 1.1–17) and to which he returns in the opening sections of *Contra Apionem*, where he attempts to mend the chief weakness of the *Antiquitates*. The problem discussed here is not how to *write* the *Antiquitates*, but whether anyone will *read* it and *believe* it, a problem of reception which concerns not just Josephus' *auctoritas* as an author but also, and more fundamentally, the cultural potency of the Judean tradition within the literate circles of late first-century Rome.

The question which most exercises Josephus in the preface to the *Antiquitates* is whether anyone will wish to read his work. He is convinced (he says) that the work will "seem to all Greeks worthy of serious attention" (αὐτοὶ φανεῖσθαι τοῖς Ἑλλησιν ἀξίων σπουδῆς, A.J. 1.5) and he parades first Epaphroditus and then Ptolemy II Philadelphus as examples of interest in his Judean subject matter (A.J. 1.8–12). Josephus' explanation of this interest is notably vague (the work is "useful" and "noble" and will appeal to "lovers of learning," A.J. 1.9, 12); but his use of the phrase "worthy of serious attention" (ἀξίων σπουδῆς) indicates his dependence on a cultural judgement of "worth" outwith his control. But beyond the question of interest, carefully foregrounded to catch potential readers, lies the deeper problem of credibility. Josephus leaves this question implicit but largely unanswered in the preface to the *Antiquitates*. He notes that the period to be surveyed in his work is remarkably long (a full 5,000 years, A.J. 1.13) and he half-recognises the critical question that this will raise: is this story really "history," or do its remoter periods stray into the category of "myth" and "fiction," as is typical of really "ancient lore"? In this context Josephus refers to "mythology" (μυθολογία, A.J. 1.15; cf. 1.22) and thus indicates the proximity of that charge, but he is content to rebuff this with an appeal to the ethical value and elevated theology contained in Judean historiography, the moral lessons and "worthy conception of God's nature" which it instils (A.J.

---


3 Josephus recognises that in dealing with "the long duration of time and antiquity [Moses] would have had a very free hand for fabricated falsehoods (ψευδών πλασμάτων)" (Feldman, BJP 3 A.J. 1.16 [↵ ]). Plutarch, *Her. mal.* 855d seems to treat "myth" and "ancient lore" as practically synonymous.
1.14–15, 22). This treats the ethical problem of “myth” but hardly the epistemological question: are there reliable sources for anything as ancient as Josephus’ narrative? Josephus says he is simply “translating” the Hebrew writings (A.J. 1.5) and setting forth, without alteration or addition, the “precise details (τὰ ἀκριβῶς) in our writings” (A.J. 1.17). But that simply pushes the question one step back: why should anyone believe the Hebrew writings on which Josephus draws?

In the first part of his Contra Apionem Josephus responds to the (real or imagined) failure of the Antiquitates to compete well in the cultural power-struggles of contemporary Rome. The opening statement of the new work indicates what he had attempted in the Antiquitates, with emphasis on the extreme antiquity of the Judean people, their pristine ethnic integrity, his account of their entry to the land and the 5000-year span of his Scripture-based narrative (C. Ap. 1.1). But he indicates immediately the double problematic which he must now address:

However, since I see that a considerable number of people pay attention to the slanders spread by some out of malice, and disbelieve what I have written on ancient history, but adduce as proof that our nation is of more recent origin that it was not considered worthy of mention by the most renowned Greek historians, I thought it was necessary to write briefly on all these matters . . . (C. Ap. 1.2–3)

Careful analysis of this passage in the light of the rest of the work indicates that Josephus here counters two equally damaging objections to his own Judean historiography. On the one hand, he faces “slanders” (βλασφημίαι), grounded in malice (δυσμενεία), terms he uses repeatedly for the “Egyptian” narratives of Judean origins, in which Judeans were presented as Egyptian lepers expelled on the order of the Gods. These are the tales which he spends much time refuting in C. Ap. 1.219 ff., and which, as we know from Tacitus (Hist. 5.2–3), gained wide acceptance in the Rome of Josephus’ day. From this angle, then, Josephus’ account of Judean origins faced intense
competition from a pervasive alternative version, with Egyptian credentials. This did not dispute Judean antiquity, but offered a derogatory account of the origins of the Judean nation critically different from Josephus’ scriptural version. On the other hand, as a second challenge, Josephus’ account faced critical doubts from people who appealed for cultural authority to those they considered “the most renowned” Greek historians. In this case, the issue was not their alternative version of Judean antiquity, but the fact that they never mentioned Judeans at all. Josephus’ comment that the Judean nation was not considered “worthy of mention” (μνήμης ἡξιώσθωκεν) indicates again that cultural judgements are at stake. The fact that the most prestigious Greek historians did not even mention Judeans was taken to show either that they did not exist in antiquity or that they were too insignificant to mention; in either case this judgement negated the cultural capital which Josephus’ Antiquitates had taken so long to accumulate.

Josephus’ fundamental problem is thus one of credibility, the most basic problem any historian can face. This is not just a matter of his personal credentials. Although he spends a little time in this context repeating and defending his earlier claims to be treated as an unimpeachable authority on both Judean antiquities and the Judean War (C. Ap. 1.47–56), the more fundamental question concerns the credentials of his subject matter. Which account of ancient Judean history is worthy of belief? Josephus, as a Judean historian utilising Judean sacred texts, faces a formidable challenge both from better known “Egyptian” accounts of Judean origins and from the presumption that his nation can hardly have existed or been of significance if superior cultural authorities, the “most renowned Greek historians,” failed...

5 A.J. 2.177 and 3.265–268 indicate that Josephus knew these Egyptian stories well at the time of writing Antiquitates; but he did not take time to confront them properly until he wrote Contra Apionem.

6 There are reasons to doubt that the criticism took exactly the form Josephus suggests. It is hard to imagine why anyone would object to a claim of Judean antiquity as such (many “obscure” nations were probably ancient in origin); and Tacitus’ variant versions of Judean origins all portray them as ancient. But Josephus’ language hints at another, related, charge: that Judeans were so culturally insignificant that no major Greek historians (who would have noticed eastern nations of importance) made reference to them; see Celsus’ comments in Origen, Cels. 4.31, 36. Since he is on weak ground concerning the cultural impact of Judeans (cf. C. Ap. 2.135–136, 182–183), Josephus prefers to fight on the issue of the sheer antiquity of his nation, for which any source reference will suffice.
even to register them. Wherever one looked for historiographical authority, to East or West, "barbarian" or "Greek," Josephus' account was frankly unbelievable.

2. Analysing Josephus' Response

Josephus' response to this double challenge takes up the first book of *Contra Apionem*, with the methodological foundations laid in 1.6–59. This passage constitutes Josephus' fullest and most interesting statement on historical method, though it has yet to receive the attention it deserves. Two important articles, by Tessa Rajak and Shaye Cohen, provide a foundation for my observations. In her essay on "Josephus and the 'Archaeology' of the Jews," Rajak assesses how Josephus' project compares to parallel phenomena in antiquity. Noting the swirl of debate in antiquity on the boundary between "history" and "myth," she rightly highlights the question of sources and their authority: where the Greek historiographical tradition typically sifted, criticised and combined historical sources, Josephus' method is simply to cite or re-present the Biblical record. The nearest analogies as precursors of his project, the native histories of Egypt by Manetho, and of Babylonia by Berossus, were mostly disregarded by Josephus' contemporaries, and even they do not parallel his attitude to the sanctity of the Judean texts. As Rajak rightly concludes, Josephus' main obstacle in presenting the *Antiquitates* in first-century Rome was not so much ignorance as arrogance: "For they [pagans] showed little or no willingness to ascribe special value to what this contemptible little nation thought about its own past; and indeed no very great willingness to consider what any nation thought about itself."

---

8 "Josephus and the 'Archaeology' of the Jews," 475. Rajak refers here to the rich and important article by E. Bickerman, "Origines Gentium," *CPh* 47 (1952): 65–81. As she notes wryly: "Perhaps our own attitudes to peoples whom we regard as barbarous are not so very different: we expect our own scholarship to produce better answers than indigenous traditions," 476.
9 "Josephus and the 'Archaeology' of the Jews," 476.
Shaye Cohen’s essay on “History and Historiography in the Against Apion of Josephus”\(^\text{10}\) discusses aspects of Josephus’ strategy in C. Ap. 1.6–59. Cohen highlights the cultural ambiguities of this text. On the one hand, it constitutes an exercise in historiographical polemics within a long-running and still-continuing Greek tradition, while simultaneously standing outside that tradition so as to “attack the Greeks with their own weapons.”\(^\text{11}\) On the other hand, this text contains certain very striking peculiarities from a Greek perspective, especially in its oblique reference to divine authority behind the Judean historical record, and its striking appeal to consensus as a criterion of truth (C. Ap. 1.26). As Cohen rightly suggests, both of these suggest an understanding of historiography as testimony to an already-established truth, not an art by which truth is tested and discovered. Being thus both “Greek” and “non-Greek” in its historical method, Josephus’ text is riddled with internal contradictions and remains difficult to characterise. Cohen concludes: “The Against Apion, then, is a complex work that faithfully mirrors the ambiguous place of Judaism in the ancient world.”\(^\text{12}\)

I believe that the observations offered by Rajak and Cohen can be both illuminated and deepened by reference to postcolonial theory. One branch of this theory analyses the ways in which colonised cultures can and do represent themselves to the colonial power, with strategic adaptations of colonial discourse. This contemporary theoretical approach can, I believe, be adapted to illuminate the different, but not wholly dissimilar, power dynamics of antiquity between Helleno-Roman cultural authority and the cultural traditions of eastern (or other “barbarian”) nations.\(^\text{13}\) Many years ago, in a seminal essay on Greek and Roman attitudes to the origins of nations, Bickerman noted how “barbarian” nations experienced their native traditions coming under “the double impact of Greek power and of Greek science,”\(^\text{14}\) an impact which generally compelled them in time to

\(^{10}\) In Essays in Jewish Historiography (ed. A. Rapoport-Albert; History and Theory 27; Middletown, Conn.: Wesleyan University Press, 1988), 1–11.

\(^{11}\) “History and Historiography,” 5.

\(^{12}\) “History and Historiography,” 11.

\(^{13}\) The compound “Helleno-Roman” obscures, of course, the complex power relations between Greeks and Romans in the Roman empire; see S. Goldhill, ed., Being Greek Under Rome: Cultural Identity, the Second Sophistic and the Development of Empire (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).

\(^{14}\) “Origines Gentium,” 73.
represent themselves within historiographical frameworks dictated by Greeks. Bickerman’s observation on the relationship between “power” and “science” anticipates a key theme in the work of M. Foucault; it is precisely this nexus between “power” and “knowledge,” as analysed by Foucault, which E. Said traced in “Orientalist” discourse, and which subsequent theorists have explored in relation to the often complex engagements between Western cultural power and the native traditions of colonised peoples. For instance, in an illuminating analysis of Western travel-narratives Mary Louise Pratt examines the culturally loaded constructions of the “barbarian” Other by Western visitors, but also the complex processes of “transculturation” whereby native narratives and self-representations engage with the colonisers’ terms of representation and constructively appropriate Western patterns of discourse in interaction with their own. These produce what Pratt calls a tradition of “autoethnography,” and by analogy we may dub the efforts of Josephus and his oriental predecessors as exercises in “autohistory”—the attempt to tell their own histories in an idiom comprehensible to the majority culture(s), but with primary reference to their own traditions and on their own terms.

What postcolonial theory offers is an analysis of the complex power-relations involved in this cultural interaction. The composition of history involves more than just style and choice of subject-matter. In determining the scope of history, in selecting a framework of arrangement and interpretation, and in determining the authority of the relevant sources, historiography both draws from, and creates, a particular regime of truth. The contact and contest between rival truth-regimes can be particularly intense where a rich indigenous tradition (such


as that of Judaism in antiquity, or, e.g., India today) runs up against the canons and standpoints of a more powerful alternative. By focusing on the asymmetrical power-relations, we can press beyond generalisations about cultural “fusions” and their resulting “ambiguities” to ask about the impact of the two traditions on one another, and the potential of the “hybrid” product to unsettle the claims of the dominant cultural tradition. In other words, I believe contemporary theory can be adapted in ways which help us pinpoint more precisely where and why Josephus’ engagement with Graeco-Roman historiography both borrows its cultural capital and disrupts its claims to superiority over “uncivilised” nations.

3. Josephus’ Strategies

I cannot offer here a full analysis of Josephus’ rhetorical and cultural strategies in C. Ap. 1.6–59. But by way of summary I here list, and offer brief comment on, six features in the text, in the hope of stimulating further discussion of this important text.

1. The first thing to notice is that Josephus discusses historical method at all. That he does so at such length and with reference to many of the key figures in the Greek tradition is a sign of his desire and his ability to join the mainstream cultural tradition in Rome. On this account Judeans are participants within the common discourse on history, not alien to its modes of reasoning and criteria of judgement. If he wants to draw a “just conclusion” (τὸ δίκαιον) from “the facts themselves, not vain opinions” (C. Ap. 1.6) Josephus is positioning himself within a universal field of reason, and in his critical comments on Greek historical youth in comparison with barbarian antiquity (C. Ap. 1.6–14) he draws on tropes at least as old as Herodotus and Plato. Josephus’ opening salvo is thus strategically non-specific to Judean tradition; he announces himself as a historian standing on common terrain.

---

18 See my forthcoming BJP commentary. It is hard to determine to what extent the strategies here analysed are conscious. As rhetorically crafted arguments, with exaggerated rhetoric against “Greeks”, they reflect a consciousness in art, but the extent to which the cultural strategy they represent is also conscious is not measurable. A post-colonial analysis which assesses the strategies of texts does not depend on assumptions concerning the consciousness of particular authors.
2. Secondly, Josephus is well-enough informed to exploit the internal disputes within the Greek tradition in order to discredit the whole. Where the Greek competitive spirit had been adopted as the signature of every self-respecting historian, Josephus uses the resulting fissures to undermine the reputation of them all, exploiting the paucity of Greek written records and recycling prevalent Roman stereotypes of Greek loquacity, argumentativeness and general mendacity.\textsuperscript{19} By positioning himself initially as a historian but a non-Greek, Josephus thus attempts to puncture the inflated importance given to “the most renowned Greek historians,” without needing to adopt any specifically “Judean” standpoint.

3. There is a notable silence in Josephus’ discourse: he never mentions Roman historians. Although Roman intellectuals had reworked the Greek historiographical tradition to their own ends,\textsuperscript{20} Josephus never refers to Roman historiography in either positive or negative terms. One could speculate much on the reasons for that silence, but the effect is to position himself alongside Roman commentators on the Greek tradition, if not explicitly among them. Thus for Roman (or Romanised) readers, no disjunctive is allowed to arise which might portray Josephus as at odds with their own tradition. This Judean historian says nothing to suggest he is not at home in the capital of the empire.

4. The only explicit self-identification in the polemical section of Josephus’ discussion of historiography (C. Ap. 1.6–29) is in analogy to three eastern nations, the Egyptians, Chaldeans and Phoenicians; Josephus first modestly refrains from adding his own nation (C. Ap. 1.8), but finally claims to match and even supersede these historiographical giants (C. Ap. 1.29). The three nations here named are those from whose records he will draw in the subsequent proofs of Judean antiquity (C. Ap. 1.69–160), but they were also immediately recognisable in Rome as eastern nations of great antiquity. Josephus’ strategy is thus to insert Judeans—a nation whose records were not known or recognised to be ancient—into


more familiar company, allowing the reputation of the group to rub off on the additional member. What is more, there is some evidence that literate circles in Rome in Josephus’ day were inclining to give greater credence to alternative “eastern” accounts of history, especially where they criticised or superseded the Greek. Thus, for instance, the alternative versions of the Trojan War by Dares of Phrygia and Dictys of Crete were “discovered” during the reign of Nero and judged by some more reliable than Homer, while a contemporary of Josephus, Philo of Byblos, seems to have persuaded some readers that he had discovered the writings of one Sanchuniathon, whose accurate account of Phoenician history proved Greek historiography to be incorrect and Greek mythology derivative. In such an atmosphere, Josephus might hope that the ancient traditions of the Judean nation would also gain a sympathetic hearing.

However, the appeal in such traditions to extreme antiquity is potentially problematic. Egyptians and Babylonians were known to make what seemed to Roman authors, such as Cicero and Pliny, absurd claims to their antiquity, bandying about figures such as 470,000 years, which were considered simply fantastic. Since Thucydides’ famous preface, to enter such realms of “pre-history” was liable to be considered a dangerous excursion into the terrain of “mythology,” a realm where it was impossible to make out what was sober truth and what fable, where the boundaries between the human and the divine were blurred, and where implausible and exaggerated tales were known to blossom, bringing pleasure only to the ignorant masses, to barbarians and to women.


22 For the growing attraction of oriental “wisdom”, and its special authority as “revelation”, we may compare the popularity of doctrines attributed to Hermes and Zoroaster; see A. Momigliano, Alien Wisdom. The Limits of Hellenization (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975), 141–48.

23 Cicero, Div. 1.36–37; Pliny, Nat. 7.56; cf. Diodorus 2.31.9.

mythology was difficult to control, examine or judge, it threatened the (masculine) control essential to the calling of a historian. To a man who should be able to investigate, to adjudicate or, as Thucydides would say, to “torture” his historical evidence in order to make it yield the truth, the truly ancient lore always threatened to leave him at a loss and open to the charge of (womanish) credulity. As we shall see, this ideology of control, which is so powerful in the Greek tradition of “criticism,” is obliquely challenged by Josephus with his alternative understanding of the acquisition of historical truth.

5. At one point Josephus threatens to invert Greek cultural arrogance completely. After offering an explanation for Greek silence on Judeans, on the grounds of their physical remoteness (C. Ap. 1.60–68), he asks: “Suppose we were to argue, in relation to the Greeks, that their nation is not ancient, and decided to use as proof the fact that nothing is said about them in our records. Would they not think that utterly laughable—adducing, I imagine, the same reasons that I have just discussed?” (C. Ap. 1.69). By mirroring and inverting the objection cited in C. Ap. 1.2, Josephus raises the prospect of a full-frontal attack on its Hellenocentric presumptions. He hints here at the possibility of affirming, without apology, a radical cultural difference: perhaps Greek claims for what counts as “worthy of mention” are merely symptoms of cultural imperialism. Why should not the (lack of) Judean evidence for Greek antiquity be taken as seriously as the (lack of) Greek evidence for Judean antiquity? In fact, however, Josephus does not pursue this potentially subversive track. Despite his awareness of the injustice in Greek cultural claims, and despite his comprehensive critique of Greek historiography in C. Ap. 1.6–27,
Josephus still wishes to cite some Greek witnesses to Judean antiquity, and had prepared in the introduction (*C. Ap.* 1.5) for the long section of Greek testimony in *C. Ap.* 1.161–218. Josephus' cultural stance is thus conflicted: his critique of the Greek tradition almost results in complete repudiation of Greek cultural claims, but he still wants, and perhaps needs, the support of Greek witness to both the antiquity and the cultural attraction of the Judean people (see *C. Ap.* 1.162, 166 etc.). The internal contradictions in Josephus' argumentation (e.g., the rubbing of Herodotus in *C. Ap.* 1.16, but his use as a reliable witness in *C. Ap.* 1.168–171) are symptoms of this deeper conflict in cultural strategy.

6. Following his critique of the Greek historiographical tradition (*C. Ap.* 1.6–27), Josephus begins the praise of his own, as guaranteed by high-priests and prophets (*C. Ap.* 1.29). He emphasises first the preservation of priestly lineage (*C. Ap.* 1.30–36), and then, in a single condensed paragraph (*C. Ap.* 1.37–41), depicts the sources of authority within the Judean tradition. Two intertwining threads run through this paragraph: first, the limitation of authority to certain key figures, named "prophets," and secondly, the resulting unanimity in agreement on the truth. Here Josephus displays the most dramatic differential in his Judean understanding of historiography. The difference lies not just in the choice of term, "prophet," but in the structures of authority which this term implies: "...it was the prophets alone who learned, by inspiration from God, what had happened in the distant and ancient past, and recorded clearly what took place in their own time just as it occurred..."\(^{27}\)

Together, the five books of Moses and the thirteen books composed by "the prophets following Moses" make up the bulk of the 22-book canon described by Josephus; its limits and controls are emphasised by his insistence that it is not a matter of free choice for anyone to write such texts (μὴ τὸ ὑπογράφειν αὐτεξουσίου πᾶσιν ὄντος, *C. Ap.* 1.37; cf. 1.20) and that, since Artaxerxes, the Judean historical records are not considered worthy of like credence (πίστεως δ' οὐχ ὁμοίας ἡξίωτων), since there is no accurate line of prophetic succession (*C. Ap.* 1.41).

\(^{27}\) ἀλλὰ μόνον τῶν προφητῶν τὰ μὲν ἀνωτᾶτῳ καὶ παλαιότατα κατὰ τὴν ἑπίπνοιαν τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ μαθόντων, τὰ δὲ καθ' αὐτοῦ ὡς ἐγένετο σαφῶς συγγραφόντων (*C. Ap.* 1.37).
Thus Judean historiography does not just have different sources from those employed by others, with which it can supplement the account of universal human history. Nor does Josephus simply claim that Judeans have particularly accurate historical records, which have been proved by investigation to be more reliable than the mythologies peddled by others. The notable feature in this account is that no investigation of these Judean sources is either necessary or desired. Their authority is not just in practice unchallenged, but in principle unchallengeable, since their authors are themselves authorised by their divine source. The point is made almost in passing by reference to Moses’ accurate knowledge of 3000 years of human history “by inspiration from God” (κατὰ τὴν ἐπίπτωσιν τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ), an authority which then leaks over by implication to all the other prophets in the accurate line of succession. It is reinforced by the chain of “learning” (μαθήματι) which applies in Judean historiography: we learn from the records of the past (C. Ap. 1.23), but the prophets in turn learned from God (C. Ap. 1.37). Elsewhere in this discussion (e.g. C. Ap. 1.10, 14, 15), as everywhere in the Greek tradition, the relationship of learner to teacher is one of subordination: to learn from another is to submit to his authority. But whereas the Greek historian in the critical tradition would never simply learn from his sources, but must scrutinise them, adjudicate what was plausible, “cleanse” them, and submit them to his own reasoning capacity, Josephus portrays (and practices) a discipline of learning from sources, whose contents are ultimately learned from God.

The difference is immediately dramatised by Josephus’ claim in C. Ap. 1.42–45 that, unlike the typical Greek attitudes to their histories, Judeans will never add to or subtract from their writings, but learn right from birth to regard them as θεοῦ δόγματα; they are willing to remain faithful to them, even to death (C. Ap. 1.42–43). This set of claims shows quite how novel an element Josephus here inserts into the tradition of historiography in which he wishes to be heard. Once again, the difference is not just in the particular sources to which Judeans appealed, but in their understanding of those sources
and of themselves in relation to them. If the sources cannot be altered by addition or subtraction, one has surrendered power to them as unquestionable and complete. If it is necessary for Judeans to maintain a belief on this point first instilled from birth (ἐνθοὺς ἐκ πρώτης γενέσεως), they maintain a “child-like” view of authority and forfeit the right to practise the λόγος which matures in adulthood. And if one is prepared to suffer, even die, for these “laws and the writings associated with them” (C. Ap. 1.43), one accords them rights even greater than one’s own interests. It is easy to see how a critic in the Greek tradition would dismiss this attitude as a superstitious and dangerous abandonment of critical reason. The structures of authority here adopted undercut the ideologies of control on which the Greek historiographical tradition is constructed.

Josephus’ provocative claim is that this Judean tradition stands not as a radical alternative to the mainstream historiographical tradition, but as a variant within it, even as its supreme exemplar of accuracy and truth. He does not offer the Judean Scriptures as new material for evaluation within the established rules of historiography, as new resources for a critical reconstruction of antiquity: that would leave untouched the authority of the Greek intellectual enterprise. Nor does he simply juxtapose Judean historiography as an alternative way of doing history, a native tradition which operates by different rules. His strategy is altogether more demanding and, potentially, more threatening to the metropolitan tradition. Josephus inserts himself and his Judean perspective into the historiographical tradition, entering its debates and disputes, echoing its values of accuracy, affirming its documentary preferences and its striving for “truth”; but he adds to that tradition a different historiographical logic which unsettles its normal structures of authority. Like Aristotle’s Judean (as reported by Clearchus, in C. Ap. 1.175–182), Josephus enters the intellectual conversation, and has the necessary discursive credentials to gain a hearing in the company of other scholars. But he also has “something of his own” to contribute (C. Ap. 1.181) and in this case what he offers is not a new illustration of an established convention, but an addition to the historiographical agenda which disturbs the rules by which the scholarly conversation takes place.

30 Cf. Agatharchides’ critique of sabbath—“superstition” in C. Ap. 1.205–211. There, as here, commitment to “tradition” leads to losing one’s own life, which for Agatharchides is self-evidently ridiculous.
Josephus thus provides a perfect illustration of that "mirror-dance" in which an "autohistory" transculturates elements of the metropolitan discourse in order to create its own self-affirmation, designed for reception in the metropolis (in this case imperial Rome). Such colonial mimicry, the reflection back of the dominant culture by the politically subordinate, can bear subversive potential. As Homi Bhabha has shown, colonial "hybridity" offers more than simply the fusion of different cultural traditions, but by creating something both similar and different it threatens to destabilise the regularities which are supposedly being reproduced.31 By inserting Judean historiography into the long-running debates of the Graeco-Roman world, Josephus does more than expand its scope and its range of sources: he insinuates a different canon of authority and a subtly different understanding of the task of the historian, without fanfare or detailed exposition but with sufficient clarity to disrupt the normal patterns of historical reasoning. His own tradition did not perhaps carry sufficient political power for this challenge to be effective.32 Despite the presence of numerous articulate Judeans in Rome, Tacitus will describe Judean antiquity without any reference to Judean autohistory (Hist. 5.2–3). But for early Christianity, Josephus' tactics offered a powerful tool with which to crack open the authority of the Graeco-Roman tradition, and in Eusebius' hands, when Christianity was gaining real political and thus cultural power, they help to effect a change in the cultural co-ordinates of the ancient world which was to prove of enormous significance for Western history and historiography.33

---

31 See especially the essays "Sly Civility" and "Signs Taken for Wonders," in H. Bhabha, The Location of Culture (London: Routledge, 1994). Of course, the subversive potential may be neither heard nor realised.

32 The problem is not just that he appeals to the authority of prophets, but that he appeals to Judean prophets, who hitherto had no cultural authority within the Greek or Roman traditions (unlike, for instance, Egyptian priests). Livy's preface illustrates perfectly the importance of political and military power in enforcing cultural attention: he presumes that other nations will submit to the authority of Rome's version of its prehistory with as much grace as they submit to Rome.

33 See, for instance, the strategy adopted in Eusebius' Praeparatio evangelica.
Thus says the LORD, the God of Israel. . . . I am going to give this city into the hand of the king of Babylon, and he shall burn it with fire.

Jeremiah 34:2 (NRSV)

1. Those who attentively read Flavius Josephus' *Bellum Judaicum* cannot fail to notice a distinctive feature of the work: the co-presence, even on adjacent pages, of realistic narratives drawn from the author's recollections and the official Roman documents available to him, on the one hand, and of narratives which we may call outright *dramatic representations* with little or no correspondence to reality on the other.

In other words, from a formal point of view, the *Bellum* displays an evident mix of different historiographical "genres": "pragmatic" historiography which seeks to present the reader with the facts as they actually happened and relies heavily on documents; and "dramatic" or "pathetic" historiography which seeks to present facts in tragic or dramatic terms, even to the detriment of their veracity, in order to impress the reader and to arouse particular psychological reactions.

This practice originated with Duris of Samos, a pupil of Theophrastus, and probably derived ultimately from Aristotle's *Poetics*, and from an attempt to ennoble historiography, giving it a greater resemblance to the poetry that Aristotle deemed more serious than history because it more closely approached the universal. In the Hellenistic period, it exerted great influence on historiography but was criticised by the pragmatic Polybius, especially in Book 13 of his *Histories*.  

To gain an idea of this co-presence of different historiographical genres in the *Bellum*, compare, for example, Josephus’s digression on the Roman army arrayed before Ptolemais when Titus had joined

---

his father (B.J. 3.70–109)—a digression that he could only have based on official Roman documents—with his description of the battlefield during the conquest of Gamala in Galilee (B.J. 4.72). Here Josephus writes: “On all sides was heard the never ending moan of the dying and the whole city was deluged with blood pouring down the slopes”2 (ἀπειρος δὴν παντοχοῦ φωνευοµένων ὁ στόνος, καὶ τὸ αἷµα πᾶσαν ἐπέκλυζε τὴν πόλιν κατὰ πρανοῦς χέωμενον). The image is as graphic as it is entirely unrealistic, and we may intuit how Josephus was able to construct it: he must have called to mind the water which washed away the blood of the animals sacrificed on the altar of the Temple and might sometimes have given the impression of an actual deluge of blood.3

In his description of the siege of Jerusalem (B.J. 6 and 7), Josephus presents us with two sets of pictures, one which describes events inside the city, and one which describes events outside it and in the Roman camps. He gives entirely different colourings to these pictures. Those which describe the exterior of the city are largely realistic and accurate in their details; those that describe its interior comprise facts which are obviously distorted and which, in the majority of cases, as we shall see, are the fruit of the author’s imagination, and where the plethora of details—which Josephus could not have witnessed at first hand—betray the fictitious character of the description. Now, we must ask ourselves, for what reason did Josephus so obviously dramatize his representation of what was occurring within the city? An answer can only be given if we consider the audience for whom his work was intended.

2. Given that the Bellum was written in Rome and at the court of the Flavians, and according to Weber on the basis of the commentaria (commentaries, ὑπομνήµατα) kept by the Roman commanders during the campaign (Vita 343 and 358),4 it would seem to be the official chronicle of the war fought by Vespasian and Titus in Galilee and

---

2 The passages from Bellum Judaicum, Contra Apionem, and Vita are cited according to the translation by H. St. J. Thackeray (LCL).

3 On washing to remove the blood of sacrifices see Ep. Arist. 90: “there are many openings for water at the base [of the altar] . . . so that all the blood of the sacrifices which is collected in great quantities is washed away in the twinkling of an eye” (trans. H. Andrews in R. H. Charles, APOT), although this does not refer to Herod’s temple. The image of “the deluge of blood” is also used by Josephus in B.J. 6.259 and in 6.406, where it even extinguishes the fires. For a similar representation in the Jewish literature see Y. Ta’anit IV.8.69a.

Judaea—just as *De bello gallico* had been the official chronicle of Caesar’s campaigns in Gaul. Titus, wrote Josephus in his *Vita*, had put his signature to the *Bellum* in order to authenticate its veracity: “indeed, so anxious was the Emperor Titus that my volumes should be the sole authority from which the world should learn the facts, that he affixed his own signature to them and gave order for their publication” (*Vita* 363). Consequently, the audience for which the work was intended could only have been the Roman public.

However, it is probable that the official chronicle of the war was another one. In the *Octavius* (33.2–4), Minucius Felix has the pagan interlocutor of the dialogue say that the worship of the Jews was directed to only one God, and that as long as they practised it in purity and innocence, they would enjoy prosperity. He continues: “scripta eorum relege, vel ut transeamus veteres, Flavi Iosephi uel, si Romanis magis gaudes, Antoni Iuliani de Iudaeis require iam scies, nequitia sua hanc eos meruisse fortunam” (47.22–48.2 Halm).5

This Antonius Julianus was very probably the Marcus Antonius Julianus who attended the council of war preceding the final assault and who was described by Josephus as the procurator (*ἐπιτροπος*) of Judaea (*B.J.* 6.238). Because Minucius Felix talks of the “fortuna,” that is, the ruin of the Jews, and sets Antonius Julianus’s work on a par with that by Josephus, it seems likely that Julianus wrote the official chronicle of the war, doing so on the basis of the *commentaria*.6

In the prologue to his work, Josephus mentions other authors who dealt with the same matter to “extol the Roman power” (*B.J.* 1.9). But, contrary to these authors, his intention is to expound *more accurately* the actions of the two sides (*ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν ἔργα μετ᾽ ἀκριβείας*

5 The editors of *Octavius* (extant in a single ms., the *Parisinus lat.* 1661 of the ninth century, which also contains the work of Arnobius) expunged “Flavi Iosephi uel.” Not only is the deletion unnecessary but it compromises the intelligibility of the text. The sense of the sentence is: “Re-read their [the Jews'] writings: if you leave aside the ancients (read that) of Flavius Josephus or, if you prefer the Romans, (that) of Antonius Julianus, then you will realize that their misfortunes depend upon their wickedness”. In other words, in proof of his assertion the pagan interlocutor of the dialogue cites the Bible (where statements of this kind abound) or, besides the Bible, Josephus’s *Bellum*. To reinforce his argument, he affirms that, apart from that work, written by a Jew, the same conclusions can be drawn from the writings of a pagan, Antonius Julianus, *whose work is clearly set in parallel with Josephus's*. On this text see also *GLAJJ* 1:460–61 no. 201.

in order to show that "it was the Jewish tyrants who drew down upon the holy temple the unwilling hands of the Romans" (B. J. 1.10). Josephus thus counterposes his own work to another. The latter, he claims, had given an account of the facts which did not sufficiently emphasise that it was the factions within the Jewish world and their intestine struggles which had provoked the Romans and caused the catastrophe. This, as we shall see, is the underlying thesis of his work. If we accept the hypothesis that Antonius Julianus wrote the official history of the war, and if we identify him with the Marcus Antonius Julianus who was procurator (ἐπίτροπος) of Judaea during the military campaign, it is not difficult to understand why his work should extol the power of the Romans—that is, describe above all their military accomplishments—while paying little or no attention to the internecine struggles among the factions within the city before and during the siege. 7

There is, however, another circumstance that should be borne in mind. As we learn from the Vita, many years after publication of the Bellum, Josephus' compatriot, Justus of Tiberias wrote a history of the conflict which openly disputed the account furnished by Josephus, who responded by conducting a violent polemic against Justus in his Vita. 8 This Justus had been imprisoned by Josephus because he refused to join the revolt (Vita 175–176). He had left Tiberias when the revolt broke out and, condemned to death by Vespasian, was saved through Berenice's intercession with Agrippa II (Vita 343). One of Josephus' ripostes concerned precisely his account of events within the walls of besieged Jerusalem, against which Justus had directed his main criticisms. Josephus replied that Justus's strictures were worthless because they were made by someone who had not been

---

7 In this regard, the material in the Bellum which seems to have been drawn from official Roman documents may in fact have been taken from Julianus' work, which was certainly based on the official commentaria. This point has been made by E. Norden, "Josephus und Tacitus über Jesus Christus und eine messianische Prophétie," Neue Jahrbücher für die Klass. Altert. 16 (1913): 664–66 and by A. Schlatter, Der Bericht über das Ende Jerusalems. Ein Dialog mit Wilhelm Weber (Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1932), 7–8.

8 When writing about Justus (Vita 40), Josephus claims that his oratory had a rousing effect on the plebeians: Justus, "was a clever demagogue and by a charlatan's tricks (γοντεία) of oratory more than a match for opponents with saner counsels". On Justus see Schürer, History 1:34–37 (with bibliog.); T. Rajak, "Justus of Tiberias," CQ 23 (1973): 345–68; Ead., "Josephus und Justus of Tiberias," in Josephus, Judaism and Christianity (eds. L. H. Feldman and G. Hata; Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1987), 81–94.
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an eye-witness to the events in question, conveniently forgetting that neither could he claim to have witnessed them at first hand: “Perhaps, however, you will say that you have accurately (μετὰ ἀκριβείας) narrated the events which took place at Jerusalem. How, pray, can that be, seeing that neither were you a combatant nor had you perused the Commentaries of Caesar, as is abundantly proved by your contradictory account?” (Vita 358).

Another consideration concerning the dispute between Josephus and Justus prompts the conclusion that there would have been no reason for the polemic—or at least no reason for its exceptional degree of violence—had Josephus’ work been the official history of the war written for the Romans, given that Justus’ work was without a shadow of a doubt written for Jews.

The conclusion to be drawn is that, although the Bellum took account of the Roman public, to which Josephus in many cases evidently adapted its language, the work was primarily intended for those Jews of the Diaspora who were able to read Greek and for whom, like their co-religionists, the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple had been the greatest tragedy of their lives. This is amply confirmed by a careful reading of the work.

On concluding a long and detailed digression on the Roman army (B.J. 3.70–109), probably composed in imitation of Polybius’s similar digression (6.19–42), and following the description of the army arrayed before Ptolemais which I have already mentioned, Josephus writes: “If I have dwelt at some length on this topic, my intention was not so much to extol the Romans as to console those whom they have vanquished and to deter others who may be tempted to revolt” (B.J. 3.108). As I shall seek to show, this was the purpose for which Josephus wrote his work: to show that Fortune was now firmly on the side of the Romans; to explain to his co-religionists how an event so tragic for the whole of Israel could have come about; and to persuade the Jews that any repetition of their behaviour would have no less tragic consequences.

The Bellum therefore contains a message addressed to the Jews of the Diaspora; and this message consisted in explaining the causes that had given rise to such calamitous events. Consequently, identifying what these causes were, according to Josephus, amounts to giving an interpretation to the work as a whole. This inquiry must be based essentially on the distinction between its “pragmatic” and “pathetic” parts. The latter part, although it was almost entirely the fruit of Josephus’
imagination, as we shall see, should not be considered negatively as a fabrication but positively as the message which Josephus intended to transmit to his co-religionists and which consequently confers a sense and a logic upon it.\(^9\)

3. Although after the end of the Galilee campaign, which Josephus had fought as commander of the rebels, he passed to the opposite camp and assisted Titus during the siege of Jerusalem, he was not a renegade\(^10\)—as was instead Tiberius Julius Alexander, who “did not stand by the practices of his people” (\textit{A.J.} 20.100 [Feldman, LCL]), and whom Tacitus called “inlustris eques romanus” (\textit{Ann.} 15.28.3).\(^11\)

Josephus would write his \textit{Contra Apionem} to defend Judaism against the calumnies of the pagans; using the model of Dionysius of Halicarnassus he produced a history of his people so that it might be known throughout the Greek-speaking world, but he wrote the \textit{Bellum} essentially to persuade his people that the destruction of the Temple transcended the contingent events of the war because it was the work of God himself, who had used the Romans as his instrument, as he had already used Nebuchadnezzar King of Babylon, who was his “servant” (\textit{Jer} 25:9; 27:6; 34:2), to destroy the First Temple.\(^12\)

In this work, Josephus left the sphere of the divine substantially undefined: human actions are performed, conditioned or impeded by a higher force which is given the name of “God” (\(\text{Θεός}\), with or without the article), sometimes of “Deity” (\(\text{τὸ θεῖον}\)), sometimes of

\(^9\) J. J. Price, \textit{Jerusalem under Siege. The Collapse of the Jewish State 66–70 C.E.} (Brill’s series in Jewish Studies 3; Leiden-New York-Köln: Brill, 1992), 151–52 points out that “Most of Josephus’s gentile audience of course did not know biblical history and had no way of assessing the strong censure with which Josephus presents the rebels’ justification (in \textit{B.J.} 5.564).”

\(^10\) J. A. Montgomery, “The Religion of Flavius Josephus,” \textit{JQR} n.s. 11 (1920–21): 297, states that “Josephus was no trimmer in religion whatever he was in politics.”

\(^11\) Tiberius Julius Alexander, son of the alabarch Alexander and nephew of Philo (\textit{A.J.} 18.259 and 20.100) was procurator of Judaea after Cuspius Fadus (44–?) until 48. See Schürer, \textit{History} 1:457–58, 502. During the war he was \(\text{τὸν στρατηγόν τῷ στρατευμάτων ἀρχῳ} \) (\textit{B.J.} 5.46) and \(\text{πάντων τῶν στρατευμάτων ἐπάρχος} \) (\textit{B.J.} 6.237), “army chief of staff.” His complete name is given in an edict issued when he was \textit{praefectus} of Egypt: \textit{CIG} 4957 = \textit{OGIS} 669. See E. G. Turner, “Tiberius Julius Alexander,” \textit{JRS} 44 (1954): 54–64; V. Burr, \textit{Tiberius Julius Alexander} (Bonn: Habelt, 1955).

\(^12\) Also according to rabbinic tradition (as in \textit{Jer} 34:2) it was God, and not Nebuchadnezzar or Titus, who destroyed the Temple. See M. Hadas Lebel, “La tradition rabbinique sur la première revolte contre Rome à la lumière du De Bello Judaico de Flavius Josèphe,” \textit{Sileno} 9 (1983): 168–71.
“Fate” (χρεών and εἰμαρμένη), but mostly of “Fortune” (τύχη). In these expressions, his co-religionists could not have failed to recognize the God of Israel, and they would certainly have been astonished to learn that the Deity was now, in Titus’s words, “cooperating” with Rome (B.J. 6.38): an expression which must have sounded blasphemous to their ears, but which Josephus had been obliged to use for his Roman readers. The concept that he really intended to convey, in fact, was the same as that expressed by Jeremiah in the passages just cited, and we shall see later where it is overtly stated in his work.

4. The reader of the *Bellum* will certainly be struck by the fact that the members of the various “factions” of Jews actively involved first in the revolt and then the war are always and only referred to as λῃσταί, “bandits”, with their actions being described as those of murderers, robbers and, with constant emphasis, sacrilegists. They are depicted as in ferocious conflict with each other, at least until the Romans laid siege to the city, but with no mention ever being made of the reasons for their intestine struggles. Yet Josephus had been one of them, indeed their leader, during the entire Galilee campaign.

So, one may ask, can Josephus’s description of those internecine struggles and the ferocious cruelty that they provoked be regarded as addressed to a Roman audience?

---


14 G. Mader, *Josephus and the Politics of Historiography: Apologetic and Impression Management in Bellum Judaicum* (Mnemosyne suppl. 205; Leiden-Boston-Köln: Brill, 2000), 123–33, has analysed the reason for the ἄφεσις of the zealots, regarding it as the ἰδée maitresse of the *Bellum*: “Josephus ingeniously represents Zealot actions as guided not by religious motives, but as evincing the rankest forms of impiety, making the insurgents not the upholders of traditional religion, but its subverters and polluters” (130).
The opinion formed by the Romans of the insurrection and subsequent struggle by the Jews of Judaea was expressed very clearly by Tacitus: "duravit tamen patientia Iudaeis usque ad Gessium Florum procuratorem" (Hist. 5.10.1). In other words, maladministration by inept and rapacious procurators had provoked the Judean uprising, which Rome had been obliged to suppress like so many other revolts in other parts of the empire.\(^{15}\)

The Romans were essentially interested in the military operations of their army—as Josephus admonishes against the report on the Judean campaign, whose author he does not name but who was probably the already-mentioned Marcus Antonius Julianus—and not in events that went on within the walls of the besieged city. Yet it is the latter which Josephus places \textit{decidedly in the foreground}, and the description of them is an essential part of the book. And this is so because the book was written, as Josephus himself says, to correct and supplement the other account, which had neglected these facts. But why, we must ask ourselves, does Josephus describe with the punctilious precision of an eye-witness (which he was not) for the Jews of the Diaspora all the horrors and all the sacrileges that occurred within the besieged city?

He talks of four "factions" of insurgents:\(^{16}\) the followers of Simon bar Giora, whose army "was no longer an army of mere serfs or brigands, but one including numerous citizen recruits, subservient to his command as to a king" (B.J. 4.510);\(^{17}\) the followers of John of

\(^{15}\) P. A. Brunt, "Charges of Provincial Maladministration under the Early Principate," \textit{Historia} 10 (1961): 189–227. That Roman misgovernment was the principal cause of the revolt has been argued by e.g. E. M. Smallwood, \textit{The Jews under Roman Rule} (Leiden: Brill, 1976) 256–57.

\(^{16}\) Tacitus, \textit{Hist} 5.12.4, mentions two factions "ita in duas factiones civitas discesit" when the Roman army drew close to the city, whereas he had previously (5.12.3) spoken of three armies led by "tres duces": Simon, John and Eleazar.

\(^{17}\) Simon bar Giora (בֶּן גיורא; b. Sanh. 94a, "proselyte"). Josephus always uses בְּרַגְיָרָא in Cassius Dio 65.7.1 and Tacitus, \textit{Hist}. 5.12.3, who attrib-
Gischala, “who carried in his breast a dire passion for despotic power and had long been plotting against the state” (B.J. 4.208); the “zealots”, whose leader was a certain Eleazar, son of Simon (B.J. 5.5), who had been given this name “as though they were zealots in the cause of virtue and not for vice in its basest and most extravagant form” (B.J. 4.161); and the sicarii who had occupied the fortress of Masada since the war in Galilee (B.J. 4.400). As stated above,
these factions are described as having been constantly in conflict before siege was laid to Jerusalem, but Josephus remains constantly silent as to the reasons for the strife. With regard to the reasons that induced them to fight against the Romans, he talks of “an unreflecting hope of regaining independence”, which Agrippa II counsels against in his speech (B. J. 2.346) as irrational because it was nourished against those “to whom Fortune has transferred her favours” (B. J. 2.360). This, though, must have been one reason for their struggle, given that coins minted respectively in year II (67 c.e.) and year III (68 c.e.) bore the inscription כתרת צדני, “freedom of Zion”—which was “not a simple inscription or statement, but a phrase akin to a slogan”, as Meshorer has commented. However, a coin struck in year I (66 c.e.) bore the inscription ירשלאם קרואה “holy Jerusalem” and one in year II (67 c.e.) ירושלים הקרופה, “Jerusalem the holy”, while three coins of year IV (69 c.e.) carry the inscription לאליה צדני “for the redemption of Zion”: it is consequently difficult to imagine that the “freedom” for which the Jews fought was purely political in its nature. As for the internecine struggles among the various “factions”, there was outright and sometimes bloody antagonism between those who sought a compromise and those who were determined to fight the Romans until the bitter end (B. J. 5.316–318: murder of the high priest Ananus). But the struggles among the factions are wrapped, as Derenbourg puts it, “dans le voile de la légende”, and very little can be learned from the rabbinical sources, although they contain some echoes of the events which seem consonant with the
account of them in the *Bellum*. Here, however, my concern is to highlight what Josephus says about these opponents of the Romans.

There is a passage in Book 7 (written later than the others, which contains, as we shall see, information that contradicts what has been said previously) which seems to lift, at least briefly, the curtain behind which Josephus conceals the religious convictions of his former comrades in arms. It narrates the final phases of the war conducted, after Titus’s departure for Rome, by Flavius Silva against the last remaining rebels barricaded in the Herodian fortress of Masada and who, before the Romans finally stormed the stronghold, would commit suicide after they had killed their wives and children (*B.J.* 7.389–397).

Refuge had been taken at Masada by a group of *sicarii* (*B.J.* 4.399–404) previously resident in Jerusalem since the times of Nero (*B.J.* 2.254). These, too, Josephus describes in terms intended to assert their wickedness and impiety: their demand for freedom was nothing, he says, “but a pretext put forward by them as a cloak for their cruelty and avarice, as was made plain by their actions” (*B.J.* 7.256). Later, with reference to the zealots, Josephus writes that “they took their title from their professed zeal for virtue, either in mockery of those they wronged, so brutal was their nature, or reckoning the greatest of evils good” (*B.J.* 7.270), adding that they received just punishment by dying under atrocious torture (*B.J.* 7.272).

Josephus also speaks of torture with reference to the *sicarii*. Some of them, he writes, had after the fall of Masada provoked turmoil in Alexandria (*B.J.* 7.409), and some Jews of that city who had given them hospitality were induced “to assert their independence, to look upon the Romans as no better than themselves and to esteem God alone as their Lord” (*B.J.* 7.410). This, therefore, was the religious

---


27 When discussing the “fourth philosophy”, founded by Judah the Galilean, Josephus states that “this school agrees in all the other respects with the opinions of the Pharisees, except that they have a passion for liberty that is almost unconquerable,
conviction of the *sicarii*. As Eleazar says in his speech exhorting the besieged Jews of Masada to commit suicide: “long since... we determined neither to serve the Romans nor any other save God, for He alone is man’s true and righteous Lord; and now the time is come which bids us verify that resolution by our actions” (*B.J.* 7.323). On their capture by the Romans, the Alexandrian Jews who had embraced the ideology of the *sicarii* were tortured: “nor was there a person who was not amazed at the endurance and—call it which you will—desperation or strength of purpose, displayed by these victims” (*B.J.* 7.417).

Josephus hastens to add that this was “madness” (ἀπόνοια; not “desperation” as Thackeray translates the term; see *B.J.* 7.67). They were tortured “for the sole object of making them acknowledge Caesar as lord” (*B.J.* 7.418); yet, according to their creed, they could only recognize God as lord, and this they affirmed with their martyrdom.

Now if these men fought because they acknowledged only God as their lord, if they minted coinage which proclaimed that “Jerusalem is holy,” is it really likely that they would profane the city by perpetrating the horrible and sacrilegious acts which Josephus attributes to them?

5. When a war is under way, ritual prescriptions may of course be temporarily suspended,28 or they may be laxly applied, but Josephus describes situations in which all the rules were ignored. By way of example, at the beginning of the fifth book, when the Romans had not yet laid siege to the city, he recounts how the followers of Eleazar, and the followers of John of Gischala and of Simon bar Giora, fought fiercely within the Temple complex. Simon, who occupied the lower part (presumably the external court and the women’s court) used *ballistae* to hurl projectiles against the followers of Eleazar encamped in the area in front of the Temple building (the courts of the Israelites since they are convinced that God alone is their leader and master” (*A.J.* 18.23–25, Feldman, LCL). However, Josephus does not identify the “fourth philosophy” with zealotism.

and of the priests) where the sacrificial altar was located, killing many adversaries, “but also (. . .) many of the worshippers” (πολλοὶ τῶν ἱερουργοῦντων) (B.J. 5.14). In consequence of these clashes, “[t]he dead bodies of natives and aliens, of priests and laity, were mingled in a mass, and the blood of all manner of corpses formed pools in the courts of God” (B.J. 5.18). There was no reverence given to the living, nor was trouble taken to bury the dead: the corpses were trampled underfoot, and the wood intended for sacrifices (to burn the victims) was taken away and used to construct machines of war (B.J. 5.30–34). How sacrifices could have been made in the presence of piles of corpses and “pools” of blood is difficult to imagine.

As in all sieges, food shortages grew increasingly severe; and this circumstance affords Josephus the opportunity to describe atrocities which he could not possibly have witnessed. The “bandits,” he writes, did not yet suffer hunger because they stole food from the city’s inhabitants, “forcing the morsels almost out of their very jaws” (B.J. 5.432) and inflicting atrocious torture (which he describes in detail, B.J. 5.435) upon those they believed were concealing food.

These episodes are justified by famine, and they are invariably part of the tragic experience of a besieged city. Others, however, seem so exaggerated, and above all so gratuitous, that their introduction into the narrative can only be explained by Josephus’ intent to arouse reactions in the reader of such profound disgust that credibility would attach to his entirely denigratory depiction of those who fought against the Romans. This depiction could only have been intended for Jewish readers, who would thus be persuaded that the rebels had fought not for ideal reasons, nor for religious ones, but solely to plunder, kill and profane.

To provide just one example, Josephus describes a group of Galilean zealots who, having made John of Gischala’s fortune and brought him to power, were authorized by him to do whatever they pleased.

---

29 The use of the term ἀλλόφυλοι (translated by Thackeray as “aliens”) poses some difficulties. Josephus (B.J. 5.14–16) had written that access to the Temple was still permitted to those wishing to offer up sacrifices—that is, Jews from outside Jerusalem—but ἀλλόφυλος unequivocally signifies a non-Jew (A.J. 4.183).

30 Price, Jerusalem under Siege, 150: “when Josephus is writing about the brutality of the Jewish rebel factions he is always to be mistrusted, and the first reaction of a skeptical reader is utterly to reject the disgusting method of torture Josephus describes in the second famine notice (B.J. 5.433–435).” Price considers the possibility that this torture was an invention by Josephus, but does not ask himself what might have been the reason for such invention, concluding that “judgement must be suspended.”
The scene of the outrages they perpetrated was Jerusalem, when the Galilee campaign was by now concluded and only a handful of fortresses still resisted (B.J. 4.550–551). Josephus writes as follows: "With an insatiable lust for loot, they ransacked the houses of the wealthy; the murder of men and the violation of the women were their sport; they caroused on their spoils, with blood to wash them down, and from mere satiety unscrupulously indulged in effeminate practices, plaiting their hair and attiring themselves in women's apparel, drenching themselves with perfumes and painting their eyelids to enhance their beauty. And not only did they imitate the dress, but also the passions of women, devising in their excess of lasciviousness unlawful pleasures and wallowing as in a brothel in the city, which they polluted from end to end with their foul deeds" (B.J. 4.560–562).

This alleged orgy within the walls of Jerusalem is just as unrealistic as the deluge of blood that "poured down the slopes" at Gamala (B.J. 4.72). That it is a figment of Josephus's imagination becomes obvious if we compare it against a genuine atrocity which occurred in the Roman camp, and which Josephus actually witnessed: "For one of the refugees in the Syrian ranks was discovered picking gold coins from his excrements; these pieces, as we have said (B.J. 5.421), they had swallowed before their departure, because they were all searched by the rebels and gold was so abundant in the town that they could purchase for twelve Attic drachmas coin formerly worth five-and-twenty. This artifice being, however, detected in one instance, a rumor ran through the camps that the deserters had come full of gold, whereupon the Arab rabble with the Syrians proceeded to cut open the suppliants and search their intestines. No more cruel calamity, in my opinion, befell the Jews than this: actually in one night no less than two thousand were ripped up" (B.J. 5.550–552). It was easy to swallow the gold coins minted at the time of Nero because of their very small size.

J. S. McLaren writes that "Josephus' picture should be regarded as an account, rather than the account from which to construct an interpretation of the first century C.E."31 The observation is indubitably correct and, I would say, especially so when addressing the problem of the authenticity of Josephus's account of the actions of

---

men whom he describes, with an insistence that should alert the reader, as \( \lambda \eta \sigma \tau \alpha \iota \), "bandits." Brunt espouses Josephus' thesis by affirming that "brigands andsicarii are the scum of the earth";\(^{32}\) while Baer takes an entirely opposite view by writing that the episodes of cruelty, hatred and ferocity which according to Josephus' narrative occurred during the siege must be dismissed as his own tendentious inventions—although Baer does not inquire as to the reason why Josephus thought those inventions necessary.\(^{33}\) Josephus' credibility has been almost universally questioned.\(^{34}\) Nevertheless, an important observation is in order here. Historians tend in general to believe that a fact narrated in the sources, however unlikely it seems, may still contain a "kernel" of truth. In the already-cited contribution by M. Smith to the third volume of the Cambridge History of Judaism—where neither Josephus nor the historians who dealt with his works are spared penetrating criticism—the author credits the homosexual orgy of John's followers (\( B.J. \ 4.558-563 \)) with a possible historical basis: "John's Galileans were mostly refugees from Tyrian towns (\( B.J. \ 2.88 \))—as boys they may have had the benefits of some contact with Greek culture,"\(^{35}\) thus failing to perceive the purpose served by the crudity of Josephus' description: to depict John's followers as men who had sunk to the profoundest depths of depravity.

6. To return to the situation within the city, certain information furnished by Josephus suggests that it was similar to that of other cities under siege. Firstly, it should be noted that coins (dated year V) were struck even in 70, albeit in smaller amounts than in previous years.\(^{36}\) Consider also the notable technical skill shown by the besieged. When the Romans had constructed massive earthworks (assembled from tree trunks) behind the Antonia fortress, the Jews dug a tunnel.

---

36 Meshorer, Ancient Jewish Coinage, 2:123: "The fifth year of the war actually lasted for only four months . . . Surprisingly these issues are not among the most rare in Jewish coinage."
under the fortress, set fire to the earthworks and destroyed them, so that “the Romans were in consternation at this sudden catastrophe and dispirited by the enemy’s ingenuity” (B.J. 5.469–472).37

In B.J. 5.518, Josephus writes that “the latter [the rebels] at the outset ordered the bodies to be buried at the public expense, finding the stench intolerable; afterwards, when incapable of continuing this, they flung them from the ramparts into ravines.” There must consequently have been persons given the task of burying the bodies, and who were paid with public money.

Even more important testimony of the relative “normality” of life in the besieged city is provided by the report (B.J. 6.94–95) that the perpetual sacrifice of two lambs burnt as holocausts, one in the morning and one in the evening,38 only ceased when Titus, having demolished the Antonia fortress (B.J. 6.93), began preparations for his assault on the Temple. However, the context in which this report is made raises doubts as to its authenticity. On Josephus’ account, immediately after the Antonia had been razed to the ground, Titus “having learnt that on that day—it was the seventeenth of Panemus [mid-July]—the so-called continual sacrifice had for lack of men ceased to be offered to God and that the people were in consequence terribly despondent” (B.J. 6.94), instructed Josephus to take to John of Gischala a proposal, that had already been made previously (B.J. 5.334), “that if he was obsessed by a criminal passion for battle, he was at liberty to come out with as many as he chose and fight, without involving the city and the sanctuary in his own ruin; but that he should no longer pollute the Holy Place nor sin against God; and that he had his permission to perform the interrupted sacrifices with the help of such Jews as he might select” (B.J. 6.95).

Besides the absurdity of the proposal of an open field battle, this is the same Titus who, according to Josephus, did not wish the Temple to be destroyed, and who in this report is even anxious that worship might proceed undisturbed. Josephus has thus carefully and cleverly constructed a fictitious figure that must now be considered with attention, for it in fact constitutes the keystone to the entire work.

37 Price, Jerusalem under Siege, 143. The episode is confirmed by Cassius Dio 65.4.4.
38 Tamid (sc. qorbân), not “continuous” or “perpetual”, but “with regular occurrence” (daily). Exod 29:38–42; Num 28:3–8; m. Ta’an. 4:6: “on the seventeenth of Tammuz... the daily offering ceased”.
7. According to Suetonius, Titus was a good soldier (Suetonius, "Tit. 4.3; 5.2) and an able commander. Having served in Germany and Britain (Suetonius, "Tit. 4.1), he had played an important part in the Galilee campaign as commander of the 15th Legion (Apollinaris) (B.J. 3.8 and 65). Josephus depicts him as a hero assisted by the divinity. "For lead I will," proclaimed Titus before Tarichaeae, "be sure of it, and will charge the enemy at your head. Do you then not fail me, have confidence that God is on my side and supports my ardour" (B.J. 3.484). Finding himself almost alone in the fray, "he should consider what he owed to fortune, and not act the part of a common soldier, lord as he was alike of the war and of the world" (B.J. 5.88).

Once Titus had laid siege to Jerusalem, according to Josephus, his over-riding concern was to save the city and the Temple: "For his paramount object was to preserve the city for himself and the temple for the city" (B.J. 5.334). After the fall of the second wall, in a speech urging the rebels to surrender which he had Josephus pronounce to them in their own tongue, Titus announced that "the Romans, though without a share in them, yet reverenced the holy places (lit. things) of their enemies" (B.J. 5.363). After the Antonia fortress had been razed to the ground, when yet again urging the besieged Jews to surrender through his spokesman Josephus, Titus proclaimed: "I will preserve the Temple for you, even against your will" (B.J. 6.128). And these sentiments of outright devotion to the Temple ("which even Romans reverenced from afar," ὅν καὶ Ἡρωμαῖοι πόρφρωθεν προσεκύνουν, said Josephus in his speech to the besieged, B.J. 5.402) were shared by the entire Roman army, given that "of the soldiers, indeed, there was not one who did not regard the Temple with awe and reverence and pray that the brigands might relent ere it met with irretrievable calamity" (τὸν μὲν γε στρατιωτῶν οὐκ ἐστὶν ὀστὶς οὐ μετὰ φρίκης εἰς τὸν ναὸν ἀφεώρα

---


40 G. M. Paul, "The Presentation of Titus in the *Jewish War* of Josephus: Two Aspects," *Phoenix* 47 (1993): 56–66. He was able to reverse an unfavourable military situation (B.J. 5.81–84); for Titus the springs flowed copiously while they dried up for his adversaries, as Josephus declared in his speech to the latter (B.J. 5.409–410). Z. Yavetz, "Reflections on Titus and Josephus," *GRBS* 16 (1973): 411–32, maintains that Titus had need of a flattering portrayal because of rumors about the death of his father.
Consequently, it was entirely natural that, when Titus held his council of war to draw up the final plan of attack (B.J. 6.236–243), contrary to the opinion of those who maintained that the law of war should be enforced with regard to the Temple (B.J. 6.239), and of those who argued “that if the Jews abandoned it and placed no weapons whatever upon it, it should be saved, but that if they mounted it for purposes of warfare, it should be burnt” (B.J. 6.240), Titus declared that “even were the Jews to mount it and fight therefrom, he would not wreak vengeance on inanimate objects instead of men, nor under any circumstances burn down so magnificent a work; for the loss would affect the Roman, inasmuch as it would be an ornament to the empire if it stood” (B.J. 6.241).

The next day (10th of Lōos: end of August), the besieged fighters sallied forth. They were about to overwhelm the Roman detachment when they were put to flight by Titus’s intervention and confined to the inner court of the Temple (B.J. 6.248).

Titus withdrew to the Antonia fortress (Josephus seems to have forgotten that it had been razed to the ground: B.J. 6.93) and made preparations for the next day’s attack against the Temple complex. At this point, Josephus indulge in the following reflection: “that building, however, God, indeed long since, had sentenced to the flames; but now in the revolution of the years had arrived the fatal day” (B.J. 6.250). Then, resuming his narrative, he states that the flames “owed their origin and cause to God’s own people” (ἐκ τῶν οἰκείων). After Titus had withdrawn, the rebels mounted a further attack and a clash ensued between the guards of the sanctuary and the Roman soldiers endeavouring to put out the flames. At that moment, one of the soldiers (a legionary: στρατιώτης see B.J. 5.290; 554 etc.), without waiting for the order to be given (the assault was planned for the next day, B.J. 6.249) and without fear of the consequences (his action contravened orders expressly issued by Titus), “moved by some supernatural impulse,” δαμονίῳ ὄρμη τιν χρόμενος, seized a brand and, hoisted by a comrade, threw it through one of the gilded windows of the chambers flanking the sanctuary on the northern side (B.J. 6.252).

The Jews present raised cries of anguish but did not intervene, while Titus, then resting in his tent, when told of the fire hurried to the Temple “to arrest the conflagration” (B.J. 6.254) followed by
the commanders of his legions and soldiers. "Caesar, both by voice and hand, signalled to the combatants to extinguish the fire; but they neither heard his shouts, drowned in the louder din which filled their ears, nor heeded his beckoning hand, distracted as they were by the fight or their fury" (B.J. 6.256). "As they drew nearer to the sanctuary they pretended not even to hear Caesar's orders and shouted to those in front of them to throw in the firebrands" (B.J. 6.258).

Unable to control the frenzy of his soldiers, whilst the flames spread ever more rapidly, Titus entered the building and beheld the sanctuary and the things contained within it, which far exceeded their fame. He assumed that the central body of the structure could still be saved—because only the external chambers were burning (B.J. 6.261)—and endeavoured to force his soldiers to extinguish the flames, ordering the centurion Liberalius to beat with clubs any of them who disobeyed. However, the soldiers' obedience to Titus and their fear of the centurion were overcome by their rage, their hatred of the Jews, and their lust for booty (B.J. 6.262–265).

One of the soldiers who had penetrated the interior of the Temple while Titus sought to restrain the others "thrust a firebrand in the darkness into the hinges of the gate" (B.J. 6.266). When the flames flared in the interior of the building, Titus realized that nothing more could be done and withdrew. "Thus, against Caesar's wishes, was the temple set on fire" (ὁ μὲν οὖν νοὸς ὅτως ἄκοντος Καίσαρος ἐμπίπτεραι B.J. 6.266).

This description, so precise and rich in detail, and which undoubtedly—although it is not explicitly stated—claims to be an eye-witness account (and is repeated word for word by Schürer),41 is a fabrication from beginning to end. Let us see why.

1. No one would reasonably believe that the role of protector of the Temple and of Jewish worship (B.J. 6.94) attributed by Josephus to Titus corresponded to reality. Suffice it to consider that, among the holy objects carried in joint triumph by Titus and Vespasian was, according to Josephus, a scroll of the Law of the Jews, "last of all the spoils" (B.J. 7.150), which was not placed like the others in the Temple of Peace but, together with the purple hangings of the sanctuary, kept in the palace (B.J. 7.162).

---

41 Schürer, Geschichte 1:630–31; History, 1:506.
2. According to Cassius Dio (66.6.2), the Roman soldiers held back from entering the interior of the Temple “because of their superstition”, and Titus forced them to enter. He did not, as Josephus says, restrain them: “Nevertheless, the soldiers, because of their superstition did not immediately rush in, but at last, under compulsion from Titus, they made their way inside” (Cary, LCL).

3. A passage in Sulpicius Severus’s *Chronica* (2.30.6)—for which the source was Tacitus or, according to Jacob Bernays, Antonius Julianus (the text mentioned earlier)—states that during the council of war which preceded the final assault, Titus was of the opinion that the Temple should be destroyed: “fertur Titus adhibito consilio prius deliberasse, an templum tanti operis euerteret etenim nonnullis uidebatur aedem sacratam ultra omnia mortalia illustrem, non oportere deleri . . . at contra et alii et Titus ipse euertendum in primis temp­lum censebant . . .”.

4. Also Orosius (*Historiarum adversus paganos libri VII*: 7.9.5–6) attributes to Titus the intention of destroying the Temple: Titus long considered whether to burn the Temple or whether to conserve it as testimony to his victory, “sed Ecclesia Dei iam per totum Orben uberrime germinante, hoc tanquam effectum ac vacuum nullique usui bono commodum arbitrio Dei auferendum fuit. Itaque Titus . . . tem­plum in Hierosolymis incendit ac diruit.”

I have already discussed these passages elsewhere and it would not be appropriate to return to them here, where my intention instead is to furnish further proof of the falseness of Josephus’s account—*proof that is forthcoming from his work itself*.

5. If we examine the passage in question, we cannot fail to notice contradictions and incongruities. Josephus says that the flames “owed their origin and cause to Gods own people” (ἐκ τῶν οἶκείων, B.J. 6.251), but he immediately afterwards states that it was a Roman soldier “moved by some supernatural impulse” who threw a brand through the window of one of the chambers flanking the sanctuary (B.J. 6.252). In B.J. 6.265 he writes that one of the soldiers, who had penetrated to the interior of the Temple, “thrust a firebrand in the darkness, into the hinges of the gate”: apart from any other consideration (what exactly is meant by “thrust a firebrand . . . into the

---

hinges of the gate”?), it is well-known that the inner chambers of the Temple were divided not by doors, but by curtains.

6. If we believe Josephus’ version, we must also believe that the fire destroyed the ritual objects kept in the hekhal: the seven-branched candlestick, the table for the bread of proposition, and the altar of perfumes already described by Josephus (B.J. 5.215). These were still in their places when Titus entered the Temple before it caught fire and “beheld the holy place and the sanctuary and all that it contained—things far exceeding the reports current among foreigners and not inferior to their proud reputation among ourselves” (B.J. 6.260).

Josephus writes later that, before the assault on the upper city (and therefore when the Temple had already been destroyed), one of the priests, whose life had been spared, handed to Titus, “from the wall of the sanctuary”, “two lampstands similar to those deposited in the sanctuary, along with tables, bowls, and platters, all of solid gold and very massive” (B.J. 6.388).43

This episode, however, is only a clumsy attempt by Josephus to justify the Romans’ possession of objects that should have been utterly destroyed according to his version of the facts before he wrote the seventh book, in which he describes the triumph of Vespasian and Titus.

However, he does not identify the objects handed to Titus by the priest with those contained in the hekhal but he does include among them the hangings of the Temple (B.J. 6.389). Now in this regard, as I have said, in the seventh book (B.J. 7.161–162) he states that the vessels of the Temple were deposited in the Temple of Peace (dedicated to Vespasian in 75), “but their Law and the purple hangings (καταπετάσματα) of the sanctuary he ordered to be deposited and kept in the palace”. The Temple hangings described by Josephus were two in number: one of them adorned the external door of the ‘ulam (B.J. 5.212) while the other divided the hekhal from the debir (B.J. 5.215). They were of considerable size (circa 25 metres × 10 metres), and it is impossible that the priest could have had them removed when all the objects contained in the temple were still in their places.44

43 Price, Jerusalem under Siege, 74 considers the report to be reliable: “It was at this time that various valuable objects from the Temple were handed over to the Romans by a priest, Jesus ben Thebuthi and the Temple treasurer Pinhas (B.J. 6.387 ff.).”

44 On the hangings of the Temple see H. L. Strack and P. Billerbeck, Kommentar
Moreover, when describing the triumph of Vespasian and Titus, Josephus writes that “the spoils in general were borne in promiscuous heaps; but conspicuous above all stood out those captured in the Temple of Jerusalem. These consisted in a golden table, many talents in weight, and a lampstand, likewise made of gold, but constructed on a different pattern from those which we use in ordinary life” (B.J. 7.148), which can still be seen depicted on the interior of the Arch of Titus.

These sentences demonstrate irrefutably that the destruction of the Temple came about in a manner entirely different from Josephus’ description of it: the Temple was first looted and then set on fire, as evinced by the detail that the hangings had escaped the flames.

8. Why did Josephus describe the destruction of the Temple in this manner? Above all, for whom did he describe it thus? Certainly not for the Romans, who had all the documentation that they might require, and who certainly had very little interest in the fate of a city situated on the periphery of the empire, or for that matter in the fate of its Temple, the spiritual centre of a people, the Jews, for whom they had scant sympathy. The account was written for the Jews of the Diaspora, the purpose being to explain to them how and why the Temple of Jerusalem had been destroyed.

There is no doubt that Josephus wanted to exonerate Titus from responsibility for the crime. He fails to do so, however, because a passage in the Talmud (b. Gittin 56b) informs us that before Titus destroyed the Temple he profaned it by unrolling a scroll of the Torah in the holy of holies and possessing a prostitute upon it. Aside from the crudity of the image, this legend comes closer to the historical truth than Josephus’s description.

However, Josephus does exculpate Titus by showing his impotence at
preventing the destruction of the Temple. This is the striking feature of the passage if we wish to treat it, not pejoratively as a fiction, but positively as a message sent to his co-religionists. He who at that moment and in that place was the most powerful man in the world was unable to halt the destructive frenzy of soldiers who first pretended not to hear his commands and then openly ignored them. The action of those soldiers, like that of the man who started the fire, was evidently controlled by a higher force against which Titus was utterly impotent. In other words, God himself (and not Titus) had destroyed the Temple of Jerusalem.

For what reason, however, did the Deity destroy his sanctuary? It was to answer this question that Josephus constructed the ideological framework of his book and wrote pages laden with horrors and sacrileges which were entirely the fruit of his imagination.

Josephus wanted to persuade the Jews of the Diaspora who read his book that the destruction of the Temple could not have been avoided, and that, therefore—to spell out the concrete and practical implications of his work—it should not be avenged. In other words, Josephus feared—and his fear subsequently proved fully justified—that the Jews might once again rise up against the Romans and suffer further tragedies (as in fact they did).

To this end, as I have said, he took great pains to conceal every religious implication of the revolt: he always and only referred to those who had fought against the Romans as "bandits"; he described, in a succession of shocking images, the wickedness that they perpetrated, wickedness that almost invariably took the form of sacrilege. Josephus depicted the sacrificial area of the Temple as heaped with bodies trampled underfoot, and as covered with a lake of blood, not because he relished the horror of the scene, but because he wanted the Jewish reader to believe that the Temple was by now irretrievably profaned and the Deity had definitively abandoned it. "My

47 The phenomenon of propheticism must have been very widespread in the period prior to the siege. Josephus recounts the story of Jesus son of Ananias (B.J. 6.300–309), but in B.J. 6.286–287 he states that "numerous prophets, indeed, were at this period suborned by the tyrants to delude the people, by bidding them await help from God, in order that desertions might be checked and that those who were above fear and precaution might be encouraged by hope". See P. W. Barnett, "The Jewish Sign Prophets A.D. 66–70. Their Interpretations and Origin," NTS 27 (1981): 679–97; R. Gray, Prophetic Figures in the Later Second Temple Palestine. The Evidence from Josephus (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993).
belief, therefore, is that the Deity (τὸ θεῖον) has fled from the holy places and taken His stand on the side of those with whom you are now at war” (*B. J.* 5.412), he says in his allocution to the besieged. According to the last of the prodigies (which Josephus lists for his Roman readers) that occurred in Jerusalem before the Temple’s destruction, on the day of Pentecost (*Shabuot*) “the priests on entering the inner court of the temple by night, as was their custom in the discharge of their ministrations, reported that they were conscious, first of a commotion and a din, and after, that of a voice as of a host, ‘We are departing hence’” (*B. J.* 6.299). Josephus’ source was indubitably Roman, and those who abandoned the Temple were therefore several divinities—a detail which his Jewish readers must have found somewhat odd.\(^48\)

Josephus also talks of a prophecy which the rebels and their behaviour had now fulfilled. “Who knows not the records of the ancient prophets and that oracle which threatens this poor city and is even now coming true? For they foretold that it would then be taken whenever one should begin to slaughter his own countrymen. And is not the city, aye and the whole temple, filled with your corpses? God it is then, God Himself who with the Romans is bringing the fire to purge His temple and exterminating a city so laden with pollutions” (*B. J.* 6.109–110).\(^49\)

Josephus is therefore saying to his co-religionists that even though the Romans were superior in the art of war, and even though Fortune was always on their side, it was not for these reasons that the Romans
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\(^{48}\)This prodigy is also described by Tacitus, *Hist* 5.13.1. The two authors must have been in contact in this instance. The problem has been discussed by O. Weinreich, *Religionsgeschichtliche Studien* (Darmstadt: Wissensch. Buchgesellschaft, 1968), 109–17 (originally published in 1929). According to Weinreich, Tacitus did not draw on Josephus, but both of them relied on a common source which Weinreich does not identify, but which, as Weber also believed, was probably Antonius Julianus. The last prodigy (*B. J.* 6.299–300) seems to have been (as Weber believed) an *evocatio deorum* reworked by Josephus in Jewish terms on the basis of his conception of the abandonment of the Temple by the Deity (Hos 5:15; Ezek 9:3; 11:23; Zech 11:1). This is amply documented in rabbinic literature: *Deut. Rab* 1:17; *b. Rosh Haš.* 31a; *b. Toma* 39b. See the commentary on the passage of Tacitus by M. Stern in *GLAJJ* 2:60–62. On the *evocatio deorum* (Plin. *Nat.* 28.18 “evocari deum, cuius in tutela id oppidum esset, promittique illi eundem aut ampliorem apud Romanos cultum”): *Liv.* 5.21.3–7; *Plut.* *Quaest. rom.* 61; *Servius*, *Aen.* 2.351.

\(^{49}\)Thackeray (LCL *ad. loc.*) thinks that Josephus might be referring to *Sib. Or.* 4.102–151, but the passage is certainly later than he believes (ca. 80) because 130–137 contains a reference to the eruption of Vesuvius in 79. See Parente, “Trasmissione,” 37 n. 55.
had prevailed, and it was not for these reasons that they had set fire to the Temple, for Titus had tried to save the Temple but in vain. Consequently, Titus’s impotence was not proof that the Deity was “allied” with the Romans; rather, it was proof that, just as the Babylonians that had destroyed the first temple, so the Romans were “servants” and instruments of the Deity.

However, Josephus’ Jewish readers were not convinced by his explanation that internecine struggles had profaned the Temple and desecrated it. Nor did they believe that Titus had been powerless to save it; indeed, they held the “wicked” Titus responsible for its desecration and its destruction. But they failed to comprehend what offence Israel had committed to induce Yahweh to destroy his sanctuary.

Those who believed that they knew with certainty what this offence was were the Christians: the Temple had been destroyed because the Jews had killed Christ—though in reality he had been put to death by the Romans with a Roman form of execution. Thus, once again, the Romans were exonerated and the Jews were blamed.51

50 Rabbinic literature contains numerous accounts of the legends concerning the profanation of the Temple by Titus and his death as a consequence of his ierousaλία which, despite their numerous versions, seem to derive from a single source. In b. Gittin 56b, Titus, after he had possessed a prostitute on a scroll of the law, ripped a Temple hanging with his sword. Whereupon blood spurted from the hanging so that Titus believed that he had killed the Deity himself. In Lev. Rab. 22:3, there are two prostitutes, and the blood spurting from the hanging is interpreted as the blood of sacrifices. In Abot de Rabbi Natan (B) 20, Titus slashes the hanging, takes the prostitute in to the Holy of Holies and challenges the Deity: “This is the one who you say slaughtered Sisera and Sennacherib. Here I am in his house and in his domain. If he has any power, let him come out and face me” (transl. Saldarini). Titus’s death was caused by a gnat which crawled up his nose and lodged in his brain, where it grew until it reached the size of a pigeon. According to Lev. Rab. 22:2, this signifies that even something which in nature seems entirely insignificant is part of a providential scheme of things (with reference to Qoh 5:8). See L. Ginzberg, The Legends of the Jews (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1925), 5:60 n. 191.

OF AUDIENCE AND MEANING:
READING JOSEPHUS' *BELLUM JUDAICUM* IN THE
CONTEXT OF A FLAVIAN AUDIENCE
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Victor Tcherikover's 1956 essay, "Jewish Apologetic Literature Reconsidered,"1 showed that Alexandrian-Jewish literature, which had hitherto been considered apologetic, polemical, and missionary work aimed at an undifferentiated gentile audience, must in fact have been directed—almost entirely—at the Jews of Alexandria. Having established this point, Tcherikover called for a reappraisal of this literature in its concrete historical environment, in light of Egyptian papyri, ostraca, and inscriptions. Understanding a text's audience, he realized, makes all the difference to interpretation: "If our opinion is right and every literary work reflects the ideas of a certain group of people [i.e., the author and first audience], then we have to know exactly where this group lived, when this work was written and under what historical conditions it was conceived."2 Audience matters.

In the study of Josephus, questions of audience have not usually been considered crucial for interpretation. Then again, interpretation itself has not been a priority: we have until recently lacked even elementary attempts at sketching the structures, themes, and characteristic language of Josephus' major works.3 The meaning of the text has most often been located rather in the interplay between our author and his sources: because he altered the Bible (or Nicolaus, etc.) in manner X, he must have meant or thought Y.4 Although Josephus' use
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2 Tcherikover, "Jewish Apologetic Literature," 186.
of sources is an indispensable avenue of inquiry, and may reveal to scholars something of his interests as an author, it leaves unsettled whether any particular audience would have been able to follow this use of sources: the question of what he wished to communicate. Josephus’ audience may have been recognized by scholars as an introductory issue for the right sort of textbook, but since few if any studies of Josephus count as textbooks, audience questions have mostly been treated piecemeal and vaguely.

One surprisingly durable view holds that Josephus wrote the *War* as Roman propaganda, whether on the basis of a comprehensive Roman source or translating an Aramaic version intended for the Parthian empire (cf. *B.J.* 1.3, 6). The *Antiquities* and later works were, according to this view, instruments of repentance or at least opportunistic rehabilitation, directed at “Roman authorities” to win support for a putative new rabinic leadership at Yavneh, or perhaps at the Yavnean rabbis themselves. Scholars who have found such a radical disjunction in Josephus’ literary career unpersuasive have usually adopted the diplomatic solution that he wrote for everyone: Romans and Greeks and Jews. But where and how he should have reached these vaguely conceived parties remains unclear. Finally, in keeping with Tcherikover’s question about Alexandrian-Judean literature—“What interest, indeed, could a Greek reader have for the practical prescriptions of Judaism?”—some scholars have insisted that only
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other Judeans could have been much interested in, or able to comprehend, the writings of this displaced compatriot, no matter what Josephus said about his expected audience.\footnote{E. Migliario, “Per l’interpretazione dell’Autobiografia di Flavio Giuseppe,” Athenaum 59 (1981): 92, 96, 136; T. Rajak Josephus: the Historian and his Society (London: Duckworth, 1983), 178 (the Jewish Diaspora was Josephus’ primary audience).}

Underlying my argument in this essay is the proposition that Josephus’ audience matters for interpretation. Thus I agree with Tcherikover, not only in his particular conclusions about Alexandrian-Judean literature, but more importantly in his (largely neglected) method and argument. Tcherikover regarded a couple of Philo’s works (the \textit{Legatio} and \textit{Flaccus}) as exceptions to his general position, for they seemed obviously targeted at Roman officials; he also thought that Josephus’ later works were written for gentiles,\footnote{Tcherikover, “Jewish Apologetic Literature,” 183.} though he left the \textit{War} unmentioned. But if we apply the same sort of historical logic to Josephus’ \textit{War}, written in Rome, that Tcherikover used for Alexandrian-Judean literature, we should conclude that Josephus wrote in the first instance—without precluding secondary and tertiary readerships—for sympathetic or at least tractable audiences in his adopted home city of Rome, who shared with him an elite education and world of discourse. These groups included some fellow-Judeans ('\textit{Ιουδαῖοι}') in Rome (\textit{C. Ap.} 1.51), though he wrote with special concern for Greeks and Romans in the capital.

Although it would be ideal to spell out some consequences of this conclusion for understanding Josephus’ \textit{War}, lack of space precludes that kind of exploration here. The interested reader may wish to consult two other essays of mine on those questions.\footnote{S. Mason, “Flavius Josephus in Flavian Rome: Reading on and Between the Lines,” in \textit{Flavian Rome: Culture, Image, Text} (ed. A. J. Boyle and W. J. Dominik; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 559–89 (chiefly on the \textit{Antiquities}, though with some attention to the \textit{War}); “Figured Speech and Irony in T. Flavius Josephus,” in \textit{Flavius Josephus and Flavian Rome} (ed. J. Edmondson, S. Mason, and J. Rives; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 243–88 (focused on the \textit{War} and \textit{Life}).} In the present study I attempt, with sharper focus than I have been able to indulge elsewhere, to explore the nature of Josephus’ expected audience; in the conclusion I shall merely suggest some of the consequences explored in the other essays, to which this one is logically preparatory.
1. AUDIENCE MATTERS FOR INTERPRETING COMMUNICATIVE TEXTS

Because interpretation of Josephus has usually ignored or abstracted the question of audience, it seems necessary to begin by establishing the otherwise trite premise that audience does matter for understanding a work's aims. The point seems straightforwardly provable. If an ancient author writes to communicate, and not merely for personal satisfaction, then he writes to communicate with someone. It follows that in composing his work he must take into account the existing knowledge base of the intended recipients (e.g., linguistic, historical, geographical) as well as their interests, values, and attitudes. A text is not self-interpreting: it has no independent meaning. It is rather a medium or "middle term" between two parties, a set of codes left by an author for a skilled readership or—with other sensory cues added—an audience to decipher. For example, a page of Aristophanes is completely unintelligible to those without knowledge of the script; someone else might be able to identify the characters as Greek without being able to read them; another person might have the ability to read them syntactically but without grasping the referential sense; yet another might make decent sense of them but, lacking appropriate historical knowledge, miss elements of wit or nuance that an interpreter with such contextual knowledge would notice. Any set of written codes requires such interpretation, and anyone who sets out to communicate verbally has no choice but to bear in mind the abilities of the expected decoders.

This does not imply that communication is ever perfect, or even that an author/speaker intends it to be so: we have all used phrases, images, or allusions because they are particularly satisfying to us,
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12 The reticence about "aim-" or "intention-" language that one often meets in classical, biblical, and humanistic scholarship represents, as far as I can see, a misapplication of W. K. Wimsatt's "intentional fallacy" (of 1946 vintage), developed in relation to bellettristic literature, especially poetry, and by no means uncontested even there: see T. Eagleton, Literary Theory: an Introduction (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996), 38–46. Eagleton aptly observes (p. 44): "Most literary theories, in fact, unconsciously 'foreground' a particular literary genre, and derive their general pronouncements from this." Since the author of the War declares intentions (1.1–30) and writes a narrative that fulfills them, I see no problem in discussing the book's aims, or indeed Josephus' aims by implication, as long as we bear in mind that our accounts can never be exhaustive and that the man Josephus behind the work remains unknown in most respects.
whether or not our audience ever detected the significance for us. (If they do, it is a bonus.) Still, as long as we aim chiefly to communicate, we can do so only with an assessment of our audience’s knowledge and sympathies.

For this paper, I mainly assume that Josephus wished to communicate. The question becomes, then: *With whom?*

Let us begin with basics. The fact that he wrote the extant *War* in Greek requires that he composed for people who could understand this language. More than that, however, he wrote a particular kind of Greek, different in pitch, tone, diction, and syntactic sophistication from the language of Jewish Greek compositions of the preceding centuries, from such contemporary texts as the New Testament’s *Mark*, *John*, or *Luke-Acts*, or from Chariton’s *Chaereas and Callirhoe*. Josephus’ writing is much closer to that of contemporary and later statesmen-teachers: Plutarch, Dio Chrysostom, Aristides, and Lucian. Like them, he shows himself keenly sensitive to questions of style (*B.J.* 1.13; 7.455; see further below). The *War’s* opening sentence comprises 264 words (on Niese’s punctuation), half a dozen μέν . . . δὲ constructions along with other binary contrasts, and a number of rare words or formations. The work as a whole scrupulously avoids the clashing of vowels (“hiatus”), à la mode, and particularly in the opening and closing sections favors old-fashioned Attic spelling.

These traits do not bespeak an easy capitulation to fashion, for they required sustained artistic effort, especially from someone for whom Greek was a second language. As critics have long observed, however, the *War* is in fact a fine specimen of the developing Atticistic Greek so popular among the Greek revivalists of Josephus’ time. Surprisingly, it contains the first attestation of many words and phrases that would become popular in the authors named above, members of the “Second Sophistic.”
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13 Rare words: àνυχήματα, 1.12; ἐπηρεάζω, 1.13; προιστορέω, 1.15; ἀρχαιολογέω, 1.17; διεξαδικός, comparative of προγενής at 1.18. Unusual formations (not used again in Josephus, for example: the neuter substantives τὸ νεωτερίζον in 1.4, τὸ Κελτικόν in 1.5, τὰ στρατιωτικά, 1.5; τὸ ληστρικόν in 1.11.

14 Thackeray, *Josephus*, 104.

15 I refer the reader to my introduction to the *Bellum* in BJP vol. 1a, *The Judean War 1–2* (Leiden: Brill, [forthcoming]).
The War contains arguably the richest surviving example of the Greek historical prologue (B.J. 1.1–30), and the narrative is conspicuously sensitive to the prescriptions of rhetorical training: variation in scene and diction, speeches and other major digressions, colorful battle accounts. It is replete with evocations of Greek epic and tragedy.

Given that Josephus will not maintain the War's literary standards in his later compositions, falling into what seems his unaided natural voice by A.J. 20–Life, one must ask why he went to all this trouble in his definitive work, during his first decade in the capital. It would be bizarre to imagine him doing so for mere self-gratification, or if he wrote for audiences who did not care about such things. It seems impossible to avoid the conclusion that he expected an audience who would appreciate or even require these touches.

In modern scholarship, classicists have shown a more determined interest in the concrete conditions of publication, in the situations of authors and audiences from Aristophanes to Virgil to Dionysius to Pliny the Younger, than have their counterparts in biblical, post-biblical/inter-testamental, and New Testament literatures—the other principal constituencies for the study of Josephus. This may be because, with the notable exception of the apostle Paul (NB: the vast library of scholarship on his letters deals very much with contexts
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19 Josephus’ last work, however (the Apion), returns to a highly polished rhetorical style.

and audiences), the authors and provenances of biblical, post-biblical, and early Christian texts are usually difficult or impossible to know. From that side of the scholarly world, one might object that the study of ancient texts obviously does not require knowledge of first audiences. But such a position would only make a virtue of necessity. The fact that we lack much evidence for the authorship and context of most biblical and post-biblical literature is lamentable. This lack does not stop critics in those fields from endlessly formulating hypotheses about the audiences of the Deuteronomistic Historian, Wisdom of Solomon, 4 Maccabees, or even Q—proof of the question's importance. Scholars simply lack the supporting material to make compelling cases. In the case of Josephus, however, the situation is much more akin to that of most classical authors: we know his name, rough dates, career outline, and place of writing. We also have a decent picture from various sources of the general environment in Flavian Rome, and Josephus' writings contain significant references to conditions and even a few persons in that environment. To neglect the fundamental question of his expected audience would therefore be irresponsible.

Before moving to the particular evidence for Josephus' audience, I pause to elucidate one further point. My working hypothesis is that Josephus wrote to communicate, but there are many levels and kinds of communication. For the sake of simplicity, I suggest that verbal communication (on one plane at least) ranges between the poles of the obvious or basic conveyance of meaning and subtle, figured, or partially hidden modes. On the plain-sense extreme, we simply try to get across an unambiguous message—as when visiting a foreign country, when our ability to use the codes and our knowledge of audience are severely limited—without causing either mirth or ambiguity. In such contexts there is little room for irony, humor, sarcasm, or other higher dimensions of communication. In these cases one must spell out everything.

Yet in Greek and Roman rhetoric such obvious writing was often considered pedestrian, even demeaning to the audience, who should be left to complete the story for themselves so as to feel respected by
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22 See e.g., Boyle and Dominik, Flavian Rome: Culture, Image, Text.
the author/speaker. So Demetrius (Eloc. 222): "It is a slur on your hearer to tell him everything as though he were a simpleton." One can only write artfully in this way, however—saying things without actually saying them, leaving things for the audience to discover—, when one knows the audience. In the case of Josephus it is especially important to consider this higher level of communication because it was so widely embraced in Flavian Rome, where it could be dangerous to speak frankly. Although we lack the space in this essay to explore Josephus' uses of figured language, it is important to remember these possibilities because they further illustrate the importance of audience for interpretation: it is only when we posit a certain kind of audience knowledge that we can detect such plays.

2. Josephus' Audience in Rome: The Evidence

At least five considerations place it beyond doubt that Josephus wrote his Greek War to communicate with an elite audience in the capital city.

1. In the ancient world, publication was normally a local and social project. The ground on which Tcherikover decisively refuted abstract assumptions about apologetic and missionary purposes in Alexandrian-Judean literature has generally been ignored. Against the then common assumption (he said) that ancient authors reached their audiences much as we reach ours, Tcherikover pointed out crucial differences between ancient and modern publication—or at least the process of making a work public (below). Since all dissemination of literature depended upon copying by hand, it was inevitably a local affair in the first instance. Book production was dependent largely on the
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23 Further on artful modes of discourse: Eloc. 287–98. Cf. Quintilian (Inst. 9.1.14, 2.65) on figured speech: "a hidden meaning, which is left to the hearer to discover."


stature or auctoritas of the author and/or his patron: "the main condition for the distribution of a book within a society was, that the author should be rooted in that society." The Jewish authors had audience/reader groups around them. This recognition by itself obviated implausible notions about the Mediterranean-wide ambitions and reach of Judean literature from Alexandria.

Quite right. But then, Josephus too must have had a local audience in Rome, and written for that audience. To apply Tcherikover's challenge to Josephus' works, one should not conclude that he too wrote for Judeans. One should rather examine all the available evidence concerning his method of writing and publication, considering the ways in which these clues reflect Josephus' context in Rome.

Since Tcherikover's time an array of studies has made the point repeatedly and for various kinds of literature that bringing out a book was a social and local enterprise. It will be most efficient to sketch some salient results of these studies as a point of reference for better understanding Josephus' remarks in the following sections of this essay. I refer the reader to the studies themselves for full documentation.

Publication as we understand it did not exist in antiquity. This may seem obvious, but it needs emphasis because most studies of Josephus appear to assume that seven-volume corpora on rolls, such as his War, could be distributed to any audience he desired. Starr appropriately suggests: "The term 'publish' should not be used because it unavoidably bears a burden of modern implications."

Technology available to us, from the printing press and its digital successors to convenient travel and electronic communication, has spawned the publishing industry. In this environment, we divide book production cleanly into two phases: the preparation of the work, which is our task as authors and is essentially private (the degree to which we involve others is discretionary), and the work's publication, when it goes out to the audience. Conditions created by mass production, editorial and marketing staffs, and modern delivery services dictate
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28 Tcherikover, "Jewish Apologetic Literature," 173.
that while writing, we meet our audiences mainly in our imaginations. We may try to keep them constantly in view, so that the resulting text (or codes) will match their competencies, but it is the publisher’s task to find that imagined audience in reality. We hand over a finished work and the publisher produces hundreds or thousands of copies, using advertising, placement in appropriate sales venues, and mass-mail resources to control the distribution of the work. In principle all such distribution depends on the publishing firm, which monitors usage for any infringement of their corporate ownership (copyright) of the work. Revision of a book, should we desire it, is a large and expensive undertaking—impossible without the publisher’s agreement and further investment. For us, then, book-writing is essentially an impersonal or asocial exercise, which can be initiated anywhere in the world if we have the requisite technology.

In the ancient world, the complete absence of such technology meant that there was no clear line between writing and publication, which is why we probably should abandon the latter term as Starr suggests. Preparing a book was almost inevitably a local and social project. Evidence from a sufficient variety of sources throughout the late republic and early empire (e.g., Cicero, Horace, Martial, Statius, Pliny the Younger, Tacitus, Lucian) creates a consistent picture along the following lines. An author normally composed a work gradually and by constant revision, presenting it in stages to ever-widening concentric circles, moving from closest friends to more remote associates through a combination of oral recitation and distribution of partial drafts. The cycle of oral presentations typically began in the intimate setting of a private residence, perhaps at a dinner party, and moved to rented auditoria as the author gained confidence in the work. The oral dimensions of this entire process, even with written texts, should always be kept in mind. Apart from scribes and other bookish types, people did not often sit down to pore over seven-scroll corpora such as Josephus’, with uncial lines lacking word dividers or much in the way of punctuation. The simple act of reading would itself normally involve a slave reciting stretches of a text to his master. (Letters, poems, and epigrams were another story.) The leisureed

---

classes commonly attended recitals to keep themselves abreast of current work.

This process of writing and testing one’s work was chiefly where the author met his intended audience: in the give and take of presentation and circulation of drafts among trusted acquaintances, receiving challenges from them, and ongoing correction. Salles observes: “The success of a literary work depended equally on the activity of the coteries, the public readings, and the representations of the author to his associates; but in all this, dissemination remained in a ‘closed circuit.’” Some authors apparently rested content with the narrowest circles of such oral/aural exposure. Horace contrasts his practice to that of the frivolous, who allegedly recite anywhere and to anyone (Sat. 1.4.73): “I reserve the reading of my work for my friends alone.” Pliny allows that he begins with his respected friends (whose criticism he still fears), but then recites (recito, lego) and sends (trado) to ever-larger audiences in the quest to perfect his work (Ep. 7.17). He concludes: “I am positive that any work must be revised more than once and read to a number of people if it is intended to give permanent and universal satisfaction” (Ep. 7.17.15; see also 5.12). Here we have to do with cycles of preparation in a social context, at any phase of which an author could simply choose to halt the project. If he did, we could not say that the work was “unpublished,” since it had already reached some levels of the author’s society. Nor, conversely, can we say that completion of the work would imply much wider circulation.

To be sure, there was a natural point of completion for a book in long preparation, at which it might be appropriate to make gift copies to the dedicatee (if there was one) and a small circle of associates. Yet the need for manual reproduction meant that each copy was also in some way a new work; the necessity of correcting each copy was well known. Because finality was not possible in the way it is with printed texts, however, deliberate revision was also relatively easy with each new copy, a condition that precludes our concept of a fixed text. Thus the “finished” copy was no different in principle
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from earlier drafts, except that the author was provisionally more satisfied with it and so may have distributed it with a stronger sense of completion. But further revision was common, and it was a significant concern to authors that an inferior version had a larger circulation than the better one. Any number of subsequent "editions" could be created with successive copies, as a result of further dialogue with the recipients of gift copies. Therefore, no clean division between preparation and publication of a book was possible.

For present purposes, the main consequence of this is that the entire process remained local. Even the further distribution of books after completion occurred mainly among close acquaintances: "The channels of circulation ran from one friend to another, never between strangers... This probably restricted both the number of texts in circulation and the number of people to whom particular texts were accessible." An illustration of the inappropriateness of our assumptions about book production for understanding Josephus' world is furnished by the phenomenon that most closely approximates modern publication: the handing over of the book rolls to others—friends, a library, or even a bookseller. Thus was the work "made public." Paradoxically, however, whereas publication for us is the point at which we begin to reach the audience we envisaged while writing, via our publisher's controlled distribution, for the ancients this handing over (EKDOΣIΣ) of the work to others was the beginning of the author's effective loss of control over audience. Anyone who wished could now have the rolls copied from exemplars, whether from friends' copies or through custom orders from booksellers. Occasionally, to be sure, copies of books made it to far-flung locales as gifts or via booksellers. Such booksellers as there were, however, lacked a distribution system: it seems that they did not transport (much less import) books in bulk but had copies produced on order from exemplars they either owned or could secure. In a world of widespread illiteracy and poverty, where books were passed avidly among friends in elite circles, the book trade seems to have been "merely an ancillary system of circulation

36 Potter, Literary Texts, 29–33.
beside the private channels..." In any case, the authors could have had no say about this added use, and therefore could not have counted on it while writing. Rather, they met their intended audiences while preparing their works.

One aspect of bringing a work to the attention of one's friends and associates, of "publication," deserves closer attention, both because it is furthest from our experience in a text-conditioned world and because of the possible light it throws on Josephus' situation. The custom of hearing texts recited, namely, was confined neither to Rome nor to the more entertaining genres, such as poetry. Recitation was a widespread practice in the Mediterranean and it was used also for historical works. In Rome, the process of disseminating new histories was comparable with practices for other genres because there were no professional historians in the first century: the field was open to anyone who could make a claim to credibility. As Tacitus' *Dialogue on Oratory* (*Dial. 3*) and the so-called progymnasmata (pre-rhetorical handbooks) plainly show, all those with advanced education in rhetoric felt able to compose in any genre: "training in exercises is absolutely useful not only to those who are going to practise rhetoric but also if one wishes to undertake the function of poets or historians or any other writers" (Aelius Theon, *Prog. 70*; cf. 60). Pliny too assumes that histories were being recited alongside tragedy and poetry (*Ep. 7.17.3*). In the Roman period it was widely reported that Herodotus, the father of history a half-millennium earlier, had recited much of his work, which indeed bears many marks of oral performance.40 (Even his younger contemporary Thucydides, the model of dense historical writing, may have recited some of his work.)41 Although it might seem bizarre to moderns that audiences would sit through sessions long enough to cover much historical narrative,42 we should remember that in many parts of the world even today it is common to listen to political speeches of several hours' duration.
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42 To recite Herodotus' narrative would require between one and two 24-hour days (Kurke, "Charting the Poles of History," 119).
In Josephus’ time, Tacitus portrays Maternus (under Vespasian) feverishly rewriting his life of Cato because the previous day’s recitation had generated concern about its potentially dangerous resonances (Dial. 3). It seems likely that figurative references (figurae) in a history by Hermogenes of Tarsus, which prompted Domitian to execute him (Suetonius, Dom. 10.1), were also detected through oral presentation, for this victim is mentioned among others who gave offense to the emperor in their performances (Suetonius, Dom. 10.3–4). Writing in the 160s, Lucian of Samosata frequently observes that he has come to know the histories being composed concerning the recent Parthian campaign by hearing authors in various Greek cities: “So then, I’ll relate to you what I recall hearing certain historians earlier in Ionia—and, by God, in Achaea just recently—relate about this very war” (Hist. conscr. 14). He claims to have walked out early from one such reading, because he could predict the clichéd narrative to follow (Hist. conscr. 15). He sarcastically describes one recital in which the author’s grandiloquent prologue failed to match up to the paltry narrative that followed: “Those who have been listening (οἱ ἄκουόντες) immediately call out to them ‘A mountain was in labour!’” (Hist. conscr. 23). The situation that he describes assumes that the speaker presented a substantial amount: enough for the audience to complain about early expectations unfulfilled.

In sum: making books public in the Roman world was a matter of disseminating the work orally and in draft copies through ever widening circles of friends and associates: it was local and social. It is difficult to imagine how Josephus could have been free of the constraints and conditions of his time.

2. The specific evidence for the publication of Josephus’ War seems indeed to require that he followed the normal practices. This evidence falls into two parts: (a) references in later works to his preparation and dissemination of the War and (b) clues within the prologue about his situation while writing.

(a) Two substantial passages from Josephus’ later works deal with his writing and dissemination of the War: the closing sentences of his digression against Justus of Tiberias in Vita 361–366 and a piece of his digression on Judean (vis-à-vis Greek) historiography in C. Ap. 1.46–56.

In the former place, Josephus asserts that Justus’ patron and employer King Agrippa II had been in frequent contact with himself while he was writing the War.
And the king, Agrippa, wrote sixty-two letters attesting to [my] transmission of the truth. Two of these I have actually appended, in case you insist on knowing from them what was written:

King Agrippa, to dearest Josephus, Greetings! I went through the volume with greatest pleasure, and it really seems to me that with superior care you have precisely described what you have portrayed. Send me the rest also. Be well.

King Agrippa, to dearest Josephus, Greetings! From what you have written, you look as though you need no instruction—[we can read you] instead of our learning everything from the start. Whenever you next meet me, I myself will inform you of many things that are not [widely] known. (Vita 364–366)

Two points emerge here with some clarity—even if Josephus invented the letters or exaggerated the contact, since he is presumably evolving a plausible scenario. First, Josephus circulated pieces of the War to others, including Agrippa, while he was writing (“Send me the rest also. . . .”; “I myself will inform you”), not merely on completion. Notice the single “volume” (ἡ βιβλιον) in Agrippa’s comment. Second, this exchange involved at least some personal contact (“Whenever you next meet me. . . .”). If these letters are indeed exemplary of the rest, they reveal their limited function. Josephus and Agrippa were close enough geographically that they could exchange such notes easily (presumably at least 124, counting both directions). But the notes themselves were brief and pointed; serious discussion was reserved for face-to-face encounters, which must therefore also have occurred easily enough. Although Agrippa wants to impart more information to Josephus, he is content to leave the matter until whenever (ὅταν) they should next meet. No travel plans need to be discussed.

In C. Ap. 1.46–49, Josephus describes his process of carefully gathering information during and after the war, and then speaks of his period of composition in Rome (notice incidentally the complete lack of reference to an Aramaic precursor): “Then, taking advantage of leisure in Rome, with all the work [προγματεία: argument? material?] now ready and at my disposal, and after I had consulted [or: arranged, furnished, engaged] certain collaborators for the Greek sound, thus I accomplished the transmission of the events” (C. Ap. 1.50). In Josephus’ enlistment of co-workers (συνέργοι) or literary friends in the capital for this massive project, we again witness a

---

43 There is no reason to imagine Thackeray’s “literary assistants” or slaves (Josephus, 105) here; see Rajak, Josephus, 63.
social affair and not the work of an isolated individual. Another point raised by this notice concerns Josephus' ability in Greek, since the collaborators helped particularly with the Greek sound (or possibly "language": φωνή), a question to which we shall return presently.

Both passages present intriguing information about those who first received copies of the War upon its completion. Vita 361–362 has Josephus delivering (ἐπιδίδωμι) the written materials (τὰ βιβλία) to the imperators, Vespasian and Titus, when the events had scarcely passed, and likewise immediately (ἐνθὸς) delivering (same verb) the historia to "many others" (ἀλλοί ὀς δὲ πολλοίς). Some of these latter had participated in the conflict, including Agrippa and certain of the king's relatives. C. Ap. 1.51–52, however, notoriously describes these same transactions differently. Josephus gives the volumes (ἔδωκα τὰ βιβλία) first to Vespasian and Titus as also "to many of the Romans who had fought alongside them," but then sells others to "many" of his own people (πολλοίς δὲ τῶν ἡμετέρων ἐπίπροσκον). Among these purchasers are King Agrippa, the king's brother-in-law Julius Archelaus, and an elusive "most dignified Herod." All are described as fully trained in Greek wisdom (1.52; cf. Vita 359), a point that seems to be offered as a reason why, though Judeans, they would be interested in the Greek-language book. If so, that would suggest that other Judeans who lacked such Greek culture were not envisaged.

It is in the nature of traditional Josephus scholarship that attention has focused largely on the dating problem created by Josephus' presentation of the work to Vespasian, who died in 79 (although Book 7 in its current form has been thought to have been written after that date), and on Josephus' apparent mendacity in claiming in one place that he gave copies to Agrippa and family, in the other that he had sold these copies. But for our purposes there are more important things to be learned. Namely, Josephus' audience—even in the sense of the first recipients of his finished, "final" copies—was local, in keeping with the normal practices considered above. His delivery of copies to individuals who were resident in Rome during much of

44 As N. Kokkinos, The Herodian Dynasty: Origins, Role in Society and Eclipse (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 197, observes, the name Iulius suggests that Archelaus' family had become Roman citizens already in the time of Herod. Herod "the most dignified" he identifies as Herod VII, the last man known to bear the famous name, son of Aristobulus III (son of Herod of Chalcis), a cousin of Agrippa II who like him grew up in Rome (ibid., 313).
45 Cohen, Josephus in Galilee and Rome, 84–90; Schwartz, Josephus and Judean Politics.
the 70s (Agrippa and his sister arrived in 75)\textsuperscript{46} confirms the picture developed above of a proximate network of interested associates.

Josephus qualifies the adjective “many” (of his fellow-Judean recipients) with only three examples, all of whom were of the highest rank. They were fairly distinguished Roman citizens, they spent much of their time in the capital, and they were fully conversant with Greek culture. We have no reason, then, to imagine massive sales of the \textit{War} to Judeans around the Mediterranean—a technically implausible project in any case. The identity of the “many” Romans who had fought alongside Vespasian and Titus who received copies, is similarly puzzling. There too, “many” seems typically rhetorical (an exaggeration common also in modern scholarship). We should not imagine the distribution of Josephus’ \textit{War} to the legionary camps in Judea or elsewhere, in the vein of Thomas Paine’s pamphleteering during the American revolution, but should probably look for a few prominent officials worthy to be mentioned alongside the \textit{principes}. Obvious candidates are the surviving legionary legates from the war, such as: Sextus Vettulenus Cerialis (\textit{legio V Macedonica}) and M. Titius Frugi (\textit{legio XV Apollinaris}), the former of whom Josephus had once accompanied on a reconnaissance trip (\textit{Vita} 420; cf. \textit{B.J.} 6.236–237); the tribune Nicanor, who had reportedly been a friend of Josephus (\textit{B.J.} 3.344–346); and Masada’s conqueror L. Flavius Silva Nonius Bassus.\textsuperscript{47}

Even if we think of “publication” as the dissemination of finished copies, then, Josephus’ audience seems to have been limited, local, Roman. There is no reason to imagine that he produced more than perhaps a dozen copies for such associates—about what we would have expected in light of general conditions. Absent from Josephus is any suggestion that his work was in demand through Roman booksellers—the venue for purchasing texts to which one had no access via friends—, even though there is some evidence that they were becoming more commonly used in his period.\textsuperscript{48} They still seem to have been rare in the western provinces at least: Pliny expresses (possibly feigned) surprise that there was a bookshop even in Lyon, center

\textsuperscript{46} Dio 66.15.3–4; Kokkins, \textit{The Herodian Dynasty}, 329.


\textsuperscript{48} Starr, “The Circulation of Texts,” 222.
of the Three Gauls (Ep. 9.11.2). Josephus’ audience in the War’s first phases of reception appears to have been local.

This picture of dissemination through growing concentric circles of associates does not materially change even if we accept Josephus’ word that Titus privileged Josephus’ account, affixed his authorization to the volumes, and ordered their publication (τὰ βιβλία δημοσιώσαι προσέταξεν, Vita 363), which may have meant nothing more than deposit in one of the new imperial libraries.\footnote{Eusebius (Hist. eccl. 3.9.1–2), significantly calling Josephus the most renowned Judean of his time also among the Romans, who had a statue erected in his honor, claims that his works (λόγου) were included in Rome’s library—which ones, we are not told.} Primary distribution would still have been among locals who wished to have copies made.

(b) When we turn to the prologue of the War, the impression of local engagement is confirmed also for the period during which Josephus was preparing the work. Evidence here indicates that he was making the work public in the familiar ways: meeting his intended audiences, circulating partial drafts, targeting those willing to hear him, receiving criticism along with praise; he was fully involved in the literary thrust-and-parry of Roman society.

Consider carefully the language of the opening sentence:

Whereas, with respect to the war of Judeans against Romans . . . those who did not happen to be at the events, but are collecting (συλλέγοντες) random and incoherent tales through hearsay, are writing them up (ἀναγράφουσιν) sophist-like, while others who were there are misrepresenting the events (καταψεύδονται τῶν προαγμάτων), either through flattery toward the Romans or through hatred toward the Judeans—their compositions comprise denunciation in some cases and encomium in others, but nowhere the precision of history—; I, Josephus . . . have set myself the task of providing a narrative in the Greek language. . . . (B.J. 1.1–3)

Although commonly available translations (such as Whiston and Thackeray [LCL]) represent the italicized verbs by the English perfect, indicating completed accounts against which Josephus reacts after the fact, like a modern scholar, his Greek portrays a much livelier and more fluid situation. He knows what other writers are currently doing. But how could he know this, if they have not yet “published” by disseminating completed works? Josephus has evidently seen advance copies or extracts via friends or he has heard some of these people recite, or both.
It appears, similarly, that others have heard and responded to his *War*—before he composes this prologue. Quite unexpectedly, having outlined the main themes of his narrative (1.1–12), he turns to criticize certain eloquent Greeks (1.13–16). These men admittedly excel in speech-craft, he says, and yet they choose for their subjects the ancient conflicts between Greeks and Persians ("Assyrians and Medes"—for effect): a fairly direct attack on the tendencies of the Greek revival discussed above. Of interest here is not only that Josephus again seems well aware of what his contemporaries are writing, but also that they are fully apprised of his work: they have "abused" him for it. What else are we to make of this lengthy and peculiar paragraph? These eloquent men "position themselves as judges" over great recent events (sc. the Judean war): "which expose the ancient wars as paltry by comparison, while abusing those who rival them for honor—in relation to whom, even if they prove superior in speech-craft, they are inferior in choice of subject." Oblique though this passage may be, for understandable reasons in a dignified prologue, it seems to show Josephus again in vigorous debate with other writers in the capital. He can even take advantage of traditional Roman stereotypes of the Greeks, as money-grubbing windbags (1.16), to drive home his attack.

So Josephus has produced an account of the war, which eloquent Greeks have dismissed, while they occupy themselves with the past glories of Hellas. One of the main issues in their abuse is Josephus' Greek style and perhaps accent, which are matters of continuing sensitivity for him (e.g., *A. J.* 20.263; *Vita* 40; cf. *B. J.* 1.16 with *C. Ap.* 1.23–24). If we wished to put all the pieces together, then, it would be easy to suppose that he secured the help of friends with better Greek than his (*C. Ap.* 1.50), "for the Greek sound," precisely because of such pre-publication criticism. This atmosphere of sniping at another's diction and style was characteristic of the Greek revival and it is clearly reflected in Lucian. But all of this happened before

---


52 See Bowie, "The Greeks and their Past."

53 See Lucian's *Pro lapsu inter salutandum* and *Pseudologista*; also Swain, *Hellenism and Empire*, 43–64.
Josephus came to write the current prologue to the *War*. We can only make sense of such evidence if he and his contemporaries knew each other's work in progress, quite possibly through recitation, though we cannot prove that. Josephus' remark even in the version of the prologue that has come down to us—"I shall not conceal any of my own misfortunes, since I am about to speak to those who know [them]" (μέλλων γε πρὸς εἰδότας ἐρεῖν; 1.22)—though susceptible of other meanings, tends to confirm the oral dimension of publication. At the very least, it reminds us that Josephus knew his audience, and they knew him.

Finally, the most obvious statements about intended audience in *War's* prologue take nothing away from the foregoing discussion, though they are implausibly sweeping statements. In *B.J.* 1.3 Josephus claims to write for those under Roman hegemony (τοῖς κατὰ τὴν Ρωμαίων ἱγεμονίαν), as a counterpart to the equally vague "upper barbarians" graced with his prior accounts of the conflict in Aramaic. A little further along (1.6), having enumerated (and wildly exaggerated) various groups among those Aramaic-speaking recipients—Parthians and Babylonians, etc.—he correspondingly elucidates the readership of his current work: "Greeks and those of the Romans who did not take part in the fighting" (*B.J.* 1.6). But we have already seen that he actually delivered completed copies of the *War* to those who had participated: Vespasian and Titus, their generals, Agrippa and his relatives (*Vita* 361–363; *C. Ap.* 1.51–52). Rhetorical motives are at work in both passages: there to stress that his knowledgeable recipients would have objected had he misrepresented the facts, here to emphasize his didactic purpose—so that he need not write for those who fought in the war. Then again, he has just claimed that even those who were present are writing their accounts from prejudice rather than fact (*B.J.* 1.1–2). All of this highlights the rhetorical malleability of such programmatic statements, in contrast to the more concrete evidence concerning audience.

---


55 As I hope to show in my forthcoming introduction to the *War*, the Aramaic precursor to the Greek *War* is best understood as some sort of concise communication(s) issued from Judea, not as a *Vorlage* in any proper sense—or indeed as a composition from his Roman period.
Still, we need not doubt the sincerity of such broad descriptions in general—cf. A.J. 1.5: the Antiquities is for “the whole Greek world”—as long as we remember that this is not a practical goal. Every self-respecting author, from Thucydides (1.22.4; cf. Josephus in C. Ap. 1.53) to Pliny the Younger (Ep. 7.17.15: quod placere et semper et omnibus cupias), strove to write for posterity or for the world. But they all had more immediate audiences and aims in view. I leave it to an expert in Thucydides—the paradigm of the writer for posterity—to make the point: “Thucydides, like Herodotus, clearly intended his work to endure, like a monument in stone. But all monuments are established for an immediate purpose.”56 Josephus’ hope for a hearing across space and time has been fulfilled beyond his wildest dreams, but that does not change the fact that he wrote the War with a concrete audience and situation in view.

The remaining three lines of evidence that he wrote for (and received) a local Roman audience may be summarily presented.

3. The narrative assumes ignorance of basic Judean realia, but substantial knowledge of Roman history. The following examples are representative.

The War’s audience is apparently not expected to know anything significant about even the most famous figures of Judean history in the centuries preceding the revolt: the Hasmoneans, including Judah Maccabee (B.J. 1.36–37), or Herod the Great (1.181, 203–204). All these men receive full introductions at first mention. As for Judean culture, Josephus must explain that on the seventh day Judeans abstain from labor (1.146), that Sepphoris is a city of Galilee (1.170), that the high priestly office requires freedom from physical defect (1.270), that Judean law (not an obscure one, note, but the second commandment) forbids representation of living creatures (1.650), that a feast called “Unleavened,” also known as Pascha (no Aramaic is assumed), is a feast involving pilgrimage and many sacrifices (2.10–11), that another known as “Fiftieth” (i.e., Pentecost) takes its name from the interval following Passover (2.42), that a certain (i.e., nazirite) vow requires shaving of the head (2.313), and that Judean law (viz. Deut 21:21) prescribes the immediate burial of corpses (4.317). Although the audience seems to have an idea about the coastal cities

56 Munn, The School of History, 316.
of Phoenicia—Berytus (a Roman colony) may be mentioned alongside Tyre, Sidon, Byblos, and Ptolemais without explanation (1.422)—they are assumed to know nothing at all about Judean or Galilean geography and topography. Even Jerusalem and its temple (5.136–229) must be described in detail, as also the two Galilees (1.22; 3.35–44).

All this is basic information. Of course, King Agrippa’s relatives and presumably even Roman commanders from the conflict would know it, but Josephus apparently has in view a local Roman audience that needs such explanations. Their lack of knowledge about matters Judean is thrown into sharp relief by what Josephus apparently does expect them to know—Roman history and politics.

Although he can also introduce minor Roman figures, of a century or more past, in the way he introduces the major Judeans (e.g., B.J. 1.205: Sextus Caesar, a relative of the great Caesar who was at that time governor of Syria), the audience receives no such help with important Roman personalities. Thus, Josephus first mentions Marc Antony, Augustus, and Marcus Agrippa without introduction (1.118) and describes Scaurus as the general who had been sent to Syria by Pompeius Magnus (notice the transliteration from Latin, rather than the Greek equivalent Μέγας)—assuming audience familiarity with Pompey if not Scaurus.57 Even Pompey’s father-in-law [Q. Caecilius Metellus Pius] Scipio, his associate in the eastern imperium, acquitted on a charge of ambitus, famous in Rome and discussed by Julius Caesar, Cicero, and Livy, can be mentioned (1.185) without introduction. Josephus likewise assumes that [P. Licinius] Crassus and his notorious Parthian campaign (53 B.C.E.) are well known to the audience (1.179). And in 1.183 we find the telling chronological pointers, “When Pompey fled with the senate across the Ionian Sea, [Julius] Caesar now being master of Rome and the world,” which expect rather a lot from the audience. (When did Pompey flee with the senate, then?) At 1.242 he casually mentions the “death of Cassius at Philippi” (in 42 B.C.E.), again expecting audience knowledge of a period so famous among Romans.

Especially telling, it seems, are the War’s first references to Queen Cleopatra, for example (1.243): Marc Antony was “now a slave to his desire for Cleopatra.” The dark portrait of the Egyptian monarch
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57 The Latin nick-name appears even more strikingly, without need of “Pompey,” at 5.409.
intensifies in 1.358–368, where Josephus speaks of Antony’s gradual destruction through enslavement to his desire for Cleopatra and now also of her “thirsting for the blood of foreigners.” This is obviously not a detached description, but highly tendentious rhetoric especially suited to the standard Roman image of the eastern seductress, who had provided the basis for much of Octavian’s anti-Antony propaganda.58 Indeed, memories of Cleopatra may well have contributed to Titus’ need to dismiss the Judean Queen Berenice from his house and bed in 79 C.E., before acceding to the principate—not another Cleopatra!59 Josephus assumes here both the subject knowledge and the values of a Roman audience.

Further examples abound. In B.J. 1.243 and 284 [M. Valerius] Messalla [Corvinus], the eminent Roman general and orator, literary patron of Ovid and Tibullus (64 B.C.E. to 8 C.E.), is mentioned quite incidentally as “Messala.” Yet both contexts have to do with oratory: defending Herod and Phasael before Antony and speaking for Herod’s kingship in the senate (40 B.C.E.). The audience should presumably understand the significance of this particular character. At 1.364 Josephus casually mentions the outbreak of war at Actium (31 B.C.E.; cf. 1.398).

At 1.400 Josephus remarks that, “In Caesar’s affections, Herod stood next after Agrippa, in Agrippa’s next after Caesar.” But this assumes audience knowledge of the very close relationship, nowhere explained, between Augustus and his son-in-law M. Vipsanius Agrippa. B.J. 2.25 is even more telling. First, [P. Quinctilius] Varus, legate of Syria in 4 B.C.E., notorious in Josephus’ Rome for his loss of three legions in the Teutoburg forest in 9 C.E.,60 is introduced without elaboration (as in the prologue, 1.20; see below). Then Augustus convenes an advisory council, in which Josephus pointedly remarks that “for the first time he also seated Gaius, the son [he] adopted from Agrippa and Iulia his daughter.” It is a pointed reference (“for the first time”), but what is the point—since neither Gaius nor Julia will appear again in the War? This notice could only have meaning for an audience

58 E.g., Cambridge History of Classical Literature 2.3: 39, 57, 93, 102.
60 E.g., Velleius 2.117–21; Tacitus, Germ. 37.5; Ann. 1.3, 43, 55, 57–62, 65, 71; 2.41, 45; Cassius Dio 56.18–22.
familiar with the sad history of Augustus’ family: the marriage of the princeps’ daughter to his loyal friend Agrippa, the birth of their son Gaius and Augustus’ hopeful adoption of him as successor, and the later tragedy of the young man’s death in 4 C.E., which so fatally shaped the subsequent imperial succession.

That such assumptions about the audience’s Roman knowledge do not derive from Josephus’ sources (such as Nicolaus) is clear because they continue throughout. In B.J. 2.247 Josephus introduces the new governor of Judea, Felix, as the brother of Pallas. But this identification only works if Pallas himself was already known to his audience. Marcus Antonius Pallas was indeed notorious in élite Roman circles as the stereotypical too-powerful freedman in Claudius’ court (Suetonius, Claud. 28; Tacitus, Ann. 12.53). Similarly, in 2.250–251 Josephus prescinds from exploring the horrors of Nero’s reign because they are well known to his audience. Notice again both the content of the audience’s assumed knowledge and Josephus’ hostile tone concerning Nero, which matches elite Roman attitudes of the late first century.61 According to Suetonius (Ner. 57) and Tacitus (Hist. 1.4), the masses rather liked Nero and mourned his death. Josephus, however, shares the scandalized outlook of the elite authors. Finally, in 4.496, he likewise avoids exploring the Roman civil war following Nero’s death on the ground that these events are well known (ὅτ’ ὁχλοῦ πᾶσιν ἔστων) and they have been written up by many, “Greeks as well as Romans.” Both of these appeals to audience knowledge, from experience and from current books, make the best sense in the context of his Roman environment.

Josephus’ pointed reference to works by both Greek and Roman authors raises the important question whether his efforts at fashionable and high-level Greek somehow restrict his audiences to Greek-rather than Latin-speaking circles in Rome. Such an assumption would, however, misunderstand Roman literary culture, which was fully bilingual. The fact that Josephus wrote in Greek was simply a result of necessity: even with a functional literacy in Latin, he would not have hoped to compose at a level high enough for elite consumption, whereas he could (and did) manage this in Greek. But we have many solid clues that he could read Latin as needed.62 An elite audience in

61 Cf. B.J. 2.184 on Gaius Caligula, who cut off the cream of nobility in his country and then extended his designs to Judea.

62 These include not only antecedent probability (after years spent with Roman
Rome, even if Roman by birth, was able to function well in Greek. In sum: Josephus' assumption that his audience is schooled in Roman conditions is thrown into sharp relief by his expectation that they know nothing (necessarily) about Judean culture.

4. The prospectus of the narrative that Josephus provides in War's prologue (1.17–30) conspicuously reaches out to a Roman audience. This fact on its own—though not discussed before, to my knowledge—seems decisive for the question of Josephus' expected audience. If one compares the Polybian-style table of contents that Josephus provides with the actual narrative to follow, one discovers that he has consistently shaped the prospectus to appeal to Roman interests, while downplaying or omitting altogether features of the narrative—no matter how large or important in the narrative context itself—that will require careful introduction.

This is immediately apparent from the personal names given. Of the Judeans, only Herod son of Antipater (who was in any case world-famous) receives mention (1.19–20). Even though the narrative to follow is about the Judean revolt and so deals at great length with such figures as John of Gischala, Simon bar Giora, and Eleazar son of Yair, Josephus leaves these men unnamed in the prologue, referring only in a general way to the Judean "tyrants" and their differences (1.24). By contrast, a number of Romans receive anticipatory billing: not only Vespasian and Titus, who figure repeatedly (1.21, 23, 24, 25, 28, 29), but also rather less important figures in Josephus' narrative such as Pompey (1.19), [Gaius] Sossius (1.19), Augustus (1.20; in Latin transliteration rather than the Greek equivalent Σέβαστός), Quintilius Varus (1.20; simply Varus at 2.25), Cestius [Gallus] (1.20), and Nero (1.20, 21). Josephus includes names that will be immediately meaningful to his envisaged audiences and readers, officers and guards in captivity, then in the capital itself) but also more concrete indicators. Josephus apparently used the generals' commentarii (field notes) as sources (Vita 358; C. Ap. 1.56); his War shows many parallels with Julius Caesar's highly esteemed Gallic War (the 7-book structure, third-person references to the author, general's ruses, and such specifics as B.J. 2.119 // Bell. Gall. 1.1), with Sallust's influential Catilinarian Conspiracy (B.J. 2.585–587 // Bell. Cat. 5 [cf. Thackeray in LCL 2.xix], and with Virgil's Aeneid [Thackeray, loc. cit.]. By the time Josephus writes the A.J. 18–19, at least, he seems to borrow heavily from Latin sources for the detailed description of Gaius' death and Claudius' accession (T. P. Wiseman, Death of an Emperor: Flavius Josephus [Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 1991]), e.g., xii–xiv.
but omits those that will sound alien or perhaps generate adverse responses without careful introduction.

Still more important are the prospectus' lack of proportion and disparity of theme vis-à-vis the narrative. For example, *B.J.* 1.19–20 passes over most of the long and detailed Book 1, concerning the Hasmonean dynasty and Herod's colorful career, focusing only on Roman involvement in the region. This Roman political and military emphasis continues throughout, with some astonishing results. Josephus omits from Book 2 the entire Herodian succession story (2.1–117), the three philosophical schools (especially Essenes), the governors of Judea, and King Agrippa's strenuous efforts before the war; from Book 3, almost everything that does not relate to the activities of Vespasian and Titus, including Josephus' own military career (the focus of that book); from Books 4 to 6 almost everything—the capture of Gamala, Tabor, and Gischala, the growth of serious factionalism in Jerusalem, the arrival of the Idumeans and the pivotal murder of Ananus and Jesus (4.233–333), as well as other crimes against the sanctuary, though these are pivotal in the book's theme and structure. Most significantly, he leaves out of the prospectus the narrative's many examples of Judean courage, resourcefulness, and partial success (5.71–97, 109–135, 258–330), as also the Romans' long hard struggle to take Jerusalem, which was delayed by the temporary victories of the Judeans (6.12–92, 129–192). He omits reference to his own final speech (6.99–110) and his relay of Titus' speech (6.124–128), as well as the worst horror of the famine: Mary's cannibalism (6.193–219). In their place, he highlights only a few paragraphs towards the end of Book 4 and the beginning of Book 5 concerning Nero, the *Roman* civil war, and Vespasian, some exotic information about the temple and its priests, the unnamed Judean tyrants and bandits, the suffering they inflicted on the Judeans, and the Roman desire to spare his compatriots (1.21–28).

If we had only this latter half of the prologue, we might suppose that the *War* was indeed an instrument of Roman propaganda on the old view, but it is crucial to remember that this outline does not in fact match the content of the book. It seems rather carefully crafted to hook the audience in—a Roman audience—while reserving detailed reinterpretation of the *War* for the appropriate time. Josephus has already signaled that he will counter the prevailing jingoistic accounts with a balanced viewpoint (1.2–3, 6–10), but the force and consequence of his revisionist view must await careful articulation in the story itself.
5. Josephus uses the major theme of his *Judean War*, civil war (στάσις ὀικεία), to connect the Judean situation with the Roman. He introduces the theme of στάσις in the prologue (1.10), makes it the first word of the narrative proper (1.31), and refers to the theme often throughout. The *War* is in many respects the story of a Judean civil war: aristocrats such as Josephus had gone to great lengths to suppress it, but they failed, so that behind the scenes of an ostensible war with Rome lay a full-scale internal conflict.

Most scholars trace this Josephan theme to Thucydides’ classic treatment of civil war at Corcyra (3.82–84), and one even tries to interpret the *War* as an ongoing intertextual play vis-à-vis Thucydides. It takes nothing away from the helpfulness of these analyses—Thucydides does remain a fund for historians throughout this period—to observe that Josephus as author does not connect the Judean stasis with Thucydides or Greek problems half a millennium before his time. He rather connects the Judean sedition, and programmatically, with the many Roman civil wars, especially the one concluded just before his arrival with Titus in Rome, which was also fresh in the experience of his Roman audience.

Already in the prologue (*B.J.* 1.4), Josephus describes the period of momentous change (κίνημα) in which the Judean war erupted as one in which internal Roman affairs were also becoming diseased (νοσείς)—a verb commonly applied in Greek and Latin literature to the blight of factionalism. Twice again in the opening prospectus he makes the same link, by distinguishing the Romans from Pompey (1.19) and by mentioning the upheavals (μεταβολαὶ) in Rome at the time of the Judean war (1.23). Josephus appears to suggest that the civil war or sedition that afflicted the Judeans and led to fateful Roman intervention in their politics was a phenomenon entirely familiar to the Romans themselves, not—as Nicolaus of Damascus (*B.J.* 2.92) and many others would claim—a distinctive ethnic trait of the Judeans.

---


64 Cf. Mader in the previous note.

In Book 1, these connections are too frequent to itemize, as the Roman civil wars and their protagonists furnish the whole backdrop for the later Hasmonean period and for Herod’s masterfully shifting allegiances. At *B.J.* 1.216–219, for example, Josephus pauses the narrative to describe the outbreak of civil war (πόλεμος ἐμφόβλιος), internal factionalism (διαστασίας) and upheaval (κίνημα) in Rome, assuming the audience’s prior knowledge of the figures and events mentioned.

After Book 1 Josephus takes the narrative back to Rome with great frequency: 2.24–38, 90–110 (Augustus ponders Herod’s will), 2.204–217 (Claudius’ accession and Agrippa I), 2.245–251 (Claudius decides the Judean quarrel with Samaritans; accession of Nero), 3.1–8 (Nero hears of the Judean revolt and sends Vespasian), 4.440 (revolt of Vindex), 4.491–502 (Roman civil war after Nero’s death), 4.545–549 (Roman civil war again). The purpose of these references becomes clear from Josephus’ language at 4.545. While describing the violent conflict between Simon bar Gioras and John of Gischala’s Zealots, he observes: “Not only in Judea were there civil war and sedition, however, but also across Italy”—citing the struggles of Galba, Otho, and Vitellius (4.545–549). This ongoing comparison is strengthened when, a few paragraphs later, he turns to describe Vitellius’ behavior as “a savage tyrant” (4.596) and the actions of that general’s army in the city of Rome: reckless looting and slaughtering of the wealthy (4.586–587)—just like the Judean tyrants in Jerusalem. Several paragraphs near the end of Book 4 are devoted to a graphic day-by-day portrait of the end to the civil war in Rome (4.630–655), but this occurs immediately before Titus is sent to end the civil war in Jerusalem (4.656–663). Titus is reportedly quite aware, as Vespasian had been, that the problem in Jerusalem is essentially a civil war among Judean factions (5.1–3), not a matter of the Judean people’s opposing Rome *en bloc*.

The fitting end of the civil-war theme coincides with the close of the main story. It is the joint triumph of Vespasian and Titus in Rome, concerning which Josephus comments (7.157): “For on this day the city of the Romans celebrated both victory in the campaign against her enemies [sc. the Judeans] and the end of civil disasters [sc. among the Romans]—and thus the beginning of hopes for prosperity.” The very next paragraph, collapsing about four years, covers the dedication of the Forum of Peace in Rome (7.158–162). Vespasian’s triumph over internal chaos, with his sons as insurance against bloody succession contests in the near future, coincides with decisive victory
over foreign enemies. From Josephus' perspective, similarly, the end of Judea's civil war has renewed the promise of peace.

Josephus continually reverts to affairs in Rome not only because that is the natural reference-point for his envisaged audience in the city, but also in order to make the Judean conflict more intelligible and less alien, by implicit comparison with the capital's own vividly remembered struggles. Every statesman knew that civil war (στάσις, seditio) was a perennial threat,⁶⁶ and the Judeans could hardly be singled out for odium because the disease had affected their society so dramatically.

Conclusion

To conclude: the general conditions of composing and disseminating literature in the first century, along with explicit indicators in Josephus' writings about the War's circumstances and assumptions he makes about his audience's knowledge and values all point in a single direction. He wrote his finest work with a sophisticated Roman audience in view, one that was fully at home in elite discourse about politics and constitutions, and that had a taste for fine writing.

Here I can only hint at some important consequences that flow from identifying Josephus' audience. Only when such concrete conditions are ignored, it seems to me, can Josephus be interpreted as a mouthpiece of Roman propaganda, in the traditional way. Abstracted from such a context, for example, his flattery of Vespasian and Titus, along with his acknowledgment of Roman fortune, might easily be read as an effort to persuade fellow-Judeans around the Mediterranean to acquiesce under Roman rule.

Once he is placed in his Flavian Roman context, however, everything changes. We no longer expect him to spell everything out, since we can see that he relies upon prior audience knowledge and values. Once we take on board the nature of Flavian self-representation in post-70 Rome, as the conquerors of a rebellious people, as those who have defeated a weak race and its deity by means of their virtue, generalship, and support from Roman deities, everything in the War takes on a completely different hue. Now we can begin to take seriously Josephus' claim that he is writing to balance the record

---

⁶⁶ This is, e.g., the dominant theme of Plutarch's Praecepta gerendae reipublicae.
with a fair treatment of his people (1.1–3, 6–9). Now his ongoing emphases on Judean valor, toughness, and contempt for death, along with their talent for outwitting the famous legions, become more meaningful as a challenge to the dominant portrait. Now we may see his flattery of Vespasian and Titus, by contrast, as no more than de rigueur, and we may become more attentive to cracks in this portrait. These cracks are especially in the famous theme of Titus’ clemency, which in fact makes the young emperor out to be rather gullible—deserving no credit for Jerusalem’s fall. And we become alive to the possibilities of irony. Whereas most scholars have treated the presentation of the 18-year-old Domitian in B.J. 7.85–88 as obsequious flattery, even redating Book 7 to Domitian’s reign in part to account for this apparent groveling (it “extols Domitian’s prowess”), against the background of a Roman audience’s likely knowledge it seems more plausible that Josephus was practicing “the art of safe criticism” through an obvious and excessive flattery.

Audience matters: the stakes are enormous.

69 See Ahl, “The Art of Safe Criticism.”
Josephus lived the last thirty years of his life in Rome, far from his native Jerusalem. There is no evidence that he ever left the city after he was brought there as a prisoner of war by Titus in 71 CE. In his foreign setting he composed four literary works and planned others. Given the large volume of his writing, Josephus must have spent a considerable portion of his days writing (or dictating) and reading, but the contours of his intellectual life in Rome—his literary and cultural associations, as well as his political and social connections—are barely known. While a wide variety of sources provide knowledge about the social and cultural history of Flavian Rome, Josephus’ place in it cannot be surmised either from his own writings or other sources. His own works, for someone who liked to write about himself, provide surprisingly sparse information about his intellectual life in the capital and no reference to the luminous literary circles there. First-century sources contain no reference to him whatsoever, and there are no instructive parallels to an oriental Jewish freed slave, probably not a Latin speaker, writing history in the capital in an imperfectly acquired language about a foreign people and culture. Faute de mieux, his literary product must serve as the main document of Josephus’ relation to his cultural surroundings. And that document reveals an historian who retained a profoundly provincial character, as reflected not only in his relative isolation in the capital, but also in the content and style of his many writings.

In another essay in this volume, Steve Mason has done probably as much as anyone could to extract all clues from Josephus’ writings

---

to reconstruct Josephus’ subtle efforts to appeal to the élite in Rome itself. The present paper asks a different fundamental question: not whom Josephus wanted to read his books, but who actually did and why. I take it as fundamental that Josephus’ books address multiple audiences—the Greek-educated Roman upper class in Rome and the cities of the empire, the Greek-speaking intelligentsia of the eastern provinces and the Greek-reading Jewish inhabitants of the eastern provinces. I shall explore how Josephus, who was simultaneously addressing these many audiences, found his place in the foreign capital of a world empire, and the extent to which he fit (or did not fit) into the fast-paced and sometimes treacherous intellectual and cultural life there; how he defined himself—religiously, culturally, intellectually—in his foreign setting, and how that self-definition left an imprint on his surviving works.

Rome in the last decades of the first century was alive with literary activity. The Flavian emperors encouraged the flourishing of the genres in which the Romans thought they excelled and made an original mark, especially Latin oratory and poetry, with an emphasis on classicism, in reaction to orientalizing tendencies under Nero. Roma resurgens was the motto advertised on Flavian coins. Quintilian, whose ten books on education and rhetoric well represent the intellectual climate of the time, was appointed by Vespasian to the first endowed chair of rhetoric in Rome, and the emperor granted special privileges to oratores and praeceptores. Tacitus’ Dialogus de oratoribus, which provides “perhaps the best access to the active society of the senatorial class and to its more public concerns [and] enables his readers to eavesdrop on a literary discussion among cultured friends,” deals with the question of whether a man should become a poet or an orator. In the spirit of his father’s project, Domitian founded the Capitoline and Alban games, where Latin orators and poets competed. The poets Silius Italicus, Valerius Flaccus and Statius composed com-
plex, allusive, classicizing and even politically fraught Latin epic, while Martial excelled in witty epigram.

Historiography was not excluded as an occupation of a cultured Roman,\(^7\) and while Latin was the focus of imperial sponsorship, it was not an exclusive requirement—after all, Josephus himself was encouraged to write his first work, a history of the Jewish War, in Greek—and certainly not a *sine qua non* for participation in the intellectual life in the capital and beyond. Not only were educated Romans completely bilingual—and in fact most of them were educated from an early age by Greek teachers, so that their first literary language was Greek—but they also gladly accepted into their homes and supported accomplished Greek cultural figures. One thinks already of the provincial writers of the late Republic and Augustan period, such as the geographer Strabo from distant Pontus, the literary critic and historian Dionysius of Halicarnassus and the historian Timagenes of Alexandria, all of whom, after arriving in Rome, managed to establish extensive connections with the literary and political élite in the city; and on the other end of the relevant chronological scale, Appian, the Antonine historian from Alexandria who exploited his connections in Rome for advancement as an advocate, and Arrian, from Bithynia, who was himself a senator.\(^8\) The careers of both Appian and Arrian demonstrate the possibilities open to someone who gains wider fame by writing history. Josephus’ exact contemporary, the Greek orator and philosopher Dio Chrysostom, who was a student of the stoic philosopher Musonius Rufus, was active in Rome and is praised by many writers of the late first and early second centuries, including Pliny—Dio left the capital only under compulsion, when he was banished by Domitian for his political activities. Other Greek intellectuals passed through Rome, where they gave well-attended and much-discussed lectures and demonstrations and even stayed there


for prolonged periods. It was under the Flavian emperors that the immensely popular Greek intellectuals of the so-called Second Sophistic, like Dio Chrysostom himself, began traveling the circuit of the eastern capitals and Rome. Although most of the intellectuals in the Second Sophistic were active in the century after Josephus, Roman audiences already welcomed men like Scopelian from Smyrna, who was a frequent and celebrated visitor in Rome, and who delivered orations even before the Flavian emperors.9

The flurry of literary activity in Greek and Latin meant constant literary salons and parties, frequent public readings and vigorous exchanges of works and ideas. This is charmingly apparent in many of the self-absorbed letters of the younger Pliny, who was a generation younger than Josephus. In one oft-quoted letter, Pliny writes a description which could well apply to Josephus' Rome: "During the whole month of April, scarcely a day went by when someone did not give a recitation. I'm pleased that literary studies are flourishing and that talented men come forward."10 Literary figures of the day, intellectuals, and Romans of social and political importance, knew about and read one another, and were often personal friends. Interlocking circles sustained and informed literary activity in the capital. Pliny mentions by name important literary contemporaries like the historian Tacitus, the poet Silius Italicus, the orator Dio Chrysostom and others. Quintilian, who was Pliny's teacher, is himself mentioned respectfully by Martial, Juvenal and many others of the younger generation, and is implicitly answered by Tacitus in the *Dialogus de oratoribus*. Martial works into his poems the names of many of the luminaries of his day—and so on; a full and detailed catalogue is unnecessary here.11

The absence of Josephus' name in any surviving contemporary literary work of the time, and during the century after his death, is significant. His failure to write in Latin is not the reason, given the prominent place bright Greek stars held in the Roman cultural scene. Yet his contemporaries' silence about him is not the only reason to surmise Josephus' absence from the literary parlors and events in the

---

9 Bowersock, *Greek Sophists*, 44.
10 Pliny, *Ep.* 1.13; it should be noted, however, that the point of the letter is to complain that such recitations are often not taken seriously enough.
11 It naturally must be remembered that some of the literary lights in Flavian Rome were provincial in the strict sense—Quintilian, Tacitus, Martial—but they were Latin speakers, born Roman citizens, raised on Roman education, and central figures in Rome's cultural life.
Rome where he lived. It is likely that Josephus refrained from public performance entirely. He seems to be offering an apology for such avoidance when he confesses, near the end of his life, to never having shed his accent in spoken Greek (A.J. 20.263). Of course proper diction and technical proficiency were essential for public oratorical performance. Quintilian (Inst. 1.1.13) sternly disapproves even of those Roman sons with a whiff of Greek inflection in their Latin, the result of their first teachers being Greek; he attributes faulty pronunciation to "distortion of the mouth produced by forming foreign sounds." We can imagine the prejudice Romans would have felt against Aramaic "distortion of the mouth." Josephus would not have embarrassed himself in a public reading, and significantly he mentions no public recitations. Even Vespasian and Titus, he says, read the Bellum Judaicum—he did not read his history to them, even those parts in which they personally featured, as for example Vergil read the Aeneid to Augustus. There is thus little reason to believe that Josephus, although he was living in Rome, was routinely invited to the homes of the literati there, or ever joined the circuit of Greek lecturers who attracted much attention among the educated public.

Patronage by powerful figures among the social and political élite of the city could help a writer of no distinguished background but possessing innate talent and an attractive topic gain entry into cultural circles in Rome. Yet once again, the sources from the period of Josephus' life, which are relatively plentiful, register a stark silence regarding the Jewish historian. I shall not linger over the proofs here, since the point has been demonstrated with characteristic thoroughness by Werner Eck, in an article soon to appear in another conference volume devoted to Josephus:¹² not only is no social or other connection with the Roman élite mentioned in any external source, but Josephus' own silence on this matter, that is, his failure to mention personal contacts with any important figure in Rome other than the emperors, is eloquent; surely Josephus, who goes to extraordinary literary lengths to bolster his authority as an historian,¹³ would have mentioned connections with a prominent Roman family had he been

able to do so. Aside from the emperors, the only other figures in Rome with whom Josephus was, on his own evidence, in contact, were his literary patron Epaphroditus (see below), a freed slave of Caligula named Thaumastus and the Jewish actor Aliturus, who introduced Josephus to Nero's wife Poppaea during his visit there in 64/65. Not exactly a constellation of stars.

Finally, in the absence of connections to powerful Roman families, an arriviste could gain access to Rome's literary and cultural life by connections to the imperial family. In this area, at least, there is no doubt that Josephus had something to boast about, and from his first work to his last he plays up his connections to the imperial family. But Josephus' "friendship" with the imperial family was obviously not a friendship on equal terms: he was their freed slave, a client and dependent, and on closer examination there is nothing to distinguish Josephus' status and role as an imperial client from that of hundreds if not thousands of other imperial clients with the name Flavius. As Eck observes, what sets Josephus apart from all these other freedmen Flavii is that he wrote a number of books which have survived. In any case, after writing the Bellum, Josephus apparently lost imperial literary patronage, for he dedicated his next three works, the Antiquitates Judaicae, the Vita and the Contra Apionem, to a certain Epaphroditus, who cannot be identified with any important figure of that name in Rome in Josephus' day. In other words, by lavishly thanking an obscure figure of (probably) servile birth as his patron, Josephus is inadvertently revealing his own obscurity in Roman society of his day.

Naturally I am not saying that we know of no one who read Josephus, who himself affirms that, in addition to the Flavian emperors, Agrippa II received copies of the Bellum and confirmed the accuracy of the account (Vita 361–366, C. Ap. 1.50–51). The Jewish king at least seems to have read the book avidly. Two other named members of the Herodian family, Julius Archelaus and an unidentified Herod, bought copies presumably for reading (C. Ap. 1.51). So far as the emperors are concerned, they could have read the presentation

---

14 Again, see Eck, in Flavius Josephus and Flavian Rome, and also the classic article by Z. Yavetz, "Reflections on Titus and Josephus," GRBS 16 (1975): 411–32, esp. 430–32.

copies, or merely the parts concerning themselves to confirm their veracity, but many works were presented to them by conscientious or enthusiastic authors. Titus for example received a copy of the Elder Pliny’s encyclopaedic *Natural History*, and in his laudatory preface Pliny indicates that he was on more intimate relations with Titus, and hints also at a correspondence about his literary-scientific endeavor, but it is difficult to imagine that Titus actually read the work very carefully if at all (and Pliny provided a table of contents for each book for easy reference). In addition, we know the name of one other reader, Justus of Tiberias, who wrote vigorously against Josephus’ account of the war but waited until after Agrippa’s death to release it; Josephus answered him in the *Vita*.

In addition to these named readers, Josephus also refers to anonymous potential or actual readers. He says he presented his history to Romans who took part in the war (*C. Ap.* 1.50), but who they were, and their place and importance in Roman society (even whether they were from Italy), are left oddly undisclosed. It is more certain that the unnamed Jews to whom, on Josephus’ evidence, he sold copies of the *Bellum*, read it—they paid money for the book, unlike the recipients of unsolicited copies. Finally, Josephus protests against certain “petty and nasty people” (φανολοί) who criticized his writing (*C. Ap.* 1.53); since these critics would be people who had some personal or vested interest in the account of the rebellion, they were almost certainly from the East and probably some or most of them were Jews.

Thus it turns out that all or most of Josephus’ known readership was in or from the East. It is important to remember that his first intended audience was in the East, for his first version of the *Bellum*, in Aramaic, was openly addressed to the “non-Greeks of the up-country” (τοῖς ἄνω βαρβάροις, *B.J.* 1.3). This initial purpose and intended audience left a strong imprint in the Greek reworking of the original. In the present Greek version he still draws a contrast between himself as a foreigner (ἄλλαν φυλακής) and his hoped-for audience of “Greeks and Romans” (*B.J.* 1.16). In preparing the Greek *Bellum* Josephus expanded his audience, instead of shifting to another one completely; most importantly, he now addressed the Roman administration and Greek and Roman intellectuals throughout the

---

16 And note Yavetz’s sobering doubt whether “Titus was so anxious to see Josephus’ book become the sole authority from which the world should learn the facts about the Jewish War” (“Reflections,” 430).
empire, and this immensely complicated his task as a writer. When assessing the additions clearly intended to benefit the “Greeks and Romans”—such as the numerous explanations of Jewish customs and laws and the geography of Palestine—as well as the unexplained references to Roman history aimed at a Roman readership, it should be remembered Josephus’ “Roman” audience was wide and cosmopolitan, and he could just as easily have had in mind the Romans in Alexandria, or really most any eastern capital of the Empire—not just Romans in Rome itself.

The unpopularity, or neglect, of Josephus’ oeuvre in Rome did not stem from his themes—first the Jewish War, then Jewish antiquities in general. The rebellion held an extremely important place in the self-presentation of the Flavian house: aside from the triumphal celebrations and the large-scale games to celebrate their victory over the Jews, the Flavians erected triumphal arches throughout the empire, issued massive series of coins with the message *Iudaea Capta* and sponsored other literary projects in addition to Josephus’ history. Many accounts of the war were written in Latin and Greek in the 70s, and even though not one word from them survives, Josephus argues and polemicizes with them, both explicitly and implicitly, in the *Bellum*, accusing those other historians of gross flattery of the Romans or despicable slander of the Jews.17

The Jews themselves were a legitimate subject for ethnographic investigation, even though some of the accounts produced in Josephus’ era were biased against their subject. No less a historian than Tacitus wrote a detailed account of the Jewish rebellion, preceding it with a set-piece of ethnic history, in Book 5 of the *Histories*. But neither Tacitus nor any other writer on the Jewish rebellion specifically or Judaism in general—at least whose works have survived—betrays any knowledge of Josephus’ extensive writings, even though, at least according to the fourth-century church historian Eusebius,18 Josephus’ books were deposited in a library in Rome. Both Tacitus and, in the third century, Cassius Dio, relied on other sources for their accounts of the rebellion, and in his “archaeology” of the Jews Tacitus

17 *GLAJJ* 1:455–57.

18 *Hist. eccl.* 3.9.2; Eusebius says there that Josephus was the best-known Jew of his day, but this was written 200 years after Josephus’ death, is unsupported by any contemporary evidence and probably reflects rather extrapolation of Josephus’ importance from Eusebius’ own time.
ferred hostile sources, probably in Latin, for the truculent opening chapters of the fifth book of the *Histories.* These chapters represent the typical attitude of the Roman upper classes towards Judaism in Josephus’ time and long afterwards. For more than one hundred years after his death, Josephus is hardly noticed by any surviving author, aside from a passing reference in Suetonius (*Vesp.* 5.6), who mentions Josephus not as an enemy general but as a *nobilis captivus* who prophesied that Vespasian would reach the throne; the third-century historian Cassius Dio (66.1.4) says the same thing about him, so that obviously they were both relying on some external source, not on Josephus’ writings directly, for they recorded only a curious by-way and missed the most important fact about him. In the third and fourth centuries, Christian authors, for theological reasons, read Josephus quite avidly, and quoted him in their polemics, but the only non-Christian author who gives definite signs of having read Josephus is the third-century philosopher Porphyry (who in fact did read him).

The reason that Josephus was passed over by serious historians and other intellectuals, both in his own time and afterwards, cannot be attributed to the hostile attitudes towards Jews and Judaism by the Roman upper classes, for it is impossible that a Roman historian like Tacitus looking for information on Judaism or the Jewish rebellion would deliberately pass over the eyewitness account in the *Bellum* merely because its author was Jewish. Rather, the reason for the neglect of Josephus may be inherent in what he wrote. On opening the first scroll of the *Bellum* the Roman reader would encounter a lengthy preface studded with familiar tropes in combination with bizarre departures from Graeco-Roman historiographical convention. The first sentence is a dazzling *tour de force*—or inordinately long, depending on the reader’s taste—containing most of the conventional,
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19 See *GLAJJ* 2:17–63, no. 281, and the extensive bibliog. there.
21 *GLAJJ* 2:435–43, no. 455. The fourth-century orator Libanius may also have read Josephus, although he does not say so (see Stern’s comments in *GLAJJ* 2:589, no. 495b).
22 The following remarks are based on my article, “Josephus’ First Sentence and the Preface to the *B.J.,”* forthcoming in a *Festschrift* volume dedicated to Uriel Rappaport.
expected elements of a historical preface: the historian’s name and credentials, his sources of evidence, the greatness of his chosen subject and his assurance of strict impartiality and adherence to truth. The vocabulary is self-consciously Thucydidean, a mannerism which continues densely throughout the preface—e.g., the statement that the Jewish war was the “greatest upheaval” (τὸ μέγαςτὸν κίνημα), the profession of strict accuracy (ἀκριβεία) and the superiority of contemporary history, an the assertion that the work was not written “for immediate pleasure” (B.J. 1.30); all this is intended to lend authority and credibility to the work. The Thucydidean imitations and posturing are, again, an expected component of a historiographical preface, as we can judge not only from surviving examples but also from Lucian’s parody of unskilled historians.23

Yet as the reader continues beyond the grandiose first sentence, trouble arises: for in the same sentence in which Josephus, having dismissed other accounts of the war as partisan and distorting, reiterates his rigorous accuracy, he adds that he shall not suppress his own emotions but rather give them free rein and allow himself to “lament the calamities which befell my country” (B.J. 1.9). The dissonance with the ostentatiously displayed literary convention, protestations of truth-telling and Thucydidean language is jarring—and would have been even more so for an ancient reader/listener than a modern reader can possibly feel today. Ancient historians assiduously avoided all bias,24 and impartiality, sine ira et studio in Tacitus’ famous phrase, was one of the conventional claims of historiographical prefaces and one which, as we have noted, Josephus himself used in the opening lines of the Bellum. Historians could and did write in an extremely partisan and biased manner, but they consistently maintained their innocence of the fault.25 Open profession of bias was unthinkable, for it would have instantly destroyed the reader’s confidence and attention. But further surprises await the reader of the Bellum who did not close the scroll after reading Josephus’ confession: for just a few lines on, Josephus asks the reader’s forgiveness

23 Lucian, Hist. conscr., esp. 15; and see G. Avenarius, Lukians Schrift zur Geschichtsschreibung (Meisenheim/Glan: Anton Hain, 1956), esp. 113–18.
for his forceful expression of his own detestation of the Jewish extremists ('tyrants' is the censure he uses) and his sustained lament for his country's catastrophe, and he begs for a compassion "which violates the law of history" (παρὰ τὸν τῆς ἱστορίας νόμον, B.J. 1.11). Thus Josephus self-confessedly writes a history which invites a response violating the conventions of that very genre, as represented above all by Josephus' two prime historiographical models, Thucydides and Polybius.²⁶

Knowing that such an admission might estrange his readership, Josephus tries to explain: his grief was inexorable because of the depth of the Jews' suffering following the height of prosperity, and the reader is instructed to separate the facts from the historian's openly expressed feelings—τὰ μὲν πράγματα τῇ ἱστορίᾳ προσκρινέτω, τὰς δ' ὀλοφύρσεις τῷ γράφοντι (B.J. 1.12)—as if the historian himself is not the medium for the facts. This is a creative solution to the problem of the historian's personal involvement in his subject: facts have lives of their own, and the historian's reaction to them can be peeled away from the straight factual narrative, as if one did not influence choice and presentation of the other. In this way Josephus attempts to maintain both objectivity and strong pathos, not to mention the sanction for strong moral censure. But the problem is one which Josephus himself creates—why bring up his bias at all? Why warn the reader away from something which could just as well not have been written? Better to avoid laments and patent partisanship, better yet to avoid admission of bias and the need to excuse and explain it. Josephus might have been experimenting with an original combination of genres and topoi—Greek historiographical and tragic, or Jewish prophetic—which he felt he could combine with impunity, trying to accomplish two mutually contradictory purposes at once. One senses here the tension which constantly beset Josephus' need to address different, and not entirely compatible, audiences—as well as the tension between Josephus' different adopted roles: Greek historian, Jewish defender and polemicist, Jewish prophet. The problem with Josephus' experiment, if that indeed is what it was, is that he was a newcomer, and very foreign, in Rome. He did not have the standing as a writer to violate accepted standards and conventions, at

²⁶ The parallels which Marincola, Authority and Tradition, 168–69, cites to explain this passage are all different in tone and purpose from Josephus' partisan statements and thus cannot explain them.
least if he wanted a sympathetic and respectful hearing from the literary and social élite. And thus Roman historians, who had no personal stake in the events, ignored or at least avoided acknowledging and quoting him.

If a Roman reader persevered beyond the laments and confessions of the preface, which set Josephus apart from the historiographical tradition in which he professes to write, he would have encountered other features in the narrative signaling that the author was a provincial writer, among them the inaccuracies in terminology for the Roman provincial administration, as well as Josephus’ outsider’s impressions of the Roman government and army. One can well imagine an indulgent smile on the lips of the same Roman reader who, with forbearance or fascination continuing into the third scroll, arrived at the detailed and enthusiastic digression on the Roman army (B.J. 3.59–109).

The digression is superfluous to the narrative of events. Of course, Josephus’ description of the Roman army is meant to recall the similar passage in Polybius (6.19–42), another provincial historian, who gained among Roman readers the respect and acceptance as an authority to which Josephus aspired. Polybius wrote digressions on the Roman army, as well as on the Republican constitution, as essential components in his large historical project, namely to explain the phenomenon, unprecedented in human history, of Rome’s acquisition of world empire and domination in the brief period of 53 years (e.g. 1.1–4). Polybius was profoundly impressed with the Roman achievement, even if later in his long life he developed doubts about its continuation, as some scholars believe. His purpose was to record historical facts and truths, and explain their deepest causation. He expected that the general and statesman would derive benefit from his accurate record of events, but the overall purpose of the new “universal history” was as much philosophical as practical: Rome’s empire—its conquests, constitution, army, religion, moral and ethical system—must be examined and understood as a unique historical

27 Note H. Mason, Greek Terms for Roman Institutions: A Lexicon and Analysis (Toronto: Hakkert, 1974), 142–43, on the “wide range of reference” for administrative terms employed by Josephus and Philo.

phenomenon; in itself it could not be presented as an example for imitation.

By contrast, Josephus announces an overtly practical purpose for his digression on the Roman army: “less to praise the Romans than as a consolation for the conquered and a deterrence for those who would rebel” (B.J. 3.108). Josephus explicitly addresses the inhabitants of the Greek-speaking provinces. If Polybius had a similar practical end in the service of his Roman patrons, i.e. a desire to inform his fellow provincials that it was futile to rebel against the Romans, it remained veiled. In Josephus’ statement of purpose, he is not only serving the ends of the Roman administration, but expressing a deeper historical conception which emerges in other parts of his history—and which would have appeared profoundly foreign to a Roman reader. For the Romans and their army are described as instruments of a greater divine plan. In Josephus’ interpretation, God decides to destroy the Temple in order to purify the site from the Jews’ defilement of it and to punish them for their transgressions; thus the Romans acted as God’s unwilling ministers in punishing the rebels. The Jews’ first sin, for which they paid with their crushing defeat, was internal strife, which was a recurrent pattern in Jewish history and which always delayed or canceled God’s help against their enemies. There are some unclear elements in this interpretation, most prominently the precise point at which God decided to abandon His Temple, and whether it was primarily the Jewish στασις or the defilement of the Temple which drove away His favor, and even whether God had programmed Jewish defeat from the beginning. But these issues shall not divert our focus here from the direct role


31 Note 2 Mace 5:19: “But the Lord did not choose the nation for the sake of the holy place, but the place for the sake of the nation.”
of God in the unfolding of historical events, in the present and in the future, the central role of the Jews in God’s historical plan, the degree to which God’s plan is discernible in past historical patterns and the belief of an ultimate purpose in God’s historical plan—these are characteristics of Josephus’ view of history, and mark it as distinctly Jewish.

God’s management of history informs the two great set speeches in the Bellum, that of King Agrippa II addressed to the population of Jerusalem on the eve of war (B.J. 2.345–401), and that which Josephus writes for himself, addressed to the besieged Jerusalem, specifically the extremist leaders, late in the siege of the city (B.J. 5.362–419). Agrippa asserts that there are practical and satisfactory ways of dealing with the offenses of Rome’s governors, and that since all the countries of the world have submitted to Roman rule, it is expedient for the Jews to do the same; God will not fight on the Jewish side, for from the present evidence of Rome’s vast and powerful empire, God has sanctioned the Roman subjection of the peoples of the world. Agrippa does not praise the Romans or their empire, or argue that the Jews must learn to appreciate Rome and all the benefits it brings, but he merely surveys the Roman achievement as an impressive fact which must be accepted and submitted to, while acknowledging the loss of independence involved. In his speech Josephus repeats some of Agrippa’s arguments—the loss of independence is bitter but too late to fight for, the fact of the Roman empire is evidence of God’s favor and must be accepted—but the bulk of the speech is devoted to a lengthy theological discourse on Jewish history, demonstrating that God helped the Jews win when they acted righteously and defeated them through an external enemy when they sinned, particularly the sin of internal strife, thus a fortiori He will punish their present crimes against the people and the holy sanctuary.

There are distinct differences between these two speeches, particularly the fact that the worldly Agrippa II argues from general history and the present demands of Realpolitik, while the deposed priest and self-styled prophet Josephus argues from divine signs and revelations in a historical sequence pertaining only to the Jews. While a

---

Roman reader could follow, with no small measure of self-flattery, Agrippa's historical references, Josephus' speech is more of an internal argument, for the names and events to which he refers were not common knowledge to an educated Roman. When the Bellum was published, the theological implications of the destruction of the Temple, which this speech is trying to work out, were very desperately being debated in Jewish circles, and Josephus' speech should be considered in the context of that anguished discussion. The underlying historical conceptions of both speeches are the same: God, who directs human history according to a just plan, has favored the Romans by bestowing empire upon them, and by virtue of this blessing will not sanction rebellion even by His own people the Jews; thus self-preservation, especially preservation of the Jewish Temple and sacred rites, dictates submission to Roman rule, which on balance is relatively mild and unoffensive.

Neither speech expresses undiluted enthusiasm for the Roman empire. This contrasts with the real admiration expressed by various provincial authors, from Polybius' astonishment at the Romans' unique and stupendous accomplishment to the encomium of Rome by Aelius Aristides, representing a theme for sophists in Josephus' time and afterwards. In the Bellum, both Agrippa II and Josephus say that submission to the Roman empire is a necessary, and not too burdensome, fact of life, not that such submission to—much less participation in—the world empire was in itself a good thing, except to the degree to which such submission also demonstrated submission to God's will. Of course, realistically neither Agrippa II nor Josephus, who in the narrative context were each trying to persuade their respective audiences, could have effectively praised the virtues of Roman civilization and expected to retain the attention and sympathy of their listeners, but inasmuch as the speeches are used, as typically in ancient historiography, to convey and develop views of the author, they hardly convey great affection or enthusiasm for the empire under which Jews perforce lived; neither speech counsels wholehearted participation in the Roman project. Josephus never wrote an encomium

33 This point has been made persuasively by M. Stern, "Joseph son of Matthias, the Historian of the Jewish War" and "The Jewish War of Joseph son of Matthias and the Roman Emperors" in idem, Studies in Jewish History: The Second Temple Period (ed. M. Amit, I. Gafni, and M. D. Herr; Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 1991), 378-92 and 393–401 (Heb.).

34 Contrast, e.g., Tacitus (Cerialis) and Philo on the blessings of the Roman peace:
on Rome; his object of praise was always the Jews, their history and their πολιτεία. Implicit in both speeches here is also the idea that, just as God has favored various ruling powers in the past, and has granted Jewish success and even sovereignty in reward for righteous behavior, so God will eventually grant the Jews success once again: such is the inevitable result of a teleological view of history with God and the Jews, who are “beloved of God” (θεοφιλεῖς, B. J. 5.381), at the center.

This idea is hinted at in a sentence from Josephus’ speech which would have been understood differently by a Roman and a Jewish reader: [Josephus said that] “τυχή had passed over to them from every side—God, who brought dominion round to each nation in turn, now was over Italy.”

Both a Roman and a Jewish reader would understand the idea that political and economic success—especially such phenomenal success as the Roman Empire—was the result of divine favor; this, as well as generally the rise and fall of great empires, was a familiar concept in each tradition (e.g., Polybius 29.21). But the exact historical mechanism assumed here is ambiguous. That is, the relationship between τύχη and God can be understood in one of two ways, depending on whether the καὶ is read as a standard conjunction or as a reinforcement of the previous point in parataxis. In general, the gods as personalities play no role in Greek historiography after Herodotus, but the introduction of τύχη as historical explanation had a long tradition, even and especially among the more “scientific”

---


historians like Polybius. Polybius asserted (36.17) that τύχη should be ruled out when there is a rational explanation available, but he often invokes it to explain historical events. In the present passage, an average Roman reader would understand τύχη to be the overriding agent, and God the immediate instrument of what τύχη determined: God's obvious favor of the Romans is a sign of the determination of τύχη, who could act randomly and capriciously or purposefully, but whose ways were ultimately inscrutable and unpredictable; above all, even if τύχη intervened on the immediate level to reward virtue or punish crime, the goddess had no teleological purpose, no grand plan, but rather reacted to events and did not plan them. Thus in the above sentence, the Graeco-Roman view would find no discernible method or end in the cycle of nations on which God has bestowed dominion. Yet a Jewish reader, with a knowledge e.g. of the Book of Daniel and the same sense of history which underlies the speeches of Agrippa II and Josephus in the Bellum, would understand Josephus to mean that God had purposefully favored different nations in turn with world power—this being the “fortune” which the Romans now enjoy from every quarter. Instead of God being fortune’s instrument, fortune is God’s. History happens according to a divine direction. Periods of suffering and slavery had been foretold, and imply a certain future: latent in those prophecies there is the promise of a period of freedom and sovereignty.

This is the deeper statement in both Agrippa II’s and Josephus’ speeches: the Jews need merely patiently to wait out Roman rule (and perhaps even other unforeseen regimes), dominion and divine favor will eventually come around to them again. The Jewish historian held fast to his Jewish beliefs while in the City of Rome, and they shaped his historical outlook.

The people, events and literary activity in the Roman East continued to preoccupy Josephus to the end of his life. He used his purported autobiography as the platform for a long polemic against Justus of Tiberias. Even the learned defense of Judaism in the Contra Apionem takes to task many oriental writers who were marginal in the Roman world (and shows no expertise in Roman historiography), and refutes the standard Greek ethnocentric claims by a rival Jewish ethnocentric argument, just like other works written by Greek-speaking oriental

---

intellectuals who tried to elevate their people’s dignity above that of the arrogant Greeks. Josephus’ literary targets were not exactly on the main reading curriculum of the social and literary élite in Flavian Rome. His most ardent and consistent interests remained not those which preoccupied and fascinated the writers in Rome, but those which continued to agitate in the East. His persistent persona and literary project were Jewish.40

Josephus’ self-professed identity, his manner and style of writing, and his own interests, kept him isolated at Rome for the last thirty years of his life.41 This was partly the result of Roman prejudice, as can be gauged from Tacitus and Juvenal. Josephus, in his lifetime project, not only did not shed his Jewish identity but emphasized it. Josephus’ exclusion was also partly self-imposed. His interests and literary purposes, as well as his artistic technique, remained profoundly provincial, despite his location in the capital. His enduring concerns are what ultimately gave his writings their main content and character. Yet we know more about Judaism because Josephus did not reach for Romanitas,42 as did other Roman historians writing in Greek, like Dionysius and Appian.

40 Cf. the statements at B.J. 6.107, A.J. 20.263, and note Walbank, “‘Treason’ and Roman Domination,” 263, contrasting Josephus with other Greek historians of Rome: “Where Josephus differs from these is in his strong and persistent identification with his native Jewish origins and with the Jewish state, to which Rome represented a cultural as well as a political threat. He was never a member of a hellenised élite; his earliest writings, even after his arrival in Rome, were in Aramaic and his Greek had to be learnt.”

41 Note two other investigations of Josephus’ provincial outlook: D. Daube, “Typology in Josephus,” JJS 31 (1980): 18–36, esp. 35–6, an illuminating contrast between Dionysius and Josephus which points out that Josephus shows that the Jews had a longer history than the Romans, that he sharply distinguishes Romans from Jews and, in contrast to Dionysius’ justification of the Roman right to rule because they are stronger (but also virtuous), that he saw Romans as ruling by God’s plan until Jews repent. S. J. D. Cohen, “History and Historiography in the Against Apion of Josephus,” in Essays in Jewish Historiography (ed. A. Rapoport-Albert; 1988, repr. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991), 1–12, demonstrates that Josephus’ central claim in the Contra Apionem, namely that the unanimity among Jewish accounts proves their veracity whereas the myriad opinions and debates among Greek historians prove their instability as regards truth, would be “absurd” to any Greek or Roman intellectual. The Greek notion of disagreement being part of the search for truth contrasts with the notion of the undisturbed unity of revealed truth which Josephus believed in, that is, truth delivered from a divine source instead of through dialectic and argumentation.

PART TWO

LITERARY QUESTIONS
"BY THE WATERS OF BABYLON": JOSEPHUS AND GREEK POETRY

HONORA HOWELL CHAPMAN
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, FRESNO

INTRODUCTION

In an essay dated November 12, 1956, Vladimir Nabokov explains to the readers of his new novel *Lolita* that he had originally composed "a short story some thirty pages long" on roughly the same theme in his native Russian back in 1940, but after leaving Paris for America, he soon destroyed it. The story, he claims, continued to "plague" him, however, and so Nabokov, now in New York state, decided to try to compose "a new treatment of the theme, this time in English—the language of my first governess in St. Petersburg, circa 1903, a Miss Rachel Home."¹ He concludes his essay with the following statement:

None of my American friends have read my Russian books and thus every appraisal on the strength of my English ones is bound to be out of focus. My private tragedy, which cannot, and indeed, should not, be anybody's concern, is that I had to abandon my natural idiom, my untrammeled, rich, and infinitely docile Russian tongue for a second-rate brand of English, devoid of any of those apparatuses—the baffling mirror, the black velvet backdrop, the implied associations and traditions—which the native illusionist, frac-tails flying, can magically use to transcend the heritage in his own way.²

Like the typical American audience who has not read Nabokov's works in Russian, most of the readers of Josephus' *Bellum Judaicum* in Attic Greek probably had never seen his original first edition of his account of the war as composed in his "native tongue."³ We, like his audience living under Roman rule, read his extant western account of the war, for which Josephus states that he "used some

² Ibid.
³ B.J. 1.3. It is uncertain how many editions of this Greek text were circulated.
assistants for the Greek language” (C. Ap. 1.50: χρησάμενος τισι πρὸς τὴν Ἑλληνίδα φωνὴν συνεργοῖς). Did Josephus employ these συνεργοί in order to inject what Nabokov calls “the baffling mirror, the black velvet backdrop” into his Greek version of the Bellum? Stepping aside from this bedeviled question of the assistants for a moment, we should concentrate on the word φωνῇ here and consider that it is not simply “language” but as much the “sound” of Greek as it would play on the ear of the first-century listener—not only vocabulary, grammar, and syntax, but even the pitch of the spoken or sung language. It is the voice in action, as the war prophet Jesus, son of Ananias, declaims in an entirely different context in the Bellum: “a voice from the east, a voice from the west.” (B.J. 6.301: “φωνῇ ἀπὸ ἀνατολῆς, φωνῇ ἀπὸ δύσεως”). In any case, Josephus would certainly have known from looking at the Greek on the scroll or from listening to it being read whether it had the right “literary sound” in trying to pitch a persuasive argument about the war to his readers. How so?

At the end of his Antiquitates, Josephus informs his readers that he has gone well beyond the bounds of a typical Judean education by learning Greek literature, both prose and poetry:

έχω γὰρ ὁμολογούμενον παρὰ τῶν ὁμοθών πλείστον αὐτῶν κατὰ τὴν ἐπιχώριον καὶ παρ’ ἑμῖν παιδείαν διαφέρειν καὶ τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν δὲ γραμμάτων καὶ ποιητικῶν μαθημάτων πολλὰ ἐσπούδασα μετασχεῖν τὴν γραμματικὴν ἐμπειρίαν ἀναλαβὼν, τὴν δὲ περὶ τὴν προφορὰν ἀκρίβειαν πάτριος ἐκώλυσεν συνήθεια

For my compatriots admit that in our Jewish learning I far excel them. I have also laboured strenuously to partake of the realm of Greek prose [or: learning] and poetry, after having gained a knowledge of Greek grammar [or: after acquiring practice in writing], although the habitual use of my native tongue has prevented [or: the usages of our nation have prevented] my attaining precision in the pronunciation.4

Niese chose not to include the underlined phrase concerning poetry, whereas Feldman does include it in his Loeb edition. The manuscripts here at A.J. 20.263 do not agree: A has the entire phrase underlined above, E(pitome) removes πολλὰ from the end of the phrase, while M and W have no phrase concerning poetry. By just looking at the conclusion of the Antiquitates starting at 20.259, one sees that manuscripts M and W noticeably omit material found in A:5

---

4 A.J. 20.263 (trans. Feldman, LCL), with his alternatives in his footnotes.
5 This is apparent in rest of Book 20, also, but not at quite the same rate per sentence.
twice in 260, once in 261, twice in 263, once in 264, and once in 266. Even if someone did later add to Josephus’ original text the idea of him studying also Greek poetry, we can nevertheless see through a close examination of the Bellum the results of Josephus having become acquainted with and then having used specific words and themes from Greek poetry in writing his account of the war. He should be granted ultimate credit for this effort, since his was the only name affixed to the scrolls, not that of any Joe the σύνεργός. In the leisure he says he enjoyed at Rome, the author Flavius Josephus was the mastermind of this project of a Greek version of the Bellum, and we can certainly attribute to him the common sense and literary talent to weave particular references to Greek poetry into his Greek text. Whether he made some or all of the poetic selections himself, or left at least part of this task to his σύνεργοί, or hired the σύνεργοί to teach him more as they went through the process of editing the text together, does not preclude the fact that poetic allusions appear in the Bellum for the audience to catch. As a point of comparison, we should consider Josephus’ remark about the contemporary historian Iustus being “well trained in the Greek sort of education.”

From this we can imagine that Iustus’ text On the Judean Kings also provided poetic allusions, perhaps ones even more clever than Josephus’ own. Since, however, Iustus’ work is not extant, this is mere speculation. Furthermore, Lisa Ullmann and Jonathan Price have already convincingly argued in their study of “the dramatic technique, language and even structure of BJ’s narrative of the fatal intrigues in Herod’s court” that “the dramatic structure and language of the Herodian domestic narrative involved creative choices so far-reaching that they could only have been the product of Josephus’ own artistic decisions and control over the material; his notorious ‘assistants’ are thus pushed to the periphery.”

---

6 Vita 40 (trans. Mason, BJP 9).
7 Ibid., 46, n. 248, offers that Photius, Bibl. 33, describes Iustus’ text “as ‘most concise’ in style.” A concise style, however, would not rule out allusion; see, for instance, A. Foucher, “Nature et formes de l’histoire tragique à Rome,” Latomus 59.4 (2000): 773–801 on Tacitus’ use of Seneca. Note that in describing his own education in the Antiquitates Judaicae Josephus never attributes to himself Iustus’ “craftiness and a kind of guile through words,” which were considered the common tricks of the rhetorical trade; see Mason’s long note to Vita 45 (BJP 9) concerning complaints about sophists.

eye out for both poetic language and structure when reading the *Bellum* for allusions.

Why would Josephus engage in this kind of literary education (and even employ others) when writing the *Bellum*? I would respond that beyond the desire for personal glory or for setting the record straight, Josephus went to all this trouble in order to create a text that would persuade educated readers with its refined Attic style. He could do this, in part, by tapping into a world of literary allusions available in Greek poetry. Allusion has the power both to delight and to persuade an audience far more than any account of the bare facts can because allusion engages the audience’s imagination in a game of making mental connections between people, places, events, myths, and ideas that otherwise might seem remote, yet their similarities resound through time and space. Beyond being entertaining in and of itself, detecting the allusion can enrich the reader’s perception and reception of what the author may be conveying through choices of verbal phrasing, context, and overall organization. The audience may make connections unintended by the original author, as most authors will attest happens, but this only proves the strength of the game inherent in all reading.

Joseph Pucci has shown quite well in his recent book *The Full-Knowing Reader* that though rhetorical treatises in the first century had no specific term for “allusion” *per se*, since the label *allusio* as a literary term seems to be first attested in Cassiodorus, writers in Rome were, of course, well aware of borrowing or referring to the works of their predecessors, especially the Greek poets. After detailing the evolution of scholarship on this topic of allusion, Pucci offers his own description of allusion:

The literary allusion is the verbal moment in a subsequent text of a specific and verifiable verbal moment in a prior text, generated through the collusion of authorial and readerly intent, neither controlled nor limited by the language that constitutes it, in which a bundle of potential meanings obtains, retrievable at any given time only in part. . . . When the Greeks and Romans thought about literary borrowing, for example, they seem also to have framed their concept against the compe-

---

tencies of a powerful reader, a tack inherited and vigorously develope
d by Christian littérateurs in late antiquity and the Middle Ages.\textsuperscript{11}

Reader and author, therefore, both take part in the "collusion," the
act of playing together with the text, and with various purposes in
mind. This, however, is not necessarily an easy game. In order to
play well, the reader of the \textit{Bellum} should be acquainted with "prior"
texts, whatever they may be, and since we as modern readers have
access to only a small fraction of Greco-Roman texts and other cul-
tural material, we're fairly hamstrung. Josephus claims that his most
esteemed original audience included the Herodians, who he says
were "men who had reached the highest degree of Greek education."\textsuperscript{12}
This education in Greek literature seems to be considered a pre-
requisite for truly appreciating the text, catching the allusions, and
making mental connections of one's own.

Furthermore, for the author there is real difficulty inherent in using
any other author's prior work, especially that of a great artist. Consider
the account in Donatus of Vergil's witty remark on borrowing Homer:

Asconius Pedianus in his book 'against Virgil's detractors', made a few
objections himself, mostly relating to fact (\textit{historia}) and based on his
taking so much from Homer. He reports that Virgil defended himself
against this charge by saying: 'And why don't they try the same thefts?
They would soon understand that it's easier to pinch Hercules' club
than a line from Homer.'\textsuperscript{13}

Writing a truly excellent piece of literature like the \textit{Aeneid} that stands
the test of time and earns its own brand of immortality through
engagement with both great literature of the past and audiences of
the future is certainly a labor to match Hercules' own. Josephus suc-
ceeded in producing a prose history, the \textit{Bellum}, and it has continued
to be read and used throughout the centuries in large part because
his account describes the history before and after the destruction of
Jerusalem; this turned out to be of tremendous interest to Christian
readers, who then preserved the text for later interested audiences.
These classically trained readers noted the "dramatic" tone of particular

\begin{footnotes}
\item[11] \textit{Ibid.}, 47–48. Pucci combats the notion that allusion is the same as the ancient
ideas of \textit{imitatio} or \textit{mimérsis} on 86.
\item[13] Donatus, \textit{Life of Virgil} 186, transl. in D. A. Russell, \textit{Criticism in Antiquity} (Berkeley:
\end{footnotes}
scenes. In this paper I shall explore in more detail specific allusions to different types of Greek poetry popular at the time Josephus wrote the *Bellum*.

Historical prose and poetry were not considered as far apart in antiquity as one might first think. Josephus’ contemporary Quintilian describes historiography in his handbook on oratory in the following way:

> Historia quoque alere oratorem quodam uberi iucundoque suco potest; verum et ipsa sic est legenda, ut sciamus, plerasque eius virtutes oratorī esse vitandas. Est enim proxima poetis et quodammodo carmen solutum, et scribitur ad narrandum non ad probandum, totumque opus non ad actum rei pugnamque praesentem, sed ad memoriam posteritatis et ingenii famam componitur; ideoque et verbis remotioribus et liberioribus figuris narrandi taedium evitat.\(^{14}\)

In Quintilian’s opinion, historiography can be a *quodammodo carmen solutum*, a kind of poetry without the restrictions of meter, but it possesses traits that he thinks are not entirely useful or desirable when composing forensic rhetoric.

The fact that poetic references\(^ {15}\) permeate Josephus’ *Bellum* is indisputable. H. St. J. Thackeray published his famous series of lectures in which he discusses Josephus’ use of Attic tragedians,\(^ {16}\) and he also edited the Loeb version of the *Bellum* with an eye towards Josephus’ literary borrowings.\(^ {17}\) Thackeray notes that his own analysis of the “drama” surrounding Herod is inspired by Eusebius’ response to this portion of the *Bellum* as τραγικὴ δραματουργία.\(^ {18}\) Thackeray proceeds to offer briefly specific examples of borrowings in the *Bellum* from Thucydides, Herodotus, Xenophon, Demosthenes, Homer, Sophocles,

---

\(^{14}\) Quintilian, *Inst.* 10.1.31; also see 10.1.73–75 on the merits of the Greek historians, and 101–104 on the highlights of Roman historiography; Josephus appears in neither list. Antoine Foucher uses this passage as a launching point for his study of the influence of epic poetry on Latin historiography from Sallust to Ammianus Marcellinus, *Historia proxima poetis* (Bruxelles: Latomus, 2000).


Vergil, and Sallust. Overall, however, Louis Feldman has done by far the most scholarship on how Josephus’ works contain allusions to classical poetry; he has argued, for instance, that Josephus modeled his description of the ‘Aqedah in the Antiquitates upon Euripides’ Iphigenia at Aulis.\(^\text{19}\) Feldman’s most sweeping study appears in his paper entitled “The Influence of the Greek Tragedians on Josephus,”\(^\text{20}\) which briefly traces general trends in rhetorical training and historiography throughout the Hellenistic period and then provides an arsenal of examples of poetic allusions from Greek tragedy found mostly in the Antiquitates. Here, however, I shall concentrate instead upon how poetic allusions from different genres function in only a few select passages of the Bellum.

For a humorous but instructive look at which Greek poets in particular were highly esteemed in Roman education\(^\text{21}\) only a decade or so before Josephus wrote his Bellum, we can turn to Petronius’ novel Satyricon. The fragmentary text we have opens with the narrator Encolpius ranting about the decline of eloquence ever since students started declaiming about “pirates” or “tyrants” or “oracles advising the sacrifice of three or more virgins during a plague”:

\[
\text{Qui inter haec nutriuntur, non magis sapere possunt quam bene olere qui in culina habitant... Nondum iuvenes declamationibus continebantur, cum Sophocles aut Euripides invenerunt verba quibus deberent loqui. Nondum umbraticus doctor ingenia deleverat, cum Pindarus novemque lyrici Homericis versibus canere timuerunt... Ad summam, quis postea Thucydides, quis Hyperidis ad famam processit? (Sat. 2)}
\]

Petronius is clearly having a great deal of fun making a relatively low-life character comment on contemporary education and literature, and in this playful scene we find the ready material for mid-first-century literary allusion.\(^\text{22}\)


\(^{21}\) For a recent study of Roman education, see R. Cribiore, Education in Greek and Roman Antiquity (Leiden: Brill, 2001).

\(^{22}\) Tacitus also highlights these particular poets when his character Maternus speaks in Dialogus 12.5, but he does not mention Pindar and replaces Thucydides with Lysias in his list of influential authors.
I would like to focus on Encolpius’ choices of some of the most eloquent poets of Greece, whose works it appears Josephus had read or possibly even heard performed:23 Homer, Pindar, Sophocles, and Euripides.24 In doing so, I shall concentrate on examples of possible Greek texts and songs that we can hear Josephus playing in a new prose tune by the waters of the new Babylon, Rome. For all writers in the Graeco-Roman world, Homer’s epics established the literary benchmark for expressing individual prowess while acknowledging the inevitable tragedy of death, especially in warfare, as the end for all mortals. Pindar’s lyric poetry provided a model for momentary celebration of human achievement. Finally, the Greek dramatists were particularly suitable for Josephus’ literary purpose given their focus on reversal of fortune, loss, and destruction. Though the Judean Psalms and other scriptures surely were a repertoire familiar to Josephus from childhood and then as a priest at the temple at Jerusalem, I leave the examination of allusions involving that material in Josephus’ writings to another paper. Overall, Josephus may not have quite “attained the stature of Thucydides,” to borrow Encolpius’ phrase, but he certainly came close, especially in the eyes of later Christian readers.

Homer

In Contra Apionem Josephus attests to Homer’s oral poetry being the beginning of Greek literature.25 Homer’s poetry was, in fact, the basis of anyone’s Greek education in antiquity. Even a recalcitrant student like Nero found Homer useful, as Suetonius relates: “And once when he was moaning to his classmates about the charioteer for the Greens who was dragged [by his horses], and his teacher scolded him, he

---

23 As A. Ford, “From Letters to Literature: Reading the ‘Song Culture’ of Classical Greece,” in Written Texts and the Rise of Literate Culture in Ancient Greece (ed. H. Yunis; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 15–37, reminds us (on 37): “More generally, I urge that readers of early Greek poetry realize they are dealing with something more than verbal patterning. Like all song, this song had a social life, and that life was its most meaningful presence, however ephemeral, variable, and hard to retrieve it may be.”

24 O. Andersen and V. Robbins have examined these authors with respect to the gospels in “Paradigms in Homer, Pindar, the Tragedians, and the New Testament,” Semeia 64 (1993): 3–31.

lied and said that he was talking about Hector.” This same Homeric scene involving Hector will be useful to Josephus, as we shall soon see. In a 1908 publication in Latin on Josephus’ use of rhetoric in the *Bellum*, the scholar Wolff commented briefly on two examples of what he called “Homerismus.” One is a short phrase from Agrippa’s speech in Book 2 and the other is the exclamation ἀ δεῖλοι (“poor wretches!”) derived from both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* and used in Josephus’ own set speech in Book 5. Two decades later Thackeray provided a fine, short list of Homeric words in his introduction to the *Bellum*. I, instead, would like to show how allusions to Homer’s poetry operate on both the small verbal level as well as the larger scene level in the *Bellum*.

For a verbal example not provided by Thackeray we can turn to Book 2, where Josephus stages a dramatic scene at the temple with all the priests and Levites begging the people not to anger the Romans to the point that they would plunder “the treasures belonging to God” (τῶν θείων κεμπηλίων). He continues:

τοὺς δ’ ἀρχιερεῖς αὐτοὺς ἦν ἰδεῖν καταμωμένους μὲν τῆς κεφαλῆς κόνιν, γυμνοὺς δὲ τὰ στέρνα τῶν ἐσθήτων διερήμενων (B.J. 2.322)

This scene in a nutshell is a brief allusion to the agony of Priam at the end of the *Iliad*. First of all, the noun κεμπήλιον is a noticeably Homeric word used to describe treasure, including that of King Priam, but it is found rarely in Greek prose, as LSJ notes, except in the works of Josephus—15 times in the *Bellum* alone. Furthermore, all manuscripts of the *Bellum* agree that the verb καταμάω appears here as a present middle participle, with the noun κεφαλή in either the accusative (which Niese chose, following mss. PAM) or the genitive.

---

27 A. Wolff, *De Flavii Josephi Belli Iudaici Scriptoris Studiis Rhetoriciis* (Halis Saxonum, 1908), 9, referring to B.J. 2.347 and 5.376. Wolff does not provide the Homeric citations, but ἀ δεῖλοι is found at *Il.* 17.201 and *Od.* 20.351.
29 B.J. 2.321.
30 A Perseus scan produces 57 results for the word, with the majority of instances being in Homer or Josephus; otherwise, it appears in a few papyri, twice in Herodotus (3.41 and 6.62, which are both colorful stories but do not involve grieving elders), Strabo 12.3.31 on Mithridates’ treasures, and Appian, *Bell. civ.* 3.2.17, where Octavius addresses Antony about Caesar’s treasures, after having just quoted from Achilles in *Iliad* 18 on fate; this could lead one to think that there is a Homeric allusion working here as well with the word choice.
The approximate phrase appears again at 2.601 (περιφρηξάμενος μὲν τὴν ἔσθητα, καταπασάμενος δὲ τῆς κεφαλῆς κόνιν) to describe Josephus’ own appearance at Tarichaeae, though only manuscript L has the verb καταμάω as an aorist middle participle, whereas the rest use the same form of καταπάσσω, “sprinkle.” This verb καταπάσσω is, in fact, the one used in the Septuagint to describe situations where people sprinkle dust upon themselves as an act of great sorrow, as in Job and Esther,31 for instance. The verb καταμάω, however, is extremely rare in extant Greek literature32 and appears most notably only once in Homer, also in the middle voice, to describe the condition in which the messenger goddess Iris finds Priam after the death of Hector:

άμφι δὲ πολλή
cύπρος ἐπὶ κεφαλῆ τε καὶ αὐχένι τοῦ γέροντος
τὴν ῥα κυλινδόμενος καταμήσατο χερσίν ἐησι. (Iliad 24.163-165)

By choosing this extraordinary verb καταμάω, Josephus invites the reader to remember the suffering of Priam, who, though he has lost a son, nevertheless follows the will of Zeus by pleading with his son’s killer, Achilles, and offering copious gifts from his palace in exchange for Hector’s corpse. While Priam covers himself in dung, the religious officials in the Bellum use the dust traditional to Judean practice. This verb in combination with the noun κόνις could allude to both the Septuagint and Homer33 and perhaps even to a choral ode in Sophocles’ Antigone, which, however, is a highly debated passage.34 [I shall discuss allusions to the Antigone later.] The Homeric allusion with the verb καταμάω, nevertheless, is clear here in the Bellum and moves the reader trained in Homer to see this dire situation predicting the loss of the temple’s wealth as one of epic proportions.

For a broader situational allusion to Homer’s Iliad, we can turn to the murder of a certain Niger the Peraean in Book 4. Josephus introduces the death notice by characterizing Niger in Homeric fashion

31 Job 2:12, and possibly 1:20, and Esth 4:1; Mason (BJP 9), p. 83, n. 659, on Vita 138, refers to the biblical tradition and provides the Esther reference.
32 Besides the two instances in the Bellum Judaicum, LSJ cites the passage from the Iliad; Sophocles, Ant. 601, and possibly Pherecrates 121, where it is emended from κατακομῆσονται.
33 Achilles leaves Hector’s corpse in the dust: Iliad 24.18.
34 Sophocles may have changed the Homeric dung to dust/ash (κόνις) at Ant. 602 to use with the verb καταμάω, since her use of dust to cover the corpse of her dead brother Polyneices is a main theme (247, 256, 409, 429); all manuscripts of the Antigone read κόνις, but Jortin suggested κοπίς, which was then adopted by later editors.
as an ἀνήρ ἁριστος when fighting against the Romans. Niger then suffers a death that shares features with Hector’s in *Iliad* Book 22. Though Niger is not as prominent a hero in the *Bellum* as Hector is in the *Iliad*, he does have some fine moments at the beginning of the war, including an amazing reappearance from a cavern after being presumed dead for three days at Ascalon. Josephus allows Niger a dramatic death scene in order to highlight the wasteful cruelty of the Zealots in killing such a valiant leader and in order to foreshadow the coming destruction of Jerusalem in epic fashion. Unlike Hector who is dragged around after he dies, Niger is dragged alive through the streets and then outside of Jerusalem; both men die outside their respective cities. Niger pleads only for burial, but his request is refused, just as happens to Hector when he begs Achilles for a proper funeral. Here the allusion works more on the situational than the verbal level. Josephus does not, for instance, use Homeric verbs for dragging or begging that appear in *Iliad* with respect to Hector. Josephus then conjures up the following death curse:

άναιρούμενος δὲ ὁ Νῖγερ τιμωροῦσ’ Ῥωμαίους σύντοις ἐπηράσατο λιμὸν τε καὶ λοιμὸν ἐπὶ τῷ πολέμῳ καὶ πρὸς ἀπασι τὰς ἀλλήλων χειρὰς. ἀ δὴ πάντα κατὰ τῶν ἁρέμων ἐκνεύρωσεν ὁ θεός, καὶ τὸ δικαίωταν, ὅτι γεύσασθαι τῆς ἀλλήλων ἀπονοίας ἐμελλον ὡκ ἐς μακρὰν στασιάσαντες. (*B.J.* 4.361–362)

Likewise, Hector in his final gasps in *Iliad* 22 has warned Achilles that his curse will be “the cause of the wrath of the gods,” and that Paris and Phoebus Apollo will destroy Achilles at the Scaean Gates. Josephus’ readers could certainly grasp and appreciate the clear allusion to Hector’s death scene in Homer, which would bring with it

---

35 *B.J.* 4.359. For instance, Agamemnon is ἁριστος at *Iliad* 2.580, as is Telamonic Ajax at 2.768 (while Achilles is away).

36 As H. St. J. Thackeray, *The Jewish War, Books IV–VII* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1928), 105, n. d, remarks: “He distinguished himself in the opening battle with Cestius, B. ii.520; was at one time governor of Idumaea, ii.566; and led two unsuccessful attacks on the Roman garrison at Ascalon, when he again won distinction and had a miraculous escape, iii.11–28.”

37 Josephus uses ἐσώρευτο (from σύρω) here instead of the Homeric ἐλκω. A much later poet, Leontius (6th cent. C.E.), uses both verbs, ἐλκω and σύρω, to describe Hector’s demise: καὶ πᾶλι ζωστήρ εὑλκσε Πρισμήδην διήρξα σύρomin, “and the belt dragged Hector, who was being dragged behind his chariot” (*Anth.Pal.* 7.152.5–6).


39 See note above on verbs of dragging. For begging, see *B.J.* 4.360: ἰκέτευεν; cf. *Iliad* 22.338 λίσσομ’ ὑπὲρ νυκήν κτλ and 22.345 γούνων γουνάζεω.

all the associated pathos when also recalling the poignant family scene in *Iliad* Book 6 and the quiet finality of his funeral at the end of the poem. Josephus includes in the curse both λωμός (famine) and λοιμός (plague), which he has already employed in Herod’s speech after an earthquake in Book 1.\(^{41}\) This is a time-honored pairing in Greek literature dating back to Hesiod, Herodotus, and Thucydides, which his readers would immediately recognize.\(^{42}\) In fact, the example from Thucydides is especially relevant, because it involves the oracle that the Athenians suddenly remembered predicting plague (or alternatively, famine) when war with the Dorians comes.\(^{43}\) But λωμός also recalls the plague\(^{44}\) that strikes the Greek army at the beginning of the *Iliad* after the priest Chryses prays to Apollo for revenge against the Greeks.

Finally, the reader of the *Bellum* can see that Josephus has transformed the Homeric imagery of eating in this death scene: Hector’s request that dogs not be allowed to eat his body (22.339), and then Achilles’ harsh reply to Hector (whom he calls “dog” in the vocative, 22.345) that he would like to hack away Hector’s flesh and eat it raw (24.346 ff.),\(^{45}\) becomes in Niger’s curse and then in the subsequent *Bellum* narrative a metaphor for the predatory behavior of the rebels. In an episode soon to follow, in which the rebel leader Simon, out of anger over his wife’s kidnapping by the Zealots, tortures and kills people foraging outside the walls of Jerusalem, Josephus adds that Simon “because of his excessive vexation almost even ate the dead bodies.”\(^{46}\) Again, the specific words are not necessarily Homeric vocabulary, but the anger stopping just short of cannibalism is. Any audience raised on Homer could then associate the fall of Jerusalem

---

\(^{41}\) *B.J.* 1.377. At *B.J.* 4.137 Destinon suggests λοιμός for λωμός in the manuscripts; otherwise, Josephus will use only the adjective λοιμωδής at *B.J.* 6.2 and 6.421. Famine plays a far larger role than pestilence in the *Bellum Judaicum.*

\(^{42}\) Hesiod, *Op.* 243; Herodotus 7.171; Thucydides 2.54.


\(^{44}\) Homer, *Iliad* 1.43 ff., and 60 for λωμός.

\(^{45}\) Hecuba wishes she could do virtually the same with Achilles at *Iliad* 24.212–213.

\(^{46}\) *B.J.* 4.541: δι’ ἔσπερβολην ἀγανακτησεος μονονουχι κοι νεκρὸν γευόμενος τῶν σομάτων. Also, see *B.J.* 5.4 for the factions feeding on their own flesh, and 6.212 where the rebels almost literally eat human flesh. See my remarks on Mary in Book 6 below. Niger’s curse combines main themes of the *Bellum Judaicum,* including the madness of the rebels and their strife.
that much more with the fall of Troy because of this collection of thematic allusions. How better to convince an audience of the importance of this event than to link it with the single most memorable destruction of a city in ancient history or literature?

**Pindar**

When Josephus studied Greek literature, he certainly would have read Pindar along with Homer, since not only Petronius but also Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Quintilian⁴⁷ make it very clear that in the first century Pindar provided the “greatest hits” of Greek lyric in his “austere” style, as Dionysius calls it.⁴⁸ As any student will admit, lyric poetry is not necessarily easy to read given its often condensed and intricate style, but at least it is much shorter and has fewer words per line than epic. In addition, since Josephus lived at a time when Pindar’s songs could still be heard performed by singers accompanied by the lyre, the lyrics would be all the more memorable, as are those of songs today.⁴⁹ I would suggest, then, the possibility that allusions to Pindar’s poetry can be found in the *Bellum*. Not all of Pindar, however, would have necessarily appealed to Josephus, considering his own remarks in *Contra Apionem* decrying myths concocted by poets about the gods and goddesses, including their sexual antics.⁵⁰ Therefore, Pindar’s famous *Olympian* I, for instance, with its revised myth about Pelops not having been served up as a meal for the gods but instead becoming Poseidon’s consort on Olympus where Ganymede later shows up,⁵¹ would, therefore, *not* have been a poetic moment to which he would have chosen to allude when celebrating Judean success.

Josephus might have found less “mythological” material in Pindar more appealing, instead. In the summary of the life of John Hyrcanus in the *Bellum*, one finds a core group of three words, εὐπραγία, θόνος, θεός, that much more with the fall of Troy because of this collection of thematic allusions. How better to convince an audience of the importance of this event than to link it with the single most memorable destruction of a city in ancient history or literature?

---

⁴⁸ Pindar was already a major source for the poets of Rome; see, for instance, Horace, *Carm.* 4.2: *Pindarum quisquis studet aemulari.*
⁴⁹ Josephus also would have possibly had access to far more of Pindar’s works than just the poems that survive today, since his contemporaries quote from Pindaric works that are now lost.
⁵⁰ *C. Ap.* 2.239 ff., esp. 244.
⁵¹ Pindar, *Ol.* 1.35–45.
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and εὐδαιμονία, which then appear in modified form in the parallel passage in the Antiquitates, as well as in a description of himself in the Vita:

Πρὸς δὲ τὰς εὐπραγίας αὐτοῦ τῇ Ἰωάννῃ καὶ τῶν παιδῶν φθόνος ἐγείρει στάσιν τῶν ἐπιχωρίων, καὶ πολλοὶ κατ’ αὐτῶν συνελθόντες οὐκ ἤρέμουν, μέχρι καὶ πρὸς φανερὸν πόλεμον ἐκρυπτισθέντες ἦττονται. τὸ λοιπὸν δ’ ἐπιβίους ἐν εὐδαιμονίᾳ Ἰωάννης καὶ τὰ κατὰ τὴν ἁρχὴν κάλλιστα διοικήσας ἐν τρισίν ὀλοί καὶ τριάκοντα ἑτεσίν ἐπὶ πέντε νεοὶς τελευτ., μακαριστῶς ὄντως καὶ κατὰ μηδὲν ἐάσας ἐφ’ ἐαυτῷ μεμφθῆναι τὴν τύχην. (B.J. 1.67–68)

'Ὑρκανῷ δὲ φθόνον ἐκίνησεν παρὰ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἡ εὐπραγία, μάλιστα δ’ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι κακῶς πρὸς αὐτὸν εἴχον, αἵρεσις ὄντες μίας τῶν Ἰουδαίων, ὡς καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἐπάνω δεδηλώκαμεν. τοσαύτην δὲ ἔχουσι τὴν ἴσχυν παρὰ τῷ πλήθει, ὡς καὶ κατὰ βασιλέας τι λέγοντες καὶ κατ’ ἀρχιερέας εὐθὺς πιστεύεσθαι. (A.J. 13.288; 289–298 on Hyrcanus and the Pharisees and Sadducees)

'Ὑρκανὸς δὲ παῦσας τὴν στάσιν καὶ μετ’ αὐτὴν βιώσας εὐδαιμόνος καὶ τὴν ἁρχὴν διοικήσαμενος ἀριστον τρόπον ἑτεσίν ἐνὶ καὶ τριάκοντα τελευτῇ καταλιπὼν νεοὺς πέντε, τριῶν τῶν μεγίστων ἁζαίς ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ κρίθεις, ἁρχῆς τοῦ ἑθνοῦς καὶ τῆς ἀρχιερατικῆς τιμῆς καὶ προφητείας—συνὴν γὰρ ἀτύχω τὸ θεῖον καὶ τὴν τῶν μελλόντων πρόγνωσιν παρείχεν αὐτῷ τοῖς εἰδεναι καὶ προλέγειν οὕτως, ὡστε καὶ περὶ τῶν δύο τῶν πρεσβυτέρων παιδίν ὅτι μη μενοῦσιν τῶν πραγμάτων κύριοι προεῖπτεν. ὅτι τὴν καταστροφήν εἰς τὸ μαθεῖν ὅσον τῆς τοῦ πατρὸς ὑπέβησαν εὐτυχίας ἁζίων ἀφηγήσασθαι. (A.J. 13.299–300)

'Ο δὲ τοῦ Λευεί παῖς Ἰωάννης, ὃν ἐφαμεν ἐν τοῖς Γισχάλοις διατρίβειν, πυθόμενος πάντα κατὰ νοῦν μοι προχωρεῖν, καὶ δι’ εὐνοίας 52 μὲν εἶναι με τοὺς υπηκόοις, τοὺς πολέμιοις δὲ δι’ ἐκπλήξεως, οὐκ εὗ τὴν γνώμην εὐθέως, κατάλυσιν δ’ αὐτῷ τὴν ἐμὴν εὐπραγίαν φέρειν νομίζων εἰς φθόνον ἐξώκειλεν οὕτι μέτρον. καὶ παῦσεν με τῆς εὐτυχίας ἐλπίσας, εἰ παρὰ τῶν υπήκοων μίσος ἐξάγαγεν, ἐπείθεν τοὺς τὴν Τιβερίαδα κατοικοῦντας καὶ τοὺς τὴν Σέπφωριν [νομίζων] πρὸς τούτοις δὲ καὶ τοὺς Γάβαρα, πόλεις δ’ εἰσίν αὐτῶς τῶν κατὰ τὴν Γαλλίαν αἱ μέγιστα, τῆς πρὸς μὲ πίστεως ἀποστάντας αὐτῷ προστίθεσθαι· κρείττον γὰρ ἐμοὶ στρατηγῆσεν αὐτῶν ἐφασκεν. (Vita 122–123)

Both Joseph Sievers and Steve Mason have analyzed and compared these passages in detail with an eye towards explaining the injection of the story about the Pharisees and Sadducees into the A.J. 13 passage.53 Mason, furthermore, recently has noted the themes found here, including Greek philosophical views on envy, in his commen-

52 This appears again in Vita 125.

tary on the *Vita*. I suggest that we look even further into the Greek literary background. On *B. J.* 1.67, Sievers comments: "It may simply be a *topos* to explain opposition against a successful ruler." Mason observes that the sentiment expressed in these passages about success breeding envy is a commonplace of Hellenistic historiography and "a characteristic Josephan theme." Perhaps it is also a stock explanation provided in rhetorical training, or simply common sense. Josephus, however, does noticeably strive to keep the verbal triad of *eupraxía*, φθόνος, and εὐδαιμονία in both the *Bellum* and the *Antiquitates* as descriptors for John Hyrcanus, though with a change in order and parts of speech for the sake of emphasis. By switching φθόνος to be the first item in the *Antiquitates* passage, he prepares the reader better for the negative material he will then insert about conflict involving the Pharisees and the Sadducees. In the passage regarding himself in the *Vita*, he replaces the last element, εὐδαιμονία, with εὐτυχία and εὔνοια; εὐτυχία has already appeared as an additional element in the frame for the *Antiquitates* passage, and εὔνοια only redounds further to Josephus’ own character in the eyes of others in the *Vita*.

When we consider the larger picture of Josephus’ Greek education, perhaps it is not too far-fetched for us as readers to turn now also to the epode of Pindar’s *Pythian VII*:

οἱ Μεγάλεες, ύμαι τε καὶ προγόνων.
νέα δὲ εὔπραξία χαίρω τι· τὸ δὲ ἄχνυμαι,
φθόνον ἀμειβόμενον τὰ καλὰ ἔργα. φαντὶ γε μᾶν
οὕτω κεν ἄνδρι παρμονίμαιν
θάλλουσαν εὐδαιμονίαν
τὰ καὶ τὰ φέρεσθαι. (13–18)

Appearing here are the three terms, *eupraxía*, φθόνος, and εὐδαιμονία, which Josephus has used in the same order to describe John Hyrcanus, his “hero” who had performed “fine deeds” for the Judean people. As stated before, Pindar may not be the only source for such thoughts or actual words, but considering his prominence in Roman education at this time, I would argue that here the reader finds an allusive moment in the *Bellum*, which Josephus then reused.

---

57 Ibid., 225.
but altered in the *Antiquititates* and *Vita* for new effects. Pindar's Megacles is a hero at the Pythian games, comes from the greatest city in Greece, Athens, and from "the widely powerful race of the Alcmaeonids." The reader, after perceiving the verbal interplay between Josephus' texts and the epode of *Pythian VII*, can then create associated meanings with respect to John Hyrcanus, as he, too, comes from a great land with a great city, Jerusalem, and from a powerful family, the Hasmoneans. Megacles was not a high priest or a prophet, but his family certainly had a history of strong influence over Athens in setting up democracy through the reforms of Megacles' uncle, Cleisthenes, and later in producing Pericles, who was the maternal nephew of Megacles and the greatest leader Athens ever had. I am not necessarily now suggesting that we as Pucci's "full-knowing" readers leap to the conclusion that Josephus is inviting us to think that he himself is a latter-day Pericles because of their shared descent from great families through their mothers, but I simply suggest that when we read, we have the power to create (and then even perhaps dismiss) possible meanings from the allusions in the texts.

Pindar's references to Megacles' success and good fortune make perfect sense in the context of *Pythian VII*, as does his commentary on envy, yet the source of the envy, besides that of being victorious, is left unstated in the poem. We know from elsewhere that Megacles was ostracized earlier in the same year as his chariot victory, perhaps for opposing Themistocles' policies. In the Josephan passages, envy as a catalyst for στάσις particularly in the *Antiquititates*, has posed real problems of narrative coherence, but when we consider envy as a theme in light of the Pindaric allusion, perhaps it becomes slightly more understandable that it is included in the Josephan passages.

Furthermore, we should note that the antistrophe (7–12), which is the centerpiece of *Pythian VII*, mentions that the Alcmaeonids had improved upon Apollo's temple at Delphi, which was the  ῥυεῖα of the Greek world. C. M. Bowra explains that "the Alkmaionid clan . . . had built a new marble portico for the temple" and that "small pieces of the Alkmaionid portico have been found." Though Josephus does not mention any temple-related construction projects in

---

58 See *Vita* 2 on his connections through his mother to the Hasmoneans.
the *Bellum* passage on John Hyrcanus, the historian does soon mention Hyrcanus’ gift of prophecy (*B.J.* 1.69–70), which certainly resonates with the prominent oracular role of Apollo’s temple at Delphi. As Seneca the Elder says in his *Suasoriae* 3.7 about Ovid using Vergilian language, Ovid did it non subripiendi causa, sed palam mutuandi, hoc animo ut vellet agnoscì.\(^{61}\) Josephus may have done the very same with Pindar’s *Pythian* VII. After all, as Horace says (*Ars* 404–405), gratia regum Pieris temptata modis. What could be more fitting an homage to his great Hasmonean ancestor John Hyrcanus than to draw from the *Pindarici fontis* (Horace, *Ep.* 1.3.10)?

**Sophocles**

Despite Hyrcanus’ success, the line of Hasmonean rulers will meet with a curiously tragic end in the *Bellum*. When the last Hasmonean ruler Antigonus is being besieged by Herod, the king leaves the Baris in order to beg for mercy from the Roman commander, Sossius, who has arrived from Syria with a massive army (*B.J.* 1.346). Josephus prefaces Antigonus’ prostration before Sossius with the comment that Antigonus “had no regard for his fortune either in the past or now” (*B.J.* 1.353). This is a man who has suffered a tragic reversal of fortune, but pays no heed to it. The Roman Sossius, though, immediately spots the tragedy playing out at his feet:

κάκεινος μηδὲν αὐτὸν οἰκτείρας πρὸς τὴν μεταβολὴν ἐπεγέλασέν τε ἀκρατῶς καὶ Ἀντιγόνην ἐκάλεσέν· οὗ μὴν ὡς γυναικὰ γε καὶ φρουρᾶς ἐλέυθερον ἄφηκεν, ἄλλ’ ὁ μὲν δεθεὶς ἐφυλάττετο (*B.J.* 1.353)

The allusion to the mythological Antigone is unmistakable. Sossius’s wordplay is clever and à propos, and but it also reflects the tension of gender in the extant tragedy we know by Sophocles, where Antigone challenges Creon’s power by playing the “female” and the “male” at the same time. Sossius does not have the “proper” reaction to tragedy, which is pity; instead, he laughs, as if Antigonus’ downfall were a comedy. Josephus, however, has set this reaction up nicely

---

\(^{61}\) On this passage, see Pucci, *The Full-Knowing Reader*, 106; also K. Galinsky, “Greek and Roman Drama and the *Aeneid*,” in *Myth, History, and Culture in Republican Rome* (ed. D. Braund and C. Gills; Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 2003), 291, observes, “Again, this may well refer not just to verbal borrowings, but rather to the recognition, on Ovid’s part, of Virgil’s dramatic technique.”
by presenting Antigonus in a negative light up to this point in his account. The Hasmonean king’s μεταβολή, therefore, is not worthy of pity. Soon after, Antigonus suffers a death, according to Josephus, “worthy of his base behavior,” (ἄξιος τῆς ἀγεννείας): he is beheaded (B.J. 1.357).

Though Thackeray does not provide examples of other allusions to Sophocles’ Antigone in his introduction to the Bellum, it seems quite likely upon close examination that this particular play provides both a verbal and a thematic backdrop for the history, since both explore the consequences of civil war and the treatment of corpses. Louis Feldman has discovered many instances of echoes in the Bellum and in the Antiquitates of all seven of Sophocles’ extant tragedies,62 and I would like to elaborate on his observations concerning the Antigone. Beyond the verbal borrowings from this play in the Antiquitates, Feldman correctly points out with respect to the appearance of the verb μυδάω in the Bellum: “The verb μυδάω, in the sense of ‘to decay’, is found in Antigone (410) with reference to the decaying body of Antigone’s brother Polyneices. This is the only occurrence in extant literature in which the verb, which usually means ‘to drip’, has this specific meaning, other than the occurrence in Josephus (War 3.530, 4.383, 5.519).”63 I would add to this that Josephus employs a whole nexus of words and actions from the Antigone in his scenes from the war involving decaying corpses, thereby creating allusive moments that invite the reader to consider the larger implications of the pollution and overall civil strife, and who’s to blame for all of it. In these passages Josephus is specifically alluding to the Guard’s speech (407–440) to Creon about having just caught Antigone performing a ritual burial of her brother. At the beginning the guard explains almost comically:

\[\text{πάσαν κόνιν σήραντες, ἢ κατεῖχε τὸν νέκυν, μυδὼν τε σῶμα γυμνόσαντες ἐδ, καθήμεθ' ἀκρων ἐκ πάγων ὑπῆνεμοι, ὅσμην ἀπ' αὐτοῦ μὴ βάλοι πεφευγότες (Antigone 409–412)}\]

This speech is one of the more memorable moments in Greek tragedy, and Josephus will use its key ideas of decaying corpses and their stench for tragic effect several times. First, after a terrible naval loss

63 Ibid., 66.
at Lake Genessar against Vespasian, Judean bodies wash ashore and rot on the beach:

δεινή δὲ ταῖς ἐξῆς ἡμέραις περιείχε τὴν χώραν ὀδηγεί τε καὶ ὄψις· οἱ μὲν γὰρ αἰγαλοὶ ναυσηγῶν ὄμα καὶ διουδόντων ἔγεμον σωμάτων, ἔκκοιμενοι δὲ καὶ
μυδόντες οἱ νεκροὶ τὸν ἀέα διέφθειρον, ὡς μὴ μόνον ὀἴκτρον Ἰουδαίους
γενέσθαι τὸ πάθος, ἀλλὰ καὶ διὰ μίσους τοὺς δράσασιν ἠλθείν (B.J. 3.530)

The Sophoclean vocabulary of decaying bodies and their stench comes through quite clearly, as well as the issue of who has done the deed. [Josephus will use both the Attic form ὀςμή as well as the early or later Greek form ὀδηγεί, whereas he will use only νεκρός, not the poetic νέκως, for the word “corpse” in the Bellum.] As Feldman has noticed, the verb μυδᾶω appears again in B.J. 4.383 with respect to Judean corpses, but we should note that σάμα and ὀςμή do not; without the stench, the scene is less physically dramatic and focuses more upon the Zealots having broken the laws of nature, man, and God. The conflict between those who make and interpret these kinds of laws is, of course, one of the major cruxes of Sophocles’ Antigone.

Later, Josephus will return to the Guard’s speech in Antigone and rework the scene even further when the rebels order corpses to be flung from the ramparts of Jerusalem:

οἱ δὲ τὸ μὲν πρῶτον ἐκ τοῦ δημοσίου θησαυροῦ τοὺς νεκροὺς θάπτειν ἐκέλευον
tὴν ὀςμήν οὐ φέροντες, ἐπειθ’ ὡς οὐ διήρκον ἀπὸ τῶν τειχῶν ἔρριπτον εἰς
tὰς φάραγγας. Περιών δὲ ταύτας ὁ Τίτος ὡς οἶθασατο πεπλησμένας τῶν
νεκρῶν καὶ βαϊνόντα ἱχώρα μυδώντων ὑπορρέοντα τῶν σωμάτων, ἐστέναξε τε
καὶ τὰς χείρας ἀνατείνας κατεμπαρτύρατο τὸν θεόν, ὡς οὐκ εἰπὶ τὸ ἐργὸν αὐτοῦ.
(B.J. 5.518–519)

At this point in his narrative, Josephus invites his audience into an even more dramatically staged scene where Titus plays Antigone, but in a positive way, unlike Antigonus earlier. The Guard in Sophocles has explained later in his speech to Creon that Antigone shrieked like a mother bird and wailed when she saw her brother’s naked corpse, whereas Titus here looks upon the Jewish corpses and groans—certainly a more manly response. In the Guard’s speech Antigone raised a curse against those who did the deed (ηράστο τοίς τοῦργον
xεξιργασμένοις, line 428), but Titus in his own form of piety swears to God that he did not commit the deed (οὐκ εἰπὶ τὸ ἐργὸν αὐτοῦ).

---

61 νέκως only found twice in Josephus at A.J. 6.337 (Saul) and 17.234 (Antipater accusing Archelaus of acting over the corpse of Herod—very fitting).
Josephus has already alluded to Antigone’s ritual of scattering dust over Polynieces’ body when the survivors of those killed by the rebels “would at night take a little dust in both hands and strew it on the bodies, though some reckless persons did this by day” (B.J. 4.332). By noticing this group of verbal and thematic parallels, Josephus’ reader could see the Antigone scene playing out before the mind’s eye when reading these passages, especially the one involving Titus, and with the allusions compounding over the course of the war, they might feel all the more deeply the extent of Judean suffering and loss, along with Titus’ sympathy for the general Judean population at the mercy of the rebels. These allusions, therefore, help to create an extra dimension of pathos as well as exoneration for Titus that otherwise might not be possible, and they only add to the persuasive force of the text’s argument by tapping into both the audience’s intellect and emotions.

EURIPIDES

During Josephus’ days in Rome, no Greek tragedian had more of an audience than Euripides. Josephus’ contemporaries Dio Chrysostom and Quintilian considered Euripides the most useful tragedian for the student of rhetoric. Louis Feldman has remarked in his work on Josephus and Greek tragedy that “Euripides was the most popular of poets (except for Homer) throughout the Hellenistic and Roman eras,” and Feldman then provides ample examples of Euripidean echoes in the Antiquitates. I would like now briefly to argue that we also be alert for allusions to Euripides in the Bellum, especially to his Bacchae. This particular tragedy provides an appropriate backdrop for understanding the Judean War as laid out in Josephus’ narrative since it deals so powerfully with the issue of impiety and its horrific consequences both for the family of Cadmus and the city of Thebes. Edith Hall has succinctly observed that “Democratic Athens was proud of its openness (Thucydides 2.39), while Thebes in tragedy is often closed in on itself, and its royalty susceptible to

---

65 Sophocles, Ant. 247 and 429.
66 See my earlier discussion on B.J. 2.322.
67 Dio Chrysostom, Or. 18.6–7 and Quintilian, Inst. 10.1.68–70. Both rhetoricians prefer Euripides over the earlier tragedians, Menander over the masters of Old Comedy.
internecine conflict, incest, and tyrannical conduct.” Josephus and his reading audience would certainly have picked up on these qualities associated with Thebes when reading or watching these plays. In the *Bellum*, the Thebes of both Sophocles’ *Antigone* and Euripides’ *Bacchae* becomes Jerusalem at its downfall. We have already seen allusions to Sophocles’ *Antigone* in the *Bellum*. Euripides’ *Bacchae*, which is also set at Thebes, looms large as well.

In the *Bacchae*, impiety leads to dismemberment, which, in turn, results in diaspora ordained as divine punishment. Cadmus warns Pentheus about his cousin Actaeon having been ripped to shreds by his own carnivorous dogs for his impiety against Artemis:

\[
\text{óρξς τὸν 'Ακτέωνος ἀθλιον μόρον,}
\]
\[
\text{δὲν ὠμόσιτοι σκυλακες ἄς ἔθρεψατο}
\]
\[
\text{διεσπάσαντο, κρείσσον' ἐν κυναγίας}
\]
\[
\text{'Αρτέμιδος εἶναι κομπάσαντ', ἐν ὀργάσιν (Bacchae 337–340)}
\]

This foreshadowing, along with other references τοσπαραγμός, then becomes reified in the horrifying punishment that Pentheus suffers at the hands of the Bacchae, including his own mother, Agave. Towards the end of the play Cadmus enters accompanying the dismembered corpse of his grandson:

\[
\text{ἐπεσθὲ μοι φέροντες ἀθλιον βάρος}
\]
\[
\text{Πενθέως, ἐπεσθὲ, πρόσπολοι, δόμων πάρος,}
\]
\[
\text{οὐ σῶμα μοχθὼν μυρίοις ζητήμασιν}
\]
\[
\text{φέρω τόδ', εὐρὼν ἐν Κιθαρώνος πτυχαίς}
\]
\[
\text{διασπαρακτόν (Bacchae 1216–1220)}
\]

Before turning to the *Bellum* passages displaying allusions to the *Bacchae*, however, I would like briefly to show how an ancient audience might read allusions to the *Bacchae* within a different text; I draw my example from Aristophanes’ *Ranae*, which is the natural choice since it served as a comic eulogy for the recently dead Euripides. The *Bacchae* had been “found among his papers” when Euripides died in Macedon only a year before *Ranae* was produced at the Lenaia in 405 B.C.E. When Dionysus arrives at the door of Hades

---


dressed as his big brother Heracles, Aeacus berates him:

ω δελυρε καναισχυντε και τολμηρε συ και μισρε και σαμμαρε και μιαρωτατε,
... η τα σηλαγχνα σου διασπαρξει, πλευμωνι τα νθασμεται
Ταρτσοια μυραινα· τα νεφρο δε σου
αυτοισι εντεροσι ειματαινο
διασπασται Γοργος Τειθρασια,
εφ' ας εγδ δρομαην ερμησω ποδα. (Ranae 465-466, 473-478)

The mock-tragic diction of Aeacus, grandfather of Achilles, now downgraded to doorman, plays off numerous mythological references, but also threatens Dionysus with bodily destruction [using the two verbs, διασπαράσσω and διασπάω] straight out of the Bacchae. Even though the character Aeacus thinks he is denouncing the vile deeds of Heracles, we can see that Aristophanes here is playing off the fate of Pentheus as the victim of Dionysiac σπαραγμός.  

In the Bellum, Josephus follows the Euripidean pattern of one body-rending setting up another far more horrifying one involving a son. This begins back in Book 1, where he has used the verb of rending almost comically in a speech made by Archelaus to Herod (B.J. 1.500), which turns out to be a failed attempt to trick him into not killing his son Alexander. The Bacchic theme of rending appears again in Book 2 when the Jewish delegates after the death of Herod “beg the Romans to have mercy on the remains of Judea and not to toss away what was left of it to those who were savagely tearing it to pieces.” (B.J. 2.90). This theme returns in Book 5 when Josephus explains the overall effect of factional infighting upon the population of Jerusalem as a whole:

Παντασθεν δε της πολεως πολεμουμενης υπο των επιβολων και συγκλυδων
μεσος ο δημος ωσπερ μεγα σωμα διεσπαρασσετο (B.J. 5.27)

Though the metaphor of the body politic is hardly unusual, the idea of rending it to pieces is less common, and thus works as a possible allusion to the Bacchae. In any case, the historian is foreshadowing Jerusalem’s ultimate doom in his narrative.

This tragic σπαραγμός will return most poignantly just before the

---

71 Euripides, Bacchae 735, 739, 1104, 1127, 1135, 1220 for the σπαραγμός.
72 See Ullmann and Price, “Drama and History in Josephus’ Bellum Judaicum,” 100, on this scene.
destruction of the temple in Book 6 in the scene involving a mother named Mary, who kills her baby in order to have something to eat during the famine in Jerusalem (B.J. 6.199–219). I have previously discussed this scene and its later Christian reception, including the readers’ recognition of the scene as “tragic,” but I wish to emphasize here that just as in Euripides’ Bacchae with Pentheus’ body, in the Bellum civic disorder and disintegration will find its physical fulfillment in the baby’s sliced up body. When the rebels come to steal her food, Mary invites them to eat part of her “sacrifice”:


Josephus’ audience could clearly read Mary as a woman from Greek tragedy, both in proclaiming this murder-cannibalism her “deed” and by referring explicitly to her status as a woman and a mother as a challenge to the rebels. She is, in fact, a conflation of several Euripidean mothers: Agave, Andromache, and Medea. Euripides’ Agave does not call her son Pentheus’s brutal death and dismemberment a “sacrifice” in the extant portions of the play, but she does invite the chorus to “share the banquet” (Bacchae 1184) and then her father Cadmus to the “feast” (Bacchae 1242). Cadmus, in response, refers to the death as “murder” and Pentheus’ body as a “sacrifice victim” (Bacchae 1245–1246). In the Bellum Mary does not dwell upon her baby’s severed limbs nor does she try to put her baby’s body back together again as Agave may have done towards the end of the Bacchae, but both women and their people suffer the same fate of dispersion. In lines reconstructed from the Christus Patiens that appear to come from Dionysus’ speech in his epiphany at the end of the Bacchae, the god may have pronounced the following sentence upon the Thebans for punishment for their blasphemy against him:


74 Dodds, Euripides Bacchae, 57–59, provides several adaptations of and citations to the Bacchae in an attempt to help fill the lacuna perceived after line 1329, which is the second line of Agave’s speech in response to Cadmus.
Josephus’ readers may very well have perceived an allusive connection between the tragic fate of the Thebans and their city at the end of the *Bacchae* and that of the Judeans and Jerusalem in the *Bellum*.

Later Christian readers, who certainly knew the Greek tragedies as both texts and performances, read this infanticide scene in the *Bellum* as an episode from Greek tragedy and also as the final catalyst for the destruction of Jerusalem. When Pseudo-Hegesippus adapted the scene for his loose Latin rendition of the *Bellum* called *De Excidio*, he seems to have read it at least in part as an allusion to the *Bacchae*, and then to have done Josephus one better by returning to and using more literally the end of the *Bacchae*, which we in the modern era do not have *in toto*. In his account Pseudo-Hegesippus goes so far as to have Mary address the hand and foot of her baby. In doing so, he makes his Mary even more Euripidean, since we have lines from the *Christus Patiens*, as well as the report of the third-century rhetorician Apsines, that point to Agave speaking to Pentheus’ individual body parts the way Mary does in Pseudo-Hegesippus.

Even setting aside Pseudo-Hegesippus’ adaptation of the *Bellum*, the allusions to the *Bacchae* are strong in the *Bellum*. All of the allusions combined invite the reader on one level to appreciate Josephus’ artistry, but on another to experience the horror and tragedy of Jerusalem’s fall in a far more vivid and sympathetic way than, for instance, with Tacitus’ telegraphic account, albeit fragmentary, in his *Historiae*, Book 5. Perhaps Josephus was even responding to the per-

---

75 This is reconstructed from *Christus Patiens*, lines 1668–1669 and 1678–1679, in Dodds’ edition 58–59, lines *de Thebanis.*
76 For authors before Pseudo-Hegesippus, see H. Chapman, “‘A Myth for the World’,” 370–78.
77 Pseudo-Hegesippus, *De Excidio* 5.40.2: “hoc est prandium meum, haec vestra portio, videte diligentius ne vos frauderim. Ecce pueri manus una, ecce pes eius, ecce dimidium reliqui corporis eius, et ne alienum putetis, filius est meus, ne alterius opus arbitremini, ego feci, ego diligenter divisi, mihi quod manducarem, vobis quod reservarem.”
78 See Dodds, *Euripides Bacchae*, 57 for the quote from Apsines. Notice that in *Christus Patiens* 1470, as reported in Dodds, *ibid.*, 58, ἰδοῦ is used to draw attention to his head (which is covered here), and then lines concerning his limbs follow; in the same way, Mary in Pseudo-Hegesippus uses *ecce* followed by body parts. Body parts are a theme throughout the *Bacchae*, foreshadowing Pentheus’ fate.
sonal taste of one of the most important characters in and readers of the *Bellum*, the future emperor Titus; we do have evidence that Titus himself wrote poetry, including Greek tragedies.  

**CONCLUSION**

Josephus's use of Homer, Pindar, Sophocles, and Euripides grants his history a certain grace and grandeur, and was presumably done to please and impress his audience with his attempts at literary artistry and ultimately to move and to convince them of his point of view concerning the war. Whether Josephus personally knew Greek poetry very well, or was still in the process of acquiring more familiarity with it at the time he was composing the *Bellum* in the 70s, does not detract from the fact that poetic allusions, whether verbal, thematic, or structural, do exist in the text for his readers to appreciate.

Should anyone doubt the Jewish general's desire or ability to read or listen to Greek poetry set to music, we should turn to the example of a modern Japanese general, Tadamichi Kuribayashi, who, like Josephus with respect to Rome, had seen the United States as a deputy attaché before World War II. From this experience he declared in a letter to his wife, “The United States is the last country in the world Japan should fight.” While the samurai Kuribayashi was putting up a well-crafted but ultimately futile defense on Iwo Jima in early 1945, he wrote again to his wife, “It really does not matter much to me where my grave will be. If there really is such a thing as a soul, then it will stay with you and our children.” The American Major General Erkine sent Japanese POWs and Japanese Americans to try to convince Kuribayashi to surrender, but he reportedly said over the radio to his compatriots, “We only laughed at

---


81 R. Thompson, *Empires on the Pacific: World War II and the Struggle for the Mastery of Asia* (New York: Basic, 2001), 334. One main message of Josephus' *Bellum Judaicum* is that war against the far more powerful Romans is futile.

this childish trick and did not set ourselves against them." When
the victorious U.S. troops, including my father, finally entered
Kuribayashi’s headquarters, which was burrowed into a hillside near
the central airfield, they discovered an elegantly wood-paneled office.
As my father looked though the papers on Kuribayashi’s desk, he
found one document that stood out from the rest: a single page
showing western musical notations and their Japanese counterparts.
Unlike Josephus at Jotapata, however, Kuribayashi had been killed
by shells and then buried, according to his son, who learned this
from a Japanese sergeant. The U.S. Marine Lieutenant General
Holland Smith called Kuribayashi “our most redoubtable adver-
sary.” Had Kuribayashi survived the war, perhaps he would have
penned a history of his country’s defeat in English, using western
literary or even lyric expressions (given his interest in music), thereby
bridging the gap between east and west, just as Josephus had done
so long ago.

---

83 Wright, op. cit., 71; cf. B.J. 3.344 ff. on Roman invitations to Josephus to
surrender.
84 There is now a memorial stele marking the site of the Kuribayashi’s cave on
Iwo Jima; see Wright, op. cit., 74; cf. B.J. 3.341 on Josephus’ cave.
85 Wright, op. cit., 74; cf. B.J. 3.347 on Vespasian’s supposed admiration for
Josephus.
Josephus gave a clear center to his *Antiquitates*: he ended Book 10 with the exile in Babylon. Books 1–10 follow the Pentateuch and the deuteronomistic history from Joshua to 2 Kings. Books 11–20 are less closely related to biblical books. The story about King Saul comprises *A.J.* 6.45–378. Saul is named by Josephus only in the *Antiquitates*: 149 times in Book 6; 40 times in Book 7; once in Book 10; once in Book 11.

The text used by Josephus, the Hebrew story about King Saul, has a very clear outline:

1. 1 Sam 9:1–15:35: election, coronation, victories and rejection by God; 2. 1 Sam 16:1–31:13: David, Saul and others, Saul’s death. The first part is strictly concentrated on the rise of Saul, the second part, ending with his death, is expanded by the court history with many important figures.¹ Josephus took over this episodic structure.

He smoothed the style and added some reflections. The result was a biographical history very closely related to the Hellenistic biographical history. The condemned sinner Saul is being transformed into a bright model of a ruler and king.

How did Josephus achieve this change and adaptation for the Hellenistic culture? How did he deal with the Saul model in the later books of the Antiquitates?

Three points will be dealt with in this essay:

2. Saul in A.J. 7; 10; and 11;
3. The role of Saul and the self-definition of Josephus.

1. Josephus’ Revision of 1 Sam 9:1–31:13

Josephus concludes the Saul story with the encomium:

To such an end did Saul come, as Samuel had predicted, because he had disobeyed God’s commandments touching the Amalekites, and because he had destroyed the family of Abimelech the high priest and Abimelech himself and the city of the high priests. He reigned eighteen years during the lifetime of Samuel and for twenty-two years more after the latter’s death. Thus then did Saul depart this life. (A.J. 6.378)

Book 6 closes with the term βίος. In Josephus’ time this term means at first the description of a life; the term “biography” was created in late Antiquity. In this final sentence of book 6, βίος signifies,
firstly, the story of Saul's death in A.J. 6.368–377 (// 1 Sam 31:1–13). Secondly, it comprises the whole Saul story. But this story does not belong to the genre of peripatetic biography. Therefore Baltzer determines rightly the Saul story as "prophetic biography." Josephus changes the genre to be a variant of the Hellenistic biographical history. This form of history came to be with Herodotus and Xenophon. In Book 1 Herodotus gives a wonderful biographical picture of the Persian king Cyrus (Herodotus 1.71–214, esp. 108–214). Xenophon wrote a long wisdom novel which he called *Cyropaedia*. Without great difficulties Josephus could rewrite the Jewish prophetic biography as Hellenistic biographical history.

In order to achieve this goal he made some alterations. He recounted only two instances of the disobedience of Saul in the final encomium: (1) the sparing of the Amalekites, (2) the destruction of Abimelech and his family. But 1 Samuel contains accounts of further instances of Saul's disobedience, which Josephus had recounted earlier. The first disobedience was the unauthorised sacrifice by Saul. The act of sacrifice belonged to the ministry of the prophet Samuel (1 Sam 13). For this disobedience, God revoked his promise of an eternal rule of the house of Saul and announced a new king "according the heart of God" (1 Sam 13:13–14). Josephus slightly changes this episode. "Forever" becomes "exceedingly long" (πληστον ἀν βασιλευσαι χρόνον) (A.J. 6.104), and the promise of the new king is omitted. Thus the punishment of Saul is minimised. The reason could be that Greek and Roman leaders always had the right of sacrifice and that the rivalry between king and prophet counted as a human matter and not a divine privilege.

Josephus has also modified Saul's last great sin, the visit given to the witch of Endor (A.J. 6.327–342). The prosaic banishment of witches here seems to be arbitrary, not an act of obeying the first
commandment (Exod 20:3–6; Deut 5:7–10, esp. 18:11–14). In an analogous way, Tiberius expelled all astrologers except his own astrologer for fear of the “bad press” he got by their art (Suetonius, Tib. 36). In Josephus the witch of Endor becomes an honourable example of her profession. Josephus concludes with an impressive encomium on her:

Here it is but right to commend the generosity of this woman who, though she had been prevented by the king from practising an art which would have made it easier and more comfortable for her at home, and though she had never seen Saul before, yet bore him no resentment for having condemned her profession nor turned him away as a stranger and as one with whom she had never been acquainted; but instead she gave him sympathy and consolation, exhorted him to do that which he regarded with great unwillingness, and offered him with open friendliness the one thing which in her poverty she possessed. And this she did, not in return for any benefit received, nor in quest of any favour to come—for she knew that he was about to die—, whereas men are by nature wont either to emulate those who have bestowed some kindness upon them or to be beforehand in flattering those from whom they may possibly receive some benefit. It is well, then, to take this woman for an example and show kindness to all who are in need, and to regard nothing as nobler than this or more befitting the human race or more likely to make God gracious and ready to bestow upon us His blessings. Concerning this woman, then, let these words suffice (A.J. 6.340–342).

So, magic incited only Saul’s “unwillingness.” The prohibition of magic by God in the Torah is totally forgotten. Josephus writes pathetic or mimetic history, which is interested in signs, predictions, invocations of deeds and miracles. He cannot accept an apodictic prohibition of necromancy and incantations. So he merely gives unclear hints to the “unwillingness” of Saul.

Josephus adds an encomium on Saul, which is much longer than the final encomium on him. Saul has committed only two sins: one against God and one against humankind. Nevertheless he is worthy of a long encomium with a comprehensive apology for his disobe-

---

The emphasis on the male beauty and stature of Agag could be an allusion to the ancient friendship cult and could motivate Saul's first sin. In Josephus' modern view Saul's sin becomes very special and strange. Like Oedipus he becomes guilty of having violated an incomprehensible commandment of an archaic time.

The second sin carries more weight. Out of pure revenge Saul murdered a clan of priests and destroyed their city (A.J. 6.259–261). Concerning this atrocity we find a lengthy reflection by Josephus on the changes in character which were caused by Saul's accession to power (A.J. 6.262–269). There is no reflection on the favour to king Agag.

Saul's portrait is ambiguous. The final encomium recalls the two sins: (1) the disobedience of an archaic divine commandment, (2) the inhuman revenge that also violates the ideal of a Hellenistic king. But the long encomium standing immediately before the account of Saul's death should not be overlooked:

---

9 Quoting Homer, Feldman explains the importance of "physical attractiveness" for Saul as well as for "his bodygards" ("Saul," 62–63). Feldman relates this motive also to Agag: "Josephus... also adds an aesthetic motive,... the very same qualities which... Josephus had stressed in Saul's choice of his bodygards (Ant. 6.130)" ("Saul," 87).

But now I shall touch an a subject profitable to states, peoples and nations, and of interest to all good men—one whereby all should be induced to pursue virtue and to aspire to those things which may procure them glory and eternal renown, one, moreover; that should instill into the hearts of kings of nations and rulers of cities a great desire and zeal for noble deeds, should stimulate them to face dangers and death for their country's sake, and teach them to despise all terrors. The occasion for this discourse I find in the person of Saul, king of the Hebrews. For he, although he knew of what was to come and his impending death, which the Prophet had foretold, yet determined not to flee from it or, by clinging to life, to betray his people to the enemy and dishonour the dignity of kingship; instead, he thought it noble to expose himself, his house and his children to these perils and, along with them, to fall fighting for his subjects. He preferred to have his sons meet death as brave men rather than leave them behind, while still uncertain what kind of men they might prove to be; for thus, as successors and posterity, he would obtain glory and an ageless name. Such a man alone, in my opinion, is just, valiant and wise, and he, if any has been or shall be such, deserves to have all men acknowledge his virtue. For men who have gone forth to war with high hopes, thinking to conquer and return in safety, and have accomplished some brilliant feat are, to my mind, mistakenly described as valiant by the historians and other writers who have spoken of such persons. Certainly it is just that these too receive approbation; but the terms "stout-hearted," "greatly daring," "contemptuous of danger" can justly be applied only to such as have emulated Saul. That men, not knowing what is to happen to them in war, should not flinch from it, but should commit themselves to an uncertain future and ride the stormy seas of chance—all this still falls short of magnanimity, however many the exploits they may accomplish. On the other hand, to harbour in one's heart no hope of success, but to know beforehand that one must die and die fighting, and then not to fear nor be appalled at this terrible fate, but to meet it with full knowledge of what is coming—that, in my judgement, is proof of true valour. And this Saul did, thereby showing that it behoves all men who aspire to fame after death so to act as to leave such a name after them; especially should kings do so, since the greatness of their power forbids them not merely to be bad to their subjects, but even to be less than wholly good. I might say still more than this about Saul and his courage, for they are subjects which afford us ample material; but, lest we should appear to lack good taste in delivering this panegyric, I will return again to the point from which I made this digression. (A.J. 6.343–351)

Saul is connected, althought in an unspoken fashion, to the archaic Greco-Roman kings such as Romulus and Theseus. Saul's virtue, wisdom, bravery and noble death provide a model for honorable kings.
Doron Mendels asks, "Did any kind of adoption of a dual identity such as Heracles-Melquart, Hermes-Toth and Anath-Athena also happen to Moses or David? It appears, that throughout the whole period we are discussing [the Roman Period, D. D.] there is no example of any connection, even a hidden one, which was made by Jews living in Palestine between a Jewish hero of the past and some seemingly pagan counterpart.""11 Maybe the early kings Saul and David modelled by Josephus as Greco-Roman founders, not as heroes, could constitute the common base for the "dual identity," which D. Mendels explored in a convincing way.12

2. Saul in A.J. 7, 10, and 11

Book 7 describes the rule of King David and the decline of the house of Saul. All male members are killed, only one survives. The rival king Jebosthos, Saul’s son, is murdered (A.J. 7.46). The other descendants are sacrificed except Jebosthos, the son of Jonathan (A.J. 7.294–296). This second Jebosthos was lame.13 But for the sake of the house of Saul he guarantees continuity through Jebosthos. Therefore book 10 puts a kings-list in the centre of the Antiquitates. The blinded king Sacchias is brought to Babylon; then Josephus reflects on the inevitability of divine prophecy and adds to the list of kings:

Thus, then, did the kings of David’s line end their lives; there were twenty-one of them including the last king, and they reigned altogether for five hundred and fourteen years, six months and ten days; for twenty years of which time their first king Saul held the royal power though he was not of the same tribe (A.J. 10.143).

---

13 “And there also met him (David) Saul’s grandson Memphibostos . . . ‘If, indeed,’ he added, ‘I had sound feet and had been able to use them in flight, I should not have been far behind you.’” (A.J. 7.267).
Saul gets the same rank as David. The long encomium of *A.J.* 6.343–351 prepared for this excellent position.

In *A.J.* 11 Josephus retells the new creation of Israel. The Persian king Cyrus ends the Babylonian captivity (11.1–12). He sends Zerubbabel (Ζοροβάβελς in Josephus) as leader back to Jerusalem (11.13): “The leader[s] of the host here enumerated [was] Zorobabelos, son of Salthielos, who was of the tribe of Judah, being one of the descendants of David . . .” (*A.J.* 11.73). Zerubbabel re-establishes for a short time the Davidic kingship. A descendant of the lame Jebosthos from the house of Saul could be elected by God and Cyrus for this ministry. But for God and Israel David was greater than Saul. Therefore God elects Zerubbabel by means of Cyrus.

In *A.J.* 11 Josephus names Saul in relation to the Hasmoneans, his own ancestors:

For the high priests were at the head of affairs until the descendants of the Hasmonean family came to rule as kings. Before the captivity and deportation they were ruled by kings, beginning first with Saul and David . . . (*A.J.* 11.111–112).

From Saul to the Hasmoneans there is a continual line of kingship and rule.¹⁴ For the Hasmoneans Saul could serve as a better model than David, because most of the Hasmonean leaders died violently, as Saul did.

Thus, the house of Saul is a real parallel to the Hasmonean dynasty. By contrast, the house of David seems to be the parallel to the Herodian dynasty, because both led Israel to the apex of power. But only the house of David led to messianic hopes, while the Herodian dynasty excited fear and rebellion. It seems that after the lost revolt against the Romans Josephus was no longer interested in Davidic messianic hopes. Therefore, in his *Antiquitates*, the house of Saul gets the same rank as the messianic house of David.

---

¹⁴ For the line from the Hasmoneans to Josephus see *A.J.* 11.111 and Dormeyer, “Vita des Josephus,” 18–19.
3. THE ROLE OF SAUL AND JOSEPHUS’ VIEW OF HIMSELF

It is obvious that *A.J.* 1–10 and 11–20 are parallel: Part I is on the First Temple; Part II on the Second Temple. Both parts have a threefold outline. Part I: (1) Creation and establishment of the constitution (1–4); (2) First Phase: leaders and kings (5–8); (3) Second Phase: decline through corruption of the constitution (9–10). Part II: (1) New creation and establishment of the constitution (11); (2) First Phase: high priests, the Hasmonean dynasty, the ascent and splendid temple-restoration of Herod (12–15), (3) Second Phase: decline through corruption of the constitution (16–20).

The Jewish revolt against the Romans repeats the revolt against Babylon and results in the renewed destruction of the second Temple (*A.J.* 20.257–258). Will Israel now be allowed a new beginning by God, a third part of historical time and history? Josephus skilfully guides the reader to this unstated major question. If the reader answers positively, the next problem arises: who will refound the constitution?

Josephus adds two appendices to his *Antiquitates: Vita* and *Contra Apionem*. The *Vita* recommends Josephus himself as ruler, *Contra Apionem* promotes him as restorer of the law. Now the reader can complete the puzzle.

The house of Saul survived with the lame Jebosthos; the house of the Hasmoneans survived with the hunchbacked (κυρπότος) Matthias (*Vita* 4). At the time of the first Temple the dynasty of David was more honourable than the dynasty of Saul. Therefore Zerubbabel became the renovator of Jerusalem and the altar after the Exile (*A.J.*

---

15 Mason, *Life* (BJP 9), xxiv; besides, he determines the parallelism as chiasmus (*Life*, xxiii–xxvii); but the chiasmus presses the books too strongly into an artificial structure.


In the time of the Second Temple the dynasty of the Hasmoneans did not cause as much evil as the dynasty of Herod.\textsuperscript{19}

Therefore, Josephus implicitly argues, a member of the Hasmonean dynasty should become the new founder of the third, new phase of Israel. Josephus is the only suitable living member of this house. He gave proof of this in the \textit{Vita} (8ff). The only respectable member of the Herodian dynasty, Agrippa II, has just died (\textit{Vita} 359).\textsuperscript{20} Josephus already gave a negative assessment of the Herodian dynasty in \textit{A.J.} 18:

\begin{quote}
I will now give a fuller account of Herod and the particulars of his line, both because the tale is pertinent to my history and because it affords a proof of Divine Providence, showing how neither numbers nor any other worldly advantage can avail aught without acts of piety toward the Divine Power. For within a century of Herod’s decease it came about that all but a few of Herod’s issue, and there were many, had perished. It may contribute to the moral instruction of mankind to learn what their misfortunes were (\textit{A.J.} 18.127–128).\textsuperscript{21}
\end{quote}

Josephus, by contrast, is capable of leading a law reform, being qualified for this task since the age of fourteen (\textit{Vita} 9).\textsuperscript{22} He also gives evidence of this qualification in the second appendix, usually called \textit{Contra Apionem}.\textsuperscript{23}

Josephus can venture to claim the right origin and qualification. He does not compare himself to Moses, the founder and lawgiver. The early Christian community only made this comparison in their message about Jesus.\textsuperscript{24}

\section*{Conclusion}

It is unthinkable that the strong warrior Saul would have prophesied eternal rule over Israel by a pagan king and would have begged

\textsuperscript{20} Siegert, Schreckenberg, and Vogel, \textit{Vita} 180.
\textsuperscript{21} “It may also be edifying to tell the story of Agrippa, which is in the highest degree remarkable. For from a position of no distinction at all and to the surprise of all who knew of him, he rose to his high and mighty exaltation” (\textit{A.J.} 18.129). The addition of this favorable portrait of Agrippa I, however, cannot change the negative image of the Herodian dynasty.
\textsuperscript{22} Dormeyer, “Vita des Josephus,” 15–23.
\textsuperscript{23} Dormeyer, “Suasoriae.”
\textsuperscript{24} Dormeyer, \textit{Markusevangelium}, 140–142.
for his life by any and all means as Josephus did (B.J. 3.400–401).
Josephus seems to be merely a miniature Saul. But Josephus was also an excellent biographical historian. He reduced the sins of Saul to only two, using them to form a new picture of Saul, and adding two wonderful encomia as a platform for future Judean politics.

Josephus' portrait of Saul makes him an impressive character. Saul opens the gallery of important Israelite kings. Thus Josephus corrects the one-dimensional ideological picture of the deuteronomistic author. Saul receives the same rank as David. He becomes a mixed tragic character according the Poetica of Aristotle. The history of readers’ response, especially in works of artists, gives full credit to this useful re-evaluation of Saul by Josephus. Josephus' hidden identification with Saul has been easily overlooked. Yet, only Saul, not Josephus, remained the moral model of the king and fighter for God's law and kingdom.25

---

25 Did therefore only Luke use and emphasise the unknown Jewish equivalent "Saul" for "Paul" in Acts?
What makes a good story? Moreover, who makes it? And do the answers to these questions differ when it comes to history? These questions came to my mind during my examination of Josephus’ Herod narratives. What is it about Herod that keeps fascinating audiences and writers to this day? Is it something about Herod, or about Josephus’ portrait of Herod (as we have no other extant substantive portrait)? Are these entities at all separable? The beauty of these questions lies, in my opinion, in their never-ending nature: there is no definitive answer to them. Nevertheless, asking them may be important, and may shed a different and refreshing light on our own historiographical inquiry.

If we were to lay the historian’s hat aside for a moment and judge the Herod narratives of Josephus by their literary merit, we would realize that both accounts retain an even higher dramatic quality than their plot initially has. Indeed, Herod’s trials and tribulations have a highly dramatic content. But Josephus, to borrow Shakespeare’s phrase, seems to have out-Heroded Herod. Meticulously applying rhetorical devices, and consciously allowing the penetration of emotions to his historical writing, Josephus created highly charged accounts whose themes and rhetorical tricks often seem to transcend the particular story of Herod to more universal interests.

My initial working assumption is that the Herod narratives of Josephus (B.J. 1.204–673 and A.J. 14.158–17.199) display the work of a conscientious and aware historian, who is well versed in Greco-Roman historiography and literature, well attuned to his prospective audience and very well in touch with his own political and moral agenda. It is also my contention that in the Herod narratives, Josephus mainly relies upon the Greco-Roman rather than the Jewish historiographical tradition.
Josephus' historiographical awareness is best demonstrated by his use of rhetorical devices throughout the narratives. He uses digressions, speeches, obituaries, descriptions of natural disasters and authorial comments in his accounts of the life of Herod in a manner reminiscent of Greek and Roman historians and also seems to be quite well-versed in other literary genres: Greek tragedy, philosophy and epic poetry often spring to mind.¹

This paper is just a glimpse into a broader analysis of Josephus' use of rhetorical devices in the Herod narratives.² Here, I shall only examine the earlier account of the Bellum, and will focus on one aspect of Josephus' complex method of portraying king Herod of Judea. This I will do through an examination of some of Josephus' authorial comments on Herod. There are many of those throughout the narrative, some short, some longer, but I will look at three that form one possible axis: Josephus' first comment on Herod (1.208), the two chapters that divide the two sections of the narrative (1.430–431), and Herod's obituary (1.665). There is much more to Josephus' Herod, of course. But those three comments perhaps contain in a nutshell Herod's complexity of character, Josephus' meticulous historical method, and the underlying themes of the account. Moreover, they may help to explain a perplexing puzzle that springs to mind after a thorough reading of the story of Herod. This puzzle has to do with a certain discrepancy between the excessively dramatic character of the narrative and the flat emotional impact of Herod's character. I shall elaborate on that below, with the help of the modern theory of narratology. For the moment, suffice it to bear this discrepancy in mind.

**Why Herod, Then?**

Herodian history was not Josephus' primary subject in either of his historical works. The earlier Bellum took the Judean revolt of 66 C.E. as its main subject. The later Antiquitates, an extensive "universal his-

1 I shall not enter the long debate concerning the Assistant Theory here; suffice it to say that in my opinion, the person ultimately responsible for all of the historiographical ornamentations and literary allusions in the text is none other than Josephus himself. This assumption is a byproduct of both my reading of Josephus and of the methodology I have been using. More on that below.


This view of Rome as bearer of both good and evil is later attested in the Babylonian Talmud as well (b. Shabb. 33b).
Judean history and more abstract themes such as freedom, tyranny and personal weaknesses, this story was undoubtedly worth relating. But that, as most historians know, is not enough.

It is possible that part of the answer has to do with Josephus' sources. In the case of Herod, source material from Nicolaus of Damascus was abundant. This, coupled with the dramatic content, might have persuaded Josephus to use the material. But it seems that there are other, deeper reasons for Josephus' decision to include the story of Herod in his histories in the first place, and moreover, to treat it with much rhetorical attention. These have to do with the thematic and symbolic relevance of Herod to later Jewish history, whether to the understanding of the rise and failure of the revolt in 66 or to the evolution and development of the Jewish Ḥǎmōc.

Herod was the last independent ruler of Judea. His death effectively marked the end of Judean national independence in the Greco-Roman period. Judean self-rule started with the Hasmonean revolt in the second century B.C.E. and continued with the subsequent rule of the Hasmonean dynasty, which ruled Judea in one form or another until Herod's assumption of the throne as a client king of Rome in 37 B.C.E.

Herod's reign was in many ways the beginning of the end of the existence of the Judean state, culminating, of course, with the defeat of Jerusalem and the destruction of the Second Temple. Herod's rule, externally peaceful and prosperous as it eventually became, was far from consensual within Judea. His un-Hasmonean (and not entirely Jewish) background, his Hellenising tendencies, his close political alliance with Rome and his tyrannical behaviour all contributed to the emergence of internal tension, factualism and dissent. Those seeds came to full and tragic fruition with the rise against Rome, the subject matter of Josephus' Bellum. It seems that for Josephus, the story of Herod was a necessary preface, an "archaeology" of the revolt, without which it would have been much more difficult to understand (and empathise with) the tragic fate of Judea.

The story of Herod, then, seems to have encapsulated many relevant themes and moral interests for Josephus. Source availability, thematic relevance and a very good story combined seem to have

---

5 Whether as autonomous rulers of an independent state (c. 141–63 B.C.E.) or, after Pompey's conquest of Jerusalem, as subject to the supervision of the Roman governor of Syria.
made the history of Herod irresistible for an eager historian. But there was still more work to be done: in order to make the Herod narratives completely relevant, Josephus had to rewrite them so that they would read as an organic part of the works they were part of.

In order to make my arguments clearer I shall first address the question of the relations between Josephus’ final products and the main source he used for them, namely, the works of Nicolaus of Damascus which seem to have come down to Josephus in a much fuller form than we have them today.

There is no way to determine exactly how much of Nicolaus’ vast corpus was available for Josephus, but most scholars conjecture that Nicolaus was indeed the source Josephus had used for the history of Herod. However, opinions differ concerning the manner in which Josephus used Nicolaus and the extent to which he borrowed from him. Whereas earlier scholarship tended to view Josephus as mere copier or attribute the characteristics of the Herod narratives to

---


7 The most recent work to assess the relations between Nicolaus and the Herod narrative of the Antiquitates is M. Toher, “Nicolaus and Herod in the Antiquitates Judaicae,” HSCP 101 (2001): 427–48. Toher detects some stylistic and thematic affinities between Nicolaus and Josephus which are all in all convincing. However, his suggestion that the portraiture of Herod is unique in essence (and not only more extensive in scope) when compared with biblical, Hasmonean and Roman portraits in the Antiquitates may be slightly modified. There are more stylistic and thematic connections between the Herod narrative and the rest of the work than he suggests.

8 This issue has been investigated particularly concerning the Antiquitates narrative. Thackeray, Historian, 66, agrees that Nicolaus was the main source for the later account of Herod’s life. G. Hölscher, “Josephus,” PW 9 (1916), 1934–2000, and R. Laqueur, Der Jüdische Historiker Flavius Josephus (Giessen: Münchow, 1920) contended on the contrary that the Antiquitates narrative was not dependent on Nicolaus. Their arguments, however, are not consensual.

9 The bulk of material for the Herod narratives was probably taken from Nicolaus’ Universal History and from his autobiography, which was composed after the death of Herod. Fragments from both works are collected in F. Jacoby, FGrH II A 90. Modern scholarship has acknowledged the presence of other sources in Josephus’ Herod narratives and in some cases tended to attribute the differences between the accounts, the discrepancies and Josephus’ criticism of Herod to those sources, rather than to Josephus’ editorial hand. See e.g. Shutt’s survey of earlier scholarship on A.J. 15–17 and his own explanation (Studies, 88–92), and Stern, “Nicolaus of Damascus,” 383.
assistants or earlier sources, more recent research sees Josephus’ writing in a new light and credits him with a greater degree of compositional authenticity and originality.

Let me briefly explain why, in my opinion, the Herod narratives could naturally be attributed to none other than Josephus and why, in the end, the question of Josephus’ extent of borrowing from Nicolaus becomes redundant. Josephus’ original hand seems more evident from several angles. First, we cannot ignore the simple fact that the two Herod narratives are very different from each other. This fact alone makes implausible the assumption that Josephus copied the Herod material from Nicolaus without alterations or interventions. The Jewish historian must have made changes at least in one of the narratives.

Secondly, the use of dramatic elements and literary allusions to Greek and Roman drama and history are not exclusively confined to the Herod narratives but appear throughout the Josephan corpus. Therefore, there is no reason to attribute them to Nicolaus. This is the case even if we assume that Josephus used Nicolaus as a source for other parts of his historical works such as the biblical paraphrase of the Antiquitates or the account of the Hasmonean period, as

---

10 E.g. Thackeray, Historian (assistants), and Hölscher, “Josephus” (earlier sources). See also Shutt’s criticism of the German predisposition towards Quellenkritik: Studies, 89–90.


12 Shutt, Studies 87–88, maintains that the later Antiquitates narrative is ‘much more close to the original work of Nicolaus’. That of course raises the question why, if Josephus had an original version, he first chose to change it but later went back to using the original.


14 That is despite his penchant for pathetic embellishment. See Toher’s analysis of Nicolaus’ fragments (“Nicolaus,” 164–72).
Wacholder does. For even if he did, it is assumed that he used other sources as well and therefore any textual ornaments need not be attributed solely to Nicolaus. Furthermore, we know that the use of dramatic elements was widespread among Hellenistic historians in general, so there is no particular reason to assume those were borrowed from his source rather than composed independently by Josephus.

Thirdly, many rhetorical and dramatic elements in the Herod narrative, as well as the whole of the Bellum, are not unique to this work but appear in the Antiquitates as well. The use of speeches and Greco-Roman rhetoric, for instance, or the use of pathos and emotions in the portraiture of rulers, appear in the biblical paraphrase (A.J. 1–10). This means, at least, that such rhetoric can be found in other sources (such as the Bible) that Josephus used—or that Josephus himself implemented such rhetorical devices throughout his works.

Fourthly, we cannot ignore Josephus’ explicit references to his sources throughout the Herod narratives, and especially his sharp criticism of Nicolaus’ affinity to Herod and his historical methodology. It may perhaps be odd that a methodologically conscious historian like Josephus would pass such unequivocal criticism on anything, while uncritically and extensively borrowing from that very same source.

And a final reason, on a different level: the use of narratology in my analysis dictates that I focus on the text as we have it, and set aside the source question. Although the implementation of narratology on historical texts requires certain modifications (upon which I shall elaborate below), it is impossible to extend the boundaries of methodology so that earlier levels, both textual and contextual, gain precedence over the text (and its context). My focus is on Josephus the narrator and his own, rather than his predecessors’, art of narrating. In other words, the emphasis of my analysis is not on the provenance of Josephus’ material but on the ways in which he treated his source material and composed an original and independent text.

Despite our attempt to find a neat solution for the source question and attribute the dramatic creativity to Josephus exclusively, the situation might be a little more blurred. My research leads me to

---

15 Wacholder, Nicolaus, 58 ff.
16 The former is apparent in the Josephan parallel to the Joseph story in book 2 (Judah’s speech in A.J. 2.140–159). Josephus’ portrait of king Saul also contains tragic elements. In the case of Herod Josephus’ use of pathetic and tragic elements is careful and complex. See below, in the conclusion to this paper.
17 A.J 14.8–9; 16.183–186.
suggest that the text we have is Josephus' original composition, neither borrowed from nor composed by anyone else. However, even if one arrives at the conclusion that Nicolaus' hand is the dominant one in content and form, one must accept that the final editorial touches must have been Josephus'. That is to say, even if regarding Herod the Jewish historian adopted (or even copied) almost everything from Nicolaus, he still had to combine this narrative within the wider frameworks of the *Bellum* and the *Antiquitates*, which evidently has taken some editing and modifying, and involved making authorial choices. In short: it would be very difficult to rule out Josephus' part in the composition and editing of the Herod narratives, even if one assumes Nicolaus, and not Josephus, to be mostly responsible for its present form.

Concerning the portrait of Herod, I shall suggest that Josephus in both narratives (but especially in the earlier *Bellum*) shifts the focus from "Herod the Man" to "Herod the Image." It is not so much the historical Herod that Josephus' accounts emphasise but rather a symbolic Herod: a metaphor and exemplum of overriding personal ambition, shrewd political perception, but also of slavery to one's passions, paranoid behaviour and, in the *Antiquitates*, of impiety and cruelty. This emphasis on the symbolic qualities of Herod is important, because it might be a clue for solving the rhetorical puzzle I have hinted at above. Before examining the text, though, let us have a look at the methodology.

**Narratology**

My analysis of the Herod narratives relies mainly (but not exclusively) on the modern theory of narratology. Narratology, as defined by Mieke Bal, is "the Theory of narratives, narrative texts, images, spectacles, events; cultural artifacts that tell a story."\(^{18}\)

Bal essentially modifies the model devised by G. Genette in his *Figures III* (1972)\(^ {19}\) and later revised in *Nouveau discours du récit*.\(^ {20}\) What

---


stands at the basis of the analyses of Genette, Bal and Shlomith Rimmon-Kenan\(^{21}\) is a tripartite division of the levels of text, from the basic (independent?) plot through an intermediate version where the plot is ordered, articulated and structured, and finally to the method of narration. Genette’s tripartite division is into “story, narrative and narrating”; Bal prefers “fabula, story, text.” Rimmon-Kenan talks about “story, text and narration.” Another branch of narratology prefers a two-level reading. S. Chatman,\(^{22}\) for instance, divides between “story” and “discourse,” essentially forgoing the notion of the initial “fabula.”

While the division to levels is useful as a tool within the process of interpreting a text, it may be well worth remembering that the borders between story, text and narration tend to blur: it is not always clear where a textual phenomenon belongs. This is especially relevant in the analysis of historical texts, where the notion of “an event” in “real life” determines the character of the text and the author’s methodology but where, in highly elaborate works such as those of Josephus or Thucydides, it is virtually impossible to distinguish the original chain of events from its relating. For this reason, the twofold division into “story” and “discourse”—what one relates, and how one does so—seems to me to be more convenient in relation to the analysis of historical texts. Hence, I shall leave aside the questions of historical accuracy and to a certain extent, the use of sources in Josephus’ Herod narratives and concentrate here on the two levels of story and narration only.\(^{23}\)

Using narratology in the analysis of historical texts (as opposed to fiction) poses a few problems and requires certain modifications.\(^{24}\) A

---


\(^{23}\) The decision to leave aside this question does not, however, entail any judgement on the historical accuracy of Josephus. It is simply a methodological step, derived from the narratological perspective I have adopted throughout my analysis. A. Feldherr, *Spectacle and Society in Livy’s History* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998), ix–xi, takes a similar methodological step in his historiographical analysis.

key issue that requires a certain degree of conceptual acrobatics has to do with the relations between author and audience (and their parallel textual personae, narrator and narratees) in historical texts. History, as genre, is perceived somewhat differently from fiction. T. Rood explains that

What distinguishes historical texts from fiction is the reader’s assumption that they relate “what actually happened.” Works of fiction may purport to relate that, and may call upon the discursive apparatus of historical texts to give their claims an air of plausibility, but these claims are seriously meant only by the narrator, not by the author, who belongs to a different diegetic world. Readers of historical texts, by contrast, tend to identify author and narrator and to suppose an “ontological connection” between the discourse and the events it signifies. The status of history as a discourse of the real calls for some further refinement of narratological models. A dichotomy of story and discourse is no longer adequate; one must also allow for a referential level, and beyond that for the extra-textual level of the deeds and words of real people, even if this level is itself only accessible through other stories.25

The questions concerning author and audience, narrator and narratees, and the relations between them become more acute when applying narratology to historical texts.26 The historian and his readership are indeed very relevant to the discussion even if the emphasis is on the textual characteristics of the work. We, as modern historians, cannot ignore the real Flavius Josephus regardless of whether or not his “real” self had any discernible impact on his contemporary “real” audience. We also cannot ignore Josephus’ prospective (immediate)

---


audience, constructed or real: an educated, Western, Greek-speaking readership for *Bellum*, and probably Roman aristocrats with a penchant for Judaism (joined, perhaps, by Greek-speaking Diaspora Jews) for *Antiquitates*. They are all part and parcel of the essential analysis of the works of Josephus.

The inclusion of the “real” author and audience in the analysis brings in turn more complexity. Apart from discussing issues concerning author and audience (and narrator-narratees) and the extent to which real-life prior knowledge may affect, we also have to address the question of the relationship between these facets, especially between author and narrator. Much as we would like to believe that Josephus the man, the historian and the narrator are distinctively different facets which have separate roles in the understanding of the works of Josephus, it is not always possible to make a clear differentiation. The three facets tend to blur, diffuse into each other and sometimes almost disappear, most notoriously when it comes to the instances of “historian” and “narrator.”

In the case of Josephus I will suggest that these two entities are even more closely linked. This is because, in addition to the conventional means of establishing authority (outlining the historical method; first-hand experience), Josephus’ narrating voice seems to remain the main focalizer of the Herod narrative from beginning to end. This has a direct impact on the way Herod’s character is portrayed and on his qualities as a dramatic character.

---

27 *B. J.* 1.3 designates them as “subjects of the Roman Empire,” τοῖς κατὰ τὴν Ἑλληνικὴν ἡγεμονίαν.

28 In this matter I am convinced by S. Mason’s arguments in his introductory essay to the third volume of the BJP. On the basis of textual references from Josephus, Tacitus and Juvenal, Mason conjectures that “The simplest solution [to the question of Josephus’ readership] is that Josephus expects gentile readers who are deeply interested in Judean culture... This atmosphere of fascination with Judaism is the context that Josephus claims for his *Antiquities*, and his claim happens to match conditions otherwise known.” See S. Mason, BJP 3, xvii–xx (here pp. xix–xx), and also Mason, “Should anyone Wish to Enquire Further (*Ant.* 1.25): The Aim and Audience of Josephus’ *Judean Antiquities/Life*” in *Understanding Josephus: Seven Perspectives* (ed. S. Mason; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 64–103.

29 Marincola, *Authority*, 131–33, discusses this tendency to identify author and narrator in antiquity. As noted above, this problem appears to some extent in fiction. It seems to me that it becomes somewhat more acute in historical narratives, ancient or modern.
As with every complex story, the Herod narrative is not simply a sum of its elements, but something more: a coherent account which derives its dramatic force not only from the implementation of rhetorical tools within it, but also from the stance the narrator adopts, his interaction with the audience, and the relation between this particular account and the rest of the work. Josephus retains a resonant and assertive narrating voice throughout the Herod narrative. This continuous retention of focalization\(^{30}\) has some interesting implications for the overall dramatic character of the narrative and for the portraiture of Herod.

Already when looking at the order of the Herod narrative—the sequence of relating the events—it is evident that Josephus chooses to narrate the historical account in an unusual manner. There is a clear partition between Herod’s public and domestic affairs.\(^{31}\) Josephus begins his narrative with a presentation of Herod as a young man, already endowed with his most characteristic traits (an energetic nature, ambition, a hot temper, and their political consequences, *B.J.* 1.204–228). Then comes an account of his struggle for power, his victories and failures (1.229–353). Finally, Josephus relates an account of Herod’s actual reign (1.354–673). The two parts are juxtaposed in chapters 430–431, where the narrator contrasts Herod’s good fortune in his public career with his grave misfortune concerning his family affairs.\(^{32}\) The account of Herod’s rise to power is dominated by his public conduct (1.204–430). That of his actual reign, in turn, emphasises his private comings and goings (1.431–673).

---

\(^{30}\) This is not to say that the narrative is devoid of embedded focalizations: these come into play in speeches, letters, and certain stories. However, the main focalizing voice seems to remain that of the narrator, Josephus, from beginning to end.


\(^{32}\) In *B.J.* 1.429–430 Josephus lists Herod’s virtues—rather Greco-Roman in nature (excellent physical constitution, invincibility in battle, precision in javelin-throwing and bow-bending). The contrast comes in 431: “But, in revenge for his public prosperity, fortune visited Herod with troubles at home” (τάς γε μὲν υπαίθρους ἐυπρομοί γὰρ τὰ ό ούκον ἀναμαρτάνειν ἐνεμέρτησεν). The duality of fortune is a familiar *topos* in Greco-Roman historiography.
The two parts are divided by a smaller section, Herod’s building projects (1.401–430).

Let us now concentrate more on the portraiture of Herod. The main emphasis in the first part of the *Bellum* narrative is on Herod’s political image, as a young and powerful contestant to the Judean throne. We are told a lot about Herod’s public traits: he is quick to react, energetic, confident, cunning and hot-headed. However, Josephus does not tell us anything about Herod’s early upbringing, education or domestic relationships: the way he treats his relatives, his personal feelings, or what indeed drives him to take the road he has taken.\(^{33}\) Perhaps as a result of that, Herod at this stage seems more symbolic than real. His character is almost schematic, that of “a young, promising (but potentially problematic) politician rising to power.”\(^{34}\) We do not know anything specific about his personality, his thoughts, his wishes or his formative past experiences. Josephus does not write about Herod’s childhood, or include anecdotes of any kind.\(^{35}\) Herod’s existence, as it were, begins not with a wise or anticipatory anecdote from early childhood as is often the case in ancient biography, but with an immediate and glorious military action: the

\(^{33}\) Ancient biography, by contrast, often tends to include accounts of early childhood and upbringing (αγωγή) in such accounts, whether they consist of curious anecdotes or an outline of the education of the promising young man who would become king. Earlier examples tend to do so much more than later Greco-Roman, and Latin political biography tends to have very little of such material: Suetonius’ *Life of Augustus*, for instance, contains an account of Augustus’ family history (1–7) but only a short account of Augustus as a child prodigy (8). The rest of the work is dedicated to the emperor’s political career. Cf. C. B. R. Pelling, “Childhood and Personality in Greek Biography,” in *Characterization and Individuality in Greek Literature* (ed. C. B. R. Pelling; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989), 213–44. Note that the first-century b.c.e. *Life of Augustus* by Nicolaus (1–14 and 25 a–b) includes a longer and more detailed section dedicated to the life of the “young Caesar” (καίσαρος τοῦ νεοῦ, 25), albeit in a fragmentary and pastiche-like form.

\(^{34}\) I am borrowing C. Sourvinou-Inwood’s notion of “schemata” and their function in historical narrative. See her analysis of Herodotus 3.48, 50–53 in *Reading Greek culture: Texts and Images, Rituals and Myths* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991), 244–67. Here the “schema” appears in the initial portraiture of Herod, but later it will also come into play in the construction of several sub-stories within the Herod narrative. Among those most notably (and interestingly similar to Herodotus) is Herod’s relations with his sons.

\(^{35}\) Josephus only includes a reference to Herod’s young age when achieving his first political role, the governor of Galilee (νέος, 1.203). Cf. Nicolaus on Augustus, *Vit. Caes.* 3.4–5, and also Josephus on himself as a young prodigy, *Vita* 8–9.
ousting of the brigands in the Galilee (1.204).\textsuperscript{36} It is my suggestion that he would retain this quality and remain distant throughout the narrative, in spite of, or perhaps due to, the rhetorical and dramatic embellishments.

The story itself, despite the brevity of description, already reveals that this young man has certain qualities that would make him a leader. Herod’s praises are immediately “sung, as the restorer of their [i.e. the towns and the villages of the Galilee] peace and possessions” (1.205). Only later one discovers that this fast track to fame is somewhat problematic, first—and this is Josephus’ first direct authorial comment on Herod—because “it is impossible in prosperity to escape envy” (ἐμήχανον δ’ ἐν ἑυπροφίας φθόνον διαφύγειν, 1.208),\textsuperscript{37} and secondly, because actions like these always have a price in the form of killing innocent people (1.209). Five chapters after Herod had been introduced, we are acquainted with his most characteristic quality: the twofold nature of his personality, his affiliations, and his conduct.

In the first part of the narrative, the overall image of Herod that we receive is of a young and ambitious politician, whose shrewd nature and sharp political senses have brought him the title of king. One thing is clear: his way to power was not smooth. Internal sedition, violence, mutual suspicion, political opportunism, all the vices that would later become very characteristic of his domestic life are already in play in the Judean public sphere.\textsuperscript{38}

Herod, though, does not seem to be fully and solely responsible for the events, as would be the case in the later part of the narrative, where the focus is on his domestic affairs. He does not initiate plotting, killing or attacking yet (except that near-attack on Jerusalem,\textsuperscript{36} This method of presentation of Herod resembles that of ancient historical monographs concentrating on one prominent character rather than an event, such as Arrian’s \textit{Anabasis}. In Josephus, this could perhaps be a remnant of Nicolaus. But even if that is the case, Josephus later moulds the literary conventions into his own narrative structure and adjusts them to his independent agenda.

\textsuperscript{37} This early comment contains a subtle hint to Herod’s subsequent misfortunes. The construction ‘prosperity-envy’, which is common in Greco-Roman historiography beginning with Herodotus, appears in Josephus both in the \textit{Bellum} and the \textit{Antiquitates}.

\textsuperscript{38} As they would be in Roman politics, too. Cf. \textit{Vit. Caes.} 19 (58–66). However, while Herod’s tribulations come at a stage in the narrative where his vices have already been hinted at, Nicolaus’ biography of Augustus is considerably more laudatory; the young Octavian is portrayed as a noble, virtuous, honest young man.
a result of his hot-tempered nature, which was prevented by his father and brother). He is portrayed as simply reacting to the circumstances. This relative passiveness, however, is not confined to the first section. In Josephus' portrait of Herod, this quality of character penetrates more deeply and comes into play in a more negative fashion in Herod's personal life.

To a certain extent, Herod’s portrait in the second section of the *Bellum* narrative bears some resemblance to that of a tragic hero. The emphasis on personal misfortune, the self-destructive streak, the fact that he is confronting and succumbing to forces more powerful than his feeble reasoning, all point in that direction. However, this is only an initial impression. Herod is in fact not a tragic character *per se*, but quasi-tragic. This is a result of many reasons, not least generic boundaries and cultural predispositions. But tragic characters are not confined to tragedies, and there is a deeper reason for Herod’s incompleteness in that area. I shall return to that in the conclusion below.

Herodotus’ portrait of Xerxes, by comparison, is also that of an ambitious king whose weaknesses cause grave disaster. However, Xerxes “allows himself to be persuaded” (Herodotus 7.7), his acts have direct implications on the fate of an entire empire, and he is subject to divine wrath for his attempt to bridge the Hellespont. Moreover, Herodotus allows his audience more than a glimpse into Xerxes’ psyche, with the inclusion of his dreams and internal scruples in the narrative and the continuous debates with Artabanus throughout...
Books 7–9. The external elements, as well as the internal glimpse, are absent from Herod’s portrait and impede the tragic effect.

Herod, however, is very human. But later in the narrative, as the account of his domestic trouble unfolds, the impression is that even his humanness is “incomplete” and incapable of stirring pity, fear or empathy in the audience. “Incomplete,” that is, somewhat lacking in what M. Ostwald calls “frailty.” Such frailty may be defined, in essence, as the common human tendency to act first, in convinced belief that this would solve a problem, and realise the futility of the action in retrospect. The expectation Josephus the narrator creates for his narratees and their readiness for emotion remain unfulfilled and hence, in retrospect, retain yet deeper dramatic irony.

Herod’s passive thread of character indeed runs throughout the whole narrative. However, the account of his conduct as King of Judea (1.431–673) takes a somewhat different turn. The second part of the Herod narrative is entirely governed by the unfortunate family affairs. Those are of course connected to political issues, and Josephus includes political affairs in this part. However, the tone and emphasis of the narrative is more personal than political.

We read a lot about Herod’s contorted relationship with his wife Mariamme, and the painful relationship with his sons. Antipater, Herod’s plotting son, carries out his political manoeuvres on a personal basis. What prompts him to take action is his hatred for his brothers, his feeling of inferiority and his greed. He does not operate on the basis of any political ideology or motivation, nor as a result of any non-human intervention as is sometimes the case in Athenian tragedies.

---

41 The emphasis on humanness, i.e. leaving the focus and responsibility of action in the human sphere, is a characteristically Greek idea (as opposed to the monotheistic tendency to view divine power as the main generator of action). See most recently Ostwald, “Tragedians,” 25: “Man is not a mere toy of divine powers who use him for their own inscrutable ends. . . . These powers may themselves be subject to a transcendent necessity, which they may know and communicate, but which they cannot avert.”


43 Herod’s relationships with his sons may be viewed not only in the personal context but also as part of a historiographical stereotype of the (Greek) tyrant and his questionable personal conduct, especially concerning the spouse and sons. See Sourvinou-Inwood, “Reading” on Herodotus’ Periander.

The image portrayed in this part is that of a king whose personal flaws are accentuated. Herod is not the successful ruler any more, but an unbalanced man and a slave to his own emotions. He tortures others and spares no sentiments, but he is also tormented by his own weaknesses. He kills his beloved wife and then laments her death. He sentences his own children to death. He is under constant life threats from different direction and he even tries to commit suicide with a fruit-cutting knife. Yet Herod does not stir the readers’ empathy as an ordinary tragic hero would do. Why is that?

A few reasons come to mind. First, whereas Josephus indeed elaborates upon Herod’s prowess, and lists some virtues (bravery and political shrewdness), the general impression is that Herod’s own sense of propriety is somewhat flawed. He refuses to be subject to any restraining powers (be they moral, religious, political) other than his own. And his own fetters, in turn, are not morally acceptable. His vanity, verging on hybris but not quite reaching the full depth of the concept, diminishes the empathy that could otherwise be stirred in the audience.45

The inability to stir empathy might have to do with another factor. The impression of an unruly tyrant, which Josephus builds gradually into a complex portrait, is not only that of Herod the man. It also alludes to more abstract discussions familiar from Greek historiography, concerning the “best regime”: what are the boundaries between monarchy and tyranny, when does a king transgress those and become a tyrant, what are the implications of tyranny for society.46 Josephus, unlike Herodotus or Dionysius, does not confine his treatment of the subject to a separate philosophical debate within the narrative but stretches the theme throughout his whole work. Within the wider (and essentially more symbolic) scope, Josephus seems to be using the portrait of Herod as an extended metaphor for two

45 An interesting comparison from tragedy might be that of Xerxes in Aeschylus’ Persae. There, too, the impression is that Xerxes’ ὄβρος was directly and almost solely responsible for the Persian defeat. However, his unbridled ambition did stir the gods’ anger and the defeat is viewed as divine punishment, not as a result of human error or vanity. Although Xerxes’ character seems rather distant and unable to invoke pity, the divine intervention and human helplessness seem to balance Xerxes’ crude vanity and make empathic reaction possible.

46 Other examples for such debates in historiography include the Persian debate on monarchy in Herodotus 3.80–82, and Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Ant. rom. 4.70–85. In philosophy, the lengthy discussion in Plato, Resp. 8–9.
issues that will prove to be relevant to the rest of the *Bellum*: the possible benefits of a political alliance with Rome, and the vices of extreme and tyrannical behaviour. Herod’s image and life are prime examples for the temptations of power and the thin line between virtuous conduct and tyrannical frenzy. His story is also an excellent opportunity for Josephus to include and display emotions\(^47\) in his narrative.\(^48\)

However: the excess of pathos seems to create an opposite effect to the expected rise in pity and fear.\(^49\) The audience’s emotional distance from Herod is enhanced even more by the slight passiveness or emotional weakness Josephus grants him. It is as if Herod does not make the effort to disentangle himself from the webs of personal misery, paranoia and cruelty that he has woven with his own hands.

To conclude this section: in the first part of the narrative, the emphasis is on Herod’s external image. His political portrait is constructed with the more philosophical ideas in mind: this is a king, who must be brave, and ambitious, must fight and win wars, depicted as a saviour of his country (pacifies seditions, establishes close ties with Rome, and builds cities and the Temple). The second part of the narrative, however, is inward-looking and concentrates on aspects of Herod’s personality and private life. This time, the emphasis is entirely upon Herod’s specific traits of character. The portrait of

\(^{47}\) I am well aware of the problems concerning the definition of emotions, and the probable differences in meaning between ancient and modern interpretations of pity and fear. More on the obstacles of cross-cultural and non-contemporary interpretation of emotions in D. Konstan, *Pity Transformed* (London: Duckworth, 2001), 1–25. Nevertheless, I shall assume a basic similarity between modern and ancient understanding of these emotions for two reasons. The first has to do with Aristotle’s concept of “the Universal”; any attempt to understand the effect of Josephus’ dramatic constructions would be doomed if we leave no common grounds between our culture and the Greco-Roman world. The second reason is linked with the first: since the nature of my analysis is textual and rhetorical, and not anthropological, it is possible to leave aside wider issues concerning cultural differences and examine the constant element in the equation: the Herod narratives themselves.

\(^{48}\) See Josephus’ contentions in *B.J.* 1.9–12. These concern all the above: civil strife, tyranny, Rome and the historian’s right to include emotions (τοίς ἐμαυτοῦ πάθεσιν, 1.9, and τάς δ’ ὀλοφόρεσις, 1.12). Josephus’ explicit appeal, in the above-mentioned passage, to the inclusion of emotions in historiography seems to me to be a unique declaration in Greco-Roman historiography. I hope to examine it in detail in the future.

Herod as a private man, as opposed to Herod the King, concentrates on the king's vices rather than on his virtues. This juxtaposition serves Josephus as a uniting, rather than a dividing, element. The partition enhances the complexity and twofold nature of Herod the man, the king and the metaphor: good and bad, peaceful and bellicose, reassuring and threatening could, in the end, dwell under the same roof.\(^{50}\)

Another uniting element is Herod's static character.\(^{51}\) It seems to me that the unchanging character of a main protagonist calls for something to fill the dramatic vacuum. The account contains dramatic elements in abundance, but in order to extract their full potential, the narrative needs a leader. Where Herod fails to lead the story, Josephus steps in with great conviction. His narrating voice is resonant, assertive and well heard throughout the narrative.

Let us now have a closer look on Josephus' concluding remarks on Herod in his obituary of the king: "In his life as a whole he was blessed, if ever man was, by fortune: a commoner, he mounted to a throne, retained it for all those years and bequeathed it to his own children; in his family life, on the contrary, no man was more unfortunate."\(^{52}\) Herod, says Josephus, was both blessed in his public life and most unfortunate (\(\alpha\nu\chi\varepsilon\sigma\tau\omega\varsigma\)) in his domestic affairs. Indeed this duality of fortune seems to be Herod's most characteristic trait. This is not untypical in the two historiographical traditions Josephus corresponds with. Greco-Roman historical accounts of tyranny often tend to portray kings fortunate in riches and prowess as suffering in their personal lives.\(^{53}\) Biblical portraits of kings are also abundant in personal misfortune.\(^{54}\)

---

\(^{50}\) Cf. Pliny's comments about the changing fortunes of Augustus in Nat. 7.155.

\(^{51}\) However complex Herod's image is, it does not evolve throughout the narrative but remains unchanged. This somewhat static quality of protagonists is typical of ancient biographies. More on the "integrated conception of personality," especially in Plutarch, in C. B. R. Pelling, "Childhood and Personality in Greek Biography," in Idem, Characterization, 213–44.

\(^{52}\) καὶ κατὰ μὲν τὰ ἄλλα πάντα τύχη δεξιά χρησάμενος, εἰ καὶ τις ἄλλος, ὡστὶς κατεκτήσατο βασιλεῖαν ἰδιότης ὄν καὶ τοσοῦτον χρόνον φυλάξας ἰδίως τέκνοις κατέληπεν, ἐν δὲ τοῖς κατ’ οἶκον ἄτυχον θεάσατο (B.J. 1.665).

\(^{53}\) Again, Herodotus' Croesus and Pliny's Augustus (Nat. 7.155) are good examples.

\(^{54}\) But there, as is the case with Saul and David's portraits, the personal grief is often directly connected with committing sins (whether consciously or not), and sins in turn cause political trouble as well. The biblical scheme tends to view domestic and public as parallel rather than contradictory.
Throughout the narrative, Josephus takes us from Herod’s successes as a young man to his emotional frenzy as an aging monarch. The two aspects of Herod’s life seep into each other, and sometimes the very same traits can be perceived in different ways. What at times seem like shrewd political sense in the public sphere (Herod’s fast changes of Roman loyalty as soon as Antony’s end was in sight, for instance) might be regarded as disloyalty and opportunism in the private realm (betraying a friend, and a long-standing familial commitment). Herod’s image in the Bellum is first and foremost complex, in both form and essence. But is it indeed a portrait of a tragic hero?

Despite the initial impression and the abundance of dramatic embellishment, Herod’s portrait lacks the essential quality of tragic heroes, be they of drama, epic poetry or historical narratives. What is missing? It seems to me that Josephus’ Herod fails to convince as a tragic hero not so much because he lacks certain tragic characteristics (and he does) but because he is not independent enough to develop them in the first place. In other words, Herod remains a distant figure and fails to arouse deep pity or fear because Josephus never ceases to be the main focalizer of the narrative.

The discussion to be found in Heath about “focus” in tragedy may be relevant here.\(^55\) Heath suggests that “intense engagement with a focal figure is a characteristic of tragedy,” and explains that this “engagement” is primarily emotional. The focus may change from one figure to another (e.g. Antigone to Creon), but it will continue to arouse emotions in the audience.\(^56\) In the case of Herod, this is never achieved: although he remains the main protagonist in terms of plot and historical interest, his character never manages to emotionally engage the audience.

Josephus’ focus on human conduct notwithstanding, it seems that Herod is portrayed not only as not engaging in initial contemplation of his deeds but also as failing to feel and express true retrospective remorse. Moreover, Herod does not seem to act in the best of intentions and to the best of his ability, and does not seem to have a sound moral conviction, or a higher cause, that prompts him to act the way he does.\(^57\) This calling, whose strength often blinds heroes in

\(^{57}\) Ostwald, “Tragedians,” 25, suggests that “the central fact of all Greek beliefs is that humans are agents who have to act in the belief that what they are doing
tragedy, may have virtuous roots (such as Oedipus' wish to end the curse on the city) or rise from revenge, which can still be more appealing or understandable to the audience (Euripides' Hecuba) or less so (Medea). In any case, this sense of revenge is often strong enough to overcome reason, insight or sensibility. In the case of Herod, however, it seems that his sheer cruelty is simply a result of his emotional weakness. He is not driven by any higher calling, good or bad. As a result, neither pity nor fear (of him, or for him) are invoked.

Herod's emotional blandness and inability to arouse emotions is what I earlier defined as an "incomplete" humanness. Herod in the *Bellum* is better understood on the more distant, symbolic level. He is not portrayed as being morally "like us," but as someone who operates on an almost inhuman level of emotions—or alternatively, with cold calculations in mind. Herod also fails to convince as "better than us," neither in status (a commoner) nor in moral conviction (no higher cause behind his deeds). In either case, it is impossible to fully empathise with him, fear for him, or rather hate him for a good reason. Herod's misconduct is not a result of an understandable, human shortcoming, nor of temporary madness driven by higher causes.

Josephus exposes his audience to Herod's acts, but not to what prompts them from within. Herod's few demonstrations of apology and regret (grave sorrow after Mariamme's execution, 1.444; the mock-sentimental speech entitling his sons with royal rights, 1.457-466; or his attempts of reconciliation after the murder of Alexander and Aristobulus where he promises to be "a more considerate grandfather," 1.556-558) are shallow, dubious and still within the realm of his emotions, not his thoughts. Josephus does not allow Herod to take

---


59 Cf. Ullman and Price, "Drama," 105: "The king lacks heroic stature, and his impulsive behaviour lacks tragic greatness. He reacts to, rather than controls, the things which are done to him, and his reactions are usually wrong..." This quotation is concerning the Eurycles episode (1.448-449) but applies to Herod's overall portraiture in the narrative.
the reins of focalization in the narrative. We never get to see the events as Herod sees them, or even to share any of his sincere thoughts or feelings. He is constantly kept behind Josephus’ rhetorical veil. This, in turn, leaves the main protagonist of a highly dramatic account distant from the audience and incapable of stirring either pity or fear. And Herod’s distance, in turn, keeps Josephus in control as narrator and main focalizer throughout the narrative.

And the narrator, no doubt, shows great skill. Josephus writes the story of a turbulent, complicated and rather miserable life with a careful and knowledgeable rhetorical hand. As we have seen in the examples above, he uses conventional rhetorical devices such as digressions and speeches, but readjusts those to the specific agenda of his narrative and always retains his voice, whether in actual comments or in the meticulous implementation of other rhetorical devices. The Herod narrative contains familiar and conventional rhetorical and dramatic devices, but their specific functions within the account are tailored to the historian’s individual aims.

For example: Josephus describes Herod’s youthful promise in a manner similar to that of Nicolaus when describing Augustus, but whereas the latter meant (we assume) to praise the young Caesar, Josephus uses the audience’s expectations to create irony and surprise. Or he takes the rhetorical frame of a political speech of alliance (Herod requests alliance from Octavian, 1.388–392), but places it in an unusual context, reversing the roles of the speakers and adding a twist to the usual theme (for the alliance between Judea and Rome is later to be turned into grave animosity). Obituaries, too, operate on a deeper level of the narrative in that they help in highlighting the complex connections between the individual, political and philosophical realms.60

Often, the result of Josephus’ continuous readjustment of the role and function of his rhetorical tools is dramatic irony: whether blunt or subtle, it is ever present in the Herod narrative. It is mostly apparent in the interaction between narrator and narratees, and less so within the story frame of the narrative. Characters are usually not using irony themselves.61 Josephus exercises his power as narrator to

---

60 Detailed examinations of these examples (and more) are in Landau, Out-Heroding Herod, 130–55.

61 Except, perhaps, in the speeches during Antipater’s trial at Rome. But there irony again operates in a different rhetorical level, not as the characters’ own, nor as the narrator’s, but as part of forensic rhetoric.
create dramatic irony both within the narrative, and in a more outward-looking direction, towards more general moral assertions. On the narrative level, irony is present in both internal allusions and echoes in the narrative itself and intertextual allusions and parallels to earlier Greco-Roman narratives. On the more general level, dramatic and tragic irony is derived mostly from the retrospective historical glance of the whole work. In either case both narrator and narratees are highly engaged in the process. They are well aware of the intertextual references and the literary background, and are also familiar with the fatal outcome of the revolt. Hence, all political successes and small failures described in the narrative, all attempts to win Rome’s support and all internal scheming may seem futile, if not pathetic (in the modern sense of the word).

The Herod narrative in the *Bellum* is, as it were, a chronicle of premeditated, or at least unsurprisingly unfortunate events. Its strength is derived not from one element or the other, but from the careful combination of plot, characters, a meticulous implementation of rhetorical tools and an assertive narrator who keeps the main focalization of the narrative well in his own hands.

Moreover, and by way of a concluding thought: the meticulous and elaborate manner in which Josephus tells the story of Herod premeditates the turbulent circumstances that later befell the main protagonists of the rest of the work: Judea and the Jewish people. The story of Herod may be more than the historical beginning of all that. Josephus’ account may perhaps be more than a linear chronology of events. It is the first link in a circular, ring-like perception of history. The reign of Herod already contains the seeds of the later historical outcome of Judea: internal strife and an active association with Rome. Herod, provoking internal unrest on the one hand but strengthening the alliance with Rome to bring relative prosperity on the other, is the embodiment of both themes. It is only natural, then, for a highly rhetorical narrator to make the most out of the details.

---

COMMONPLACES IN HEROD'S COMMANDER SPEECH IN JOSEPHUS' A.J. 15.127–146

JAN WILLEM VAN HENTEN
UNIVERSITY OF AMSTERDAM

1. Introduction¹

The two versions of Herod’s commander speech (B.J. 1.373–379; A.J. 15.127–146) in Josephus’ report about Herod’s conflicts with the Arabs before the Battle of Actium (31 B.C.E.) differ greatly. I will concentrate here on the more embellished version in the Antiquitates, which sets the speech in the period before Actium (A.J. 15.109, 121, 161) and describes how Herod had to fight several battles against “the Arabs,” as Josephus consistently writes. Most probably, “the Arabs” refer to Nabataeans, as is apparent from details in the context.² Herod had to deal also with Mark Antony and Cleopatra, lovers and key players on the international scene. They played, at least in Josephus’ presentation, a crucial role in the history that leads up to Herod’s conflicts with the Arabs. Instigated by Cleopatra, Mark Antony ordered Herod to attack the Arabs. The Arabs were negligent with the paying of rent to her through Herod as intermediary (A.J. 15.107), but Cleopatra also hoped to benefit personally from a conflict between Jews and Arabs (A.J. 15.110). Josephus had reported already that Cleopatra desired to take over Herod’s country (A.J. 15.77). The first battle ended successfully for Herod. He triumphed over the Arabs at Diospolis, which is probably the Decapolis city of Dion, east of the Sea of Galilee. Josephus suggests that Herod would have been successful too in the second battle at Cana/Canatha,³ if

¹ I warmly thank Luuk Huitink (Amsterdam) for collecting references and making most useful comments on draft versions of this paper, Katell Berthelot (Montpellier) and Daniel R. Schwartz (Jerusalem) for references, Jonathan Kirkpatrick (Oxford) for correcting my English, as well as Antony Forte for polishing my translation of A.J. 15.127–146.

² Graeco-Roman authors applied the name “Arabs” to a variety of peoples, but Josephus attaches it specifically to the Nabateans, F. Millar, “Hagar, Ishmael, Josephus and the Origins of Islam,” JJS 44 (1993): 23–45, esp. 33.

³ B.J. 1.366: Canatha. See for various readings in the mss of the Bellum and the
Athenion, Cleopatra's general in Coele-Syria, had not intervened. Athenion's attack resulted in a major defeat for Herod's soldiers (A.J. 15.116–119). A heavy earthquake made matters worse for the Jews, and the Arabs felt so confident that they even killed the Jewish envoys, who had come to them to negotiate about peace (A.J. 15.121–124). Herod's army was in a deplorable condition, which gave the Arabs great prospects for a definitive victory. At this dramatic point in the narrative Josephus inserts Herod's elaborate commander speech. The Arabs suffered a devastating defeat and made Herod, out of admiration for his leadership, their ruler or patron (A.J. 15.146–159). The Antiquitates do not mention the location of this final battle, but B.J. 1.380 indicates that it took place near Philadelphia, a city of the Decapolis (currently Amman).

Herod's speech in A.J. 15 reads like a masterful oration. The speech's well-polished composition and persuasive rhetoric offer a very positive picture of Herod as someone who encourages his soldiers. This does not match the rather critical image of Herod found elsewhere in Josephus. Yet, the smooth transition from speech to narrative and vice versa and the strong cohesion between the speech's content and its narrative context indicate that the speech's vocabulary and argumentation are probably Josephus' own creation. Josephus may have invented Herod's speech, because Herodotus shows already that it was a well-known convention that commanders gave a speech of encouragement before a major battle (section 3.1 below). This may have triggered fictitious speeches made up by the historians themselves. If, on the other hand, Herod actually gave a speech of encouragement before this battle against the Arabs, Josephus might have tried to catch the tenor of his words, as Thucydides tried to

Antiquitates and various identifications of this city, A. Schalit, König Herodes: Der Mann und Sein Werk (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2001), 697–98. Both the Bellum and the Antiquitates indicate that the place was part of Coele-Syria. The most probable hypothesis is that the battle took place near the city of Canatha (= Qanawat), west of the Hauran Mountains.

4 Schalit, König Herodes, 122–23.

5 Josephus' term προστάτης can mean, among other things, “leader,” “ruler” or “protector.” P. Richardson, Herod: King of the Jews and Friend of the Romans (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1996), 67 n. 57, considers it unlikely that the Nabataeans appointed Herod as their ruler or protector because this is not confirmed elsewhere.

do with the commander speeches he reported. In that case, Josephus probably used a source that contained the speech, perhaps Herod's memoirs, mentioned in AJ. 15.174. In any case, we do not know the content and style of these memoirs nor any other source that transmitted the speech. We only have the two versions of the speech in Josephus, which differ quite strongly. The speech's embellishment in the Antiquitates shows that Josephus did not hesitate to adapt its vocabulary, rhetorical style and composition. And if Josephus polished and expanded the speech in several ways, he may have adapted his source, if there ever was one, by adding conventional topoi from earlier commander speeches that were available to him. A comparison of Herod's speech in Josephus with commander speeches in major non-Jewish histories may, therefore, be quite useful for the speech's interpretation.

In this contribution, I will first discuss the composition and type of speech of AJ. 15.127–146 (section 2). Subsequently, I will offer a survey of motifs in Herod's speech that are more or less paralleled by non-Jewish commander speeches in Greek (section 3). The pièce de résistance of this survey will be the cluster of bellum iustum motifs put forward persuasively by Herod in order to convince his soldiers that another battle against the Arabs was just and necessary. For the Greek historians my comparative reading will focus upon Herodotus, Thucydides, Polybius, and Dionysius of Halicarnassus, who are all well known for their particular use of speeches in their histories. All four of them included commander speeches. Of course, this choice implies that my non-Jewish source material is selective, which means that my results are far from exhaustive. Yet, the survey should allow us to draw conclusions about Josephus' use of rhetorical and historiographical conventions concerning commander speeches transmitted by Greek authors.

---

7 R. Leimbach, Militärische Musterrhetorik: Eine Untersuchung zu den Feldherrnreden des Thukydides (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1985), 9–14, argues that Thucydides' commander speeches are exemplary in two ways: 1) the authentic tenor ("Gesamttendenz") shows how speeches typically were given, and 2) his fictitious vocabulary is paradigmatic too, indicating how speeches should be.

8 M. Mantovani, Bellum iustum: die Idee des gerechten Krieges in der römischen Kaiserzeit (Bern: Peter Lang, 1990), 95.
2. TYPE OF SPEECH AND COMPOSITION OF A.J. 15.127–146

2.1. *Type of speech:* parakletikos logos

Josephus’ speeches represent the three major types of speech according to ancient theories of rhetoric, but most of them are deliberative. Donna Runnalls identifies thirteen speeches in Josephus, nine of which belong to the category of deliberative speech (*genos symboleutikon*).\(^9\) *A.J.* 15.127–146 and its counterpart in *B.J.* 1.373–379 are deliberative as well. Herod does his best to persuade his soldiers to fight the Arabs again with high spirits. Nevertheless, his speech also shows features that belong to forensic speech.\(^10\)

The speech’s introduction clearly indicates Herod’s intention: he has chosen to encourage his soldiers (παρακαλέσαι προεἰλόμενη) and to instruct them, in order to keep up their spirits (*A.J.* 15.128).\(^11\) His soldiers had lost their hope and courage because of the disastrous fight against Athenion (*A.J.* 15.125), so he tries to raise their spirits (ἀναλαμβάνειν αὐτῶν πεπτωκότα τὰ φρονήματα) and encourage them again (παραθαρρύνας . . . παρεκάλει, *A.J.* 15.126).\(^12\) It concerns, therefore, a matter of war and peace, one of the five subjects of deliberative speech discussed by Aristotle.\(^13\) The key word παρακαλέω in the introduction is one of the formal indications that the speech is a commander’s speech, a παρακλητικὸς λόγος.\(^14\) Other vocabulary in

---


\(10\) See the accusations against the Arabs and the dikaios-vocabulary. Overlaps between deliberative and forensic speech are common, Lausberg, *Handbook of Literary Rhetoric*, 97.

\(11\) Other encouragement speeches of soldiers in Josephus: *B.J.* 4.39–48 (Vespasian) and *B.J.* 7.33–53 (*Titus*).

\(12\) Definition of a commander speech in Leimbach, *Militärische Musterrhetorik*, 15: “Unter Kampfparänesen sind daher hier Reden verstanden, die, von Feldherren meist unmittelbar vor einer Schlacht gehalten, darauf abzielen, mangelnde Kampfbereitschaft aufzuheben, vorhandene zu verstärken oder übergrosse zu dämpfen.”

\(13\) Aristotle, *Rhet.* 1.4.7–9 1359b–1360a.

\(14\) Polybius 12.25.3 attributes the introduction of political, hortatory and ambassadorial speeches to Timaeus (τῶν συμβουλευτικῶν καὶ παρακλητικῶν, ἢτι δὲ πρεσβευτικῶν λόγων); 23.2.9; 28.4.2; Dionysius Ant. *rom.* 4.26; Zech 1:13 LXX. Alternative Greek names for commander speeches seem to be παρακέλευσις (“exhortation”) and παραίνεσις (“exhortation”). Thucydides uses the verbs παράκελευθαι or παραινείν, 2.10.3; 2.86.6; 2.90.1; 4.9.4; 4.11.1, Leimbach, *Militärische Musterrhetorik*, 14.
the introduction, calling upon the soldiers’ courage, which is partly repeated at the speech’s end, supports this conclusion (ἀνδραγαθία: A.J. 15.127, 140, 146; θαρρέω: A.J. 15.127, 143; ἀνδρεία: A.J. 15.138; τόλμα: A.J. 15.142). The continuation of the narrative in 15.147 also matches this kind of speech. The soldiers regained their self-confidence and triumphed over the Arabs (A.J. 15.147–160).

2.2. Composition

A.J. 15.127–146 can be divided into four sections, in line with Aristotle’s view of the composition of speeches\(^{15}\) and the setup of several other deliberative speeches in Josephus:

2) Statement (propositio, 129).
3) Proof (argumentatio, 130–145).
4) Conclusion (peroratio with recapitulatio and affectus, 146).\(^{16}\)

The introduction includes a common formula to call for the soldiers’ attention (οὐκ ἄγνω ὅν, ὁ ἀνδρε, ὡς ἀπό... , A.J. 15.127),\(^{17}\) followed by a reference to their hard times, which is taken up afterwards. The second section, the statement (129), concisely formulates the speech’s two main points (πρῶτον μὲν... μετὰ δὲ), anticipating Herod’s proof for both of them (βούλομαι ἐπιδείξαι... μετὰ δὲ τῶν τεῦτο δείξαι). The two topics are:

1) The battle that has to be fought is just (δικαίως πολέμειν) and necessary (ἡναγκασμένοι).
2) There is no reason for fear and the prospects for victory are great.

The body of the speech, the proof, perfectly matches this summary of its content. Its first topic (A.J. 15.130–137) elaborates Herod’s statement that the battle is just and necessary, obviously because of the enemy’s behavior. This section includes a double narratio in order to support Herod’s point; A.J. 15.130–134 lists the Arabs’ reprehensible

\(^{15}\) Aristotle, \textit{Rhet.} 3.13.4 1414b. Also Cicero, \textit{Part. or.} 27.


\(^{17}\) Cf. 2 Cor 1:8; 2:11; 1 Thess 4:13.
deeds and A.J. 15.136 mentions their outrageous killing of the Jewish envoys. Herod’s proof calls upon the soldiers’ own experiences by making them into witnesses (μάρτυρας ὑμᾶς ποιούμενος ὁν λέγω, A.J. 15.130). His list of the Arabs’ wicked deeds (A.J. 15.130–134) includes references to: ¹⁸

1) their lawlessness (παρονομία; cf. 136; 140; 156);
2) their unfaithfulness (ἀπίστως διακειμένων; cf. 110; 130; 132; 134; 140);
3) their greed (πλεονεξία; cf. κερδαινο, 134);
4) their jealousy (φθόνος);
5) their cowardly way of fighting (τοίς ταραχαῖς ἐφεδρεύοντες . . . ; cf. 140–142).

As the references in brackets indicate, most of these accusations are taken up again in the speech’s narrative sections. The Arabs’ recent behavior towards Herod and the Jews reported in the speech’s narrative context underpins several of these accusations (i.e. their lawlessness, unfaithfulness and greed). The first narratio (A.J. 15.131–134)¹⁹ about the lawless deeds of the Arabs is introduced by the rhetorical formula “But why do I have to say much (more)?” (καὶ τὰ μὲν πολλὰ τί δει λέγειν;). ²⁰ The formula suggests that there is no need to say more about these wicked Arabs, but functions, in fact, as an introductory phrase for a list of accusations. Herod notes his own benefactions toward the Arabs: they benefited from his friendship with Antony (132) and his taking care of Cleopatra’s greedy attempts to take over land from both kingdoms (133), but returned his friendship with treachery. The friendship motif (cf. φιλοί and πίστες; 133–134) is repeated in a difficult rhetorical phrase in A.J. 15.134, which again results in emphasis on the Arabs’ treachery and the preliminary conclusion that their unjust deeds have to be punished. The battle, therefore, is just and necessary (τοῦς ἀδίκους τιμωρήσασθαι . . . τοῦ θεοῦ

¹⁸ The ἀρξόμενος δ’ at the beginning of A.J. 15.130 (“I will start with . . .”) is conventional, projecting the beginning to the future and enhancing the audience’s eager expectation in this way, I. Pfeijffer, First Person Futures in Pindar (Hermes Einzelschriften 81; Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1999), 33, referring to a contemporary analogy in a song of The Beatles: “lend me your ears and I’ll sing you a song and I’ll try not to sing out of key.”

¹⁹ Cf. Aristotle, Rhet. 3.16.11 1417b about narratio in deliberative speech.

²⁰ Exactly the same phrase is found in Demosthenes, Pant. 12, in a narratio. Phrases like τί δει λέγειν can indicate a transition, see, e.g. Thucydides 1.73.2 and Dionysius, Ant. Rom. 10.6.
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βουλομένου μισεῖν τὴν ὑβριν καὶ τὴν ἁδικίαν ... οὗ μόνον δίκαιον ἄλλα καὶ ἀναγκαῖον πόλεμον, 134–135), repeating the statement in A.J. 15.129. The slaughtering of the Jewish envoys, a major accusation in Herod’s speech, reported in the second narratio (136), is highlighted as the greatest sacrilege among Greeks and non-Greeks, screaming for revenge. It leads up to an extra argument for a victorious outcome, God’s support.

It is not immediately clear where the section about Herod’s second major topic starts, because there are two rhetorical formulae that can be interpreted as the transition to the second issue, the soldiers’ own situation. This section either starts at A.J. 15.139 with the phrase: “Let us also look at our own situation.” (ίνα δὲ καὶ τὰ καθ’ ἑσυχοῦς ἔξετάσωμεν), or at 138 with “At this point, someone will perhaps say...” (ἔσως τοῖνυ ἔρει τις...).22 Herod switches, in fact, already in A.J. 15.138 to his second point by starting his comparison between his own soldiers and the enemy there. Divine support and justice on the Jews’ side are contrasted with the Arabs’ courage and multitude. Herod’s arguments are basically:

1) He and his soldiers were victorious in the earlier battles (A.J. 15.139–140) up to the moment Athenion entered the battlefield in a treacherous way, like the Arabs before (παρανομία καὶ ἐνέδρα, 140).

2) Even if the enemies are courageous, which they are not, this should be an extra motivation to beat them (141).

3) The earthquake caused less damage than the Arabs think, which should be taken as an advantage (142–143).

4) God will be on their side (144–145).

The conclusion of Herod’s speech is extremely brief and offers hardly more than a staccato summary of the major points, starting with the last point of the second statement in a chiastic arrangement, God’s help, emphasizing again the enemy’s treachery, and noting in the end that earlier the Arabs always had been inferior to Herod’s soldiers’ excellence.23

---

21 Cf. ἀδίκος (A.J. 15.134, 146), ἀδικέω (134, 144), ἁδικία (135, 140), δίκαιος (135, 137, 138 twice, 145, 146), δικαίος (129).

22 The introduction of an anonymous and hypothetical other speaker, a case of sermoinatio, Lausberg, Handbook of Literary Rhetoric, 366–69, only supports Herod’s own argument.

23 According to Aristotle, Rhet. 3.19.1 1419b, a conclusion of a deliberative speech
3. CONVENTIONAL ELEMENTS

In this section I intend to compare Herod's commander speech in A.J. 15 with similar speeches in Herodotus, Thucydides, Polybius, and Dionysius of Halicarnassus, searching for conventional motifs in Herod's speech. Before engaging in this search a few introductory remarks about the four Greek authors and their commander speeches seem helpful.

3.1. Four Possible Models

Herodotus, the father of Greek historiography, was fond of using speeches to mediate various views of the events reported. Unfortunately, Herodotus did not include many commander speeches in his histories. Most of his speeches that concern war deal with consultations or councils of rulers and commanders as they deliberated whether marching to war was appropriate or advantageous. There is one passage, however, in which Herodotus summarizes a speech of exhortation by Themistocles. This passage shows that a commander speech was a convention already in Herodotus' time, which is confirmed by the rather stereotypical vocabulary of the speech's summary: “At dawn the fighting men were assembled and Themistocles was chosen to address them. The whole burden of what he said was a comparison of all that was best and worst in life and fortunes, and an exhortation (παρανέσετες) to the men to choose the better.” (8.83, trans. De Selincourt). Yet, many of the arguments that return time and again in Thucydides' commander speeches can be found already in Herodotus' consultations and councils. Relevant passages in Herodotus' speeches and battle reports will, therefore, be included in my survey of topoi in Herod's speech.

Thucydides includes twelve or thirteen commander speeches in his history of the war between Athens and Sparta. Several arguments can have four functions: 1) disposing the hearer favorably toward the speaker and unfavorably toward the opponent, 2) amplifying and depreciating, 3) exciting the hearer's emotions, and 4) recapitulation. Runnals, "The Rhetoric of Josephus," 748-49. Apart from the amplification Aristotle's four functions are covered by the conclusion.

24 E.g. Herodotus 1.206-207; 6.9-12; 6.109; 7.8-11; 8.57-60; 8.68.
25 O. Luschnat, Die Feldherrnreden im Geschichtswerk des Thukydides (Philologus Supplementband 34.2; Leipzig: Dieterich, 1942); Leimbach, Militärische Musterrhetorik.
in these speeches return again and again, no matter whether they are brought forward by Athenian, Spartan or other commanders. It is obvious from Thucydides’ speeches that commanders analyzed the battle’s circumstances, the specifics of its location, the enemy’s capabilities and numbers (e.g. 2.11.1–4), and also discussed the strategy that resulted from these analyses. Past performance by one’s own army as well as by the enemy’s soldiers is also a major reason for encouragement in these speeches (e.g. 2.89.2, 5, 9; 4.95.3). It is obvious that one has to defend oneself against an attack by the enemy, especially if the enemy’s behavior is outrageous. Such accusation is launched several times at the Athenians (e.g. 2.11.7–9; 4.92.1–2, 7), who threaten the liberty of the other Greek states, in short the freedom of all Hellas, in their striving for supremacy in the Greek world (e.g. 4.92.7; 5.9.1, 9). Yet, also more elusive and rhetorical arguments are found in these speeches, for example, a great number of enemy soldiers does not necessarily imply that they will win, because courage and/or experience can compensate for quantity (below). Important echoes of such Thucydidean arguments seem to be present in Herod’s speech.

Polybius’ approach to speeches is rather different from Herodotus’ and Thucydides’ use of them. Polybius (200–118 B.C.E.) points out that he attempted to find out what was actually said and report that in a trustworthy way (Polybius 36.1.1–7). His speeches are selective and focus on facts, besides indicating the antecedents and causes underlying the events. Polybius knew very well that a commander speech was most appropriate before a battle, because he refers to such speeches many times. But he mostly summarizes them briefly, often in fixed and stereotypical ways. One formula especially, with slight variations, indicates briefly the content of many commander speeches, adhering to the principle that underlies Thucydides’ commander speeches, namely that they should address the circumstances: “... encouraging them with the appropriate words according to the circumstances” (παρακαλέσαντες αὐτούς τὰ πρέποντα τῷ καιρῷ). Polybius,

---

26 Further references: Leimbach, Militärische Musterrhetorik, 90.
28 Polybius 1.32.8; 1.45.3; 1.60.5; 2.64.1; 3.71.8; 4.80.15; 5.53.6; 11.11.2. Other formulae also contain the verb παρακαλεῖν to indicate the commander’s purpose, e.g. 16.5.9: καὶ παρακαλών τοὺς ἀνδρὰς εὐθαρσεῖς εἶναι, διότι νικώσι τῇ ναυμαχίᾳ.
therefore, hardly offers a full report of commander speeches, but his histories do include larger sections of such speeches. Contrary to his own principles at least one of these speeches was probably invented by Polybius, and the speeches by Publius Scipio, which parallel those of his adversary Hannibal, were most probably not created by Scipio himself. Polybius presents Scipio and Hannibal both as masterful orators. One of Hannibal’s speeches, given before the battle at the Ticinus (218 B.C.E.), gets a personal touch with the help of miserable prisoners brought in front of Hannibal’s soldiers to exemplify what would happen if the noble death adage “triumph or die!” was not met by his soldiers.

Dionysius of Halicarnassus is another author whose rhetorical conventions Josephus may have been familiar with, or who may have influenced him at least indirectly. Dionysius wrote the Antiquitates Romanae, a history of Rome from the very beginning up to the point where Polybius started his work. He is an interesting match for Josephus. Although being a Greek he justified the Roman imperium, but sugared the pill for his Greek readers by pointing out that Rome’s first leaders were Greeks. Dionysius was first and foremost an orator, who wrote many rhetorical works, including one about Thucydides in which he criticized the great historian. Nevertheless, he found much to admire in Thucydides’ speeches and molded the many speeches in his history of Rome by drawing on Thucydides. Many of Dionysius’ speeches are rhetorical compositions that may well have been published separately, like Livy’s speeches. Dionysius’ attitude towards the composition of speeches is rather similar to Thucydides, and his other main model seems to have been Demosthenes. Elaborate examples of Dionysius’ commander speeches are: 3.23.6–21 (Fufetius to the Albans), 6.6–9 (Publius Postumius to Roman troops), and 9.9 (Fabius to the Romans).

(Also 1.44.1; 2.67.1; 3.19.4; 3.43.11; 3.116.3; 5.4.6; 5.48.16; 5.62.1; 10.14.3; 10.49.7; 11.15.4).

29 Aemilius Paullus’ speech before the battle at Cannae (3.108.3–109.12), Pédech, La méthode historique de Polybe, 274.
30 Pédech, La méthode historique de Polybe, 274–75.
31 Another argument for displaying great courage in this speech is Rome’s wealth as the huge reward (Polybius 3.63.1–14).
34 Usher, “Style of Dionysius of Halicarnassus,” 832–33; cf. Dionysius, Ant. Rom., 1.6.5; 7.66.3; 11.1.3.
3.2. Analysis of the Situation

In the body of Herod's speech Josephus seems to follow the important convention, already touched upon above in connection with Thucydides, that speeches of encouragement before a battle derive most of the soldiers' motivation from a discussion of their situation and the opportunities coming with it. This requires an analysis of the battle's location, the specifics and capabilities of both armies (number, experience, courage and discipline), with their advantages and disadvantages, as well as a discussion of past performances. 35 Many Thucydidean commander speeches show this convention in detail and include an analysis of the circumstances as well as the battle's location and the opportunities it provided. Commanders in Thucydides also discuss the qualities of both armies, their experience and former success, and the particularities of the enemy's condition. The speeches sometimes reveal the strategy that obviously resulted from the analysis as well, which also helped to encourage the soldiers. 36 The Spartan commander Brasidas observed, before his battle against the Athenian commander Cleon at Amphipolis (422 B.C.E.), that the enemy was treating its opponent with contempt, while actually not being properly organized (ἀντύκτως) itself, so that its confidence was not justified. His analysis leads to the conclusion that an immediate attack by an elite group was called for before the enemy could line up. This would frighten the enemy and enhance its disorder (5.9.3–6). 37 The location and particularities of the armies also play a prominent role in some of Thucydides' commander speeches. The Peloponnesian commanders encourage their soldiers in 2.87 before a naval battle, after Athens' earlier triumph over them in the summer of 429 B.C.E. on the high sea, by listing the advantages of these factors: "There are solid advantages on your side—you have the bigger fleet: you are fighting off your native shores with hoplites ready to support you. And as a rule the side that wins is the side with the numbers and the equipment. There is no single reason, therefore, why we should lose." (2.87.6–7) 38

---

35 Cf. Aristotle, Rhet. 1.4.9. Deliberative speeches concern action in the future, but this requires relevant knowledge about matters from past and present, Lausberg, Handbook of Literary Rhetoric, 98.
36 Luschnat, Die Feldherrnreden, 113; 117.
37 Leimbach, Militärische Musterrhetorik, 87–89. Cf. Thucydides 4.10.
38 Cf. Thucydides 4.10.3–5; 6.68.3.
Polybius’ commander speeches also address the specific circumstances. He notes that most of what Publius Scipio had said to encourage his soldiers before the battle at the Ticinus against Hannibal concerned the glorious reputation of the Roman fatherland and the deeds of their ancestors, as well as their current situation (τὰ δὲ τοῦ παρεστῶτος καυροῦ, 3.64.2). Book 15 of Polybius offers a pair of speeches by Hannibal and Publius Cornelius Scipio Africanus, preceding the battle at Zama in 202 B.C.E. (15.10.1–7; 15.11.6–13). The introduction of Scipio’s exhortation (παρακαλῶν) indicates that it addressed the circumstances (οἰκεῖως δὲ τῆς ὑποκειμένης περιστάσεως, 15.10.1), but the speech offers, in fact, hardly more than a cluster of commonplaces. Scipio reminds his soldiers of earlier victories, encourages them to fight in a manner worthy of the glorious tradition of their country, and points to their supremacy over the rest of the world if they would be victorious. But he also warns them against the disgrace of flight or of falling into the hands of the enemy (15.10.1–4). He too uses hackneyed rhetoric of the noble death, saying, that the soldiers’ choice was dead simple, “triumph or die” (νικῶν ἢ θνῆσκεν, 15.10.5), just as Hannibal had urged before (3.63.4).

Thus, Graeco-Roman literature shows that there was an arsenal of arguments linked to the particular military situation that a commander could use in his speech of encouragement before a battle. How does Herod’s speech deal with the circumstances of the future battle against the Arabs? Herod does not spend a word on the battle’s location, which is unclear anyway in the Antiquitates, perhaps another indication of Josephus’ invention of the speech. But in line with the convention in Greek commander speeches Herod does offer a brief comparison of both armies after discussing the Arabs’ outrageous acts against the Jews. A. J. 15.138 starts this comparison in elusive and rather rhetorical phrases, which also introduce issues discussed later on in the speech: “At this point, someone will perhaps say: ‘while holiness and justice are with us, they [our enemies], however, happen to be more courageous or more numerous.’ But, first of all, you ought not to say this. For, those who have justice with them (also) have God with them, and wherever God is present, there

39 Cf. 3.54.2–4; 3.111.1–11.
40 Walbank, Commentary, 2.456.
41 B. J. 1.380 refers to Philadelphia (above).
42 This argument shimmers through in the Bellum version of the speech.
are also numbers and courage." From A.J. 15.139 onwards the focus is upon earlier encounters with the enemy, during which the Jews were victorious. Herod relativizes the recent defeat in this way and disqualifies the enemy further by his arguments that its victories were based on unjust acts and taking advantage of their opponents' misfortunes (A.J. 15.140–144, below).

3.3. Encouragement and Instruction

Josephus indicates that Herod had a double intention with his speech: "I have deliberately chosen to encourage you and instruct you (παρακαλέσαι... καὶ διδάξαι) at the same time how you might be true to your proud designs." (128). The instruction mentioned is not a hollow phrase, because Herod does instruct his soldiers about the enemy and their own situation (130–145), which supports his exhortation. Other commander speeches show that such a twofold purpose of a commander speech is conventional.

The Spartan commander and politician Brasidas starts his speech in Thucydides 4.126 with a phrase that indicates his intention to encourage and instruct: "Peloponnesians, I should not be giving you advice as I do now, but only saying a few words of encouragement, if it were not for the fact that I imagine that you are down-hearted because of your isolated position in face of an attack by a barbarian army which is in great force. As it is, what with the desertion of our friends and the number of our enemies, there are a few things of which I want to remind you and there is some advice I want to offer (... οὐκ ἂν ὁμοίως διδαχὴν ὁμα τῇ παρακελεύσει ἐποιούμην) in an attempt to satisfy you on the most important points." The instruction in commander speeches concerns that part of the speech that analyzes the situation, the location of the battle, the enemy's army etc. (see 3.2). This analysis allowed for the choice of the best strategy in the given circumstances. The commander's clarification of situation and strategy shows his intentions (cf. Thucydides 5.8.5). It is obvious that all this information, if presented persuasively, could be a major ground for the soldiers' encouragement.45

---

45 Cf. Thucydides 2.87.7.
3.4. **Turning the Soldiers’ Adversities into an Advantage (A.J. 15.142)**

In his introductory phrase Herod acknowledges already his soldiers’ mishaps as a way to sympathize with them. He returns to their adversities in his discussion of his second point, using the misfortunes as a springboard for his argument that the prospects in the upcoming battle were great.\(^{46}\)

In Thucydides some of the commander speeches are also situated after a defeat. The Peloponnesian commanders refer in their speech in 2.87 to the insufficient preparations, inexperience and misadventure (\(\tau\alpha\ \acute{\alpha} \pi\acute{\alpha} \tau\acute{\iota} \chi\epsilon\varsigma\ \omicron\upsilon\kappa\ \omicron\lambda\iota\gamma\varsigma\ \acute{\epsilon} \nu\acute{\alpha} \nu\acute{\alpha} \omega \theta\eta\eta\eta\eta\omicron\alpha\), 2.87.1–2) that led to defeat, but build on these by stating that inexperience is never an excuse when the soldiers have proper courage (\(\acute{\alpha} \delta\rho\epsilon\omicron\alpha\)) (2.87.3–5). One should learn from the mistakes in the past (\(\nu\acute{\omicron} \alpha\upsilon\omicron\tau\alpha\ \tau\acute{\omicron} \tau\omicron\alpha\ \pi\omicron\omicron\sigma\gamma\epsilon\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\nu\epsilon\omicron\alpha\nu\omicron\alpha\omicron\nu\omicron\omicron\nu\epsilon\omicron\omicron\epsilon\omicron\), 2.87.7), which, of course, by way of encouragement, implies that future battles will turn out well. Aemilius Paullus addresses the soldiers’ recent mishaps (\(\tau\omicron\nu\nu\omicron\omicron\nu\omicron\omicron\omicron\nu\omicron\upsilon\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\upsilon\omicrontextde
mies], however, happen to be more courageous or more numerous. But, first of all, you ought not to say this. For, those who have justice with them (also) have God with them, and wherever God is present, there are also numbers and courage.” Associating great numbers with courage, which is repeated in this passage in chiastic order, builds on a commonplace in Greek commander speeches.

Herodutus already contrasts multitude and courage with experience time and again in his report of the events connected with the battle of Thermopylae. In the Persian council Mardonius first convinces Xerxes that there is no risk in attacking Greece because of the multitude of the army (7.9). Next Herodotus offers a marvelous speech by Artabanus, who strongly advises Xerxes not to attack the Greeks. Artabanus combines the importance of divine support with the observation that the bigger army does not necessarily win: “You know, my lord, that amongst the living creatures it is the great ones that god (ό̇θεός) smites with his thunder, out of envy of their pride... Often a great army is destroyed by a little one (Οὕτω δὲ καὶ στρατὸς πολλὸς ὑπὸ ὀλίγου διαφθείρεται κατὰ τοιόνωνδε), when god in his envy puts fear into the men’s hearts, or sends a thunderstorm, and they are cut to pieces in a way they do not deserve. Because god tolerates pride in none but himself. Haste is the mother of failure...” (Herodotus 7.10; trans. De Sélincourt). In his discussion with Demaratus, however, Xerxes keeps putting his trust in his army’s multitude, whereas Demaratus stresses the Spartans’ excellence in battle (Herodotus 7.101–105).

Thucydides’ speeches also raise the matter of the number of enemy soldiers. Before the naval battle near Naupactus with the Spartans, the Athenian commander Phormio discusses the multitude of the Peloponnesian forces (2.89; cf. 4.12), but he does not consider it a reason to be frightened. Referring to the enemy’s earlier defeats and triumphs for Athens he points out that the greater army nevertheless lost before because of lack of experience (ἀτειρία) and courage (ἀτολμία, 2.89.7). Brasidas deals with this motif in a way characteristic for ancient Spartans. He constructs an analogy between the situation of the battle at hand and Spartan oligarchic rule. The great number of enemy soldiers should not be frightening, because the Spartans know out of their own experience that it is not the multitude that

---

48 Leimbach, Militärische Musterrhetorik, 52.
is ruling over the few, but the minority over the majority; and the minority’s power is based on nothing else than military success (4.126.2). Brasidas, therefore, applies the rhetorical strategy of turning real advantages of the enemy into seeming advantages.\(^{49}\) The Athenian commander Nicias counters the great number of enemy soldiers and their expectation to triumph with the quality and experience of Athens’ fighters (6.68).\(^{50}\) Dionysius of Halicarnassus too contrasts multitude and valor in one of his elaborate commander speeches: “all wars are won not by the forces which are larger in numbers (οἱ πλείονος τοῖς ἀριθμοῖς), but by those who are superior in valor (οἱ κρείττους ἅρετή)” (6.8.1).

Herod’s speech departs from the way in which number and courage are usually contrasted in commander speeches.\(^{51}\) Herod combines the two, arguing that God’s support, which could be expected in the case of a just war (below), implies sufficient numbers and courage. In this case, Herod’s argument links up with the reasoning in Jewish passages from the Second Temple period that God’s help and not the number of soldiers or their power determines the victory.\(^{52}\)

### 3.6. The Battle is Just and Necessary

Herod’s speech is the prime text for the notion of just war in Josephus.\(^{53}\) Herod emphasizes time and again that the continuation of the war against “the Arabs” was called for, because it was a justified war. A coherent semantic field of just war phrases indicates this:

- οὐ μόνον δίκαιον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀναγκαῖον πόλεμον ἐπεξιόντων (135)
- πολεμεῖν ... δικαιώς (129)
- τὸ μὲν ὀσιὸν καὶ δίκαιον ἔστι μεθ’ ἡμῶν (138)
- μεθ’ ὄν τὸ δίκαιον ἔστι μετ’ ἐκείνων ὁ θεός (138)
- τὸν δὲ πόλεμον ... δίκαιον οἴδεν (145)


\(^{50}\) Cf. Thucydides 2.87.6; 7.61.3. Luschnat, *Die Feldherrnreden*, 60–61; 133 (references).

\(^{51}\) I thank Jonathan Kirkpatrick (Oxford) for pointing this out to me.


\(^{53}\) Mantovani, *Bellum iustum*, 86, argues that Josephus combined the biblical notion of holy war commanded by God with non-Jewish conceptions of just war.
Commonplaces in Herod’s Commander Speech in A.J.

Ancient historians time and again report about just and unjust causes for the many wars fought in antiquity, whether in their attempt to reconstruct the events as precisely as possible or to legitimize wars afterwards. In the case of the Romans, the theory of the “just war” is even used in advance as a pretext to start a war (cf. the examples from Dionysius of Halicarnassus below). From Thucydides onwards the theme of just war appears in commander speeches and other passages with a rather fixed vocabulary (key words: πόλεμος and δίκαιος, ὀσίος or ἱερός; with the Latin equivalents bellum iustum and/or pium). At the outbreak of the war between the Athenians and Spartans (431 B.C.E.), the Spartan king Archidamus pointed out to his soldiers that the battle against Athens was “right” (δίκαιος) for two reasons: 1) faithfulness to the reputation of the Peloponnesians and their allies’ ancestors; 2) Athens’ unusual (ἀθήνης) acts against other Greeks by attacking their land and destroying it (Thucydides 2.11.2, 7–9). Some fifty years before, Mardonius urged the Persian king Xerxes to continue his war against Greece by indicating the outrageous acts committed against the Persians by the Athenians, which called for revenge (Herodotus 7.5, 9). Dionysius of Halicarnassus uses bellum iustum vocabulary time and again in his description of Rome’s early history. A striking example is Tullus’ declaration of war on the Albans because of breaking a treaty: “I declare against the Albans a war which is necessary and just (τὸν ἀναγκαῖον τε καὶ δίκαιον πόλεμον, 3.3.6).” In 8.2–5 Marcius warns Tullus not to attack
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54 Other passages in Josephus also touch upon justified war, but Herod’s speech is the most elaborate passage about this theme. In A.J. 8.295 the Israelites’ victory against the Ethiopians is attributed to their being just and holy (δίκαιοι καὶ ὀσίοις). A.J. 8.223 notes that God prevented the battle between Solomon’s son Rehoboam and Jeroboam on the ground that it is not just to fight somebody of the same kin (οὐ γὰρ εἶναι δίκαιον τοὺς ὁμοφύλους πόλεμεῖν). See also A.J. 14.63; Vita 22; B.J. 2.399; 2.582; ἀγὼν δίκαιος in Eleazar’s speech at Masada (B.J. 7.355). Sementchenko, “Two Conceptions of Just War.”

55 S. Albert, Bellum iustum: die Theorie des “gerechten Krieges” und ihre praktische Bedeutung für die auswärtigen Auseinandersetzungen Roms in republikanischer Zeit (Frankfurter Althistorische Studies 10; Kallmünz: Michel Lassleben, 1980); S. Clavadetscher-Thürleman, polemos dikaios und bellum iustum: Versuch einer Ideengeschichte (Zürich: Juris, 1985); Mantovani, Bellum iustum.

56 Leimbach, Militärische Musterrhetorik, 19–20; 33.
Rome immediately, but to establish deliberately a righteous and just
ground for war (αἰτίαν...δεῖν ἐυσεβῇ καὶ δικαιῶν ἐνστήσασθαι τοῦ
πολέμου, 8.2), because of the gods; his advice is to let the Romans
break the treaty first. In 5.5.4 Collatinus advises the consuls not to
keep the possessions of the expelled tyrants, because that could give
them a just reason to begin a war (πρόφασιν πολέμου δικαίων).

Coherent theoretical reflections about just war started only with
Cicero, but he builds on arguments brought forward already in
earlier sources that discuss whether a war was just or not. A justified
cause for a war could be based on religious, philosophical or juridical
reasons. Religious grounds for launching a just war could consist of
insolent deeds (ὀβρίς) against deities, like the desecration of their
temples, unjust and godless acts against relatives, because they violated
blood ties, and internal war, violating kinship relations, alliances or
the political body of the state. A philosophical reason could be that
the strong have a right to fight inferiors like animals or barbarians
(see below). Juridical grounds were most important and include the
right to defend oneself against an enemy attack, or to help an ally
being attacked, the right to take revenge on the enemy for its outrageous deeds, as well as the right to free oneself from tyranny or foreign oppressors.

Just war also required that a proper procedure was met before
the war was declared. According to Greek traditions, the procedure
included in any case a formal declaration of war, presented by envoys. Roman sacral law (ius fētiale) prescribed several steps for the procedure for Romans: a consultation of the senate, a decision by the people and the transference of the decision by priestly envoys. In
the republican period the priestly role of the fētiales declined already
and was taken over by envoys from the senate. And finally, a
justified war had to be fought in a just manner. Both sides had to
fight the war with fairness, nobleness, avoidance of cunning and
guile, putting into action, for example, only trained soldiers.

57 Cicero, De re publ. 2.17.31; 3.23.35; De off. 1.7.20–23; 1.11.34–36; 1.23.80–81;
2.8.26–27. Albert, Bellum iustum, 20–25; E. S. Ramage, “The Bellum Iustum in
58 Albert, Bellum iustum, 17–18; Mantovani, Bellum iustum, 1–84.
60 Albert, Bellum iustum, 12–16.
61 Albert, Bellum iustum, 15; Mantovani, Bellum iustum, 60–61.
62 Clavadetscher-Thürleman, POLEMOS DIKAIOS, 104–26; 140–52; Mantovani, Bellum
iustum, 70–79.
Herod also indicates that the battle against the Arabs was necessary (135), which seems to be closely related to his just war argument; the Arabs had to be punished.⁶³ Thucydides’ commander speeches also refer a few times to necessity (ἀνάγκη), indicating that the battle could not be avoided in the circumstances at hand, or that a specific strategy is forced upon the army because of the circumstances (4.10.1; 6.68.4; 7.62.4; 7.77.5).⁶⁴

3.6.1. Injustice done by the enemy (A.J. 15.131–134, 136–138)
Injustice done by the enemy is an important cause for a justified war. Herod got small thanks for his pains when he helped the Arabs against Cleopatra, for they deceived him in return (131–134). To cap it all they even killed the Jewish envoys (136–138; cf. B.J. 1.378). It is striking, that when the Arabs had sent envoys after their defeat, Herod did not repeat their unjust act, although he was eager to take vengeance. Thus, the detail of the Arabs murdering the Jewish envoys gains significance after the speech, making Herod appear even more favorably (A.J. 15.155).⁶⁵ Herodotus already indicates that maltreatment of envoys is a clear case of a just cause for war, because envoys were protected by law and had immunity.⁶⁶

Greek commander speeches justify war by recalling the enemy’s unjust acts. In Thucydides, the Syracusan commander Gylippus justifies the war against the Athenians before a naval battle (413 B.C.E.). Revenge was called for because Athens attempted to enslave all Sicily, and would, if successful, commit all kinds of outrages against the Sicilians, including wives and children (7.68.1–3).⁶⁷ The Spartan king Archidamus’ speech also refers to the improper behavior of the Athenians (Thucydides 2.11.7–9, above). In Polybius, Aemilius Paullus seems to hint at just war motifs in his speech before the battle at Cannae against Hannibal (3.108.3–109.13), by imagining what terrible

⁶⁴ Luschnat, Die Feldhermreden, 35–36; 76–77; 133; Leimbach, Militärische Musterrhetorik, 97.
⁶⁵ Another case of just war because of the maltreatment of envoys in A.J. 7.119–120, where David takes revenge upon the Ammonites because their king shaved off half of his envoys’ beards and cut off half of their garments.
⁶⁶ Herodotus 7.136.2. Also 5.18–21; Thucydides 4.98.7; Plato, Leg. 941a; Livy 4.58.6; 8.6.7; 10.12.2–3; Albert, Bellum iustum, 18; Mantovani, Bellum iustum, 44.
⁶⁷ Cf. Thucydides 1.86.2–3.
things would happen if Hannibal were to defeat the Romans. He first encourages the soldiers to fight for themselves, their country, and their wives and children, and next hints at the outrage and destruction by the enemy of all things mentioned in case of a defeat (Polybius 3.109.7–8). The fatherland’s entire existence was at stake (3.109.9), which qualified the war against Hannibal as a justified war of defense. Dionysius points at outrageous acts by the enemy before the war with the stock phrase ἡ ὀβρίς τῶν πολεμίων (“the enemy’s outrageous act”) in connection with the announcement of war and embassies. In 5.44.2, for example, following the Sabines’ unannounced incursion into Roman territory, Publius Postumius considers the enemy’s outrageous behavior to be intolerable.

3.6.2. Improper enemy practices in connection to warfare customs (A.J. 15.130, 139–140)

Herod first reminds his soldiers that the Arabs were cowards, waiting for the best opportunity and taking advantage of the Jews’ mishaps: “. . . they were waiting to make a sudden attack in our confused state.” (130). Further on, he seems to blame the Arabs for starting a war unannounced, shifting quickly from Cleopatra’s general Athenion, who took the initiative for re-opening the battle, to the Arabs and blaming them instead of Athenion (cf. B.J. 1.375): “But even though we were victorious, Athenion attacked us and started a war without declaring it. Was this (a proof of) their bravery or a second (example) of (their) lawlessness and treachery?” (A.J. 15.139–140). There is even a third passage in Herod’s speech that suggests that the Arabs were violating the laws of war: “And how is it that we are terrified by such (men), who, whenever they fight honestly, have always been defeated, and, whenever they are believed to win, succeed by means of depravity?” (140).

Starting a war unannounced was a clear violation of the obligation to fight a war in a fair way according to Graeco-Roman passages

---

69 Cf. Polybius 5.104.1–5; Herodotus 7.5, 9.
70 Cf. Dionysius 5.45.1 about a very insolent embassy, which the Romans receive from the enemy (παρὰ τῶν πολεμίων πρεσβεία πολλὴν ὑβριν ἔχοντι) and Fabius’ opening words in his speech in 9.9.
71 Cf. B.J. 1.375.
72 Josephus refers to other unannounced wars in B.J. 1.269; 2.30; C. Ap. 1.318. Mantovani, Bellum iustum, 94.
COMMONPLACES IN HEROD'S COMMANDER SPEECH IN AJ.  

(above). In Herodotus 5.81.2 such a war (ἀκήρυκτος πόλεμος) is seen as a crime. 

3.6.3. It is natural to fight against barbarians (AJ. 15.130, 136) 
Herod emphasizes the treacherous acts of the Arabs, as we have seen. He seems to suggest that these acts are no surprise, because they were committed by barbarians. In AJ. 15.130 he calls the Arabs a barbarian people without notion of God. The meaning of βάρβαρος developed from “not speaking Greek” into “non-Greek,” frequently with a pejorative connotation. 
But Herod was a non-Greek too. The additional reference to the God of the Jews in AJ. 15.130, 136 seems to indicate a principal difference between the Jews and the Arabs (cf. 136), implying that only barbarians without knowledge of God cannot be trusted (ὡς εἰκὸς ἐξεν τὸ βάρβαρον καὶ ἀνεννόητον θεοῦ, 130). The statement seems to build on a distinction between Jewish and non-Jewish barbarians. In this way, Herod could use the negative connotations of the phrase “barbarian” (non-Greek = uncivilized), while keeping out of range himself. Implicitly Herod seems to connect Greeks and Jews in AJ. 15.136 as the two groups who consider envoys sacred, either out of declaration or because God’s laws were transmitted to the Jews by God’s messengers. If this reading is justified, only the Arabs are really barbarians in Herod’s statement, at least in Josephus’ rendering. The passage may hint, in line with this interpretation, at yet another reason for starting a just war, the philosophical argument that there is a self-evident enmity between opponents by nature, e.g. humans versus animals, or Greeks versus barbarians. Heraclitus developed this line of thinking and Plato and Aristotle applied it to the antagonism between Hellenes and barbarians. The argument occurs time and again in reports about the wars of the Greeks against the Persians in the fifth century B.C.E. 
Brasidas hints at it in the beginning of his speech of encouragement in Thucydides 4.126 by calling the Macedonian enemy barbarians, arguing that there is no reason to fear them because they are barbarians (4.126.1). 

---

73 Mantovani, Bellum iustum, 60-70. 
75 Such an argument is absent from Herod’s speech in the Bellum. 
77 The locus classicus is Herodotus 8.142.5. Mantovani, Bellum iustum, 21-23. 
78 Leimbach, Militärische Musterrhetorik, 80.
3.7. The Divine Factor

The Hebrew Bible, as well as the Septuagint additions, frequently presents wars as authorized by God. Deuteronomy 20, of course, offers God’s laws concerning warfare. Josephus builds on the biblical notion of holy war in the section of the Antiquitates that parallels the Bible, but he incorporates the just war vocabulary in several passages where it is absent in the Hebrew Bible and the Septuagint.

In Herod’s speech too, God’s help is closely related to the just war theme (4.7. 15.144–146). Josephus’ argument in this section can be summarized in three points:

1) If the mishaps for the Jews had happened in accordance with God’s will, God’s attitude to them had changed in the meantime, because they were punished enough (144).

2) God would support the Jews this time, because God knew it concerned a just war (145; cf. 146).

3) A clear sign of God’s changed attitude was the fact that all soldiers were spared during the earthquake (145).

This argument too builds on Greek commander speeches, which clearly indicate that divine support was guaranteed if the war was just. Thucydides’ report of a speech by the Boeotian commander Pagondas points out this central notion of just war (4.92). Pagondas elaborates the outrageous acts of their neighbors, the Athenians, who were destroying their country and occupying their sanctuary (Thucydides 4.92.1–2, 7). Therefore, the deity of the occupied sanctuary’s support was certain in the Boeotian war of defense against the Athenians: “We can be confident that we shall have on our side the god (πίστευόμαστας δὲ τῷ θεῷ πρὸς ἡμῶν ἔσεσθαι) whose temple they have unlawfully fortified and now hold, confident too in the favorable appearance of the victims which we have sacrificed.” (4.92.7).

---

79 Herod’s speech in the Bellum Judaicum does not mention God’s interference.
80 E.g. 1 Sam 17:47; 18:17.
82 Herod goes to the very edge here by hinting at God’s injustice.
83 Only soldiers who were fighting for a just case were entitled to get divine support (Livy 21.10.9). Mantovani, Bellum iustum, ix; 4–6.
Thucydides’ commander speeches refer to fortune (τύχη) several times, but in a rather loose way, meaning hardly more than good luck. The Syracusan commander Gylippus sneers at the Athenians, who trust more in the help of fortune than in the preparation of their armament (7.67.4). Thucydides’ speeches seem to distinguish τύχη, however, from the intervention of the gods (Thucydides 7.61–64). Nicias’ final speech of encouragement attributes the Syracusan victory to their being lucky, apparently with the consent of the gods. Yet, the situation will turn for the better for the Athenians, because they were punished enough by the gods: “Our enemies had good fortune enough, and, if any of the gods was angry with us for our setting out, by this time we have been sufficiently punished (καὶ εἰ τῷ θεῶν ἐπίφθονοι ἑστρατεύσαμεν, ἀποχρώντος ἢδη τετιμωρήμεθα)” (7.77.3). Polybius’ report of Hannibal’s speech before the decisive battle at Cannae (3.111.1–10) starts in plain language with a double thanksgiving, one to the gods who granted the earlier victories over the Romans, and one to himself because he compelled the Romans to fight at Cannae. The past performance rhetoric is combined with the prospect of the unheard victory, mastering Italy, but the triumph over the Romans is ultimately dependent on the will of the gods, as the last words of the speech indicate: “Therefore no more words are wanted but deeds; for if it be the will of the gods (θεῶν βουλομένων) I am confident that I [Hannibal] shall fulfill my promises forthwith.” (3.111.10, trans. W. R. Paton).

4. Conclusion

My discussion of the type of speech and composition of A.J. 15.127–146 as well as its conventional commander speech motifs shows that Josephus has not only incorporated rhetorical forms and vocabulary, but also many topos that can be found in earlier commander speeches. The pertinent question seems to be: What is not conventional in this speech? The speech is clearly presented as a commander speech according to the best Greek traditions, especially those represented by Thucydides. Its composition follows Aristotle’s description of

84 Thucydides 2.87.2–3; 7.67.4; 7.68.1. τύχη occurs frequently in Polybius (e.g. 3.63.4; 15.10.5), Pédech, La méthode historique de Polybe, 278.
85 Luschnat, Die Feldhermreden, 104.
deliberative speech. Even my limited comparative search into conventional motifs in Greek commander speeches demonstrates that Josephus incorporated many of those and applied them to Herod's speech before his battle with the Nabataeans. His use of bellum iustum arguments strikes the reader of earlier Greek commander speeches. Although the just war motifs themselves do occur individually in those speeches, Herod seems to apply the entire available arsenal to "the Arabs," who violated the rules of warfare on all three accounts: reason, procedure and actual conduct of war. Even in regard to God's support in the war, Herod mostly builds on conventional Greek arguments and not on biblical traditions, although what he says hardly counters Jewish religious views. Herod probably spends so many words in Josephus' presentation on legitimating the battle as a just and necessary war because it was grist to the mill of his Roman audience, which was keen on just war and probably also loved commanders who could argue for it in front of their soldiers so eloquently.
PART THREE

JOSEPHUS AND JUDAISM
READING THE BIBLE IN ROME: JOSEPHUS AND THE CONSTRAINTS OF EMPIRE

PAUL SPILSBURY
ALLIANCE UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, CALGARY

1. INTRODUCTION

If Josephus already had an inkling of the invincibility of Roman might at the tender age of twenty-six, as he claims in his *Vita* (17–19), he had incontrovertible proof of it by the time he returned to the city less than a decade later as a newly minted Roman citizen and pensioner of Vespasian (*Vita* 423). While we are often reminded that Josephus arrived in Rome with immeasurably better prospects than many of his contemporaries, we should not forget that Josephus’ life too had been shattered by the events of 66–70 C.E. and that he, no less than any other displaced Judean of his time, would walk the rest of his days under the stars of a hostile sky. For us who read his works—all of them written in Rome, all of them written after 70—the shadow of national and personal tragedy is still to be discerned lying across the pages of what he wrote, even when he is not directly describing the war or aspects of it. Recent readings of Josephus have recognized this, and increasingly scholars pay close attention to the apologetic and polemical nature of all Josephus’ writing and to the rhetorical strategies he employed in the service of his agenda. Scholarship on Josephus thus acknowledges that he wrote to achieve more or less discernible political and social ends relating to the situation in which he found himself at various stages of the Flavian era. But even more than this, recent explorations into Josephus have highlighted the importance of paying special heed to the very significant constraints Josephus laboured under—the constraints of empire. The way forward in this regard has been most helpfully shown by John M. G. Barclay in his essay entitled, “The Empire Writes Back: Josephan Rhetoric in Flavian Rome.”¹ In this study of

Josephus’ rhetorical strategies in *Contra Apionem*, Barclay invokes the insights of post-colonial theory to argue that Josephus is best understood when seen against the backdrop of the unequal power-relations that characterized Josephus’ historical and political context. Post-colonial theory, Barclay suggests, is “particularly well attuned to the phenomenon of power and how subordinate groups can (or cannot) represent themselves.” Rather than castigating those who live under the yoke of empire for their inability to throw off their servitude, post-colonial theorists seek to understand the complex ways in which “superior nations or classes control not only the economic and material lives of their inferiors, but also the terms in which they think and speak, even when they are thinking and speaking about themselves.” Given this control or “hegemony,” there is a real question as to whether members of subordinate groups or classes are able to speak in their own voices at all, or if they are “forever condemned to mimic the authoritative discourses” of the dominant. In the context of such considerations, post-colonial theory looks for “strategies of resistance” (ways in which writers manage to evade, twist or subvert the cultural authority of the dominant group) on the one hand, and instances of “cultural hybridity” (creative re-workings and adaptations of the dominant culture) on the other.

Applying this analysis directly to the writings of Josephus, Barclay argues that we should begin by acknowledging the “considerable constraints” under which Josephus undertook his writing projects. These constraints included not only the raw fact of the recent subjugation of the Judean revolt, but also his desire to communicate effectively with elite Roman society. Under such circumstances it would have been counter-productive, if not entirely impossible, to give voice to overt criticism of either Roman policy toward the Jews or of key Roman figures such as Vespasian and Titus. As Barclay puts it, “Josephus cannot afford to allow his discourse to clash with Roman sensibilities in open or direct statement.” This insight leads to a second, namely that “we should expect Josephus’ most effective advocacy for the Jews to emerge not in confrontation with Roman cultural values,
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2 Barclay, “Empire.”
3 Barclay, “Empire.”
4 Barclay, “Empire.”
5 Barclay, “Empire.”
6 Barclay, “Empire.”
but in the ways he turns and shapes those values to his own interests." In addition to this, Barclay continues, we might also find in Josephus' works "suitably concealed or partial in expression... hints of cultural defiance which refuse to let Judaism merely mirror back to the Romans their own cultural mores." Reading Josephus in this mode, Barclay suggests, will help us to move beyond the narrowly personal-psychological terms in which Josephus' relation to the Romans has usually been viewed, and to see him in a more complex and interesting light as an individual coming to terms with the political and social constraints under which he, and all those like him, worked.

2. Reading the Bible with Josephus

One of Josephus' most sustained activities in Rome was reading the Bible. The better part of eleven books of the Antiquitates Judaicae are given over to a retelling of the narrative of the Hebrew Scriptures, forming the historical foundation of his portrayal of the Jews and Judaism for a Roman public. His reading of the Bible is central to his construction of identity both for himself and for his entire community. While Josephus presents his biblical narrative as a literal translation into Greek of the Hebrew Bible (A.J. 1.5), following the precedent set by the translators of the Septuagint (A.J. 1.10-13), it has long been recognized that Josephus' account is anything but a literal translation. Josephus omits large sections of the original and adds material of his own despite his promise to do neither (A.J. 1.17). Further, even where he follows the biblical story fairly closely he adapts, shapes and colours the material in ways that have long been the subject of extensive and detailed study. Traditional exegesis and Hellenistic sources have been studied with good effect to gain an...
understanding of Josephus’ paraphrasing presentation of the Bible. Where post-colonial theory might take us further, though, is in our understanding both of the social and political forces that influenced Josephus’ retelling of the Bible, and in the possible outcomes that Josephus may have hoped to achieve by presenting the Bible in the way that he did. Perhaps too, it could offer new light on the sense of self- and community-definition that emerges from the existential ambiguities that bedevil the reading of sacred texts in less than ideal circumstances. Here as much as anywhere else in Josephus we might perhaps expect to find evidence of the “considerable constraints” of writing in the shadow of empire that Barclay has alluded to. Equally, it is here that we might expect to find examples, if indeed there are examples to be found anywhere in Josephus, of the appropriation of Roman norms, values and beliefs for Josephus’ own political and social interests. And, as we shall see, we may also be able to discern hints of a cultural defiance that bespeak what Barclay has referred to as “a cross-current to his own public deference towards Rome.”

The Bellum Judaicum

Before looking at a number of key themes in Josephus’ biblical paraphrase, it will be instructive to look initially at the first example we have of a sustained reading of the Bible by Josephus—not in the Antiquitates, but in the Bellum. In a notorious speech before the walls of the besieged Jerusalem Josephus, so he tells us, recounted the lessons of sacred history to an unwilling audience of Jewish rebels and insurrectionists (B.J. 5.375–419). In his opening comments Josephus makes it clear what moral is to be learned from his history lesson: in their rebellion against Rome the insurrectionists are “warring not against the Romans only, but also against God” (μη μόνον Ῥωμαίοις πολεμοῦντες ἀλλὰ καὶ τῷ θεῷ B.J. 5.378 [Thackeray, LCL]). This statement, along with others of a similar nature in the speech, including the infamous revelation of his belief that “the Deity has fled from the holy places and taken His stand on the side of those with whom you are now at war” (B.J. 5.412 [Thackeray, LCL]) are precisely the utterances that have earned for Josephus a host of pejorative epithets such as traitor to the Jewish cause and lackey of the Romans. On the face of it, therefore, it would appear that Josephus has so
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subverted the traditional reading of Scripture as to find there now only a message of surrender to Roman hegemony. However, if we take into account the factors discussed above, we may be able to move beyond such a simplistic reading of the text.

In the first place we would do well to recognize the considerable constraints Josephus was under. Both in the implied situation of the narrative itself and in the circumstances of the writing and publication of the *Bellum* Josephus was in no way at liberty to speak freely or to express views overtly critical of the Romans. Indeed, the review of biblical history in the speech is invoked only because a prior attempt to convince the rebels of Roman leniency had failed (*B.J.* 5.372). Josephus claims that he tried to convince the rebels that the Romans forgive all that was past and that they were by nature gentle or civilized (φύσει τε γὰρ ... ἡμέρους) in victory.¹⁴ Such a description obviously panders to Rome’s own ways of describing itself, and as such is hardly a reflection of the Judean experience of Roman aggression. This immediately alerts us to the *prima facie* tenor of Josephus’ argument. There is no denying Josephus’ collusion with the Flavian propaganda agenda at this point. However, Josephus is not satisfied with mere praise of Roman virtues. Instead, he insists on a profound congruence between what the Romans find agreeable and the values that lie at the very heart of the Hebrew Scriptures. This, as post-colonial theorists have taught us to recognize, is as much a statement of cultural self-assertion on the part of Josephus as it is submission to imperial domination. Josephus finds in his reading of the Bible a call to a peaceable, even pacifist, stance toward foreign powers. This reading, no doubt a surprising and irritating one for many of his contemporaries, Josephus achieved by careful selection of biblical material, and by wholesale reshaping of specific biblical episodes. Thus Abraham becomes a pious pacifist in response to Pharaoh Necho’s abduction of his wife described as a princess and the mother of our people (βασιλίδα, τὴν μητέρα τοῦ γένους ἡμῶν *B.J.* 5.380–382). Despite his command of 318 officers, each with a boundless army under him,¹⁵ Abraham resorted to prayer rather than to military action, thus enlisting the aid of “the invincible Ally” (τὸν

---

¹⁴ Roman *φιλονθρωπία* is a recurring theme of the *Bellum* as well of *Contra Apionem* (e.g. *B.J.* 6.324, 357; *C.Ap.* 2.40, 73 [*magnanimitas*]).

¹⁵ This statement is an embellishment of Gen 14:14 which speaks of 318 trained men born in Abram’s house.
The argument for passivity rather than exemplifying Josephus’ capitulation to the Romans becomes the vehicle for an affirmation of God’s military alliance with the Jews and for their special place in his affections. The episode is also an affirmation of the dignity of the Temple because Abraham’s prayer is described as being “towards this spot which you [i.e. the rebels] have now polluted” (B.J. 5.380–381 [Thackeray, LCL]).

The second episode in Josephus’ biblical-historical review is the Israelites’ sojourn in Egypt (B.J. 5.382–383). Here Josephus speaks of “the migration (μετοικίαν) of our fathers to Egypt” and of their oppression and subjugation to foreign kings (βασιλεύσιν ἀλλοφύλοις) for 400 years. Once again, the protagonists committed themselves to God without resort to arms and violence and consequently found themselves conducted by God out of Egypt, “without bloodshed, without risk” (ἀναιμάκτους ἀκινδύνους [Thackeray, LCL]). Now Josephus refers to them as “the future guardians” of God’s shrine, again making the Temple central to the story. Passing over the stories of the conquest of the land in silence, and thus keeping intact his picture of peaceable Israelites, Josephus next invokes the story of the capture of the ark by the Philistines (Josephus calls them Syrians B.J. 5.384–386), and how “the whole nation of those raiders” (πᾶν τὸ τῶν ἀρπασαμένων έθνος [Thackeray, LCL]) came to rue the deed. God’s leadership won the day without any help from human hand or Israelite weapon, and the sanctity of the shrine was restored. Then again in the time of Sennacherib (B.J. 5.388) the foreign invader was routed by arms raised in prayer rather than by an army, and they fled from the Hebrews “who were neither armed nor pursuing.” Finally, Josephus recalls the submission of the Judean exiles who “never reared their heads for liberty” (B.J. 5.389 [Thackeray, LCL]) until Cyrus, in gratitude to God, sent them home to re-establish the temple-worship of their Ally. “In short [Josephus concludes], there is no instance of our forefathers having triumphed by arms or failed of success without them when they committed their cause to God: if they sat still they conquered, as it please their Judge, if they fought they were invariably defeated” (B.J. 5.390 [Thackeray, LCL]).

While it might be argued that such a reading of the Bible and of the national history is little more than a capitulation to imperial aggression, it should not be missed that this reading retains key elements of cultural pride as well. The very fact that Josephus couches
his argument in terms of a review of his national history reflects his continued attachment to the dignity and venerability of that history. At the beginning of both the *Antiquitates* and *Contra Apionem* Josephus would reaffirm the antiquity of the Jewish people, their history spanning no less than five thousand years (*A.J.* 1.13; *C.Ap.* 1.1). More than this, the records of Israel’s ancient history are preserved in sacred books scrupulously cared for—a point which Josephus draws attention to again in both the *Antiquitates* (1.5–13) and *Contra Apionem* (1.29, 37–38). These are points which Josephus would have expected the Romans themselves to appreciate, given their attachment to ancient traditions and ancestral ways. Josephus uses this confluence of values to communicate more effectively with his Roman audience, while at the same time trying to say something of a political and social nature to his Jewish readers in Rome. For both types of reader Josephus has a message about the essential peaceableness of the Jews, the continuing importance of appropriately expressed piety, and the centrality of the Temple not only in Jewish history but for the rebuilding of Judaism in the future as well. Beyond all this, there are clear hints of a more confident cultural defiance as well. God is the ally of the Hebrews. When they entrust their cause to him they will overcome their enemies. Those who destroy the Temple are nothing more than a “nation of raiders” who will eventually come to rue their hubris. Truly wise foreign rulers recognise the one true God and the Jewish people as the guardians of his sanctuary.

This is by no means to say that Josephus’ narrative is untainted by ambiguity, collusion or conformity to Roman expectations. Nor is it to imply that Josephus himself was always noble or heroic—like some kind of literary resistance fighter. Rather, it is an attempt to take stock of the ironies, vagaries and polyvalence of Josephus’ project. To state that he pandered to the Romans is in one sense to state the painfully obvious. To look beyond the obvious to the more complex and oblique is far more interesting and instructive. And ultimately, it renders a more realistic account of what Josephus may have hoped to achieve by writing as he did. All of this means too that we must do away with simple dismissals of Josephus as a traitor or coward. These kinds of two-dimensional representations of the man’s motives and actions do not ring true either with the complexities of his situation or with the determined efforts he made to provide such a substantial written response to Roman aggression.
We are now ready to look at the more extensive biblical material in the *Antiquitates*. Obviously we will not be able to conduct a detailed or comprehensive analysis of the entire paraphrase of the Bible. Instead, I propose to analyse three important concepts, paying special attention to indications of the constraints Josephus may have felt in how he expressed himself, evidence of the co-opting of Roman norms and values for Josephus’ own purposes, and, finally, hints of cultural defiance in Josephus’ retelling of the biblical narrative. The three concepts are covenant, constitution and empire.

**Covenant**

It is a well know fact that Josephus’ rewritten Bible contains no references at all to the biblical covenant between YHWH and the Israelites. Indeed, Josephus’ narrative seems deliberately to avoid all overt references to the covenant, with the result that readers familiar with the narrative of the Hebrew Bible are obliged to ask themselves whether Josephus made a conscious decision to suppress this biblical motif, and if so, why? Betsy Halpern Amaru has answered the question in the affirmative by arguing that Josephus rejected the “land” aspect of classical covenant theology, and with it the kind of messianism that may have fuelled the nationalistic fanaticism of groups such as the Zealots. According to this theory, Josephus rejected the territorial implications of much of the biblical covenant language, not least because of their importance to certain strands of (potentially revolutionary) Davidic messianism in his day. This construal of Josephus’ motives certainly fits well with the picture of Josephus as a client of the Flavian regime unwilling to jeopardize his status with them by seeming to endorse an ideology that might sound to outsiders uncomfortably similar to the one promulgated by Jewish insurrectionists. In other words, Josephus may have felt constrained to avoid expressions of what might be taken for Jewish nationalism. Of further significance is Halpern Amaru’s argument that, for Josephus,
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the land was in any case no longer at the heart of Jewishness per se. Instead, she argues, Judaism for Josephus had become “a religion of law, or virtue, of obedience to God’s statutes.” Her point is that in his paraphrase of the biblical narrative Josephus constructed a model of Jewish life that fit well into a Diaspora context. For Jews in communities throughout the Roman Empire and elsewhere, possession of the “land” was not the indispensable commodity that a covenant theology might portray it to be. What is now much more important than land, is the faithful practice of Torah. Thus, while the omission of the language of covenant from Josephus’ account of the national history might seem at first to be nothing less than a great violence committed against the Hebrew Scriptures, it turns out to be something much more positive than that. In the give and take of adapting his narrative to the needs of the setting in which he writes, Josephus gives up “covenant” in order to affirm a form of identity not dependant upon where the Jews might live, or the current state of their political fortunes in the world.

Even more than this, though, it would seem that Josephus is also consciously adapting his narrative to the conventions of a Romanized discourse in which language of a covenant between God and Israel would have seemed quaint and possibly even offensive. In its place Josephus seeks to develop a set of terms whose implications would still affirm the importance of the Jewish people in the divine order of things, but which would at the same time also be more accessible to his audience in Rome. Thus, instead of claims about a covenant between God and the Jews, we find in Josephus’ retelling of the Bible consistent and well developed recourse to what H. W. Attridge has identified as the language of benefaction and alliance. The significance of this observation is two-fold. Firstly, benefactor terminology has potential universal application, as opposed to the exclusivity implied by covenant (cf. A.J. 8.116–117; also 2.332), and secondly, alliance terminology does not imply “any necessary, formal, long-term or automatic commitment on the part of God to act on behalf of the Israelites. Terms such as σύμμαχος refer primarily to God’s role in times of need, and not to a fundamental agreement which determines the relationship between God and Israel.”

21 Attridge, Interpretation, 82, emphasis original.
Attridge's main point is that God's relationship with Israel is one example of God's justice. "His special concern for Israel is ultimately due to the special virtue of the people or its leaders."\(^{22}\) Later he asserts again, "The belief in a special providence for Israel is subordinated to... [the] general principle [of proper retribution for good and evil] and is seen to be a particular instance of it."\(^{23}\) Going even further than Attridge, we might observe that the language of benefaction and alliance is a key aspect of the patron-client system of relations in the ancient world, and that it is here that we find important insights into Josephus' reshaping of the biblical concept of covenant for a Roman audience. Josephus himself had substantial personal experience of the patron-client system of relations (see, for example *Vita* 16, 422–429, 430; *A.J.* 1.8; *CAp.* 2.296),\(^{24}\) so that it is not surprising to find that Josephus adopted and adapted this model for his presentation of the notion of covenant for a Roman audience. Far from abandoning the conviction of a special bond between God and the Jews, Josephus rather transposed the motif of covenant into a Roman key. God is presented as the patron of the Jewish people, and they are his favoured client.

Examples of this transposition are scattered liberally throughout Josephus' paraphrase of the Bible, and only a few of them need be recited here. In David's prayer for Solomon (*A.J.* 7.380) he addresses the Deity as the leader or patron (προστάτης), as well as the guardian (κηδεμών) of the Hebrew people. The pagan seer Balaam confirms to the Israelites that God thinks more highly of them than for any other people (θεοῦ μόνους ύμᾶς ἀνθρώπως ἔφορόντος *A.J.* 4.114); and on the borders of Canaan the fainthearted Israelites are nevertheless described as those whom God "held in greater honor than all the rest of humankind" (ὁ πάντων μᾶλλον ἀνθρώπων ἐσχε διὰ τιμῆς *A.J.* 3.313 [trans. Feldman, BJP]). These statements are supported by many others in which a special relationship is implied by the kinds of benefits that attend God's regard for the Israelites. Many of these...

\(^{22}\) Attridge, *Interpretation*, 83.


benefits may be summarized under the heading of God’s alliance with the Israelites. God as their ally (σύμμαχος) and helper (βοηθός) guarantees them both freedom from slavery and even the possession of a favoured land (cf. A.J. 2.268–269 and 3.300; also 3.19, 44–46, 64; 4.294). In the episode of Balaam and Balak we find an emphasis on God’s assistance against the nation’s enemies. Balaam’s attempt to sour the relationship between God and the Hebrews reminds us of the fact that one the most useful aspects of Flavian patronage for Josephus himself was the protection it afforded him against the accusations of people who apparently hoped to ruin his standing with the imperial house. Josephus was very proud of the fact, and no doubt deeply gratified as well, that in no case had his patrons accepted any of the charges brought against him (Vita 428–429). In the Balaam episode, Balaam is forced to admit to his own patron that he is unable to overturn the Divinity’s goodwill toward them, or his determination to bless them with a happy life (A.J. 4.122). Rather than gaining the desired curse, Balaam receives an oracle implying that those who attempt to destroy the Israelites will themselves face destruction (4.125). In his parting advice to Balak, Balaam again asserts, in a passage with no biblical precedent:

[C]omplete destruction will not befall the race of the Hebrews, neither in war nor in epidemic and famine and lack of the fruits of the earth, nor shall some other unexpected cause destroy it. For God’s providence is theirs, to save them from every misfortune and to allow no such suffering to come upon them, by which all would perish. (A.J. 4.127–128 [Feldman, BJP])

While Balaam allows that misfortunes may befall them from time to time, these will be only temporary setbacks, after which the Hebrews will “flourish and bring fear upon those who caused injury to them” (A.J. 4.128 [Feldman, BJP]). Much more could be said on this theme, but what we have noted here is already enough to confirm that Josephus’ adaptation of a Romanized model for characterizing the relationship between God and the Jews contains more than a few hints of cultural defiance. “Covenant” is gone, to be sure, but in its place is a robust affirmation of the Jews’ place in the divine scheme of things asserted in terms easily accessible to Roman ears.

Before leaving the subject of the covenant in Josephus’ Bible, I want to look briefly at a key aspect of the Hebrew Bible’s description of covenant, namely, its association with the practice of circumcision. According to the book of Genesis, God required Abraham and the
male adherents of his household to adopt circumcision as a sign of the covenant he made with them (Gen 17). Despite his omission of explicit references to the covenant, Josephus does not exclude the institution of circumcision in his retelling of this episode (A.J. 1.191–193). Very significantly, the intent of circumcision is said by Josephus to be that “He wished his posterity to remain unmixed with others” (A.J. 1.192 [Feldman, BJP]). While this was apparently not the only significance Josephus attached to the rite of circumcision, it is telling that he so clearly affirms the social separateness of the descendents of Abraham. While the accusation of unsociableness (ἀμιξία) is one that Josephus would later put on the lips of enemies of the Jews such at the Midianite women (A.J. 4.137) and Haman (A.J. 11.212), Josephus apparently affirmed circumcision as a distinct mark of Jewish identity. A little later in his paraphrase of Genesis (A.J. 1.214) Josephus states that it is not just the fact, but the manner in which it is done that is distinctive. The Arabs, for instance (following Ishmael), circumcise their young males when they are thirteen years old rather than at eight days which is the Jewish custom. Josephus is also aware that the Egyptians not only practise circumcision themselves, but have taught others (e.g. the Ethiopians) to do so as well (C.Ap. 2.141–142).

Nevertheless, he argues that the reference in Herodotus to people in Palestine who practice circumcision is an allusion to the Jews, because “no others of the Syrians in Palestine practise circumcision but ourselves” (A.J. 8.262; cf. C.Ap. 1.171 [Thackeray, LCL]). Josephus therefore clearly felt no embarrassment about circumcision or indeed, about the separateness that it implied. In a passage where he omitted any overt reference to the covenant, he nevertheless left the reference to circumcision as clear and direct as it is in the Bible. If Josephus felt constrained in some sense to modify his presentation of the covenant and to give it a particularly Roman flavour, he apparently felt no reason to omit circumcision from his account as
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27 See Herodotus, Hist. 2.104.
a result. We cannot therefore reduce Josephus’ motives simply to the avoidance of what may have seemed strange or offensive to Roman ears. In the case of circumcision we find a countercurrent in Josephus’ work that should cause us to credit Josephus with a more complex and nuanced project. To be more specific, it would seem that Josephus gave up explicit references to a covenant in order to make space on the margins of Roman discourse for an affirmation of God’s commitment to the Jews.

Constitution
The next subject that I want to consider is Josephus’ presentation of the laws of Moses. Moses is referred to regularly as νομοθέτης, or as the subject of the verb νομοθετεῖο. The noun νομοθεσία is used in connection with Moses in A.J. 3.287 and 320. These terms may be taken as a measure of the degree to which Josephus has accommodated his narrative to a Romanised audience. While the laws are still construed as a gift from God, and therefore as another measure of the favoured status of the Jews, they are also presented as indications of the superior virtues of the lawgiver (e.g. A.J. 2.229). As a child Moses’ precocious intellectual development gave promise of the great deeds in adulthood (A.J. 2.230). The culmination of this potential was the formulation of the laws of the Hebrews, something which was based on Moses’ knowledge of the mind of God (A.J. 4.180). In a preface to his summary of the Law in Antiquitates Book 4, Josephus asserts that what follows is consonant with Moses’ reputation for virtue (ἀρετή, A.J. 4.196). In his final encomium he asserts

29 E.g. A.J. 1.95 [quote from Nicolaus of Damascus], 240 [quote from Alexander Polyhistor]; 2.6, 18, 20, 23, 24; 3.180; 4.13, 150, 156. See also CAp. 2.75 [noster legislator], 145, 154, 156, 161, 165, 169, 173, 209, 257, 286.
that Moses surpassed all others in understanding (σύνεσις) (A.J. 4.328), and that from his laws one may deduce the superiority of his virtue (τὸ περὶ ὁμοῦ τῆς ἀρετῆς, A.J. 4.331). At the risk of de-emphasizing the divine origin of the Jewish law, therefore, Josephus presents Moses in terms reminiscent of a Greek lawgiver in order to create rapport with a Hellenized audience.

Along the same lines, we might also notice that Josephus presents the Law of Moses as a political constitution, or πολιτεία. On descending from Mount Sinai, Moses announces to the people that God in his grace has provided the people with a “well-ordered constitution” (πολιτείας κόσμον) to live by (A.J. 3.84 [Feldman, BJJP]). In the same context Moses explains that the laws are tokens of God’s favour, and that they are mediated to the people through his interpretation (A.J. 3.87–88). A little later Josephus claims that the ten words of the Decalogue were spoken directly by God and that only their meaning, and not the words themselves, might now be divulged (A.J. 3.90). All of this material indicates the extent to which Josephus continued to insist on the centrality of the Mosaic Law as constitutive of Jewish existence, even in Rome.

33 Josephus draws direct comparisons with Lycurgus, Solon and Zaleucus of Locri in C.Ap 2.154, and with Minos in C.Ap. 2.161. Rajak (“The Against Apion and the Continuities in Josephus’s Political Thought” in Understanding Josephus, 235) points out further that the comparison with other lawgivers echoes the opening of Plato’s Laws.


36 On this point, see further L. H. Feldman, Judean Antiquities, 253 n. 190.
Nevertheless, we also find in Josephus’ recasting of the biblical narrative a number of very interesting concessions to a foreign audience that significantly influence his presentation of the law. For example, in his summary of the laws, Josephus acknowledges somewhat unnecessarily that Moses left what he wrote in a “scattered condition”—an eventuality which has made it necessary for Josephus to reorganize the laws of the constitution into their several subjects (A.J. 4.197). This, Josephus insists with apologies to his Jewish readers, is the only innovation he has introduced into his presentation of the Mosaic code. Further, in subsequent passages Josephus goes on to characterize the Hebrew πολιτεία as an “aristocracy,” which he argues is the best form of government to live under. For Josephus, aristocracy is to be distinguished from other, inferior, forms of government such as monarchy or democracy. It must also be noted that for Josephus aristocracy is equated with the rule of God. It is thus not surprising that in Contra Apionem Josephus uses the term “theocracy” (θεοκρατία) for the Jewish constitution rather than aristocracy (C.Ap. 2.165). What is most significant for our purposes here is the polemical thrust of Josephus’ terminology. Josephus’ readership would undoubtedly have been familiar with philosophical discussions about the competing virtues of different forms of government. The discussion in Polybius (Hist. 6.3.1–9.14), for example, describes how popular dissatisfaction with one form of government inevitably leads to another. Monarchy leads to kingship and then to tyranny. Tyranny leads to aristocracy, then through oligarchy to democracy and mob-rule, and thence back to monarchy. In Josephus’ scheme the aristocratic form of government under the Judges degenerated to a tyranny under the sons of Eli, and from there to kingship under Saul. When the people of Israel clamoured to have a king rule over them in the days of Samuel, God was outraged, Josephus tells us, at the impiety (δοειπεια) and hubris of the demand (A.J. 6.88–89). The desire for a king constituted a betrayal of his worship and his religion (τηn

37 On this matter, see L.H. Feldman, Judean Antiquities, 397 n. 575.
38 On this subject, see further Spilsbury, Image, 160–71.
40 On current constitutional debates in Rome at the time of Josephus’ writing, see especially Mason, “Should any Wish to Enquire,” 81–84.
When Josephus champions aristocracy (i.e. the rule of law administered by a priestly elite) over kingship one cannot but suspect that he was firing a few shafts at Roman hegemony—under whose kingship he and the rest of the Jews currently lived. Thus, again we have an example of how Josephus has submitted his narration to the cultural dominance of Rome in adapting his terminology to suit a Roman audience. Josephus pays respect to the Roman love for order, and presents Judaism as a noble constitution, indeed, as the noblest of them all. Yet what emerges is not simply Roman. Rather it is a form of Roman Judaism that is still Judaism for all that.

Empire

The final aspect of Josephus’ reading of the Bible that I want to look at is the matter of empire. We have already noted in our brief analysis of the passage in the *Bellum* that Josephus accommodated his reading of the Hebrew Scriptures to a view that legitimated the rule of Rome. God, Josephus argued, was on Rome’s side against the Judean insurrectionists. In an earlier part of the same section of the *Bellum*, no less notorious for its apparent capitulation to Roman imperialism, Josephus argues that Fortune (ἡ τύχη) has passed over to the Romans and that God, who determined the rise and fall of nations in predetermined sequence, was presently pleased to allow “empire” (τὴν ἀρχὴν) to rest with Rome (*B.J.* 5.367). When we turn to the *Antiquitates* we find that Josephus’ rewriting of the Bible is similarly hospitable to foreign empires. Cyrus is described as acting under the guidance of the Scriptures (*A.J.* 11.3), and Alexander the Great is led into battle by God himself (*A.J.* 11.334). Even more telling than these examples is Josephus’ recasting of the visions of Daniel, especially Nebuchadnezzar’s vision of the great statue (*A.J.* 10.195–210; cf. Dan 2). In this vision successive empires are represented by different metals. Josephus not only accepts this as indicative of God’s
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42 On this subject, see further Paul Spilsbury, “Flavius Josephus on the Rise and Fall of the Roman Empire,” *JTS* n.s. 54 (2003): 1–24.

will for the world, but interprets the vision in such a way as to make it clear that he believed the final empire represented by the statue to be Rome. Thus the Roman Empire, like the empires of the Babylonians, Medo-Persians, and Greeks before it, is underwritten by God himself. In the *Bellum Judaicum* this perspective is attributed also to Agrippa II who opines that “without God’s aid so vast an empire [as the Romans] could never have been built up” (*B.J.* 2.390 [Thackeray, LCL]).

Three aspects of Josephus’ description of this vision suggest further that Josephus wished to avoid overt criticism of Rome. The first is the barely noticeable omission of the biblical statement that the second kingdom was inferior to the first (Dan 2:39). Although a downward trend is already inherent in the progression from gold through silver and bronze to iron, Josephus apparently wished to avoid making explicit the implication that the kingdoms grew successively weaker, since this would imply that Rome, the fourth kingdom, was the weakest of them all. A second indication of Josephus’ desire to avoid explicit criticism of Rome is his omission of the biblical detail (Dan 2:33, 42–43) that the fourth and final kingdom was made of both iron and clay and was therefore inherently flawed because of internal divisions. In Josephus’ retelling there is no mention of clay at all, but only a reflection on the invincibility of iron (*A.J.* 10.209). Finally, the third indication of Josephus’ reticence to criticize Rome openly is his refusal to explain the meaning of the stone that ultimately destroys the statue (*A.J.* 10.210). Having said this, though, it is telling that Josephus did not omit the account of the stone altogether as he obviously could have done. Instead, he includes the description of the stone, but refers interested readers to the Book of Daniel itself for the appropriate interpretation. As we have noted before, this deference paid to the Hebrew Bible is very much a statement of Josephus’ enduring faith in his cultural heritage. Nor is this the only place
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where we find readers referred to the Scriptures for insight about the future. In *Antiquitates* Book 4, Josephus tells us that the unfulfilled prophecies of Balaam reveal aspects of the future including, by implication, information about the demise of the Hebrews’ enemies (*A.J.* 4.125). In this context Josephus reads Balaam’s oracles as a celebration of the future worldwide Diaspora of the Jewish people (*A.J.* 4.115–116). When read in the light of Daniel’s vision of the Rome-destroying stone, which would yet grow so large that the whole world would be filled with it (*A.J.* 10.207), it becomes clear that we have here more than just a hint of cultural defiance on Josephus’ part. The result is that we find in Josephus’ reading of these biblical texts both an acceptance of the political realities of his day (realities which he describes as God-ordained), and an affirmation of a form of Jewish nationalism that held out hope for the eventual ascendancy of his own people, when the “rod of empire” would rest over Judea instead of over Rome.

**Conclusion**

Josephus’ reading of the Bible was certainly deeply affected by his situation in Rome. He paid attention to Roman categories and sensibilities and used them for the benefit of the Jews and Judaism. While the lengths to which Josephus went to accommodate his sense of the constraints he was under are often observed and commented on, there has been less acknowledgement of the positive measures Josephus took either to adapt Roman terms and values for the benefit of the Jews, or of those places in which he gives evidence of a defiance and a resistance to Roman cultural hegemony. When we take these into account we find in Josephus a much more nuanced and complex example of an individual living under the yoke of empire.

When Josephus related the closing stages of Moses’ speech at the end of his life, he put in the great lawgiver’s mouth a message of both acquiescence and of national fortitude. On the one hand Moses is made to tell the people that they ought not to think that “liberty lies in resenting what your rulers require you to do” (*A.J.* 4.187). Nor are the people to “show the same anger toward [their rulers] that you have often ventured to display toward me” (*A.J.* 4.188 [Feldman, BJP]). Indeed, Moses states, the path of the future lies along the way of moderation (*σωφρονήσειν*), and not of violence against those in
authority over them (A.J. 4.189). Later, even David himself, that paragon of zealot nationalism, will say, “[I]t is not such a terrible thing to serve even a foreign master, if God so wills” (A.J. 7.373 [Thackeray and Marcus, LCL]). Yet, on the other hand, again in the context of Moses’ farewell message, we find the insistence that the Jews’ well-being is ultimately guaranteed by the guidance of the laws, and the order of the constitution (A.J. 4.184). Beyond this, it is God’s own providence to which they may look for protection so long as they remain securely on the path of virtue. Indeed, if they but remain loyal to their laws, they will eventually utterly vanquish all their enemies (A.J. 4.191). Thus we find strains of resistance to Roman hegemony being voiced by Moses himself. And it is a resistance that relates specifically to the three inter-related subjects of covenant, constitution and empire. Josephus’ work is certainly not left untouched by its location so close to the heart of empire. There are times when he seems to speak with the accents of Roman propaganda. However, his own native voice is never so utterly overwhelmed that we cannot still hear within his speech subaltern tones quite unlike the voice of Rome.
JOSEPHUS’ USE OF PRAYERS: BETWEEN NARRATIVE AND THEOLOGY
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1. INTRODUCTION

Josephus is often seen as a man of two worlds: brought up in Palestine, where he received a Jewish religious education, he later lived in Rome, where he tried to adapt to the Graeco-Roman language and culture. His work is said to show clear signs of this dichotomy, in that he tried to write for his Graeco-Roman public, using their language and terminology to describe Jewish issues.¹

In my opinion, however, the case is somewhat different. Josephus grew up in a Palestine that had been under Roman dominion for a hundred years and had indeed been part of the Hellenistic world for some four hundred years.² Josephus would have had an international upbringing and had most probably learned to read, write and speak Greek well before he ever set foot outside Judaea.³ When he arrived in Rome, he came into closer contact with prevailing ideas about the world and religion and such philosophical schools of thought as Stoicism and Epicureanism. His Greek naturally improved all the time because he spoke it “in the street,” and he will certainly have been totally acculturated by the time he started writing his Antiquitates Judaicae. I do not think that we may conclude from his work that he constantly adapted his language to suit his public, but that it is more correct to say that he wrote in the language he used daily; he expressed himself in a vocabulary which he had made his own and


which was also that of the people amongst whom he lived. Josephus himself would not have regarded his Jewish and Graeco-Roman "sides" as two separate parts of himself. He was not a man of two worlds: to him, there was only one world; like so many of his near contemporaries, he was a historiographer who worked in Rome and wrote in Greek. ⁴

The fact that Josephus wrote in Greek and modelled his work upon that of great historiographers like Thucydides and Polybius illustrates the extent to which he was a part of his literary surroundings. The one thing, however, that marks out Josephus' work in comparison with others working at the same time and place, like Tacitus and Martial, is his choice of subject matter: whereas Tacitus described Roman history and Martial portrayed every-day Rome in his satirical epigrams, Josephus decided to describe the history and religion of the Jewish people. ⁵ So far as we know, he was the only one in Rome at that time who chose to write on the subject, which is where his Jewish background comes in.

In this context, this essay will focus on prayer in Josephus. Prayers are an interesting object of study, because they may form self-contained units within a narrative, like dreams or speeches. When Josephus is following a source text, he usually keeps the story-line more or less intact. But as soon as he encounters a prayer, he departs from his text and fills in whatever suits him best at that moment; prayers appear to offer him an opportunity of adding a personal touch: by changing a prayer, he can stick to the story-line, but nevertheless include his own views about the incident in question or the motives of his principal actors.

One may well ask, however, why a discussion of prayers should be fitting in a volume on Josephus and Jewish history in Flavian Rome. The answer is, because these prayers appear to encapsulate the entire subject in a microcosm: they are Jewish elements in Josephus' work, which are, as the rest of his work, full of characteristically Greek themes and ideas. The fact that they are Jewish elements emerges clearly from a number of considerations:

Josephus' work includes 134 prayers; in this respect, he obviously differs from the great Greek historiographers, like Thucydides or

⁴ As, for example, Chairemon the Stoic or Alexander Polyhistor.
⁵ See the essay by Jonathan Price in this volume.
Josephus, on whom he modelled himself: not one of them includes anything like this number of prayers. When we consider that, of these 134 prayers, 102 are quoted in the biblical section of the Antiquitates, we may conclude that their use has been prompted by his biblical, thus Jewish, source. Further confirmation may be found in the fact that a total of only six prayers is ascribed to non-Jews, and none of these is more than a short remark. The prayers are all (except these six) addressed to the Jewish God.

The prayers, then, are Jewish elements in which, as has been said above, Greek words and ideas are as prevalent as in the rest of Josephus' work. Seeing that the prayers are nearly all addressed to the Jewish God, it is safe to assume that when Josephus conveys theological issues in these short pieces of text, they are expressions of Jewish theology. It may therefore be of interest to take a closer look at the terminology Josephus uses in his prayers.

For the rest of this paper, I shall concentrate on the following three points. First, I shall show that prayers are indeed used as self-contained units, a device which allows Josephus to leave the story-line intact while entirely changing the content of the prayer included in order to add a personal touch; then I shall give an example of Josephus' use of Greek terminology to express Jewish theology; and finally, I shall give specific examples of the way in which Josephus uses prayers to express his view of God, making use of Graeco-Roman concepts.

2. Narrative and Theology

2.1. Prayers as Self-contained Units

Of course, stories as told by Josephus are never exactly the same as in his source texts. But there is a perceptible difference between the fidelity with which he tells a story and the liberties he takes when handling a prayer incorporated in the text. Let us look at a few examples.

6 Titus, B.J. 5.519; soldiers, B.J. 6.123; crowds, B.J. 7.73; Vespasian and Titus, B.J. 7.128–129, 155; Tiberius A.J. 18.211. The prayers of Balaam (A.J. 4.105), Nebuchadnezzar (A.J. 10.217) and Darius (A.J. 11.31) need to be mentioned as well, but they are not counted as pagan prayers since the three characters are presented as believers who pray to the Jewish God.
The first is the story of the Hebrews standing on the shores of the Red Sea who see the Egyptian army bearing down on them. As in Exodus, the Hebrews in the *Antiquitates* panic and turn to their leader, Moses. In Exodus, Moses then addresses them, telling them to place their trust in the Lord. In the *Antiquitates*, however, Moses starts praying to God; he asks for God’s help and proposes several solutions himself, one of which is to make the sea dry up so that the people can cross it. Naturally, this is what happens. As we see, Josephus has kept to the story-line but, by inserting a prayer, has made it appear as though it was Moses who came up with the solution, thus depicting him as a great leader.

A second example again concerns Moses in the desert with the Israelites. At Rephidim, the people complain that they are thirsty. Moses is alarmed at this, and, in order to avert the threat, he starts to pray. When he has finished, God tells him to strike a rock with his staff, and water pours out. The story is the same in Exodus and the *Antiquitates*, but the content of the two prayers is quite different: in Exodus, Moses cries out, “What should I do? They are ready to stone me!”; in the *Antiquitates*, on the other hand, Moses shows no signs of desperation and merely asks God to provide water. The story is the same, but Moses’ actions appear in a totally different light because of the content of his prayer. Once again, Moses is the great leader who is now shown to be not only wise, but also selfless, in that he does not pray for his own safety, but for water for the people.

Another prayer that gives a different interpretation to an otherwise unchanged story is that of Joshua. The Israelites have been greatly disappointed at losing a battle under the generalship of their new leader, Joshua. They are very despondent. After Joshua has prayed, the cause of their defeat becomes apparent: some people have stolen holy things which were intended to be destroyed in order to honour God; the culprits are found and put to death. So far, both versions of the story are in agreement. Once again, however, the difference lies chiefly in the prayer. In the Book of Joshua, Joshua

---

7 *A.J.* 2.334; Exod 14:10–12.

8 *A.J.* 2.335–337; Exod 14:13–14.

9 The tendency to depict Moses as a great leader can be seen all over Josephus’ work; on the portrait of Moses see also Feldman, *Josephus’s Interpretation*, 374–442.

10 *A.J.* 3.33–38; Exod 17:1–6.

11 *A.J.* 3.34; Exod 17:4.

is angry with God: he is lying on the ground, weeping, and in his prayer, he reproaches God: there is no request as such. In the _Antiquitates_, however, Joshua is outspoken (παρρησίαν λαμβάνει πρὸς τὸν θεόν) and asks God to put the matter right and to take away the people's disappointment. Josephus has changed the reproach into a much less bold request; the story is now much less negatively charged and Joshua emerges from the story much stronger because he has recognised the problem and remains calm.\(^{13}\)

Another example is Samson's prayer:\(^{14}\) as in Judges, Samson is misled by the men of the tribe of Judah in order to deliver him to the Philistines. When he finds out about it, he is furious and kills a thousand Philistines with an ass' jawbone; he is very proud of what he has done. Afterwards, he feels thirsty and prays to God. Again, however, it is in the text of the prayer that the stories diverge: whereas in Judges Samson reproaches God in his prayer, saying that he would just let him die of thirst now, Josephus' Samson realises that he has committed the sin of pride; he hopes that God will not be angry with him and will help him solve his problems.

A further example is a prayer of Ezra's,\(^{15}\) which differs from that given in the Bible, though the context remains unchanged. Ezra has travelled from Babylon to Jerusalem and is told by a number of people that there are men (including some priests) who have married non-Jewish women; they are afraid that all the people will be punished. Ezra is shocked at this news, and starts to pray. In the biblical version of the story, Ezra confesses, whereas Josephus has changed the prayer into a request for forgiveness; moreover, in the Bible, it sounds as though Ezra includes himself among the guilty, whereas Josephus' Ezra asks for forgiveness for those who have sinned. After the prayer, they all agree that the men should divorce their wives.

Finally, there is the story of Esther and Mordecai. Josephus retells the story of Esther as told in the Bible, including the additions that are present in the Greek versions. These additions have both Mordecai's and Esther's prayers, which Josephus therefore also includes. However, although Josephus has retold the entire book in most precise detail, when relating these two prayers, he departs from his source. In

---

\(^{13}\) For another approach on the presentation of Joshua in Josephus' work see also Feldman, _Josephus's Interpretation_, 443–60.

\(^{14}\) _A.J._ 5.302; Judg 15:18.

several places, Mordecai’s prayer is given a slightly different twist, expressing the bond between God and the Jewish people in a way different from the way it is presented in the biblical text, and stressing God’s role in the present misfortune;16 but Esther’s prayer in particular has been completely changed:17 Esther prays for herself. She prays for beauty and the power to convince, so that the king will listen to her. In the biblical version, however, she stresses her bond with God and the Jewish people. With a few clever additions like these, Josephus succeeds in romanticising the story, and he makes use of this prayer to highlight Esther’s romance with the king.

In all the instances cited above, Josephus has given himself some latitude in writing the prayer, but has left the actual story, as told in his source text, unchanged. This does not mean that he never changes the story itself—of course he does—and he does so regularly. But I maintain that in many instances, he makes particular use of prayers to emphasise certain points or to make certain changes in a story. Of the 134 prayers in his work, I have examined and written a commentary on 32,18 and in nearly all of these cases, the prayer appears to serve a particular purpose in the story. It may be used for added romantic emphasis, as in the story of Esther, or to draw the reader’s attention to an aspect of especial interest, as in Moses’ prayer at the burning bush, in which he asks God to tell him his name.19 In Exod 3:13, he does so in a conversation with God, not in a prayer. An historical turning point may also sometimes be given special emphasis by the use of a prayer, as in the case of the people’s prayer at Mount Sinai, just before they are given the law.20 Moreover, some prayers have been used to give the story a different twist. For instance, when telling the story of Noah:21 after the flood, as in Genesis, Noah offers a sacrifice. God answers with a speech in which the covenant between God and humanity is sealed. In the *Antiquitates*, however, Noah also says a prayer at the sacrifice in which he asks God never to inflict such a catastrophe on humankind again.22

---

16 *A.J.* 11.229–230; Add Esth 4:17b-h.
17 *A.J.* 11.231–233; Add Esth 4:17f-z.
18 These commentaries are to be included in my doctoral dissertation (Universiteit Utrecht), tentatively titled “Prayer in the Writings of Josephus.”
19 *A.J.* 2.275.
20 *A.J.* 3.78.
21 *A.J.* 1.77–103; Gen 6–8.
22 *A.J.* 1.96–98.
God’s speech is changed into an answer to this request, thus in effect crediting Noah instead of God with the initiative for the covenant.

In most cases, however, Josephus makes use of prayers for two reasons: firstly, to depict a person’s character, as we saw in the case of Moses’ prayers by the shores of the Red Sea and at Rephidim; and, secondly, to convey theology, as was done for instance in the prayers of Solomon at the dedication of the Temple, which shall be discussed below, or the prayer of the Israelites at Mount Carmel after the strife between Elijah and the Baal priests: they call God the greatest and only true one, as opposed to the other gods who are merely names “created by cheap and silly opinion.” Josephus amplified this prayer with regard to the biblical text, where the Israelites only cry “The Lord is God.”

To sum up, in retelling a story, Josephus repeatedly manages to manipulate the narrative by altering the prayers, thus conveying a personal opinion about the story itself by slightly changing the emphasis, or about the chief protagonist by changing his or her prayer as given in the source text, though without departing from the main story-line. But even in his treatment of the theological content, Josephus tampers with the text of the prayers, as I shall show in the next two paragraphs.

2.2. Greek Terminology in Jewish Contexts

The moment when Isaac was about to give his oldest son his blessing was a crucial one in Jewish history. The son who obtained the blessing was to become the father of the Jewish people. We all know now what actually happened: that Jacob, the younger brother, contrived to manipulate the situation in such a way that he received the blessing that had actually been intended for Esau. Josephus worded this blessing as a prayer. Much could be said about this prayer, but I shall concentrate on Josephus’ remarkable choice of words in one particular part of it.

In Genesis, Isaac’s blessing starts with the words, “May God give you of heaven’s dew and of earth’s richness—an abundance of grain

---

26 For a full discussion of this prayer see my forthcoming dissertation.
and new wine” (Gen 27:28). Josephus’ wording is interesting. In his version, Isaac asks God for the following: “Protect my son graciously and maintain him untouched by every evil by giving him a happy life and possession of good things as much as is in your power to give.”27 In asking God to protect his son “graciously,” he uses the word ευμενής. Throughout Josephus’ work, ευμενής and ευμένεια are the words most commonly used to express God’s benevolence and mercy: ευμενής is used on 53 occasions, 42 of which refer to God. It is used 10 times in prayers, and in seven instances, God is requested to be merciful. In the Septuagint, the word occurs only four times, but not with reference to God.28 In classical Greek texts, on the other hand, it is more common to use the word to denote an attribute of a god. For instance, in Aeschylus’ Suppliants (686–687) the choir sings, “and to all the young people may Lyceus (i.e., Apollo, T.J.) be graciously disposed.” And in Aristophanes’ Lysistrata (204), the eponymous heroine cries, “O Queen Persuasion, and O Loving Cup, accept the offerings by these women graciously (ευμενής).” A final example comes from Alcestis by Euripides (791), where Heracles says, “ Honour Aphrodite too, sweetest of the gods to mortals, for she is a kind (ευμενής) goddess.”

Another word that stands out in Isaac’s prayer is ευδαιμόνα: Isaac asks for a happy life (βίος ευδαιμόνα) for his son.29 This is not a biblical expression, nor is it to be found in the Septuagint. But by Josephus’ time, it was in common use and had been for some time.30 The original meaning of the word, “he who has a favourable deity,” stems from the idea that “human well-being and adversity are dispensed by the gods.”31 This idea was fundamental to popular Greek religion. Plato and Aristotle wrote a great deal about it,32 and in Hellenistic times, philosophers searched for an answer to a question they had formulated earlier: “What is happiness or well-being and how does one achieve it?” The concept of ευδαιμονία is examined in all three

27 A.J. 1.273.
28 2 Macc 12:31 and 13:26 (ευμενής); 2 Macc 6:29 (ευμένεια) and Wis 6:16 (ευμενῶς).
29 A.J. 1.273.
32 E.g. Plato, Resp. 621c1–d3; Pol. 311b7–c6; Aristotle, Eth. nic. 10.6–8.
main branches of Hellenistic philosophy, Scepticism, Epicureanism and Stoicism.\textsuperscript{33} Moreover, Seneca wrote a work entitled \textit{De vita beata}, the Latin equivalent of εὐδαιμονία, and Cicero, too, wrote about it.\textsuperscript{34}

Another prayer in which Josephus has chosen to write about a Jewish matter using a typically Greek word is that of Moses on the shores of the Red Sea, which I discussed earlier. In this prayer, which incidentally has no parallel in biblical texts, Josephus' Moses asks for God's providence, for which he uses the Greek word πρόνοια.\textsuperscript{35} Although obviously the idea of God caring for the Jewish people is a Jewish belief, the word Josephus uses for this concept is interesting: in the Septuagint, the word occurs only in a few books, which were originally written in Greek.\textsuperscript{36} In Hellenistic Judaism, the word gained more common currency. Philo, for instance, wrote an entire work entitled \textit{De providentia}; unfortunately, however, only two large fragments of it have survived.\textsuperscript{37}

Harold Attridge has undertaken a detailed study of Josephus' frequent use of the concept of πρόνοια.\textsuperscript{38} Attridge omitted, however, to mention the important place which the concept occupied in Hellenistic philosophy, and I would like to discuss this first. Later, I shall show what meaning Josephus intended the word to convey.

The concept of divine providence is closely linked to the process of rationalising traditional Greek beliefs and the manner in which they were expressed. The idea that the gods did not just allow things to happen, but that they had a purpose, was thereby formalised. This implied that behind the confusing events in the world, a conscious order lay hidden.\textsuperscript{39}

This idea came to occupy a central place in Stoic philosophy, where divine providence is seen as the governing principle of the world, equivalent to Zeus and Logos,\textsuperscript{40} as may be seen, for instance,

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{33} Long, \textit{ibid.}, 6.
\item \textsuperscript{34} See for example Cicero, \textit{Tusc.} 4.84, 5.119–120.
\item \textsuperscript{35} \textit{A.J.} 2.336.
\item \textsuperscript{36} Wis 14:3; 17:2; Add Dan 6:19; 2 Macc 4:6; 3 Macc 4:21; 5:30; 4 Macc 9:24; 13:19; 17:22.
\item \textsuperscript{38} Attridge, \textit{Interpretation, passim.}
\item \textsuperscript{40} Gordon, \textit{ibid.}, 664.
\end{itemize}
when Cleanthes writes in his *Hymn to Zeus*, “Nothing supervenes, Lord, on earth, in the divine vault of heaven or the sea, without you.”

The concept was also used in earlier times, but then it usually had a cosmic, not a personal connotation. Later, however, the word lost some of its philosophical significance, and came into more general use, even becoming part of the popular vocabulary.

The word πρόνοια appears to be central to Josephus' thinking. Many of the main personages in the *Antiquitates* make use of it, as does Moses in his prayer by the Red Sea and in the speech which precedes it. As mentioned earlier, Attridge has made an extensive study of Josephus' use of the *pronoia* theme: he combines the idea that God exercises “providential care” with a theology of “God as ally and helper.” According to Attridge, Josephus used this theology in place of the theology of the covenant; he thus made the bond between God and humanity more universal (that is, not confined to the Jewish people) and less of a special pact. Of course in Josephus there is still a special bond between God and Israel, but it is not based on a covenant, but on the merits of her leaders. God rewards the good and punishes those who have done wrong; Israel's leaders have acted righteously and Israel therefore has a special relationship with God; and because of this special bond, God looks after this people. God's providence shows itself, for instance, in his power to cause great changes in the lives of people or in their actions; people must therefore have confidence in God.

This is why, in his prayer by the Red Sea, Moses appeals to God and his providence: from him comes salvation. As we have seen, it is not un-Jewish for Moses to appeal to God for salvation, but his use at this point of the word πρόνοια (a term with such unmistakably Hellenistic philosophical connotations), is indicative of the fact that Josephus characterises the bond between God and the Hebrew people in a manner more appropriate to his own time and Graeco-Roman environment than to biblical times.

---

2.3. God in Greek

As we saw in the previous paragraph, Josephus often presents Jewish theological subjects in contemporary Greek terms. In the introduction, I indicated that nearly all the prayers in his work are spoken by Jews and are accordingly addressed to the Jewish God. A number of prayers start with an invocation to God, and sometimes Josephus has translated typically Jewish attributes into Greek. Examples are θεός τῶν ἄλων, “king of the universe” (which is an equivalent of the Hebrew שמים) or δεσπότης παντός αἰώνος, “master of the whole world.” On closer examination, however, in most cases, Josephus proves to have used Greek invocations rather than specifically Jewish ones.

The clearest example is a prayer of David’s, when he hands over power to Solomon and gives him the plans for building the temple. Everyone is glad and promises to cooperate with Solomon whereupon David thanks God in a prayer which actually consists mainly of invocations: “Thereupon all the people rejoiced, and David (…) began to praise God, calling him with a loud voice father and origin of the universe and creator of human and divine things with which he adorned himself; and (calling him) guardian and protector of the Hebrew nation, of their happiness and of this kingdom he had given him. Thereupon he prayed for the whole people for good things and for his son Solomon for a mind sound and just, and also empowered by the other elements of virtue; and he commanded the multitude to praise God” (A.J. 7.380–381).

A.J. 7.380 comprises the three following invocations:

(a) πατήρ τε καὶ γένεσις τῶν ὅλων (“father and origin of the universe”);
(b) δημιουργὸς ἀνθρωπίνων καὶ θείων, αἷς αὐτὸν ἐκόσμησε (“creator of human and divine things with which he adorned himself”);
(c) προστάτης τε καὶ κηδεμών γένους τῶν Ἑβραίων καὶ τῆς τούτων εὐδαιμονίας ἦς τε αὐτῷ βασιλείας ἔδωκεν ("guardian and protector of the Hebrew nation, of their happiness and of this kingdom he had given him").

Josephus has carefully built up the three invocations in three stages: the first part presents God as the origin of all things; the second

46 Isaac’s blessing, A.J. 1.272.
47 Josephus often presents ideas in threes, a technique that may be called tricolon.
part is more about God himself, and the third part is about his relation to the Hebrew people: guardian of the nation and of the kingdom.

Let us take the first invocation: father and origin of the universe. God was spoken of as “father” in the Old Testament, though not very often. Where the word is used, God is characterised as the father of Israel or of particular people; the emphasis is more on protection and sympathy than on procreation.\textsuperscript{48} The fact that Josephus uses the word here in conjunction with the idea of origin or genesis, suggests that he had a father as origin in mind, particularly in view of the fact that the idea of “protection” already appears in the third invocation.

God as γένεσις, “origin”, as a kind of source from which the universe came into being: this would appear to point to a philosophical way of invoking God. However, I have never seen a similar expression in either biblical or apocryphal texts, nor even in pagan literature. Josephus does not use the word in this sense anywhere else. The only other remotely similar reference is a fragment of Aristobulus, who says, “Just so has Moses called the whole genesis of the world words of God in our Law. For he continually says in each case ‘and God spoke and it came to pass.’”\textsuperscript{49}

In the second invocation, God is seen as creator of human and divine things, with which he adorned himself. δημιουργός is not commonly used to indicate God. Josephus himself uses it in relation to God in only two other places: in one, he says that Abraham was the first person who had the courage to declare publicly that God, the creator (δημιουργός) of the universe, was one.\textsuperscript{50} The second occasion is the invocation in Isaac’s prayer, which was discussed earlier, and in which he refers to God as δημιουργός τῆς ὅλης οὐσίας, “creator of all being.”\textsuperscript{51} On each of these three occasions, God is thus called the creator of all things: of the universe, of all being, and now,

Two further examples, in prayers discussed above, are Isaac who asks for three favours in his blessing, and Moses by the Red Sea, who suggests three solutions to the problem facing him. See also H. St. J. Thackeray, “Introduction,” in \textit{Josephus. Jewish Antiquities, Books I–IV} (LCL; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1930), xv–xvi, who ascribes the technique to the “Sophoclean assistant.”


\textsuperscript{50} \textit{A.J.} 1.155.

\textsuperscript{51} \textit{A.J.} 1.272.
by David "of all human and divine things." Nowhere in the Septuagint is God referred to in this way, and only once in the New Testament, when God is called the architect and builder (δημιουργός) of a city.52

Plato, on the other hand, used the word very often in this sense. The clearest instance of its use is in his Timaeus, where he writes, "Now to discover the Maker and Father of this Universe were a task indeed; and having discovered Him, to declare Him unto all men were a thing impossible. However, let us return and inquire further concerning the Cosmos. After which of the Models did its Architect construct it? Was it after that which is self-identical and uniform, or after that which has come into existence? Now if so be that this Cosmos is beautiful and its Constructor good, it is plain that he fixed his gaze on the Eternal."53 Plato uses three different words here to refer to God as creator of the universe: ποιητής (maker), τεκτωνόμενος (builder, architect) and δημιουργός. In a similar passage in his Republic (530a) he states that an astronomer who turned his eyes upon the movements of the stars, would be willing to concede that the artisan (δημιουργός) of heaven fashioned it and all that it contains.54

And, finally, there is Epictetus, a contemporary of Josephus', who wrote in his Diatribai, "but the works of God are capable of movement, have the breath of life, can make use of external impressions, and pass judgement upon them. Do you dishonour the workmanship of this craftsman (δημιουργός), when you are yourself that workmanship?"55 To me it is clear that Josephus, in his use of the word δημιουργός is close to Plato and Epictetus, and has once again used a Greek term by which to address God.

It is in the third invocation that God is addressed most intimately. Unlike the first and second invocation, this one refers directly to the Hebrew people, their happiness and the present kingdom, of which God is the protector. It is not at all usual to call God προστάτης. The basic meaning of the word is leader or chief. In the Septuagint, the word occurs only eight times, and each time it refers to people.56 In classical Greek literature, on the other hand, it is much more

52 Hebr 11:10.
53 Plato, Tim. 28c–29a (Bury, LCL).
54 See also Plato, Tim. 28a, 31a and 40c.
55 Epictetus, Diatr. 2.8.21.
56 1 Chron. 27:31; 29:6; 2 Chron. 8:10; 24:11 (2x); 1 Esd 2:12; Sir 45:24; 2 Macc 3:4.
common, and here, again, it usually refers to people and is trans­
lated as "leader," "ruler," "administrator," but also as "one who
stands before and protects." It is also occasionally used as an epi­
thet for a god. In Sophocles’ *Trachiniae* (205–210), for example, the
choir sings, “let the voices of men be one with ours in prayer to
the archer-god, Apollo, our defender ('Απόλλων προστάταυ)!" This is
similar to Clytemnestra in *Elektra* 637: "O Phoebus our defender
(Φοίβη προστατήριε), may you now listen to my prayer.” The word
κηδεμών, “protector,” which occurs only once in the Septuagint,58
was commonly used in the Greek-speaking world. God is also called
“protector” in the Old Testament, but the Hebrew נב is generally
rendered in the Septuagint by a form of the verb φυλάσσειν; the
word for “leader” is more commonly ἀρχων than προστάτης. The
words προστάτης and κηδεμών, with which Josephus’ David invokes
God in the present passage, obviously originate in the Greek world
and were not inspired by his biblical source.

As a further illustration of the use of Greek expressions to speak of
God, I should like to touch on the prayers of Solomon at the ded­
ication of the Temple, since the manner in which they refer to God
is again uncommon. These prayers are of great interest because of
the extent to which they are permeated with Greek (especially Stoic)
philosophical thinking. I shall give just two examples, which refer
specifically to God.59

Firstly, in both prayers, Josephus hints at a pantheistic world view
when he puts the following words into Solomon’s mouth: “We know
that you have an eternal dwelling in those things which you created
for yourself—in the heaven and air and earth and sea, all of which
you fill without being contained by them."60 In other words, God is
in everything. This is one of the principal points in Stoic philosophy,
which believes in a principle that shapes and moves everything and
that is immanent in everything.61

Another Stoic principle found in these prayers is the idea that God

57 Phoebus is one of Apollo’s epithets.
58 2 Macc 4:2.
59 For a detailed discussion of these prayers, see also T. Jonquière, “Two Prayers
by King Solomon in Josephus’ *Antiquities* 8 and the Bible,” in *Internationales Josephus-
Kolloquium Paris 2001* (MJSt 12; ed. F. Siegert and J. U. Kalms; Münster: LIT
Verlag, 2002), 72–89.
60 A.J. 8.107.
is ἀπροσδεής: he does not need anything. Ever since Xenophanes, certain qualities were attributed to the gods, qualities that were considered worthy of a god; according to Xenophanes, a god was only a true god if he acted in a fitting manner; such words as “eternal” and “constant” were used. At a later date, a sort of reversal took place, and divine nature was viewed from a different perspective: what qualities were unworthy of a god? Divine attributes were defined by their opposites: gods were no longer “eternal,” but “not temporal.” The adjective ἀπροσδεής was used to signify another one of these negative attributes.

### 3. Summary and Conclusion

I hope my paper has shown how rewarding a study of the prayers can be for a more general study of Josephus. In many passages, as we have seen, Josephus made use of prayers to introduce nuances of his own in the stories, but at the same time he used the opportunity to convey his own ideas about the Jewish religion and God. In the history, which Josephus wished to write in Greek manner, the prayers constitute a Jewish element not only because there is no other such accumulation of prayers in Greek historiography but also, and more particularly, because the prayers are put almost exclusively into the mouths of Jewish personages and addressed almost exclusively to the Jewish God.

The degree to which Josephus was influenced by his Graeco-Roman environment and by his life in Rome has often been discussed. However, it may be an interesting exercise to turn the question around: we will then see a Josephus who lives in Rome where he takes an active part in Hellenistic circles; but when he decides to write a book about the people to whom he belongs by birth, having been born in Palestine, this is where he looks for his source material. Like any other author, he is influenced by his source material; but in the final analysis, Josephus’ style and language are nevertheless those of his own Hellenistic culture.

---

62 There are a number of other texts in which this word is used (Let. Aris. 211; 2 Macc 14:35 and 3 Macc 2:9); Josephus was therefore not the only Jewish writer to ascribe this quality to God.


This paper examines the ideal of the praying community. I would like to show that this ideal was spread across cultural and religious boundaries during Greco-Roman times. It originated in pagan philosophy but was later adapted by Hellenistic Jews for apologetic reasons. I will scrutinize this process of adaptation on the example of the Essenian morning prayer depicted by the Jewish historian Flavius Josephus. For pagans, the regular prayer at sunrise was directed at the sun god. Indeed, pagan sources mention this morning prayer as a hallmark of a pious Pythagorean’s religious life. It also demonstrates the utopian character of societies described by Hellenistic authors such as in the travel accounts of Iambulus. This proves that regular prayers to the rising sun were rooted in the ideal of Hellenistic literature and closely connected with philosophical thinking. Diaspora Jews were familiar with these sources, especially since pagan authors had already described Jewish piety in accordance with the ideal of a praying community. For example, pagan sources characterized the particular spirituality of Jewish religious movements with respect to the aforementioned ideal. This was true, for instance, with the Essenes. The example of the Jewish historian Flavius Josephus also shows that Jews were familiar with this pagan perspective and deliberately adopted it in their writings. In this way, Josephus modeled his reports about the Essenes’ morning prayer after the Pythagorean prayer to the sun. One can even see how Josephus partly obscures the Jewish character of this Essenian prayer and in fact, his description of the prayer appears almost completely influenced by this pagan Vorlage.

I will begin my paper by discussing the shape and meaning of the Pythagorean prayer at sunrise. The biographical literature about Pythagoras written in late antiquity informs us that the day of the Pythagoreans was strictly regulated. Prayer at sunrise was obligatory. Before defining this morning prayer, I will briefly outline the history of the Pythagoreans and provide a short summary of the philosophical
literature with which we become better informed about their piety and philosophical doctrine.

The Pythagoreans traced back to the teachings of the Greek philosopher Pythagoras from Samos. Around 530 B.C.E., in the prime of his life, Pythagoras left this island and settled in southern Italy near Croton. There he established a community with a cultic basis that soon became renowned for its philosophical and scientific achievements. The community garnered much political influence thereby. Adherents to the Pythagoreans lived in many other cities in southern Italy and eventually joined together in a kind of union; allegedly, the Pythagoreans ruled a number of cities. The political convictions of the Pythagoreans were decidedly conservative. At about 500 B.C.E., Pythagoras himself was forced to leave Croton because of political opposition and moved to the neighboring city of Metapontum. Shortly thereafter, he died. Some years before 450 B.C.E, many cities rose up in revolt against the Pythagoreans and the ensuing conflict left meeting places destroyed; some Pythagoreans were also killed. Other members of the Pythagoreans were able to escape to the Greek motherland. Small groups were also able to regain some influence in Italy. However, the Pythagoreans ceased to flourish at the end of the fourth century B.C.E. and the movement gradually died out.¹ Pythagoras himself had left no written record of his teaching for further generations to follow and instead his philosophy was merely passed on in his school. This tradition survived the decline of the Pythagoreans, however, and was never forgotten. This proves the continuing interest in Pythagoras and his doctrine. Part of this tradition was also the increasingly idealized description of his philosophical way of life which was later absorbed by biographical literature about Pythagoras’ life, written during Hellenistic times. According to this tradition, Pythagorean ethical teachings were embodied in religious conviction. Among other things, followers rejected animal sacrifices and prayed to the rising sun every morning. Another aspect of their piety, which I shall not discuss in this paper, was the singing of hymns and communal meals taken together regularly. The morning prayer is often mentioned in Hellenistic as well as Greco-Roman accounts about Pythagoras and his followers. This literature is connected with the various influences of contemporary philosophical schools such as Platonic thinking and stoic theories. For instance,

the famous philosopher, miracle worker and wandering teacher Apollonius from Tyana, who lived in the first century C.E., reported in a biography of Pythagoras:2 "Pythagoreans did not rise from their beds after the sun rose (…) they would watch for sunrise to pray to the sun as it rose." Apollonius’ biography is lost today and we know its content only through quotation by authors or late antiquity. The quoted text is transmitted by Iamblichus’ biography of Pythagoras, who used Apollonius’ book as his source.3 Apollonius himself adhered to Pythagoras’ model in his daily life; this phenomenon is documented by Apollonius’ biography by Philostratus, who mentioned several times Apollonius’ particular veneration of the sun.4

However, the prayer to the sun is not only mentioned in the biographical literature on Pythagoras. It was also mentioned in combination with other philosophical ideas that were not specifically related to the historical doctrine of Pythagoras or his adherents from the sixth to the fifth century B.C.E., but originated in Hellenistic philosophy, that developed from the fourth century B.C.E. Among these ideas, the stoic proof for the existence of God should be stressed. This proof was based on the contemplation of the cosmos and particular celestial phenomena.5 The beauty of celestial bodies, their regular movements and above all the orbits of sun and moon, allegedly provided proof of the divine creator. Therefore, celestial bodies were also venerated as deities. The emperor and Stoic philosopher Marcus Aurelius, mirrored these cosmological speculations in his famous Meditations.6 He remarked on Pythagorean piety: “Look, said the

---


4 Philostratus, Vit. Apoll. 2.38; 7.10; 7.31 (LCL); cf. H. Strathmann, Geschichte der frühchristlichen Askese bis zur Entstehung des Mönchtums in religionsgeschichtlichen Zusammenhang, Vol. 1: Die Askese in der Umgebung des werdenden Christentums (Leipzig 1914), 301; I. Lévy, La légende de Pythagore de Grèce en Palestine (Bibliothèque de l’école des hautes études, Sciences historiques et philologiques 250; Paris, 1927), 277.


6 11.27 (LCL): Οἱ Πυθαγόρειοι ἔθεσαν εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς ἀφορμὰς, ἵνα ὑπομονημακομένῳ τῶν ἀηδῶν καὶ ὀδάστας τὰς ἔκτυφος ἔργον διανυόντων καὶ τῆς τάξεως καὶ τῆς καθαρότητος καὶ τῆς γυμνότητος.
Pythagoreans, at the sky in the morning, that we may have in remembrance those hosts of heaven that ever follow the same course and accomplish their work in the same way, and their orderly system, and their purity, and their nakedness.” In this passage, Marcus Aurelius stresses those characteristics of the stars and heavenly bodies that caused human beings to acknowledge their divine character and origin, especially because of their unchangeableness and regular orbit. The Pythagoreans meditated on just these characteristics every morning. Markus Aurelius does not mention prayer in this context however. Yet the knowledge of god had its origin in the contemplation of the rising sun and observation of the sun contributed a great deal to the quintessential philosophical life. For this reason, veneration of the sun was not only a characteristic of philosophical groups like the Pythagoreans during this time, but also punctuated literary description of utopian communities and their fictitious religiousness. Those communities venerated the heavenly bodies. Above all they prayed to the sun. A famous example that describes such an ideal state is contained in Iambulus’ writings. We only know his travel accounts through excerpts of the Greek historian Diodorus from Sicily, who lived in the middle of the first century B.C.E. Although he wrote a universal history in 40 volumes, only volumes one to five and 11 to 20 are still preserved today. We find Diodorus’ excerpt of Iambulus’ novel in his second book. According to Diodorus, Iambulus described his adventures and among them, a particular journey, upon which he embarked after his father’s death. He traveled as a merchant to Arabia, where he was captured by thieves and brought unwillingly to Ethiopia. The Ethiopians, however, sent him to the open sea in a kind of expiatory ceremony. Iambulus sailed southwards, where he discovered an island near the equator. His description of the island bears similarities to Ceylon which became known to the Greeks after

---


Alexander’s campaign. Nevertheless, Iambulus’ novel includes many fantastic details. The island’s inhabitants were taller than other known ordinary humans; the bodies were different with the tongues split into two parts. Also, the inhabitants were alleged to die only after approximately 450 years. Reportedly, Iambulus returned to Greece via Persia. His novel unites geographical information, philosophical influences, merchants’ tales and traces of myth from the Golden Age. It is the philosophical influences, which are of the most interest here for Iambulus found among the island’s inhabitants that veneration of heaven and heavenly bodies was also prevalent. Diodorus quoted the following passage from Iambulus’ novel: “And they worship as gods that which encompasses all things and the sun, and, in general, all the heavenly bodies.” Diodorus completes his excerpts with the following notes about the inhabitants’ feasts: “And at the festivals and feasts which are held among them, there are both pronounced and sung in honor of the gods hymns and spoken laudations, and especially in honor of the sun, after whom they name both the islands and themselves.”

According to the quoted texts, Iambulus discovered an ideal community that possessed religious underpinnings and orientated itself towards the recognition of divinity in the stars, the regularity of the planets’ movements and, of course, the sun. Prayer to these heavenly deities was the focus of the islanders’ piety. Neither animal sacrifices, nor existence of temples designed for worship were mentioned by Iambulus.

10 W. Kroll, “Jambulos,” PW 9, cols. 681–83, esp. 681; Rohde, Der griechische Roman, 256; Ferguson, Utopias, 126; Ehlers, “Mit dem Südwestmonsun,” 78–79.
12 Rohde, Der griechische Roman, 253; Ferguson, Utopias, 127.
15 Diodorus Siculus 2.59.2 (Oldfather, LCL): σέβονται δὲ θεοὺς τὸ περιέχον πάντα καὶ ἡλίου καὶ καθόλου πάντα τὰ οὐράνια.
16 Diodorus Siculus 2.59.7 (Oldfather, LCL): ἐν τε ταῖς ἐορταῖς καὶ ταῖς εὐαγγείαις λέγεσθαι τε καὶ ἤδεσθαι παρ’ αὐτοῖς εἰς τοὺς θεοὺς ὕμνους καὶ ἐγκωμία, μάλιστα δὲ εἰς τὸν ἡλίον, ἀν’ οὐ τὰς τε νήσους καὶ ξανατοὺς προσαγορεύουσι; on this cf. Rohde, Der griechische Roman, 248; Ferguson, Utopias, 127.
This image of Pythagorean piety and also the portrayal of prayer-oriented ideals from authors such as Iambulus indeed influenced Hellenistic Judaism. The Jews followed pagan literary models. This can be evidenced by the description of the Essenes and especially their spirituality, which is rooted in pagan sources. These pagan accounts influenced the image of the Essenes depicted by Jewish authors like Josephus. At this point, I would like to substantiate my hypothesis regarding the literary influence of pagan authors on Josephus' description of the Essenes through accounts of this Jewish group by the Roman orator Dio from Prusa and by Pliny the Elder, both of whom lived during the first century C.E. Dio from Prusa, also called Chrysostomos, mentioned in one of his speeches the πόλις εὐδαιμών of the Essenes. He located this “fortunate city” near the Dead Sea. Dio's word choice shows the influence of Greek utopian concepts about the ideal state. Unfortunately Dio’s entire speech is lost and the brief note on the Essenes is quoted by Synesius from Cyrene, who wrote about Dio in late antiquity. But Synesius stresses that Dio “praised” the Essenes (ἐπαινεῖ). This same admiration is noticeable in Pliny's account of the Essenes. Pliny creates an image of the Essenes that is clearly styled after the panegyrics of classical literature. He calls the Essenes “remarkable beyond all the other tribes in the whole world”. Both authors—Dio as well as Pliny—probably based their reports on the Essenes on a common pagan Vorlage, that transfigured the Essenes in the light of ideal philosophers. It is also remarkable that Josephus affords the same view on the Essenes as a perfect and exemplary community. Josephus was a Jewish priest that, according to his autobiography, had contact with the Essenes for some time during his youth. Thus he was rather well-informed. But Josephus drew a picture of the Essenes that shows a number of remarkable similarities with the Pythagoreans. Josephus was very well-aware of these connections and stressed them in the Antiquitates. There he wrote about the Essenes: “This is a group, which follows a way of life taught to the Greeks by Pythagoras.” Here Josephus explicitly

---


20 Nat. 5.73 (Rackham, LCL): gens ( . . . ) in toto orbe praeter ceteras mira.


22 AJ. 15.371 (Marcus, LCL): γένος δὲ τούτ’ ἔστιν διαίτη χρώμενον τῇ παρ᾽ Ἐλλησιν
equated the Essenes and the Pythagorean philosophers. In both of his main works, the *Bellum* and the *Antiquitates*, he assumed the Essenes to be a brand of Jewish Pythagoreans. This equation also shaped his description of Essenian prayer life and it might help to understand why exactly the Jewish historian reports in his own words about a "peculiar" morning prayer of the Essenes: "Their piety towards the Deity takes a peculiar form. Before the sun is up they utter no word on mundane matters, but offer to him certain prayers, which have been handed down from their forefathers, as though entreating him to rise." In this passage, Josephus probably thought of the traditional Jewish morning prayer that could be the *Shema*. This might be indicated by the words "which have been handed down from their forefathers." However, Josephus describes a prayer to the sun "entreating him to rise." It appears that Josephus wanted to bring Essenian prayer in line with pagan veneration of the sun god. It probably would be best explained by the fact that Josephus intentionally refers to Pythagorean prayers. It can also be assumed, that the Jewish historian used the same pagan source that was also read by Dio and Pliny for modeling his report after Pythagoreanism. For apologetic reasons, he wanted to characterize exemplary piety of the Essenes and thus described them in a sense that his philosophically educated Greek readers would comprehend. In fact, he did not even develop the Pythagorean form of his description. Pagans already completed this process of acculturation. Josephus simply adopted their results and fitted them into the frame of his historical work.
Josephus probably had another reason for connecting the Essenes with the Pythagoreans. Namely, the Pythagoreans possessed a special affinity with the Near East. Many authors of antiquity related the story of Pythagoras’ visit to Egypt. He went there in order to acquaint himself with the wisdom of the priests. Some of these pagan authors also reported about contacts of Pythagoras to Jewish wise men. Josephus was very well aware of this alleged dependence of Pythagoras on the Jews, which he found in pagan sources. He also cleverly used its apologetic potential for his own purposes. This is proved by an explicit quotation in his Contra Apionem that he found in the works of the Greek philosopher and grammarian Hermippus. The latter claimed that Pythagoras “was imitating and appropriating the doctrines of Jews and Thracians.” Josephus quoted this passage to prove the superiority of the Jewish religion. It influenced the history of Greek philosophy from its beginning. Therefore he also named Pythagoras as a man who expressly admired the Jews. Certainly it suggested itself to Josephus, that he ought to underpin this bold claim by binding the Essenes to the Pythagoreans. But Josephus smartly avoided making the Essenes Pythagoras’ teachers because he did not want to become mired in chronological contradictions. Josephus mentioned the Essenes for the first time in his Antiquitates during the reign of Jonathan the Hasmonean (161-143 B.C.E.). This passage suggests that Josephus knew that the Essenes originated in the second century B.C.E. Pythagoras could not have personally associated with the Essenes, because he lived and died in the sixth century B.C.E. Therefore, Josephus left the exact form of the mutual relation between Essenes and Pythagoreans very much in the dark.

To conclude my paper, I wish to stress the following points: The passages of Josephus quoted above may suggest that a pagan ideal, involving among other aspects, the morning prayer to the rising sun,
was deliberately adapted by a Jewish author and used for an apologetic description of his own religion. This adaptation may also be an interesting indication of the Hellenization of a Jewish author like Josephus, who shaped his description of the Essenes in accordance with pagan literary models. The possible influence of a pagan literary Vorlage on Josephus’ presentation of the Essenes and other Jewish groups should be discussed by further research.
PART FOUR

HISTORIES AND HISTORY
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DIE DARSTELLUNG DES FLAVISCHEN TRIUMPHZUGES
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1. EINLEITUNG


2. ZU GESCHICHTE UND BEDEUTUNG DES TRIUMPHZUGES

2.1. Geschichte

Der Triumphzug ist eine alte römische Tradition, deren Anfänge umstritten sind. Teilweise wird er auf ein altes etruskisches Neujahrs- und Inthronisationsfest zurückgeführt,² teilweise auf ein latinisches

¹ Korrekterweise sind noch die Erwähnungen des Triumphzuges bei Cassius Dio 66,12 und in den Kaiserbiografien Suetons (Vesp. 8; Tit. 6; Dom. 2) zu nennen. Da diese jedoch nur äußerst knapp und beiläufig sind, ist es m.E. legitim, sich auf die beiden erwähnten Zeugnisse zu beschränken.
Ritual.\textsuperscript{3} Allem Anschein nach gab es Triumphzüge schon seit der römischen Königszeit.\textsuperscript{4} Davon zeugen auch die so genannten \textit{fasti triumphales}, steinerne Listen, die früher an den Hauptpfilern des dreitorigen Augustusbogens neben dem Caesartempel angebracht waren und seit dem 16. Jahrhundert im Conservatorenpalast auf dem Capitol aufbewahrt werden. Sie sind eine – teilweise fiktive – Aufzählung der Triumphatoren von Romulus\textsuperscript{5} bis Lucius Cornelius Balbus, der 19 v.Chr. für seinen Sieg in Africa mit einem Triumphzug geehrt wurde. Auch wenn viele Angaben nicht historisch sind, zeugen die \textit{fasti} von einer langen Triumphzugstradition, die zur Zeit des Augustus eine besondere Wertschätzung erfuhr.\textsuperscript{6}

Waren die römischen Triumphzüge zunächst wahrscheinlich Feiern, die anlässlich eines Sieges zu Ehren Jupiters abgehalten wurden, so vermischte sich im Laufe der Zeit die Verehrung des römischen Hauptgottes mit der Verehrung des Triumphators.\textsuperscript{7} In der spätrepublikanischen und kaiserlichen Zeit entwickelte sich der Triumphzug zu einer spektakulären Großveranstaltung. Er wurde zur Inszenierung der Macht des Römischen Weltreiches und des Imperators. Im Mittelpunkt der „Show“ stand immer mehr die Überfülle der zur Schau gestellten erbeuteten Schätze.\textsuperscript{8} Der letzte Triumphzug fand 303 unter Kaiser Diocletian statt.

\textsuperscript{7} Vgl. z.B. Livius, 5,23,5; Eder, „Triumph,“ 837; Künzl, \textit{Triumph}, 94–96.
2.2. Quellen

Die antiken Quellen über Triumphzüge sind nicht sehr zahlreich. Mehrmals berichtet Plutarch (ca. 50–120 n.Chr.) über Triumphzüge, ebenso Sueton (* ca. 70 n.Chr.). Einzelne Berichte finden sich bei Diodor (1. Jh. v.Chr.), Livius (ca. 59 v.Chr.–17 n.Chr.), Appian (2. Jh. n.Chr.) und Cassius Dio (ca. 155–ca. 235 n.Chr.).


9 Rom. 16,5–8 (über den sagenhaften Triumphzug des Romulus im Jahr 753 v.Chr., den dieser noch zu Fuß begangen haben soll); Marc. 22,1–4 (über einen Triumphzug des Marcus Claudius Marcellus 211 v.Chr. außerhalb Roms in den Albanerbergen, sowie über einen „abgespeckten“ Triumphzug in Rom, die sogenannte ovatio); Aem. 32,2–34,8 (über den Triumphzug des Lucius Aemilius Paullus, 167 v.Chr.); Crass. 11,7–8 (über die ovatio des Marcus Licinius Crassus 71 v.Chr.); Luc. 37,1–4 (über den Triumphzug des Lucius Licinius Lucullus 63 v.Chr.); Pomp. 45 (über den zweitägigen Triumphzug des Pompeius 61 v.Chr.); Caes. 55,1–4 (Summarium über drei Triumphzüge Caesars 46 v.Chr.).

10 Caes. 37,49,51 (Summarium über fünf Triumphhe des Caesar, sowie einige Einzelheiten aus dessen Triumph über die Gallier 45 v.Chr.); Tib. 17,20 (über den Triumphzug des Tiberius 12 n.Chr.); Nero 25 (über den Einzug Neros in Rom, der gewisse Ähnlichkeiten mit einem Triumphzug hatte).

11 Diodor 31,7,9–12 (über den Triumphzug des Lucius Aemilius Paullus 167 v.Chr.).

12 Livius 34,52,2–12 (über den dreitägigen Triumphzug des Titus Quinctius Flaminius, 194 v.Chr.).

13 Appian, Hist. rom. 12,17,116–117 (über den Triumphzug des Pompeius 61 v.Chr.).

14 Cassius Dio 51,21,2–22,3 (über die Triumphzüge des Octavian 29 v.Chr.).

15 Vgl. dazu Beard, „Triumph“, 544 ff.

man diese Fragen beantwortet, es dürfte unumstritten sein, dass Josep­
phus bestens über die Ereignisse um den Triumphzug informiert war.

Neben den Berichten über Triumphzüge in der Literatur finden
sich auch Darstellungen in der Kunst, vor allem in Reliefform. Es
handelt sich dabei in der Regel um zeitgenössische Darstellungen.
Vor allem aus der Kaiserzeit stammen die erhaltenen Darstellungen
von Triumphzügen sowie viele Kunstwerke mit der Triumphalsymbolik
der Victorien und Trophäen. Unter Augustus bildete sich die Vor­
stellung vom Kaiser als ewigem Triumphator heraus.17 Ebenfalls unter
Augustus wurde Victoria auf Statuen, Reliefs, Gemmen und Münzen
zum Symbol der Unbesiegbarkeit Roms. Die Identität von Rom und
Sieg wurde so bei vielen Menschen im Bewusstsein verankert.18

2.3. Der Verlauf eines Triumphzuges

Wie die genannten Quellen zeigen, hatten Triumphzüge meist einen
ähnlichen Verlauf. Das Heer übernachtete samt dem siegreichen
Feldherrn in Zelten oder in Gebäuden auf dem Marsfeld, das außerhalb
der römischen Stadtgrenze lag.19 Dort stellte sich der Zug am näch­
sten Morgen auf. Durch das Triumphtor wurde die Stadt betreten.20
Der Weg führte durch die Gemüse- und Viehmärkte am Tiber (forum
holitorium und forum boarium) zum Circus maximus, um den Palatin
herum und über das Forum Romanum bis zum Capitol, wo vor
dem Jupitertempel ein abschließendes Opfer dargebracht wurde.21
Nach diesem offiziellen Ende des Zuges waren weitere Aktionen
obligatorisch. Dazu gehörte die Veranstaltung eines Mahls für aus­
gewählte Gäste, sowie oft auch Geldzuwendungen an Soldaten und
römische Bürger.22

17 Das erste Forum, das von Triumphalsymbolik beherrscht war, war das im Jahr
2 v.Chr. eingeweihte Augustusforum, in dessen Mitte sich vermutlich ein Standbild
des Augustus in der Triumphalquadriga befand, ein Zeichen seines ewigen Triumphes.
18 Vgl. Künzl, Triumph, pass.
19 Für den Feldherrn stand das große Gebäude der villa publica zur Verfügung,
das Heer übernachtete wohl in Zeltlagern, in der Kaiserzeit auch in Theatern,
Stadien und Thermen, die auf dem Marsfeld errichtet worden waren; vgl. Künzl,
Triumph, 32 ff.
20 Der zeitweise in der Forschung beliebten These, es handle sich bei dem
Durchzug durch das Triumphtor in die Stadt um ein Reinigungsritual, ist bereits
mehrfach widersprochen worden, da es im Prinzip keine Belege dafür gibt. Vgl.
dazu Künzl, Triumph, 41–42.
21 Vgl. Künzl, Triumph, 16.82; Eder, „Triumph, Triumphzug,“ 837–38 mit Karte
und Legende, 839 ff.

Neben den einfachen Triumphzügen, die nur einen Tag dauerten, gab es – gerade in der Zeit der späten Republik – auch mehrtägige. Die Zuschauermenge zur Kaiserzeit wird von Künzl auf 300 000 bis 400 000 geschätzt.

2.4. Der Triumphzug der Flavier 71 n.Chr.

In der zweiten Junihälfte des Jahres 71 n.Chr. feierte Kaiser Vespasian zusammen mit seinem Sohn Titus, der sich im Jüdischen Krieg als erfolgreicher Feldherr erwiesen hatte, in prunkvoller Weise den Sieg über die Juden. Dabei präsentierten sich die beiden siegreichen Militärführer auf den für Triumphatoren üblichen Quadrigen, während der jüngere Sohn Vespasians, Domitian, auf einem Pferd nebenher ritt. Der Triumphzug war somit nicht nur, wie sonst üblich, die Siegesfeier eines einzelnen Imperators, sondern gleichzeitig eine gut inszenierte Inthronisationsfeier der neuen flavischen Dynastie.

---

23 Künzl, Triumph, 79.
25 Vgl. z.B. Livius 34,52,2–12; Plutarch, Aem. 32,2–34,8.
26 Vgl. Künzl, Triumph, 72.
3. Die Darstellung des Triumphzuges auf dem Titusbogen


3.1. Das “Triumphatorenrelief”


---

32 Der Triumphzug ist auch Thema des langgezogenen Frieses über dem Durchgang; s. dazu Pfanner, Titusbogen, 82–90; Künzl, Triumph, 21–24.
33 Liktoren nannte man die Amtsdieners des Magistrats, deren Aufgaben vor allem die Begleitung der Beamten, den Strafvollzug und den Opferdienst umfassten; vgl. Gerhard Schrot, „Lictor“, Der kleine Pauly 3 (1979), 645–46.
36 Vgl. Pfanner, Titusbogen, 81–82, 98.
Relief als Begleiter des Titus dargestellt, allerdings eine Ebene tiefer als der siegreiche Imperator: Während Titus erhoben über die Menschen ringsherum auf dem Wagen fährt, läuft der Gott nebenher.


Vor der Quadriga ist eine weitere Göttin abgebildet. Als Gespannführerin nimmt auch sie den Platz eines Sklaven ein. Dabei handelt es sich um Virtus, die Göttin der Tugend, die vor allem Mut und Tapferkeit repräsentiert. Sie unterstützt Titus bei seinem Triumphzug, wie sie ihm auch bei seinem Feldzug gegen das jüdische Volk beige-standen hatte.


### 3.2. Das „Beuterelief“

Das „Beuterelief“ zeigt einen Ausschnitt aus dem Triumphzug, der in logistischer Hinsicht der im „Triumphatorenrelief“ dargestellten

---

37 Dies ist auch bei anderen kaiserzeitlichen Abbildungen der Fall, so zum Beispiel auf einem Marmorrelief vom triumphierenden Kaiser Marc Aurel, das heute im Konservatorenpalast in Rom zu sehen ist.


39 Zu den verschiedenen Triumphzugsteilen s.o. 2.c.
41 Da die Reliefs ursprünglich bemalt waren, ist davon auszugehen, dass die ersten Betrachter die Tafelaufschriften lesen konnten. Heute sind sie wie alle anderen Farbspuren verschwunden. Vgl. dazu Pfanner, _Titusbogen_, 56.74.
44 So Künzl, _Triumph_, 27; ähnlich Hachlili, _Menorah_, 50.
Die beiden Personen im Bild, die keine Funktion als Träger der Schilder oder der Beutestücke haben – eine davon mit abgeschlagenem Kopf links neben der Menora, die andere stark zerstört links neben dem Schaubrottisch – sind wahrscheinlich bekannte Personen, die im Krieg eine wichtige Rolle gespielt hatten.  


47 Vgl. Josephus, B.J. 7.152; Sueton, Dom., 2; Cassius Dio 65,12.

48 So z.B. Eltester, „Leuchter,“ 70 A.16; Kleiner, „Triumph,“ 42; Pfanner, Titusbogen, 72; Roehmer, Bogen, 255.
Die Darstellung ist allerdings nicht eindeutig genug, um ihre Identität zu klären.\textsuperscript{49} Die Aussage ist jedoch klar: Die flavische Familie wurde bei ihrem Triumphzug von Gottheiten begleitet und unterstützt.

Die Deutung der Figurengruppe auf der Attika als die flavischen Triumphatoren gibt Aufschluss darüber, wie der Bogen im Hintergrund des Reliefs zu verstehen ist. Da nicht davon auszugehen ist, dass im Jahr 71 bereits ein Triumphbogen für die Flavier errichtet worden war, ebenso wenig eine Umgestaltung der \textit{porta triumphalis} durch eine neue Bogenkrönung in Betracht kommt, handelt es sich bei dem Bogen auf dem Relief nicht um ein real existierendes Bauwerk. Er ist vielmehr symbolisch „als ein Zeichen des Triumphes zu verstehen, den die Vertreter der flavischen Dynastie gemeinsam errungen haben“\textsuperscript{50} und zwar geht es um einen von den Göttern unterstützten Triumph.

Vor diesem Hintergrund ist auch das dominierende Motiv des Bildes, der siebenarmige Leuchter, zu interpretieren. Die Menora aus dem Jerusalemer Tempel hatte einen hohen Wiedererkennungswert\textsuperscript{51} und wurde wahrscheinlich auch von vielen Römern als jüdisches Symbol verstanden. Dass der Leuchter auf dem Relief durch den flavischen Triumphbogen getragen wurde, verdeutlichte somit den Sieg der Flavier über das jüdische Volk.\textsuperscript{52} Eine theologische Aussage – etwa den Sieg der römischen Götter über den jüdischen Gott beinhaltend – dürfte jedoch nicht intendiert gewesen sein, da sonst die untergeordnete Darstellung der römischen Gottheiten, die lediglich auf dem abgebildeten Bogen als Diener der Flavier vorkommen, nicht erklärbar wäre.

3.3. Zusammenfassung

Die Funktion der Götter, wie sie am Titusbogen dargestellt sind, ist, den Flaviern zu dienen. Honos, Virtus und Victoria unterstützen Titus auf der Triumphatorenquadriga, Victoria preist den flavischen

\textsuperscript{49} Während Kleiner, „Triumph,“ 42, und Eltester, „Leuchter,“ 70 A.16, an Virtus denken, favorisiert Pfanner, \textit{Titusbogen}, 72, Minerva.

\textsuperscript{50} Roehmer, \textit{Bogen}, 221. Vgl. Künzl, \textit{Triumph}, 22: „Es handelt sich um die für den Titusbogen bezeichnende Mischung von Realität und Ideologie, die man auch am Triumphwagenrelief... ablesen kann“\textsuperscript{4}.


\textsuperscript{52} Vgl. Roehmer, \textit{Bogen}, 255.


Eine Schilderung des gleichen Triumphzugs, die jedoch in theologischer Hinsicht von der Darstellung der Reliefs völlig verschieden ist, findet sich im siebten Buch des Bellum Judaicum bei Flavius Josephus. Im folgenden soll zunächst ein kurzer Überblick über den Text gegeben werden. Anschließend sollen die theologischen Implikationen des Textes herausgearbeitet werden, um dann schließlich den allgemeinen Duktus des Berichts näher beschreiben zu können.

4.1. Aufbau und Eigenart von BJ. 7.123–162


123–131 Vorbereitungen zum Triumphzug
132–152 Beschreibung des Triumphzuges
132–133 Lob des zur Schau gestellten Reichtums
134–138 wertvolle Gegenstände: Geräte, Stoffe, Schmuck, Göttbilder, Schmuck an Tieren und an der Kleidung von Trägern, Ehrenpersonen und Gefangenen
139-147 die Schaugerüste und ihre Bilder, die vom Krieg erzählen
148-150 die Beutestücke aus dem Jerusalemer Tempel
151 Statuen der Nike
152 Vespasian, Titus und Domitian
153-156 Schluss des Triumphzuges
157 abschließendes Resümee
158-162 Anhang: die Aufbewahrung der erbeuteten Gegenstände
158-159 Bau und Ausstattung des Friedenstempels
160 Aufbewahrung von Schätzen aus aller Welt im Friedenstempel
161-162 Aufbewahrung der von Vespasian wertgeschätzten jüdischen Ritualien im Friedenstempel und in seinem Palast


4.2. Kultobjekte, religiöse Handlungen und die römische Tradition in B.J. 7.123–162

Um die theologischen Implikationen von B.J. 7.123–162 herauszuarbeiten, wird der Text im folgenden im Hinblick auf religiös bedeutsame Begriffe und Aussagen untersucht. Dabei finden drei Kategorien besondere Beachtung:

1. Kultobjekte: Dazu zählen der Isistempel (123), beim Triumphzug mitgeführte Götterstatuen (136), im Jüdischen Krieg zerstörte

53 Zum historischen Aufbau eines Triumphzuges s. o. 2.c.
Heiligtümer (144), der Jerusalemer Tempel und die in ihm erbeuteten Ritualgegenstände (148–150; 161–162), Statuen der Siegesgöttin (151), der Tempel des Jupiter Capitolinus (153) und der Tempelbezirk der Friedensgöttin (158)

2. religiöse Handlungen: Im einzelnen sind dies Gebete der Imperatoren (128; 155), Opfer (131; 155), sowie die Bewahrung des Tempelvorhanges und der Tora durch Vespasian (162).

3. Verweise auf die römische Tradition: Sie finden sich in Bezug auf kaiserliche Gewänder (124), Gebete (128; 155), das Frühstück der Soldaten (129), das Triumphtor (130) und die Exekution des feindlichen Feldherrn (153; 154).


Beim Triumphtor, durch das – wie Josephus betont – „schon immer“ (αὐτί) die Triumphzüge geleitet wurden (130), begehen Vespasian und Titus die nächste kultische Handlung: sie opfern „den Göttern, deren

54 Der griechische Text lässt offen, ob die Flavier im Isistempel selbst oder lediglich in der Nähe des Isistempels übernachtet hatten, da sich ἐκεῖ (dort) sowohl auf τοῦ τῆς Ἰσιδος ἱεροῦ (den Tempel der Isis) als auch auf πλησίον (nahe) beziehen lässt. Die meisten Übersetzer entscheiden sich aus inhaltlichen Gründen für die letztgenannte Möglichkeit (so z.B. Michel und Bauernfeind sowie Thackeray); vgl. auch Beard, „Triumph,“ 557 A.34.


Desweiteren sind in 144 Abbildungen von im Krieg abgebrannten Heiligtümern (πῦρ . . . ἐνείμευον ἵεροῖς) erwähnt. Es ist unsicher, ob sie mit konkreten galiläischen bzw. judäischen Synagogen identifiziert werden können,56 oder ob es sich um einen vorgegebenen Bildinhalt handelte, der dem römischen Publikum wie bei Triumphzügen allgemein üblich eine von mehreren Facetten des gewonnenen Krieges vor Augen führen sollte. In der Darstellung des Josephus sind die

55 Ähnlich Michel und Bauernfeind, Flavius Josephus, 244 A.70.
56 So Michel und Bauernfeind, Flavius Josephus, 245 A.74.
Heiligtümer auf jeden Fall Teil der im Krieg zerstörten Orte. Eine religiöse Bedeutung tragen sie nicht.


Nach der erstaunlich knappen Erwähnung der Flavier, die im Zug den zur Schau gestellten Kostbarkeiten folgten (152), wendet sich Josephus in 153–156 dem Abschluss der Feierlichkeiten zu. Der Triumphzug endet am Tempel des Jupiter Capitolinus (153). Es war alte Tradition (_CONDĘ γὰρ πάλαιὸν πάτριον), dass der Zug dort anhielt

---

57 S. die vielfältigen Erwähnungen des Sabbats bei antiken Autoren wie z.B. Ovid, Seneca und Plutarch; vgl. dazu Menahem Stern, Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism, 3 Bände, Jerusalem: The Israel Academy of Sciencees and Humanities, 1974–1984, pass.
58 So auch Künzl, Triumph, 26–27.
Wer dient wem?


Mit dem Resümee in 157, das den Triumphzug als Siegeszug über die Feinde in der Vergangenheit, als Ende der inneren Wirren Roms in der Gegenwart und als Beginn einer glücklichen Zukunft preist,


Die Beschreibung des Josephus endet mit dem griechischen Verb φυλάττειν. Es verdient Beachtung, dass dessen hebräisches Äquivalent רכּוּ (bewahren) ein fester Terminus in Bezug auf das jüdische Gesetz ist. Das Gesetz zu bewahren entspricht dem, was in Deut 6,3 das Gesetz selbst für seinen Gebrauch vorschreibt: du sollst es hören, Israel, und bewahren (ךֵּֽמַּעַת הַשֵּׁם שֵּֽמַּעִ֥ית יִשְֹרָאֵֽל וְלִבְּלֵֽךְ). Die Septuaginta übersetzt: καὶ άκουσον Ἰσραήλ καὶ φύλάξοι. Die Tora zu bewahren ist nach biblischem Denken, wie auch die zitierte Bibelstelle zeigt, die Voraussetzung dafür, sie zu tun. Für die Bewahrung der Tora

---


4.3. Die Aussagerichtung des Berichts über den Triumphzug in B.J. 7.123–162

Insgesamt zeigt sich, dass der Triumphzugsbericht des Josephus an historischen Ereignissen orientiert ist. Die Abfolge des Triumphzuges von den Vorbereitungen im Morgengrauen bis zu den Festmählern, die den Tag beschließen, stimmt – nach allem, was wir heute anhand der Quellen belegen und vermuten können – mit den historischen Ereignissen überein. Auch die Aufzählung der mitgeführten Beutestücke dürfte der historischen Realität entsprechen. Auf einer zweiten Ebene besitzt der Textabschnitt des Bellum Judaicum jedoch auch eine hohe symbolische Aussagekraft. Sie erschließt sich durch die Eigenheiten der Erzählung, die im wesentlichen in drei Punkten zusammengefasst werden können.


2. Eine weitere Besonderheit der Triumphzugsdarstellung des Josephus ist die bereits von verschiedenen Forschern konstatierte auffällige Hervorhebung der Traditionstreue der Flavier. Vor allem dort, wo Josephus religiöse Handlungen schildert, betont er, dass alles geordnet nach römischer, alter Tradition vor sich geht. Gemäß dem Charakter von B.J. 7.123–162 als flavischem Propaganda-

---

60 Vgl. Michel und Bauernfeind, Flavius Josephus, 241 A.66 (Exkurs XX); Beard, „Triumph“, 554.
bericht\textsuperscript{61} und zugleich Höhepunkt des \textit{Bellum Judaicum}\textsuperscript{62} können die Gründe für diese Darstellung in zwei Richtungen gesucht werden. Zum einen entspricht die Traditionstreue dem Selbstverständnis der flavischen Dynastie, die den Anspruch erhob, an die alte Ordnung der julisch-claudischen Zeit vor Nero anzuknüpfen.\textsuperscript{63} Josephus trug somit durch die Art seiner Berichterstattung dazu bei, den flavischen Kaisern Sympathien im traditionsliebenden römischen Volk zu sichern. Auf der anderen Seite gelingt es Josephus als jüdischem Schriftsteller, der seine Religion nie verleugnet hat, durch seine Art der Darstellung die pagane Rituale zu rechtfertigen, die den Triumphzug begleiten. Wie Bernd Schröder gezeigt hat, ist die Treue gegenüber den eigenen Gebräuchen, den πάτριοι νόμοι, für Josephus ein Grundwert, den Juden \textit{und} pagane Römer teilen.\textsuperscript{64} Indem Josephus immer wieder unterstreicht, dass die einzelnen Handlungen während des Triumphzugs genau nach alter römischer Sitte geschehen, versucht er, eine Basis herzustellen, die ihm und möglicherweise auch anderen Juden\textsuperscript{65} hilft, die mit dem Triumph verbundene Religiosität zu tolerieren. Indem er die Opfer und Gebete der Flavier beim Triumphzug als Teil der römischen Tradition sah, konnten sie als Akte der Frömmigkeit und nicht als Götzenkult gewertet werden.


\textsuperscript{61} So Beard, “Triumph,” 556–58.

\textsuperscript{62} So Michel und Bauernfeind, \textit{Flavius Josephus}, 240 A.66 (Exkurs XX).


5. Schluss


66 Dies beobachtet auch Künzl, Triumph, 14.


“Winners are grinners”—a motto that sums up the way we reflect on achievements that range from the sporting arena to the desolation of a battlefield. Those who triumph can gloat and write their own authorised version of what happened. In Judea, in 70 C.E. there was a clear winner. The city of Jerusalem was largely destroyed and as victors the Romans could “remember” the uprising in Judea as they saw fit. For the Flavians it provided a wave on which they could ride all the way to the beach. Here was a victory for Roman rule under its new leadership. They could claim peace was being restored, even while other spot fires were still flaring up in parts of the empire.

Ironically, no literary account of substance written by the victors has survived. Instead, we have the account of Josephus, one of the vanquished Jews. To continue the ironic dimension of this episode in history, Josephus is generally regarded as being sympathetic to the Romans, opposing the war and readily accepting the patronage of his captors. One of the clearest examples of this pro-Roman stance is the supposed complimentary portrait of Titus. The eldest son of Vespasian is given prime billing in the account to such an extent that Josephus is credited with being part of the effort to construct a positive public image of Titus. The following discussion does not question the presence of a positive dimension to the portrayal of Titus and his family in Josephus’ *Bellum Judaicum*. Instead, it is my intention to question whether the portrait should be labelled as a positive one. It will be argued that Josephus conformed to aspects of accepted public speech regarding the image of Titus, but that he was also reacting critically against that public speech, rejecting some of the bold claims being made about Titus’ supposed prowess. We will commence with a brief review of the way Josephus’ portrait is employed in existing scholarship. We will then outline Roman attitudes to the issue of what constitutes a good commander and compare this outline with the depiction of Titus in the *Bellum*. In the
third part we will outline the public image of Titus evident in Roman sources and compare that image with Josephus’ comments. In the final part of the paper we will propose an explanation for the subtle nature of Josephus’ critical portrait of Titus.

1. THE RECEPTION OF JOSEPHUS’ PORTRAIT OF TITUS IN SCHOLARSHIP

Titus stands out as the central character among the many Romans who appear in the narrative. His prominent role is flagged from the outset in the preface (B.J. 1.10, 25, 27–28). Although it is not until Book 3 that we are introduced to Titus as a participant in the conflict, he becomes the dominant figure in the description of the siege of Jerusalem from Book 5 onwards. This prominence is evident in his role as a participant in the actions as described by Josephus, in his numerous speeches and his reflections on the progress of the war.

It is not surprising that the prominence of Titus in the narrative has often attracted the notice of scholars. Almost without exception, this portrait of Titus is deemed to be a positive one. It is claimed Josephus was actively trying to help to enhance the public image of Titus.1 Where debate remains is over the motivation of this effort to promote a positive image of Titus. To some the portrait is the product of official Flavian propaganda, commissioned by the new regime as part of a concerted effort to win public support.2 To others the positive account is more like a panegyric derived from a personal commitment to repay and honour the protection afforded to Josephus by Vespasian and Titus.3 Although the nature of Josephus’ motiva-

---


2 For example, R. Laqueur, Der jüdische Historiker Flavius Josephus: ein biographischer Versuch auf neuer quellenkritischer Grundlage (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1970 [= Giessen: Münchow, 1920]).

tion for providing the positive portrait continues to be debated, the net effect remains the same. Josephus is an active part of the process of constructing the positive image of Titus in Rome. He is pro-Flavian in outlook. In essence, the vanquished Josephus sides with the victors.

Three elements of Josephus’ account normally feature as the evidence upon which the positive portrait is based. One is the ability of Titus as a commander. He displays great courage, regularly averting disaster by his personal involvement in the fighting, including engaging in hand-to-hand combat against the rebels (B.J. 5.56–59, 75, 81, 86–87, 288, 295; 6.245). Titus is repeatedly cited among the feats of individual bravery mentioned in the Bellum, with the highlight being his saving of the 10th legion (B.J. 5.97). He is calm and decisive in the face of mortal danger. The second element is the compassion and clemency of Titus. These character traits are displayed consistently in relation to the fate of Jerusalem and the Temple. Titus is depicted as taking every possible step imaginable to preserve the Temple. It is his stated motivation, right from the outset in the preface (B.J. 1.10), in all his speeches (B.J. 3.472–484, 495–496; 5.362–419; 6.33–53, 94–110, 328–350) and most significantly, in the meeting held with his staff before the final assault (6.236–243). Titus’ clemency also extended to people, with Josephus being the most obvious example (B.J. 3.346–351; 4.627–629). The third element is the reference to Titus providing his approval of the account (Vita 361–363, C. Ap. 1.50–51). These two brief asides act like the seal on an official document, verifying the portrait as one that found favour with the emperor.

Supporting these three points is an implied principle regarding Josephus’ worldview. Josephus’ natural tendency was to be in sympathy with Titus on social and political grounds. As an aristocrat who was part of the ruling elite in Judea, Josephus knew the benefits of Roman rule and the futility of opposing Rome. He had been educated on such concepts and was therefore opposed to the war and saw Titus as helping to restore proper order.

---


5 The question of historical responsibility for the destruction of the Temple lies outside the scope of this paper. Note that all existing discussion of the topic has been framed in the context that Josephus was trying to help Titus.
What we are left with is a one-dimensional portrait that seeks to show Titus in the best light possible, whether as a paid advertisement and/or as an expression of thanks. What contours are evident relate to the exact extent that Josephus wants the narrative to be dominated by matters Roman as opposed to matters Jewish. There is, however, reason to be far more cautious in how we assess Josephus’ portrait of Titus than is currently evident. Two much neglected but important pieces of evidence regarding the portrait require further assessment. One is the presentation of Titus as a commander. Although Titus’ military activity is regularly cited, this crucial aspect of the portrait has not been properly grounded in the Roman setting. It is important to determine how Josephus’ presentation of Titus as a commander interacts with existing Roman notions of good commanders. The second piece of evidence is also noticeable by its absence in the existing discussion. It is the dedication on the triumphal arch in the Circus Maximus erected during Titus’ reign, boasting of his great success over the Jews. The existence of the dedication makes it appropriate to reconsider whether Josephus’ portrait is simply part of an effort to construct a favourable public image of Titus. It is possible that Josephus was, in fact, responding to an existing public image with a counter view. An examination of the two contexts, Roman attitudes regarding the requirements for being a good commander and the public image of Titus, is in order to determine the exact extent to which Josephus’ sympathy lay with the victors when it came to constructing his portrait of Titus.

2. ROMAN ATTITUDES REGARDING A GOOD COMMANDER

There was no officially sanctioned job description for being a general in the Roman army. However, there is a substantial amount of literature from which it is possible to identify key areas of activity in which a good commander was expected to excel. There are notable examples of Roman commanders in action in several late Republican and early Imperial period texts, making reference to the activities of such figures as Pompey, Julius Caesar, Corbulo and Agricola. To these practical examples can be added the mid-first century C.E. military manual, Onasander’s The General. While the examples of the known historical figures generally require little explanation, the inclusion of Onasander warrants brief comment. We cannot be certain
of the exact extent to which his manual related to existing practices and/or accepted principles.\(^6\) However, military manuals were a known entity by the first century C.E. and manuals on other aspects of life were common. Onasander was clearly working within a well-founded genre.\(^7\) Furthermore, there is an overlap between the key principles of what constitutes a good commander according to Onasander with the main examples cited in the narrative texts.\(^8\) As such, the following outline will use his manual as the basic guide to which relevant examples can be added.

There were three main areas in which the commander was expected to excel. One relates to the safeguarding of the army at all times. Attention must be paid to the proper disposition of the troops (Strategicus 15–22, 24, 31) on the battlefield. The commander must ensure the safety of his troops while en route (6–7), provide secure fortified camps while in enemy territory (8), provide sufficient guards at night (10.4) and keep the troops in a state of readiness through training and other activities (10.1). The army also needs to be protected by undertaking a thorough inspection of the enemy camp (10.8), the use of spies (10.3) and appropriate stratagems to trick the enemy (21.9; 22.2).\(^9\) It is also important for the commander not to pursue an enemy without taking due caution (11.1) nor for him to ignore any information provided (11.2). In relation to sieges Onasander refers to the need for the besieging army to be protected from assault (40–41) and the necessity of appropriate equipment to successfully undertake the siege (42.3). It is notable that Tacitus places great

---


\(^{9}\) Frontinus also places great emphasis on the role of various strategies on the part of a good commander during and after a battle (*Strategemata* 1.1–12; 2.1–3, 4–5, 7–8, 11–12). It is interesting that of the few imperial period figures cited Vespasian and Domitian are named but Titus does not appear among any of the exempla offered (*Strategemata* 1.1.8; 1.3.10; 2.3.23; 2.11.7; 2.11.17; 4.6.4).
emphasis on Agricola being successful because of his ability to organise the disposition of his troops in an effective manner (Agr. 20, 22). In his account of the siege of Bourges Julius Caesar describes how he endeavoured to protect the siege works and his troops by judicious positioning (Bell. gall. 7.22–28).

The second main area of activity associated with a good commander is the provision of appropriate discipline among the troops. Good order is important to maintain, in terms of appearance and formation (27–28, 30). Stratagems can be used to help encourage the troops in difficult situations. It is important that the commander ensures precise orders (10.9) are passed down the chain of command (25) to maintain order in battle. Indiscriminate pillaging and murder of the prisoners should be avoided (35; see also 42.8). Furthermore, those who surrender should be treated humanely in order to avoid turning the enemy into desperate fighters (38.1). Tacitus is loud in his acclaim of Corbulo and Agricola for their effective use of firm discipline among the troops under their respective command (Ann. 11.18–20; 13.35–39; 15.26; Agr. 20).

The third main area of activity is the personal conduct of the commander. In battle the general must avoid making rash decisions but be able to think quickly on the spot (32). He must display confidence, especially when the troops are fearful (13) and he must ensure the troops are not dominated by fear nor overcome with a lack of caution (14.1). He should call upon his staff to offer advice (3). After a successful battle sacrifices of thanksgiving should be offered and troops should be rewarded for their valour (34). Most important of all, at no stage should the general become directly involved in the actual fighting. Onasander claims that “the duty of the general is to ride by the ranks on horseback, show himself to those in danger, praise the brave, threaten the cowardly, encourage the lazy, fill up gaps, transpose a company if necessary, bring aid to the weary, anticipate the crisis, the hour, and the outcome” (33.6).

Plutarch expresses the same basic principle about the commander not becoming involved in the fighting at the outset of his account

---

10 Onasander also comments on the key elements associated with selecting a good general. The most important factor is the persons’ character (Strategicus 2). They must be “self-restrained, vigilant, frugal, hardened to labour, alert, free from avarice, neither too young nor too old, indeed a father of children if possible, a ready speaker, and a man with a good reputation” (1.1). Wealth and family connections are seen to be the wrong basis on which to appoint a general (1.19–25).
of the lives of Pelopidas and Marcellus. He states "no-one demands that a general should risk his life in fighting like a common soldier" (Pel. 2.4). It would appear Plutarch’s decision to focus on this theme as a flaw common to the lives of Pelopidas and Marcellus would strike an accord with his audience. The same situation applies with the examples of actual commanders—with very few exceptions the commander is not depicted as regularly entering the battle to fight. Agricola oversees the battle from near the front (Agr. 18). Although attacked by enemy troops, it appears that Pompey came under threat not because he was actually fighting but because he was positioned close to the front, the normal location for the commander during battle (Plutarch, Pomp. 19.35). Julius Caesar provides a very clear example of how he also stationed himself close to the front but did not actively engage in the battle. Fighting against the Nervii he describes how the situation on the right wing was so dire that it required his intervention. However, Caesar never suggests he actually engaged in battle. Instead, he reforms the line, rallies the troops and issues orders (Bell. gall. 2.25). The principle was simple, "where our men were in difficulties I sent up reinforcements" (Bell. gall. 7.85). It was not the role of the commander to fight.

In the light of the preceding outline of Roman expectations regarding the behaviour of a good commander, the portrait provided by Josephus no longer reads as a simple case of heaping praise on Titus. In all three areas of command there are examples of good and bad behaviour on the part of Titus. Significantly, what stands out most about the portrait is that the balance lies firmly on the negative side of the scale.

11 Marius (Plutarch, Mar. 20) is a possible exception to this principle while Cotta’s involvement in the fighting was by accident rather than design (Bell. gall. 5.33). See A. Goldsworthy, ‘‘Instinctive Genius: The depiction of Caesar the general,’’ in Julius Caesar as Artful Reporter. The War Commentaries as Political Instruments (ed. K. Welch and A. Powell; London: Duckworth, 1998), 193–219.

12 Note also how Julius Caesar dealt with the trouble at the siege of Alesia, sending Labienus to assist rather than personally intervening (Bell. gall. 7.86). See also Bell. civ. 3.88–94 regarding the approach adopted at Pharsalus.

13 Petronius is probably the best example of a good Roman general according to Josephus. A. Goldsworthy, In the Name of Rome: The Men who won the Roman Empire (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 2003), 290–315, outlines the activity of Titus in Judea but does so accepting the general view that Josephus was only interested in presenting a positive portrait of his Roman patron (213). For a counter view see B. Jones, “The Reckless Titus,” in Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History VI (ed. C. Deroux; Bruxelles: Latomus, 1992), 408–20. Jones also presumes Josephus is only trying to provide a positive account of Titus' activity.
The first area of activity is the overall organisation of the campaign to ensure the safety of the army. On the positive Titus consults with his staff on several occasions, oversees the location of some camps and employs such tactics as the building of a siege wall (B.J. 5.276, 446, 491-496; 6.149, 220). There are, however, also a number of ways in which Titus fails to ensure appropriate organisational decisions. The positioning of the initial camps and the protection of the siege equipment is far from effective (B.J. 5.67-84, 275-287, 291-295, 479-485). Although these are often used as examples of Titus' personal intervention to "save the day" such interventions should not have been required in the first place, nor should it have been Titus who intervened by fighting. The initial assault on the second wall was unsuccessful, apparently because the breach in the wall was too small—a decision of Titus (B.J. 5.331-341). Although Titus rectified the situation in the preparation for the next attack it was an inappropriate error in the first place (B.J. 5.346).

There are several examples of Titus utilising certain stratagems while being in command. On the positive side, the prime examples occur during the siege. After the failure to win an immediate victory Titus ordered all the troops to be paraded before the walls to receive their pay (B.J. 5.348-356). On another occasion captured Jews were crucified in view of the defenders (B.J. 5.289). Both schemes could be viewed as attempts to deflate the spirit of the Jewish defenders. On the negative ledger, however, Titus was foiled by a ruse when given his first command. Attacking Gischala Titus parleyed with John, who is depicted as persuading Titus to wait until the Sabbath was over before accepting the surrender of the town (B.J. 4.92-111). Titus obliged, withdrawing some distance from the town only to find the next day that John had escaped overnight (B.J. 4.112-116).

In the realm of discipline Titus is both good and bad. There are examples of Titus punishing troops for their lack of order and of him offering warnings about falling for various ruses instigated by the defenders (B.J. 5.121-128, 316; 6.155). Despite these efforts of Titus there are also a number of indications that he was not in control of the troops. The ruses of the defenders repeatedly dupe unsuspecting Roman troops (B.J. 5.109-114, 318-329). Furthermore, at

---

14 At the same time, this particular stratagem defied the principle of not forcing the defenders to become desperate because they saw no hope of escape.
the most important point in the assault, the capture of the Temple, the troops openly disobey the orders of Titus on more than one occasion without there being any suggestion that they were subse-

It is in the third aspect of command, Titus’ personal conduct in battle where the portrait is most damning. It is only in the final assault on the Temple that Titus is depicted as adhering to the principle of being at hand but not actually engaging in battle (B.J. 6.131–133). Elsewhere the portrait provided by Josephus is the exact opposite to the recommended course of action. Repeatedly Titus is depicted as leading the attack and/or intervening to save the situation (B.J. 5.486; 6.68). Josephus goes so far as to state that Titus would have even led the final assault on the Temple but for the persistent advice of his staff (B.J. 6.132). As presented by Josephus, Titus is a hands-on general, right in the thick of the battle. Such supposed personal bravery, however, runs counter to the notion of the general being near to the fighting to oversee what happens but not actually directly engaged in battle on a regular basis.15

Drawing on the context of Roman attitudes on being a good com-
mander provides an important corrective to any enthusiasm for a simple positive reading of Josephus’ portrait of Titus’ military activ-
ity. This point is no more obvious than in the most often cited fea-
ture of the so-called positive image, Titus’ bravery in his personal involvement in the fighting. What Josephus provides is far from a flat one-dimensional portrait of Titus. It has nuance that requires explanation.

3. THE PUBLIC IMAGE OF TITUS

It is generally agreed that the Flavian family was in need of immediate credence to support its claim to act as rulers of the Roman Empire. They were outsiders. Writing shortly after the period in question Suetonius asserts that Vespasian was well aware of his family’s lack of pedigree (Vesp. 1.1, 2.1, 4.5, 7.2). The authority of the Flavians needed to be asserted. To make matters worse this had to be done in the immediate aftermath of a civil war in which Roman blood was spilt within the capital and this claim to authority was being

15 For the counter view see Jones, “Reckless Titus.”
made primarily through power that lay in the Eastern part of the empire. The odds were stacked up against the Flavians. The victory in Judea provided an excellent opportunity for political mileage. So the decision to celebrate a joint triumph and the many coin types minted commemorating aspects of the victory helped to promote an image of the effectiveness of the new family.

In this setting the war was of particular importance for Titus. If Vespasian was in a difficult position as the new emperor, his eldest son was in an even worse situation. At least Vespasian could point to previous activities as a commander and governor as an indication of a track record. Titus, however, could not point to any such experience. Any positive image for Titus was almost entirely dependent on what could be claimed in relation to the war. Accentuating the problem, according to Suetonius, was Titus' lack of popularity before he became emperor (*Tit.* 6–7). Suetonius’ subsequent description of Titus’ actions as emperor indicate that a positive image was quickly established (*Tit.* 7–8). Of particular importance here are the various indicators that the war was being used to construct a positive image of Titus as a highly successful commander.

By far the most significant expression of the propaganda activity relating to the war is the triumphal arch that once stood in the Circus Maximus. It was constructed during Titus’ reign (80–81) and although the arch has long since disappeared the dedication has survived. The crucial part of the dedication reads: “with the guidance of his father and under his auspices, he [Titus] subdued the Jewish people and destroyed the city of Jerusalem, which all generals and kings of other people before him had either attacked without success or left entirely untried” (*CIL* VI.944). This dedication on a public monument points to the way people were meant to view Titus. He was not to be seen as one among equals, let alone as a commander who simply restored Roman rule but as the commander who had succeeded where all others had previously failed by being the first to subdue the Jewish people. This was a bold claim and one that ignored the reality of past events. To those with a short memory regard-

---

16 It is possible that the contrast outlined by Suetonius has been exaggerated in order to heighten the extent of Titus’ success.

17 Rajak, *Josephus*, 203, describes the claim in the dedication as “patently absurd” but does not consider its possible relevance for the attitude of Josephus toward Titus. Overman, “First Revolt,” 217, appears to link the dedication with the arch constructed by Domitian.
ing Judea or to those with no knowledge of its history the dedication may have read as an impressive and significant achievement.\textsuperscript{18}

It was, however, not the only indicator that extravagant claims were being made by those promoting Titus in the public arena. Suetonius includes a number of claims about Titus’ contribution to the war that exaggerate his role. During the campaigning in Galilee Suetonius states that Titus commanded a legion and that he subdued the two strong cities of Tarichaeae and Gamala (\textit{Tit.} 4). In so doing Titus faced danger with his “horse killed under him in one battle and mounting another, whose rider had fallen fighting by his side” (\textit{Tit.} 4.3). The source of Suetonius’ information is unknown. It could simply be an anecdote which reflected gossip rather than information formally disseminated from the imperial household. However, even if an example of the former it does convey a sense of what was being bandied about regarding Titus’ involvement in the war against the Jews—namely, he commanded troops and bravely subdued the enemy.\textsuperscript{19}

Further indicators that Titus’ image was bound up with the war are less specific in terms of actions and they pertain to the Flavians as a whole. However, they do help provide ongoing reminders of the importance placed on the victory over the Jews. They are all visual in nature. One is the minting of \textit{IUDAEA CAPTA} coins. Vespasian, Titus and Domitian all used the victory by issuing coinage marking the event. The series was notable by its length of issue, spanning over 10 years. Of particular note is the increase in the production of the coins in the first year of Titus’ reign. The other indicators of the ongoing connection are architectural features of the Roman landscape: the formal opening of the Colosseum by Titus and the second arch of Titus constructed by Domitian. Although commenced by Vespasian it was Titus who opened the Colosseum, a venue probably paid for out of booty from the war.\textsuperscript{20}

\textsuperscript{18} An important consequence of this connection is the need to reconsider the dating of the \textit{Bellum}. There is no particular reason why the text needs to be dated before the reign of Titus. The dating of the text is the subject of a forthcoming publication by the author.

\textsuperscript{19} Note that Suetonius makes only a brief reference to the capture of Jerusalem (\textit{Tit.} 5) that places emphasis on Titus’ direct involvement in the fighting. It is possible that Titus was willing to foster a picture of him being actively involved in the battles, believing it would add to his prestige.

of the second arch and the prominence given to Titus in the depiction of the victory suggests that a public image of Titus as a successful commander was known and that it was of benefit for Domitian to continue to promote such an image as he established himself as the successor of his older brother.

Whatever Titus may have lacked in actual experience appears to have been more than made up for by claiming extensive military prowess in his role in the war. As such, it is important to note that the spin-doctors were hard at work creating an image of Titus that was not dependent on anything Josephus wrote. The revolt of a small province on the outer reaches of the empire became the occasion of Titus being the first Roman to subdue the Jewish people. Although it is possible Josephus became part of this propaganda effort, his account was not a necessary contribution. In fact, it is more plausible to view Josephus' account as one that sought to provide an alternative portrait to the one being promoted in Flavian circles.21

All of the claims about Titus' involvement in the war from extant Roman sources are explicitly contradicted by Josephus. Contrary to the claim made in Suetonius, Titus was not in command at the capture of Tarichaeae. According to Josephus it was Vespasian (B.J. 3.445, 485, 503, 522). Furthermore, Josephus describes other officers as being involved in the action at Tarichaeae along with Titus (B.J. 3.485). In relation to Gamala the contrast is even more clear-cut. Not only is Titus not in command but also Josephus deliberately informs the reader that Titus was not with Vespasian at the beginning of the siege (B.J. 4.31). He is there for the final assault but it is Vespasian who oversees the capture of the town (B.J. 4.70–82).

By far the most significant example of contradiction relates to the way Josephus' account counters the claim in the dedication on the arch of Titus. The narrative of the Bellum describes previous occasions Jerusalem was captured—by Antiochus IV Epiphanes, Pompey, the Parthians, Herod and Varus (B.J. 1.32; 138–152; 265–270; 342–356; 2.66–79).22 Titus is clearly not the first to capture Jerusalem, let alone subdue the Jews. In case anyone had missed this point,

21 This line of argument is in direct contrast to the approach advocated by Overman, “First Revolt.”

22 Note also the comments of Agrippa II in his speech about the belated timing of the revolt (B.J. 2.356–357) and the mention of Crassus plundering the Temple (B.J. 1.179).
Josephus makes it very clear by stating at the moment Titus troops do so in 70 C.E. that it was destroyed on the anniversary of the destruction at the hands of the Babylonians (B.J. 6.267–270; also see B.J. 6.435–442). There is no embarrassed hiding of how the Temple and city were occupied on previous occasions, it is even proclaimed by Josephus in one of his speeches (B.J. 5.391–398). It almost appears to be a perverse strained over emphasis by Josephus of past defeats suffered by the Jews. There is no effort to cover up the past. It is, therefore, not simply a case of Josephus supplementing the Roman efforts to promote a positive image of Titus. Contradictions existed between what Josephus described and what circulated among Roman circles about Titus.

4. EXPLAINING THE NATURE AND PURPOSE OF JOSEPHUS’ PORTRAIT OF TITUS

It is evident that the portrait of Titus provided by Josephus is anything but one-dimensional in nature. Even though Titus is the main character in the narrative and such aspects of his life as the relationship with Berenice are ignored, it is not a uniformly positive one in the light of the preceding discussion. We are left with the question of why nuance exists in the portrait. There appear to be two possible explanations. One has Josephus being well-meaning but not capable of fulfilling the task, while the other has him as an artful writer deliberately setting out to undermine Titus.

The first option revolves around the concept that Josephus was incompetent. His intention may have been to present an entirely complimentary portrait of Titus, with the hands-on approach of Titus as commander being an attempt to emphasize his prowess and bravery. If so, it means Josephus was either ignorant and/or unconcerned about how such a portrait could be heard in a Roman context. Any apparent criticism was inadvertent at best, or a sign of Josephus’ incompetence at worst.

---

23 This stands in direct contrast to the approach of Josephus in C. Ap. 2.125–134, where he awkwardly glosses over the fact that the Jerusalem Temple had been captured. See J. M. G. Barclay, “The Empire Writes Back: Josephan Rhetoric in Flavian Rome,” in Flavius Josephus in Flavian Rome (ed. J. Edmondson, S. Mason and J. Rivers; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 315–32. I am grateful to Professor Barclay for providing a copy of his essay prior to publication.
The second basic option is that Josephus was deliberately trying to provide a multi-dimensional portrait of Titus. The tensions between what was known to be the behaviour of a good commander and the way Titus behaved were intentional, as were the contradictions between the details in Josephus and the public claims being made about Titus. This option requires a radical shift in the existing framework for how we understand the relationship between Josephus and Titus, and more generally, regarding his attitude toward Roman rule.

An important preliminary point to the following discussion is that we remember Josephus was not free to say whatever he liked, presuming he was interested in staying alive. It was not possible for Josephus, nor anyone else for that matter, to launch blatantly into an open attack on Titus or Rome and expect to remain alive and well. There were constraints on public speech, especially for those writing while residing in Rome. Any desire to articulate critical ideas needed to be couched in a way that would not attract unwanted scrutiny. It should come as no surprise, therefore, that if Josephus was trying to express views not officially popular that he would seek to do so with extreme care. Sensitivity regarding passing comment on Titus was particularly important for Jews in Rome. Although they had no firsthand experience of the revolt, we need to recognise how much its consequences were a reality for their everyday lives. Many Jews would have either witnessed or at least heard stories about the triumph celebrated by the Flavians, with the parading of captives, along with the display of battle scenes and precious goods taken from the Temple. More lasting signs of the war were also encountered in daily existence. There was a large influx of slaves who had been captured during the war. The issue of several coin types celebrating the victory were a constant reminder of the outcome. The fiscus Iudaicus also acted as a clear reminder of the defeat. The use of the tax to help restore the Temple of Jupiter only rubbed salt into the wound, as did the placement of precious goods from the Jerusalem Temple in the new Temple of Peace.

These reminders meant the war was not simply a matter of some

24 Josephus, therefore, did not have the freedom enjoyed by those responsible for the rabbinic sayings, who resided in a distant province and used a language most Roman officials could not understand.

25 R. H. Darwell-Smith, Emperors and Architecture: A Study of Flavian Rome (Bruxelles: Latomus, 1996), 55–68 regarding the Temple of Peace. It is likely that placing Temple vessels alongside works of art would have only made matters worse.
abstract curiosity for the Jews in Rome, it had a direct impact on their lives. It does not take much imagination to envisage questions being asked among the Jews of Rome about the war. How did it happen? Why did it end in such a devastating defeat? Such thoughts about understanding what had passed were also probably matched by concern about the immediate future. In the past there had been no guarantee of safety, recent events in Rome and abroad would have only added to a sense of uncertainty regarding what lay ahead. Criticism could not be voiced openly without fear of reprisal.

Some recent developments in Josephan scholarship further clarify the sense in which a more complex reading of his texts is required. Of particular benefit is the approach of John Barclay in relation to the interpretation of Contra Apionem. Barclay draws on aspects of post-colonial theory as a means of engaging with possible subtleties present in Josephus’ text. An important insight from this approach is that “the ‘public transcript’ can be heard differently by different audiences: while those in power may hear only compliance, others who know, or suspect, a hidden transcript can detect the oblique and circumspect strategies by which the subordinate maintain an alternative discourse.” Barclay goes on to propose three key areas of consequence for the reading of Josephus. They are: Josephus was writing under considerable constraints; he was using Roman cultural values for his own interests; and, he provided “hints of a cultural defiance.”

All three are evident in the portrait of Titus. There was an existing public image of Titus that constrained Josephus and required a level of compliance in order for him to survive. At the same time, this public image acted as an impetus for Josephus to draw on existing Roman cultural values in the guise of attitudes about what was expected of a good commander for his own agenda. This agenda was to express defiance of Titus in his claims to greatness as a general.

26 See Barclay, “The Empire” as well as his essay in this volume.
27 Barclay, “The Empire,” 320–21. A further possible approach to explaining the complexity of the portrait is the role of irony in Roman public life.
28 Although Josephus makes claims about Titus viewing the text and providing his imprimatur caution is warranted as to the veracity of these claims. Josephus only asserts such formal sanction in the context of defending the authenticity of his accounts. Given the concern to claim credence of the account in the preface of the Bellum, it is surprising Titus’ approval is not mentioned. The claims to imperial approval only appear long after the death of Titus. It is also evident that Josephus is unclear as to whether Titus was given a copy or whether the emperor actually sanctioned the text as the official account.
The preceding discussion has focused on points of tension noted between external points of reference and what Josephus has narrated. There are also a number of internal points of reference in the narrative of the *Bellum* that affirm Josephus' intention to critique Titus. Three immediately stand out for comment. First, in *B.J.* 3.70–109 Josephus presents a digression on the Roman army. In describing the various aspects of Roman success two features are particularly important: the Romans are never subject to surprise attacks, they always fortify their camp (*B.J.* 3.76); and, the importance of discipline and their respect for generals and their resultant good order in battle (*B.J.* 3.103, 105–106). This ideal, however, is far from what occurs when Titus attacks Jerusalem. The Roman camps are subject to numerous surprise attacks, often with substantial success. On a number of separate occasions, including the firing of the Temple, the orders of Titus are ignored by the troops. Second, Josephus never presents Titus as the one who conquered the Jews. Instead, he repeatedly reminds the reader that it was factions, famine and the Romans that brought about the defeat and, everything that occurred was all done at the beckoning of God (*B.J.* 1.27; 5.1–26; 6.39–41, 109–110, 214–216). Third, Vespasian (*B.J.* 4.372) and Titus (*B.J.* 5.316) speak of the importance of avoiding any rash behaviour or undertaking any unnecessary risks, as do Titus' staff (*B.J.* 5.87–88). However, this wise counsel is not reflected in the actions of Titus, who continually puts himself at risk.29

**Conclusion**

The positivist readings of the portrait of Titus that dominate scholarship have distorted the situation. Josephus does not construct a one-dimensional picture. Rather, we need to see positive and negative elements in the portrait. The latter do take some unravelling, as they are not openly displayed. Such a situation should not come as a total surprise. Paul Spilsbury has shown how Josephus' writing of the *Antiquitates* incorporates a critique of Rome amidst the reality of current circumstances.30 These insights help provide a framework

---

29 The naming of Tiberius Alexander as Titus' advisor lessens the claim of sole command (*B.J.* 5.44–46).

in which to understand what Josephus has sought to undertake in constructing his portrait of Titus in the *Bellum*. This text has long been relegated to the realm of pro-Flavian propaganda. The sophistication being linked with Josephus' later writings should also be associated with the *Bellum*. Titus was the victor and had to be publicly recognised as such in order for Josephus to survive. However, as one of the vanquished, Josephus did not miss the opportunity to undermine the victor, especially as he was making outlandish claims to grandeur well beyond what could be deemed as legitimate. Josephus may have been conquered but that does not mean he was submissive.\(^{31}\)

\(^{31}\) Such a reading opens up the question of whether or not Josephus was also anti-Roman before the war. It could also help offer an alternative perspective on the Masada episode in *B.J.* 7. It may have been included by Josephus to provide one final "insult" against the Romans about the hollow nature of their victory. See also the approach taken by Steve Mason regarding the portrait of Titus in his essay in this volume.
JOSEPHUS AND THE PHILOSOPHERS OF ROME: DOES CONTRA APIONEM MIRROR DOMITIAN'S CRUSHING OF THE "STOIC OPPOSITION"?

GUNNAR HAALAND
THE NORWEGIAN LUTHERAN SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY

INTRODUCTION

Scholarship on Josephus has had a tendency to neglect his Roman context, just as scholarship on imperial Rome has neglected Josephus.¹ This is about to change. The focus on Josephus' Roman context has been one of the most significant traits of recent research on Josephus.² The gathering in Rome of Josephus scholars from around the world is indeed a proper occasion for a further pursuit along this path. Such a pursuit is the aim of the present article.

I will first examine a certain aspect of Roman culture and politics in Josephus' days, namely the changing fortunes of the city's philosophers. Then I will discuss Josephus against this background. My key proposal will be that in Contra Apionem there are reflections of Domitian's crushing of the so-called "Stoic opposition" in 93–94 c.e.³

THE THIRTEENTH YEAR OF DOMITIAN'S REIGN

The more concretely we attempt to relate Josephus to concurrent events in Rome, the more important the years 93–94 c.e. become. Just as

---


² Note e.g. the programmatic title of the Josephus conference in Toronto, 2001: "Flavius Josephus in Flavian Rome." Several of the papers from this conference are of great relevance for this article, but they have been published too late to be considered in this article (Flavius Josephus and Flavian Rome [ed. J. Edmondson, S. Mason and J. Rives; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005]).

³ The designation "Stoic opposition" refers to a group of senators known for their Stoic inclinations. This grouping will be presented further below, as will Domitian's actions against them.
Gallio's proconsulship in Achaia in 52 C.E. serves as the anchorage point for reconstructions of Pauline chronology, the dating of the Antiquitates to "the thirteenth year of the reign of Domitian Caesar and to the fifty-sixth of my life" (A.J. 20.267) is a fixed point of departure for Josephan chronology. Domitian became emperor in September 81, and Josephus was allegedly born during the first year of Gaius' reign (Vita 5), which started in March 37 C.E. The period from September 93 to March 94 C.E. represents the overlap between the two schemes. However, Josephus may not be counting from the date of the emperors' ascent to power. He may instead be referring to the Roman civic years when Gaius and Domitian gained power, 37 and 81 C.E. respectively. If this assumption is correct, the Antiquitates could have been published at any time in 93 C.E.

We may ask: What was going on in Rome at that time? For anyone interested in Josephus and philosophy, the answer is indeed intriguing! Several leading members of the "Stoic opposition" were executed, and many philosophers were expelled from the city. These events are related in several sources, and we may quote one of them:

It is recorded that when Rusticus Arulenus extolled Thrasea Paetus, when Herennius Senecio extolled Helvidius Priscus, their praise became a capital offence, so that persecution fell not merely on the authors themselves but also on their books: the police, in fact, were given the task of burning in the courtyard of the Forum the memorials of our noblest characters. They imagined, no doubt, that in those flames disappeared the voice of the people, the liberty of the Senate, the conscience of mankind; especially as the teachers of Philosophy also were expelled, and all decent behaviour exiled, in order that nowhere might anything of good report present itself to men's eyes. (Tacitus, Agr. 2)

---

5 Ancient sources are quoted from the translations of the Loeb Classical Library, unless otherwise indicated.
6 See e.g. the discussion in S. Mason, Life of Josephus: Translation and Commentary (BJP 9; Leiden: Brill, 2001), xv–xvi note 1.
7 See also Agr. 45; Pliny, Ep. 1.5 and 3.11; Suetonius, Dom. 10; Dio Cassius 67.13, and Aulus Gellius, Noct. att. 15.11.4. The passages from Suetonius and Dio Cassius are quoted below.
8 The names of Junius Arulenus Rusticus appear in several combinations in the different sources.
9 We will encounter both the elder and the younger Helvidius Priscus. In this passage, Tacitus is referring to the elder.
It is usually assumed that the early autumn of 93 C.E. was the starting point of these affairs, and that the crackdown on philosophers may have lasted well into the following year. This means that around the time when the *Antiquitates* was published, “philosophers” and “philosophy” were significant in relation to a major political controversy in Rome. Before we further examine these events, however, we will have a look at the broader picture, focusing first on Domitian’s reign, and then on the position and reputation of philosophers and philosophy in Rome during this period.

**THE REIGN OF DOMITIAN**

Titus Flavius Domitianus (51–96 C.E.), the last emperor of the Flavian dynasty, has been perceived as an incarnation of the wicked and ruthless tyrant. The negative evaluation by Tacitus, the younger Pliny, Juvenal and Suetonius in the early second century C.E. has been retained until today.

During the past few decades scholars have attempted to draw a more nuanced and balanced picture of Domitian. It is first of all easy to see that the image of an insane despot served to legitimate the reign of his followers—Nerva, Trajan and Hadrian. The fact is that during the reign of Domitian, Tacitus and Pliny were themselves a part of the political system, pursuing their careers while keeping their mouths shut. Secondly, several of Domitian’s achievements, his administrative skills, his building projects, etc., were hardly related by historians like Tacitus, Suetonius or Dio Cassius. Their focus was rather Domitian’s troublesome relationship with the Senate. Domitian ruled as a sovereign monarch, and did not conceal it. Unlike several

---


11 As only the younger Pliny, the younger Seneca, and the younger Cato figure in this article, I use only their given names below.

12 In other words: Even more than Josephus, Domitian has suffered from a serious image problem!


14 See e.g. Tacitus, *Agr.* 45.
of his predecessors, he did very little to support the quasi-republican pretence of the Senate. He preferred the designation *dominus et deus* (“Lord and God,” Suetonius, *Dom.* 13), rather than acting as if he was just the first among equals.\(^{15}\) Tacitus and Pliny both belonged to the senatorial aristocracy to which Domitian did not pay much respect.

As we try to picture Josephus’ environment in Rome, Domitian’s bad relationship with the Senate is more relevant than his administration of the larger empire. In this perspective, the fact remains that his reign grew significantly worse towards the end of his life.\(^{16}\)

**Philosophers and Philosophy in Rome**

Philosophy in Rome at the time of Josephus was a multifaceted phenomenon, maybe as manifold as religion is today. It would involve the genius and the copyist, the rationalist and the magician, the hermit and the lobbyist, the ascetic and the rabble-rouser. You would find the longhaired, bearded Cynic preacher on the street corner, the Pythagorean mystic at a more remote location, the Greek teacher in the upper-class house, and the Stoic senator involved in imperial politics.

The spectrum of different types of philosophers—and their relevance for our pursuit of Josephus’ context—may appear more clearly if we introduce some significant representatives. From the days of Claudius and onwards we encounter Demetrius the Cynic time and again—admired by Seneca, witnessing Thrasea Paetus’ forced suicide, insulting Vespasian, etc. The Pythagorean Apollonius of Tyana—and his trial before Domitian—has been immortalized by Philostratus in his *Vita Apollonii*. Among the more genuine thinkers were Musonius Rufus—known as the Socrates of Rome—and his students Euphrates, Epictetus and Dio Chrysostom. Epictetus was among those who were expelled from Rome by Domitian in 93–94 C.E., while Dio Chrysostom was forced to leave the city already in the early 80s. Finally we have

---

\(^{15}\) Many scholars accept Suetonius’ description at this point. See e.g. Southern, *Domitian*, 36 and 45. For critical views, see e.g. Jones, *Emperor Domitian*, 108–9, and L. L. Thompson, *The Book of Revelation: Apocalypse and Empire* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990), 104 ff.

the Stoic senators, who will be our main focus of attention. Seneca and Thrasea Paetus were leading figures during Nero's reign, and from the time of Domitian we have already encountered Junius Arulenus Rusticus and Herennius Senecio. We will shortly get acquainted also with the younger Helvidius Priscus.

Romans generally viewed philosophy with ambivalence, partly with suspicion and partly with admiration. This ambivalence is typical of the Roman attitude to everything Greek. Greek teachers of philosophy, as well as of rhetoric or grammar, could make a living among the Roman aristocracy, but they were viewed with a certain suspicion. Philosophy was perceived with sympathy to the extent that it proved itself useful in everyday life—by promoting virtue, procuring refinement, and providing happiness. If, on the other hand, it appeared that philosophy engendered arrogance and egotism, if philosophers disregarded Roman values or if their students abandoned the Roman way of life, the sympathy would quickly disappear. Too deep involvement, or total subjection to a school of philosophy, was probably as suspicious as "fundamentalism" or "fanaticism" is today.\(^{17}\)

The Roman upper class approached philosophy pragmatically and eclectically, with Stoicism as the main component.\(^{18}\) Stoic teaching supported their conservative values and provided a sense of sophistication in addition, but it could also give voice to criticism, opposition and subversion. Stoics would sometimes heavily stress that their philosophy encouraged active participation in society and politics—a primary duty for the members of the Roman upper class. Nonetheless, a quiet life of contemplation and teaching was undoubtedly appealing also to Stoics. "Nature has begotten us for both purposes—for contemplation and for action."\(^{19}\) Participation in public life was not encouraged if there was nothing to achieve: "Let him who would be righteous leave royal courts. Virtue and autocracy cannot be mixed."\(^{20}\) For a Roman senator, such withdrawal could easily be interpreted as

\(^{17}\) See e.g. Tacitus, *Agr.* 4.


\(^{19}\) Seneca, *De Otio* 5. On this Stoic ambiguity, see e.g. Brunt, "Stoicism and the Principate," *passim*, and MacMullen, *Enemies of the Roman Order*, 11 and 50 ff.

treason—"for what one avoids, one condemns." That was apparently what happened to Thrasea Paetus in the 60s, to the elder Helvidius Priscus in the 70s and to Herennius Senecio in the 90s.

DOMITIAN'S CRUSHING OF THE "STOIC OPPOSITION"

In the days of Josephus many Greek philosophers resided in Rome for longer or shorter periods of time, among them Dio Chrysostom and Epictetus. During the same period the number of senators of Greek origin increased. Nonetheless, the "Stoic opposition" in the Senate of the Flavian period was not a Greek import. Through family ties, friendship and teacher-student successions, the group could trace its roots back to the victims of Nero in the sixties—first of all Thrasea Paetus, who suffered death together with Seneca, Lucan, and many others.

One of the victims of Domitian in 93–94 C.E., the younger Helvidius Priscus, was actually a third generation Stoic oppositionist. His father, the elder Helvidius Priscus, was in fact Thrasea Paetus' son-in-law. Thrasea Paetus had been consul in 56 C.E., was a good friend and former student of Seneca, and remained loyal to Nero for many years. In the 60s, however, he did not fulfill his obligations as a senator, and was finally sentenced to death in 66 C.E. His son-in-law, the elder Helvidius Priscus, survived Nero's crushing of the Pisonian conspiracy, and was a leading critic of Vespasian in the early 70s until he was expelled and later executed.

Another victim of 93–94 C.E., Junius Arulenus Rusticus, had been personally involved in similar events in the 60s. He was a member of Thrasea Paetus' circle, and as a young tribune in 66 C.E., he attempted to intervene in order to save Thrasea Paetus.

From these examples it is clear that the events of 93–94 C.E. did not come out of a clear blue sky. There were tensions between the emperors and certain philosophical-political oppositionists for decades, and from time to time open conflict and persecution broke out.

---

23 See e.g. Suetonius, *Vesp.* 15.
24 On Vespasian's expulsion of philosophers, see e.g. Dio Cassius 66.13.
The attachment to previous generations of oppositionist heroes, to their philosophical or political ideals and to their courage in confronting the ruler, could be expressed through the composition of biographies or pamphlets of praise. Thrasea Paetus wrote a laudatory biography of Cato, the tragic hero from the final phase of the republic in the first century B.C.E. Junius Arulenus Rusticus and Herennius Senecio wrote about Thrasea Paetus and the elder Helvidius Priscus respectively. The quotation above from Tacitus reveals the fatal consequences of that literary enterprise.25

In order to understand the picture of Domitian and the “Stoic opposition” more clearly, let us examine the accounts of Suetonius and Dio Cassius:

He put to death . . . Junius Rusticus, because he had published eulogies of Paetus Thrasea and Helvidius Priscus and called them the most upright of men; and on the occasion of this charge he banished all the philosophers from the city and from Italy. He also executed the younger Helvidius, alleging that in a farce composed for the stage he had under the characters of Paris and Oenone censured Domitian’s divorce from his wife. (Suetonius, Dom. 10)26

But the deeds now to be related . . . cannot be described in similar terms. I refer to his killing of Arulenus Rusticus because he was doing philosophy (ἐπιλόγοι)27 and because he called Thrasea holy, and to his slaying of Herennius Senecio because in his long career he had stood for no office after his quaestorship and because he had written the biography of Helvidius Priscus. Many others also perished as a result of this same charge of philosophizing, and all the philosophers that were left in Rome were banished once more. (Dio Cassius 67.13)

The following pretexts for persecution and punishment can be detected: the criticism of the emperor disguised as drama or biography, the lack of participation in public life, and finally—as it appears from Dio Cassius—even philosophizing as such. It is easy to understand why Domitian preferred not to be insulted from the stages of his theatres or challenged through politically charged biographies, and we have seen above how the absence from the political stage could be interpreted as a sign of opposition or subversion. However, it is hardly

25 On literature during the Flavians, see e.g. J. W. Iddeng, Princeps et vis librorum: Literature, Liberty and the Flavian Regime (69–96 AD) (Acta Humaniora 186; Oslo: Unipub, 2004).
26 Suetonius—apparently by mistake—attributes both eulogies to Junius Arulenus Rusticus. The death of Herennius Senecio is not mentioned.
27 My translation. Cary (LCL) translates “because he was a philosopher.”
correct that Domitian considered the very act of doing philosophy a crime.\textsuperscript{28} We need, therefore, to take a closer look at the ideology that characterized the "Stoic opposition."

They "professed allegiance to a tradition of liberty, of integrity and courage,"\textsuperscript{29} not to any detailed party program. As we have seen, Tacitus pompously applies to them "the voice of the people, the liberty of the Senate, the conscience of mankind."\textsuperscript{30} When the bid for \textit{libertas} ("freedom," "liberty") was voiced during the Flavian period, it sounded like echoes of the late Republic, but was in fact far less ambitious. Where Cato, Cicero and Brutus wanted freedom from autocracy, the "Stoic opposition" of the Flavian period could only hope for freedom of speech under a \textit{de facto} monarchic rule. In other words: They demanded freedom from tyranny. Even that demand could be dangerous enough, as it could encourage others to act. "Tyrannicide was esteemed in antiquity as not a crime but a noble deed."\textsuperscript{31}

The "Stoic opposition" of the Flavian period may have appeared as only shadows of its predecessors, not only regarding the nature of their demands. Their family background was less prestigious, and their power-base more fragile. Whereas the heroes of the late Republic were the sons of proud Roman families, their followers a century later were often newcomers in Rome.\textsuperscript{32} In order to facilitate their claims and to boost their prestige, Stoic philosophy was probably all the more important. Their advertisement of perfect virtue was often perceived as arrogant and patronizing.\textsuperscript{33} This might explain why philosophizing or "stoicizing" could become almost equivalent to treason.\textsuperscript{34}

Thus far we see that there is no need to assume that Domitian was insane or possessed by a hatred of philosophers as such. There were several reasons for him to act.\textsuperscript{35}

\textsuperscript{29} Syme, "Domitian," 124.
\textsuperscript{30} Tacitus, \textit{Agr.} 2.4.
\textsuperscript{31} Brunt, "Stoicism and the Principate," 27.
\textsuperscript{32} Thrasea Paetus was from Padua (Patavium) in northern Italy; the elder Helvidius Priscus was from Cluviae—an insignificant town east of the Apennines; Herennius Senecio was from Baetica in Spain, while the origin of Junius Arulenus Rusticus is not certain.
\textsuperscript{33} See e.g. Tacitus, \textit{Ann.} 14.57, and Seneca, \textit{Ep.} 73.1.
\textsuperscript{34} See e.g. MacMullen, \textit{Enemies of the Roman Order}, 46 and 56 ff.
In addition to the emperor, the Roman aristocrats could also face dangers from their colleagues. The fate of Herennius Senecio may serve as a good example. In a separate event shortly before he was sentenced to death, Herennius Senecio was charged with *majestas* ("treason") by Baebius Massa. Just some months earlier the roles had been the opposite. Together with Pliny, Herennius Senecio acted as prosecutor in a case against Baebius Massa.36 “Freedom to prosecute was one of the last vestiges of Republican *libertas.*”37

Other factors, missing from the brief accounts of Tacitus, Pliny, Suetonius and Dio Cassius, may also be conjectured.38 However, my concern in this article is more with the rhetoric surrounding the confrontation than with what happened behind the scenes. Below we will discuss how Josephus deals with this rhetoric. First, however, we will look at a scene that is an important part of this show, namely the forced suicide of the philosophical-political oppositionist. We will also see what happened to philosophers and philosophy after the death of Domitian.

### The Death of Socrates and the “Stoic Opposition”

When Thrasea Paetus was sentenced to death, he—like so many other philosophical-political oppositionists—chose suicide in imitation of Cato and Brutus. We do not know how Junius Arulenus Rusticus described Thrasea Paetus’ forced suicide, but we may make a qualified guess. First of all, we have accounts of his death from Tacitus and Dio Cassius.39 Secondly, we possess a great number of similar records of forced suicide—those of Cato, Brutus, Seneca, Lucan, Euphrates, etc.

In a striking way, these texts share similar features. The hero faces death with dignity and serenity. He comforts his friends and students, engages them in a philosophical discussion about the afterlife or another suitable topic, and delivers some apt last words on virtue versus tyranny, suicide as the ultimate expression of freedom, etc., or by quoting one of the classics. Tacitus pictures Thrasea Paetus as he is discussing “the nature of the soul and the divorce of spirit and

---

36 See e.g. Pliny, *Ep.* 7.33.
38 See e.g. Penwill, “Expelling the Mind,” 358 ff.
body” with Demetrius the Cynic. Cato quoted *Phaedo*, Lucan quoted his own *Pharsalia*.

The model for these accounts is clearly the death of Socrates, as it is for other types of martyrdom literature. Philostratus points to Socrates a few times in his *Vita Apollonii*, and Epictetus does it repeatedly. In fact, Socrates is mentioned in Epictetus’ writings far more frequently than anyone else, usually as a martyr executed by the state for his beliefs. Seneca is even said to have prepared long in advance the poison “which was used for dispatching prisoners condemned by the public tribunal of Athens.”

**The Rehabilitation of Philosophers and Philosophy**

Before we turn to Josephus, let us have a brief look at what happened after Domitian’s death. Philosophers and philosophy were quickly rehabilitated. Pliny broke the silence and voiced his praise to the younger Helvidius Priscus in the Senate already in 97 C.E. Pliny later published his eulogy, thereby adding another generation to the chain of such eulogies.

Philosophers, among them Euphrates and Dio Chrysostom, returned to Rome, and at one point Trajan’s wife apparently claimed to be an Epicurean. Philostratus even relates that Dio Chrysostom accompanied Trajan in a triumph. Philosophers and philosophy were again politically correct. Some decades later, Marcus Aurelius appeared as a bearded emperor writing philosophical literature in Greek, while Christians were going out of their way to present themselves as the true philosophers.

That is a different story, however. It is time to turn our eyes to Josephus.

---

40 Tacitus, *Ann.* 16.34.  
41 See e.g. the extensive treatment in MacMullen, *Enemies of the Roman Order*, 67 ff., or the recent discussion in Penwill, “Expelling the Mind,” 353 ff.  
42 See e.g. *Vit. Apoll.* 8.2.  
44 Tacitus, *Ann.* 15.64.  
45 See e.g. *Ep.* 9.13.  
47 *Vit. soph.* 1.488.
We have already seen that during Domitian's reign, Tacitus and Pliny kept their mouths shut and their pens at rest, as they promoted their own careers by serving the emperor that they would later denounce. In this light Josephus becomes an all the more intriguing figure. He did not keep quiet, but published extensively during the last years of Domitian's reign: Antiquitates, Vita and possibly also Contra Apionem.48

Domitian's brutal rule has for a long time served as an important interpretative context for the book of Revelation.49 Why not engage Domitian in the interpretation of Josephus' writings from the same period? Since the publication of Josephus' magnum opus coincides with Domitian's crushing of the "Stoic opposition," does it in any way mirror the dramatic events in Rome at the time? And what about Contra Apionem, being published somewhat later?

As far as I am aware, only Steve Mason has previously addressed these issues. He, however, has done it in several contexts—first as a part of his discussion on Jewish (or Judean)50 philosophy, and more recently in his treatment of the Antiquitates.

In his two articles on Greco-Roman, Jewish and Christian philosophy, Mason includes the writings of Josephus in his presentation of Jewish philosophy.51 He notes that the publication of the Antiquitates coincided with Domitian's expulsion of philosophers from Rome, and indicates that the presentation of Jewish philosophy might be problematic against this background: "Why would Josephus, who is now living in Rome, seek to present Judaism as a philosophy when philosophers are in such difficult straits?" He suggests the following solution:

---

48 Whether Contra Apionem was published before or after the death of Domitian is an open question. See e.g. discussion in C. Gerber, Ein Bild des Judentums für Nichtjuden von Flavius Josephus: Untersuchungen zu seiner Schrift Contra Apionem (AGAJU 40; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 64 ff. The question will be addressed below.
49 See e.g. Thompson, Book of Revelation, 15 ff. and 95 ff., and D. Aune, Revelation 1–5 (WBC 52; Dallas: Word Books, 1997), lvi ff.
50 From the mid-nineties Mason has consistently used the translation "Judean" rather than "Jew" or "Jewish." I use the more traditional terms, also when referring to Mason's views.
Josephus "does not say that Judaism is a philosophical school within Greco-Roman society, but rather that the Jews are a nation with their own philosophical schools."\(^{52}\)

In his recent essays on the *Antiquitates*, Mason returns to the events in 93–94 C.E.\(^{53}\) He reads the *Antiquitates* not only as an exposition of Jewish history and of the Jewish constitution, but also as a brave comment on Roman affairs—"as directly as any writer would dare at this point in Domitian's reign."\(^{54}\) Mason argues that there might be a link between the publication of the *Antiquitates* in 93–94 C.E.—"a dangerous moment for bold and subversive speech"—and Domitian's punishment of Flavius Clemens and Flavia Domitilla shortly afterwards. He even hints that Josephus may have died at the hands of Domitian, together with Flavia Domitilla, Flavius Clemens, and his own patron Epaphroditus.\(^{55}\)

Below I will argue that Josephus might have sensed the danger after the publication of the *Antiquitates*, and as a consequence made sure that *Contra Apionem* would appear somewhat less provocative in the eyes of the emperor. My contention is that the relationship between Jews and "philosophers," between Judaism and "philosophy," has been redefined in *Contra Apionem* as compared to Josephus' previous writings, and that the dramatic events of 93–94 C.E. might explain this shift.

\(^{52}\) Mason, "Philosophies," 17-18.


\(^{54}\) Mason, "Flavius Josephus in Flavian Rome," 589.

Until recently, scholarship on Contra Apionem often regarded the treatise primarily as the only extant piece of Jewish-Hellenistic apologetic literature. The treatise has often been read against an Alexandrian background. Contra Apionem has thus appeared as a bridge between Philo and other Jewish-Hellenistic authors on the one hand, and Christian apologetic literature on the other—from Judaism dressed as philosophy to Christianity dressed as philosophy.

Over the past ten years there has been a shift toward emphasizing Josephus' actual context in Rome at the end of the first century C.E. In my opinion, there are reasons not only to replace the Alexandria-focused, source-critical approach, but also to question the perception of Contra Apionem as a presentation of Jewish philosophy.

This perception appears very frequently. According to Mason, Contra Apionem is "an invitation to Judean philosophy" and a part of Josephus' "sustained effort... to portray Judaism for his Roman readers as a national 'philosophy' with its own philosophical schools." Per Bilde claims that in Contra Apionem "Josephus describes Judaism as the true philosophy which is testified and revered by the best Greek philosophers and historians." Similarly, Pieter W. van der P.
Horst states that this work reveals "Josephus' attempt to present Judaism as the best philosophy, actually as the source of the teaching of many Greek philosophers," and Aryeh Kasher maintains that Josephus "made efforts to present it as a clear and true philosophy, admired by the greatest of Greek thinkers."

In my opinion the claims of these scholars are only partly adequate. It is correct that Contra Apionem describes Judaism as being testified, revered and imitated by the best Greek philosophers. This “dependency theme” appears not infrequently in Contra Apionem. Furthermore, many of the major themes in C. Ap. 2.145–296, the final part of the treatise, are typical of the philosophical discourse of antiquity: the nature of God and virtue, the framing of good laws and the perfect constitution, martyrdom, etc. Nonetheless, I am highly hesitant towards the use of “Judean philosophy,” “national philosophy,” “the true philosophy” or “the best philosophy” as catchwords for the Jewish way of life as presented in Contra Apionem.

If we examine Josephus’ use of φιλοσοφεῖν (“to philosophize,” “to be a philosopher”), φιλοσοφία (“philosophy”) and φιλόσοφος (“philosophical,” “philosopher”) and related words, we discover a striking difference between the Bellum and the Antiquitates on one hand, and Contra Apionem on the other. In the Bellum and the Antiquitates Josephus

---

64 I have argued this case in a previous article: G. Haaland, “Jewish Laws for a Roman Audience: Toward an Understanding of Contra Apionem,” in Internationales Josephus-Kolloquium Brüssel 1998 (ed. J. U. Kalms and F. Siegert; Münsteraner Judaistische Studien 4; Münster: Lit, 1999), 282–304. The argumentation below is partly a summary of material from that article, partly a development. It is my intention to discuss these questions more extensively in an upcoming study.
generally employs these terms in references to Jewish philosophy. Most famous, of course, are his excursuses on the Jewish schools of philosophy (B.J. 2.119–166, A.J. 13.171–17366 and 18.11–25). In Contra Apionem the picture is different. With very few exceptions,67 “philosophy language” has disappeared from the descriptions of the Jews and their way of life.68 These terms instead appear in references to gentile philosophy, most often Greek philosophy. The following quotation is typical of Contra Apionem in this respect: “Our earliest imitators were the Greek philosophers” (C. Ap. 2.281).

Contra Apionem represents a new picture also in several related matters: The Judaism of Contra Apionem is not divided into different sects or schools as in the Bellum and in the Antiquitates.69 Furthermore, the treatise never presents the Jewish way of life as a way to ἔνδομονία (“happiness”),70 and the question of divine providence is only touched upon.71 These latter topics are both prominent in the Antiquitates.72 These findings make perfect sense against the background of Domitian’s crackdown on philosophers in 93–94 C.E. While Josephus in his earlier works had confidently and enthusiastically employed the image of the philosopher and the concept of philosophy in his presentation of the Jewish way of life, in Contra Apionem he was much more restrained.

THE DEPENDENCY THEME

The quotation above from C. Ap. 2.281 is typical not only because of the reference to Greek—not Jewish—philosophers, but also as an

66 In A.J. 13.171 the word οἶρεσις (“school,” “sect”) is used, but not “philosophical” or “philosophy.” The same applies to Vita 9–10.
67 Since C. Ap. 1.177–179 is part of a quotation from the Greek author Clearchus of Soli, the occurrences of Jewish φιλοσοφία in C. Ap. 1.54 and 2.47 remain as the most significant exceptions.
68 A similar development can be traced for words like σοφία (“wisdom”) and φρόνησις (“prudence,” “wisdom”). See Haaland, “Jewish Laws for a Roman Audience,” 295.
69 The word οἶρεσις does not occur at all in Contra Apionem.
70 The word is never used in Contra Apionem. Mason fails to note this in his argument for Contra Apionem as a logos protreptikos. See Mason, “Contra Apionem,” 198–99 and 222–23.
72 See e.g. Mason, “Introduction,” xxx–xxxi.
example of the dependency theme. We may ask: How do we reconcile this absence of explicit statements about "Jewish philosophy" with the occurrences of the dependency theme? Why avoid references to Jewish philosophers and Jewish philosophy, while at the same time maintaining that the foremost Greek philosophers were the disciples of Moses? 

First of all, the "proof from antiquity" was very important in ancient times, and is very prominent throughout Contra Apionem. Within such a framework, the dependency theme was a card that Josephus could not afford not to play. He introduces it carefully in the first part of the treatise, C. Ap. 1.1–218. First he points out that the Greeks entered the stage of civilization relatively late. Then he points out their dependence upon more ancient cultures—Egyptian, Mesopotamian and Phoenician, and then he includes his own tradition in the family of the most ancient cultures. The next step is, by necessity, to claim that the Greeks have learned from the Jews.

Secondly, he made sure to use the dependency theme in a way that preserved a distance from the philosophers of his own time. There was a significant difference between a Stoic oppositionist senator and the classical figures of Greek philosophy. Plato was not Helvidius Priscus, neither the elder nor the younger. Furthermore, Moses had not taught the Jews how to withdraw from public life, and not how to fight for τελευθερία ("freedom," "liberty") or παραρητικα ("freedom of speech"). What he had provided them with was a noble constitution and excellent laws. In Contra Apionem, even though he is the teacher of philosophers, Moses is pictured as a legislator, as a political and military leader. He is simply superior to philosophers. In this way Josephus is able to retain the dependency theme while at the same time keeping a distance from the labels "philosopher" and "philosophy."


74 The word is used frequently in the Bellum and in the Antiquitates, but only twice in Contra Apionem, namely in references to Egypt's lack of liberty (C. Ap. 2.128) and Sparta's loss of liberty (C. Ap. 2.227). Jewish liberty appears only once in Contra Apionem, when the word τελευθερος is used with reference to the Hasmonean era (C. Ap. 2.134).

75 This word is never used in Contra Apionem, while it is frequent in the Bellum and the Antiquitates.

76 See e.g. C. Ap. 2.151 ff.
The death of Socrates appears not only behind the martyrdom stories of the "Stoic opposition," but also as a part of Josephus' argument in *Contra Apionem*:

> On what other ground was Socrates put to death? He never sought to betray his city to the enemy, he robbed no temple. No; because he used to swear strange oaths and give out (in jest, surely, as some say) that he received communications from a spirit, he was therefore condemned to die by drinking hemlock. His accuser brought a further charge against him of corrupting young men, because he stimulated them to hold the constitution and laws of their country in contempt. (*C. Ap.* 2.263–264)

Josephus apparently finds it totally appropriate that Socrates was sentenced to death, and adds several other examples on how the Athenians punished ΤΟΥΣ ΡΗΜΑ ΜΟΝΟΝ ΠΑΡΑ ΤΟΥΣ ἘΚΕΪΝΟΝ ΝΟΜΟΥΣ ΦΘΕΓΞΑΜΕΝΟΥΣ ΠΕΡΙ ΘΕΩΝ ("any who uttered a single word about the gods contrary to their laws," *C. Ap.* 2.262).

Keeping in mind Socrates' position as the model martyr in the eyes of the "Stoic opposition" and many others, we may discover the events of 93–94 C.E. between the lines. No one could claim that Josephus was not loyal to the emperor's way of maintaining law and order! At the same time, a reader with an oppositionist view would maybe see a carefully posed irony.\(^77\)

The treatment of Jewish martyrdom in *Contra Apionem* is totally consistent with the lack of compassion on behalf of Socrates.\(^78\) In fact, the reason for Jewish martyrdom is exactly the opposite to that of the Athenian victims. The Jews are prosecuted because they refuse to do what Socrates did: ΡΗΜΑ ΦΘΕΓΞΑΟΣΟΙ ΠΑΡΑ ΤΟΝ ΝΟΜΟΝ ("to utter a single word contrary to their Law," *C. Ap.* 2.219).\(^79\)

Jews die on behalf of their ancestral laws, not in order to demonstrate their freedom, and not in order to challenge the tyrant. They do have to face death at the hands of tyrants, but Josephus even at one point virtually excuses the prosecutors of the Jews (*C. Ap.* 2.233).

---

\(^77\) On the subtlety of this passage, see Gerber, *Ein Bild des Judentums*, 212.

\(^78\) See *C. Ap.* 1.43, 190 ff., 212; 2.219, 232 ff., 272.

\(^79\) Very similar wording also appears elsewhere in similar contexts: The Jews endure torture and death rather than ΡΗΜΑ ΠΡΟΕΘΟΙ ΠΑΡΑ ΤΟΥΣ ΝΟΜΟΥΣ ("utter a single word against the laws," *C. Ap.* 1.43). To them the only evil is ἡ πράξει τι παρά τούς ἐκατόν νόμους ἡ λόγον εἶπεν ("to do any act or utter any word contrary to their laws," *C. Ap.* 2.233).
The Jewish martyr in *Contra Apionem* is not dressed as an oppositionist philosopher as in 4 Maccabees, and he does not deliver lofty, philosophical words about "death which gives liberty to the soul" as Eleazar in the Masada scene (*B.J.* 7.344). The impression we get is that, even though Josephus might have been brave, he was apparently not brave enough to brag about martyr philosophers subsequent to Domitian’s crackdown on the "Stoic opposition."

**DOES **CONTRA APIONEM** MIRROR DOMITIAN’S CRUSHING OF THE "STOIC OPPOSITION"?**

Josephus ardently employs the dependency theme, and proudly points to Jewish martyrs in *Contra Apionem*. These themes were stock arguments for an author who wanted to present the Jews and their way of life in a positive light. Josephus uses them, while keeping philosophy at arm’s length at the same time.

This is the tendency throughout *Contra Apionem*. Josephus is not embracing philosophy, and not abandoning it. He speaks about God, piety, virtue and good laws in a language that resembles Stoic popular philosophy. However, pious and virtuous heroes do not need to be philosophers, and "virtue language" does not belong to philosophical discourses exclusively. The commendation of virtues and ancestral laws is as typically Roman as it is typically philosophical. The two references to Jewish φιλοσοφία (C.Ap. 1.54 and 2.47)—presented as transmission and interpretation of the ancient Jewish scriptures—are similarly harmless to a Roman mind.

In *Contra Apionem*, Josephus does not present the Jewish way of life as the path to happiness, nor does he discuss divine providence. He poses no plea for liberty or freedom of speech, nor does he include

---

80 On the similarities between Socrates and Eleazar, the trial scene of the Jewish martyrs as the frequent use of the φιλοσοφία-stem in the description of the Jewish martyrs, on their contempt of death and their philosophical challenging of the tyrant, and on the motives of virtues and law-abidance in 4 Maccabees, see e.g. van Henten, *Maccabean Martyrs*, 270 ff., and MacMullen, *Enemies of the Roman Order*, 83–84. Van Henten rightly points out that 4 Maccabees and *Contra Apionem* speak very similarly about virtues and law-abidance, but he fails to note the difference when it comes to the dressing of the martyrs—and Jews in general—as "philosophers." MacMullen makes no reference to *Contra Apionem* in his discussion of the "Stoic opposition" and other philosophical martyrs.

81 Cf. the quotation above from Mason, "Flavius Josephus in Flavian Rome," 589.

82 See e.g. Quintilian, *Inst.* 12.2.
φρόνησις or σοφία among the cardinal virtues. He never employs the verb φιλοσοφεῖν with reference to Jewish philosophizing, and he does not compare Jewish groups with Greek schools of philosophy. In fact, he presents a Jewish society without antagonism, without disagreement, and without any troubling opposition.83

In other words: Contra Apionem is full of virtues, yes, but not specifically philosophical virtues. The treatise presents martyrs, yes, but they are not dressed in a philosopher’s mantle. There is a Jewish φιλοσοφία, yes, but only twice, and there are no philosophical schools, no philosophers, no philosophizing, and no retirement from public life as in the favorable descriptions of the Essenes.

**SOME CLOSING COMMENTS ON JOSEPHAN ISAGOGICS**

In A.J. 1.25 Josephus claims that, after completing his Antiquitates, he has planned to write a work on the philosophical nature of Judaism. That work was never accomplished. Things happened in Rome that made “Jewish philosophy” a useless label. A more careful adaptation to Roman values was needed.84 Due to these changing circumstances, Contra Apionem was designed as a work on Jewish virtue, piety and law-abidance—without strong claims about Jewish philosophy.

This reading of the Antiquitates and Contra Apionem against the context of Roman politics has a bearing on the isagogics of these writings. First of all, my reading would indicate that the Antiquitates might have been completed before Domitian’s crackdown on the “Stoic opposition,” maybe as early as the spring or summer of 93 C.E.

Furthermore, such an early dating of the Antiquitates makes it more likely that Josephus was also able to compose Contra Apionem during the reign of Domitian. Martin Goodman has pointed out a couple of passages that give reasons to assume that Contra Apionem was written after Domitian’s death.85 My reading indicates that the treatise

83 See e.g. C. Ap. 2.179 ff.
84 On the appropriation of Roman values in Contra Apionem, see e.g. Goodman, “Josephus as Roman Citizen,” 334–35; Goodman, “Josephus’ Treatise Against Apion,” 57; Haaland, “Jewish Laws for a Roman Audience,” and Barclay, “Judaism in Roman Dress.”
85 C. Ap. 2.158–159 (on the contrast between Moses and lawless despots) and 2.193 (on the temple of Jerusalem) both fit the situation after Domitian’s death. Goodman, “Josephus’ Treatise Against Apion,” 50 and 57.
was written while Domitian was still in power, since we know that the younger Helvidius Priscus was rehabilitated by Pliny in the Senate soon after Domitian’s death in 96 C.E.

Obviously, if *Contra Apionem* was indeed written during the last years of Domitian’s reign, Epaphroditus might be identified with Nero’s freedman. He was apparently involved in Nero’s crushing of the Pisonian conspiracy in 65 C.E., as well as in Nero’s suicide, and was killed by Domitian toward the end of his reign. If this identification is correct, Josephus’ patron would literally have had first-hand knowledge of—or even hands-on experience from—the issues that I have been struggling to get a grip on!
In den Werken des Josephus erscheint das ägyptische Alexandrien gegenüber anderen Städten mit 94 (+24) Vorkommen nicht übermäßig häufig (als Vergleich dazu z.B. Jerusalem 578 mal [+119]; Rom 244 mal [+895] – dann schon mit Abstand Caesarea am Meer 84 mal [+13]; Samaria 80 mal [+67]; Akko [Ptolemaïs] 69 mal [+11]; Tiberias 65 mal [+61]; Antiochien 64 mal [+32]; Jericho 50 mal [+4]; Damaskus 47 mal [+26]), wobei sich natürlich die Anzahl durch die Erwähnungen der Einwohner erhöht. Im gesamten Werk des Josephus besitzt von dieser Statistik her Palästina, vor allem Jerusalem...


Vespasian wollte zuerst Alexandrien in seine Hand bekommen, da er wusste, dass die Getreideversorgung aus Ägypten von größter

11 Vor allem im B.J.
12 Vgl. Tacitus, Hist. 2.82.3: Titus bekam die Befehlsgewalt der Truppen in Palästina und Vespasion sichert die Schlüsselpositionen Ägyptens (Vespasionum obtinere claustra Aegypti placuit). Fast wörtlich auch bei Sueton, Vesp. 7.1: „Er (Vespasian) setzte inzwischen nach Alexandrien über, um die Schlüsselpositionen von Ägypten fest im Griff zu haben (interim Alexandriam transiit, ut claustra Aegypti optineret.)”
13 Insgesamt 159 Nennungen (B.J. 128 mal; A.J. 6 mal; Vita 23; C. Ap. 2 mal); Die grundlegende Bedeutung spiegelt sich somit auch in der erheblich kürzeren Vita!
16 Michel etwas frei: „die Kornkammer Ägypten“ (τὴν τοῦ σίτου χορηγίαν); vgl. 2.386.
Josephus benutzt diese Gegebenheit, um recht ausführlich die besondere geographische und strategisch bedeutende Position Alexandriens mit ihren Häfen und dem berühmten Leuchtturm,\(^{21}\) einem der sieben Weltwunder der Antike, zu beschreiben. Während Mucianus zur Sicherung der Verhältnisse nach Rom geschickt wird, reist Vespasian selbst in dieser Situation nach Alexandrien.\(^{22}\) Schon seit Augustus stand die Stadt ja unter der besonderen Aufsicht des Senats. Tacitus erklärt die außergewöhnliche Maßnahme des Senats mit der Furcht der Römer\(^{23}\) dass jeder, der (die Hauptstadt) einer Provinz besitzt, damit

\begin{itemize}
  \item[18] Die Formulierung ἡς κρατήσας εἰ παρέλκοι ist nicht zu übersetzen. Die Konkordanz setzt an dieser Stelle für die Übersetzung ein Fragezeichen (aufschieben?, beiseite bringen?).
\end{itemize}
den Schlüssel (des römischen Reiches) zu Land und zu See in den Händen hält, schon mit einer kleinen militärischen Macht, Italien durch eine drohende Hungersnot erpressen könne.\(^{24}\)


Josephus verfolgt nun nicht mehr den Erzählduktus über den Regierungsantritt des Kaisers, sondern konzentriert sich ganz auf die Ereignisse in Palästina, wo das römische Heer ab sofort unter dem Oberbefehl des Titus steht.\(^{25}\) Zwar werden schon vorher die Fäden gesponnen, aber in Alexandrien erreichen Vespasian die Ehr- und Treuebekundungen aus Ost und West. Die Stadt fungiert daher in aller Eindeutigkeit als Dreh- und Angelpunkt der römischen Weltherrschaft; dies wird bei Josephus fast pathetisch so zum Ausdruck gebracht, dass die riesige Weltstadt die Menschenmassen schier nicht mehr bewältigen konnte.


\(^{25}\) B.J. 5.2 erwähnt noch die Unterstützung für seinen Vater: „er war ihm in Alexandrien bei der ordnungsgemäßen Übernahme der ihnen soeben von Gott anvertrauten Regierungsgewalt (τῷ πατρὶ τὴν ἡγεμονίαν νέων συντοῖς ἐγκεκριμένην ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ συνέβη) behilflich.“ Zur Bedeutung der Stadt für Titus s.u. zu B.J. 7.117; ähnlich lässt Tacitus Macht und Einfluss des Titus in Alexandrien beginnen (Hist. 5.1.1; s.u.).

1. Josephus in Alexandrien

Die Beziehung zwischen Josephus und dem römischen Herrscher begann bei der Kapitulation in Galiläa; dies ist eine der bekanntesten Geschichten aus seinem Leben (B.J. 3.141–408).\(^{27}\) In dramatischer Weise, in unterschiedlichen Perspektiven hat Josephus seine eigene Biographie dort in Szene gesetzt.\(^{28}\) Allein die dreiseitige, kurze Zusammenfassung durch Steve Mason\(^{29}\) lässt noch etwas von der Atemlosigkeit, einem Thriller vergleichbar, spüren; das Leben des Helden stand nicht nur einmal, auch im wörtlichen Sinne, „auf des Messers Schneide“.\(^{30}\)

Die Darstellung in der Vita setzt jedenfalls voraus, dass Josephus schon vor der Reise nach Alexandrien in Palästina, nämlich bei den ersten deutlichen Treuebekundungen für Vespasian – die zunächst vorwiegend aus dem Osten des Reiches kamen – freigelassen worden ist.\(^{31}\) Danach bleibt er als hochgestellte Persönlichkeit immer – zunächst

---

\(^{26}\) B.J. 5.2 beim Aufenthalt des Titus in Alexandrien.

\(^{27}\) In der Vita wird auf die geschilderten Ereignisse nur kurz hingewiesen (Vita 412; vgl. die längere Anmerkung 33 in der Ausgabe Münster, S. 181).

\(^{28}\) S. Mason verweist zu Recht auf die literarischen Vorbilder bei Odysseus (Odyssey 13.250–301) und Judith (s. nächste Anmerkung).


\(^{30}\) Zu Josephus als Kriegsgefangener des Vespasian vgl. Sueton, Vesp. 5.6. Ähnlich auch Cassius Dio, Hist. 65.1.4; 65.9.1.


2. TIBERIUS JULIUS ALEXANDER

Eine andere Gestalt aus Alexandrien verdient in diesem Zusammenhang eine etwas ausführlichere Behandlung. Schon bei den ersten Schritten Vespasians zum Antritt seiner Herrschaft sind wir auf seine Person gestoßen und die entscheidende Rolle, die ihm für die Proklamation

---

32 Das greift Josephus noch einmal auf in der Einleitung des ersten Buches C. Ap. 1.48; er war genötigt, immer in der Nähe von Vespasian und Titus zu bleiben (ἀεὶ προσέδρευσιν αὐτοῖς ἰνάγκασαν).
33 Sueton, Vesp. 5.6: Er (Josephus) versicherte zuversichtlich und entschieden, als man ihn in Fesseln legte, dass er genau von diesem Mann (Vespasian) in Kürze befreit werde, dann aber sei er bereits Kaiser.
Vespasians zum Kaiser zufiel. Er, der Präfekt von Ägypten, war der erste, der von Vespasian um Unterstützung für seine politischen Absichten schriftlich um Hilfe ersucht wurde.


Dabei ist aber wenig wahrscheinlich, dass diese sich des Judeseins des Präfekten bewusst waren. Nie wird Tiberius Alexander bei ihnen als Jude bezeichnet. Tacitus kennzeichnet ihn allerdings zu Beginn seiner Historien als „Ägypter“,41 eine Bezeichnung, die mit seiner Heimat in Alexandrien noch nicht einmal als ganz falsch oder als Missverständnis abzulehnen ist. Da aber in diesem Zusammenhang die Ägypter im Allgemeinen völlig negativ dargestellt werden, dürfte eine Absicht dahinter stecken; darum wird man davon auszugehen haben, dass Tacitus um die jüdische Herkunft des Alexanders gewusst hat.42 Bei ihm fallen die Verachtung der Ägypter und die der Juden in eins; es handelt sich um eine bewusste Missachtung des Selbstbewusstseins Alexanders als Griech und Bürger Alexandriens (s. OGIS 669.3–4).

Wir können davon ausgehen, dass Josephus selbst dem Präfekten in Alexandrien begegnet ist; doch schweigt er sich über solche Kontakte aus. Tiberius Julius Alexander wurde im Bellum Judaicum schon dreimal kurz erwähnt und so als Statthalter Ägyptens seit 66 n.Chr. unter Nero eingeführt.43 Selbst bei einem der ersten brisanten und blutigen

39 Sueton, Vesp. 6.3 zu diesem Tag: qui principatus dies in posterum observatus est.
40 Sueton, Vesp. 6.4; Strabon, Geogr. 17.1.13.
41 Tacitus, Hist. 1.11 zu Ägypten: regebat tum Tiberius Alexander, eiusdem nationis.
42 Vgl. den berüchtigten Judenexkurs in Hist. 3.3.

Beziehung zu Vespasian sind freundschaftlich und zugleich herzlich und ohne Einschräskungen: er wird umworben und lässt sich umwerben als ein Mitarbeiter und Freund des Kaisers (συνεργόν αὐτῶν . . . καὶ βοητῶν).\(^{48}\) In der Zeit des Krieges mit den Juden scheint er immer an dessen Seite gewesen zu sein.

Alexander tut damit in Alexandrien das, was nötig ist, wenn Scharfmacher – auch in den eigenen Reihen – sich ans Werk machen und bürgerkriegsähnliche Zustände herbeiführen wollen, während gleichzeitig in Palästina die Ereignisse sich von Monat zu Monat zusipiten und überstürzen.

Die etwas ausführlichere Beschreibung des Alexander als Freund der Römer und insbesondere des Titus zu Beginn der letzten Monate der Belagerung Jerusalems passen durchaus in diese positive Tendenz.\(^{49}\) Denn Titus selbst erscheint ja sogar bei der Einnahme der Stadt als ehrbarer Heerführer, der die Vernichtung des Tempels mit allen Mitteln, eigenhändig und im Einverständnis mit Tiberius Alexander und zwei anderen Heerführern, zu verhindern versuchte.\(^{50}\)


\(^{48}\) B.J. 4.616.

\(^{49}\) B.J. 5.45–46: „Unter den Freunden (des Titus, φίλων) war derjenige mit dabei, der sich, was Ergebenheit/Loyalität und Verstand/Urteilsvermögen anbelangt, am besten bewährt hat (δοκιμώτατος εὔνοιάν τε καὶ σύνεσιν) . . . “; ja gegenüber Titus wird er geschildert als „an Alter und Erfahrung voraus (ἡλικίατε προύχων καὶ κατ’ ἐμπειρίαν), als ein Berater in allen Angelegenheiten des Krieges (σὺμβουλός γε μὴν ταῖς τοῦ πολέμου χρείαις).“


3. TITUS IN ALEXANDRIEN

Für mehr als einen Politiker der römischen Zeit war also Alexandrien eine wichtige Station. Ähnliches wie bei Vespasian lässt sich auch

---

52 So die Bedeutung von ἀπόστασις zu dieser Zeit überhaupt wie z.B. die Verwendung des Begriffes in den Makkabäerbüchern, vgl. ähnlich auch die Septuaginta zu Num 14,9; Jos 22,22. Zum Begriff selbst s.o. Anm. 15.
bei seinem Sohn Titus nachzeichnen. Exemplarisch sei genannt dessen Rückkehr nach Rom nach der Eroberung Jerusalems 70 n.Chr.\textsuperscript{57} In Alexandrien entlässt er seine beiden Legionen und schifft sich selbst mit ausgewählten Gefangenen nach Rom ein. Sueton ist an dieser Stelle ausführlicher als Josephus.

Wieder einmal erweist sich der Besuch eines Römers in Alexandrien als brisant. Sueton berichtet von einem Verdacht er (Titus) habe versucht, vom Vater abzufallen und sich die Herrschaft über den Orient zu verschaffen (\textit{Titus} 5.3).\textsuperscript{58} Sueton nimmt seinen Protagonisten in Schutz – trotz späterer gravierender Kritikpunkte – und erklärt die dortige Anwesenheit seiner ganzen Streitmacht mit den Wünschen und Bitten seiner Soldaten; doch mag an den damaligen Gerüchten ein Körnchen Wahrheit gehaftet haben.\textsuperscript{59}

In ganz ähnlicher Weise war ja auch früher schon ein vergleichbarer Verdacht gegen Germanicus bei seiner Ägyptenreise 19 v.Chr. aufgekommen, eine Episode, die auch Josephus erwähnt.\textsuperscript{60} Er hatte die Reise ohne die ausdrückliche Genehmigung durch den Senat unternommen. Touristische Attraktionen allein waren selten aus schlaggebend. So werden bei Germanicus die Öffnung der staatlichen Getreidespeicher,\textsuperscript{61} der Verfall der Getreidepreise und sein wachsender Einfluss beim Volk erwähnt, bei Josephus zusätzlich seine Benachteiligung der Juden.

In diesem Zusammenhang ist erwähnenswert, dass man damals des Öfteren prophetische Worte bei den ägyptischen Weisen suchte. Es war nicht von ungefähr, dass auch Vespasian gerade in Alexandrien eine Bestätigung seines Weges zur Macht und vor allem zur Dauerhaftigkeit seiner politischen Funktion empfangen hatte.\textsuperscript{62} Später werden

\textsuperscript{57} Vgl. vorher schon das Rekrutieren der Truppen in \textit{B.J.} 3.8, 64 und 5.2.

\textsuperscript{58} \textit{quasi desciscere a patre Orientisque sibi regnum uindicare temptasset.} Der Verdacht wurde dadurch noch vermehrt, dass Titus eine Reise nach Memphis unternahm und dort der Beisetzung eines Apis-Stieres bewohnte. Dabei trug er ein Diadem, „wie es der althergebrachte Brauch einer altehrwürdigen Religion verlangte (\textit{de more quidem ritequ priscae religionis}).“

\textsuperscript{59} Immerhin lässt auch Tacitus die Macht des Titus in Alexandrien beginnen (s.o. zu \textit{Hist.} 5.1.1 durch die Wahl seines Vaters, ihm die Truppen für die Belagerung Jerusalems anzuvertrauen).

\textsuperscript{60} Siehe \textit{C. Ap.} 2.63.


\textsuperscript{62} Sueton, \textit{Vesp.} 7.1 mit Besuch des Sarapistempels; ähnlich schon vorher ebd. 5.6 auf dem Kärmel.
noch mehr Ereignisse mit seinem Ägyptenaufenthalt verbunden. So gesehen, ist es kein Zufall, dass Vespasian zusammen mit Titus die Nacht vor dem großen Triumphzug in Rom im dortigen Isistempel verbringt.


4. WELTPOLITISCHE PERSPEKTIVEN: DER KAMPF ZWISCHEN WEST UND OST


Auf der einen Seite stehen Octavian und Agrippa, die die Werte der traditionellen römischen Gesellschaft widerspiegeln mit den


66 *Vita* 359–361; *C. Ap.* 1.50–51.

Mitten befehlt die Fürstin auf heimischer Rassel⁶⁸ den Völkern, Und doch bemerkt sie nicht die beiden Schlangen im Rücken: Mancherlei Götter von seltsamer Art und der Beller Anubis Halten gegen Neptun und gegen Minerva und Venus Waffen gezückt . . .

Nicht Isis, Osiris oder Sarapis symbolisieren hier die ägyptische göttliche Macht, sondern Merkwürdigkeiten von Göttern, unter ihnen Anubis, dessen Hundekopf auch der außerägyptischen Antike bekannt war. Es ist deutlich: eine solche Welt mit ihren unterschiedlichen Werten und Empfindlichkeiten im religiösen und politischen wie auch kulturellen Bereich findet in Alexandrien, der Metropole der Kleopatra, ihre Veranschaulichung; mit ihrer Faszination und Anziehungskraft, aber auch mit ihrer Abwehr und orientalischen Fremdheit.

In vergleichbarer Weise kann auch Josephus auf dieser Klaviatur spielen.⁶⁹ Das werden die Römer positiv registriert haben. Alexandrien wird bei ihm mehr und mehr auf die Seite des ägyptischen Einflusses gerückt, auch wenn er der dortigen jüdischen Gemeinde in anderen –

⁶⁸ Der Text nennt das sistrum aus dem Isiskult – kein militärisches Schlachtinstrument wie eine Trompete!

---


73 Eine Untersuchung zur Bedeutung Roms in einer solchen Perspektive ist bisher leider ebenfalls noch ein desideratum.
Jews, Romans and Christians: From the Bellum Judaicum to the Antiquitatus

Giorgio Jossa
Università di Napoli "Federico II"

Josephus’s references to the Christians have been the object of innumerable studies. In recent years, they have known a new wave of interest. However, they have been studied almost exclusively with regard to their authenticity. Only recently more questions have been asked about the intentions which lie behind those references, and their relationship to the overall direction of the works of Flavius Josephus, considered as a whole. My paper, instead, takes its shape from precisely these questions. As a matter of fact, it aims to answer one specific question: why is it that in the Antiquitates, therefore in 93–94 C.E., Josephus has included in the account of the years 26 to 66 two references to the Christians (A.J. 18.63–64; 20.200) which, when dealing with the same period in the earlier Bellum, written between the years 75 and 79, he did not include? A very simple answer could be that the documentary material of the Antiquitates, as regards the years from the beginning of the Hasmonean period to the outbreak of the war, was taken from additional sources, and is therefore richer than that in the Bellum. To the one and a half books devoted to this period in the Bellum correspond nine books of the...

---


3 L. H. Feldman, “Flavius Josephus Revisited: the Man, his Writings, and his Significance,” ANRW 2.21.2 (1984): 826, points out the silence ("rarely noticed") of the Bellum on John, Jesus and James, but hardly accounts for it. Carleton Paget, “Some Observations,” 608–609, rightly emphasizes the different aim of the Antiquitatis and of the Bellum, but does not sufficiently develop this consideration.
Antiquitates. Such an answer, though, would be insufficient. Most of the new accounts concern the time of Herod, and they are thus related to a period prior to the appearance of Christianity, for which the privileged source is Nicolaus of Damascus. For the period we are concerned with (Books 18–20), the new sources are mainly Roman. They are not the ones to contain the references to the two episodes of Christian origins in Palestine. And, pace Nodet, Paul and Bardet, nothing lets us suppose that Josephus ever read any Christian source. As we are about to see, there is nothing specifically “Christian” in these two references. Why, then, did he decide to recall characters and events he had not mentioned in the Bellum?

Of course, the question implies that those two references were indeed Josephus’ and were not, instead, just the result of later interpolations. I have no doubt as far as the James episode is concerned. Neither the overall account of Ananus’ initiative (A.J. 20.199–203), nor the reference to “Jesus called Christ” (A.J. 20.200: Ἰησοῦς ὁ λεγόμενος Χριστός) raise any perplexity. On the contrary, they perfectly match the interests and the style of the author. We shall see that the passage has nothing “Christian” about it. Its subject is Ananus, not James. It was not the Christians who included that reference. The passage on Jesus is obviously different. Here the interpolations are clear. Josephus could never have written of Jesus that “he was the Christ” (ὁ Χριστός ὁ πρῶτος ήν), or that “he appeared to them alive again on the third day,” or “if indeed one ought to call him a man.” I will not attempt to reconstruct a hypothetical original text. But it is enough to think that in Josephus’ text there was a reference to Jesus “called Christ” (and not that “he was the Christ”), and to the fact that, on the one hand, people thought of Jesus as a wise man whose disciples were among the best men in Judea, and, on the

---

4 T. Rajak, Josephus: the Historian and his Society (London: Duckworth, 1983), 131; 151, and K. A. Olson, “Eusebius and the Testimonium Flavianum,” CBJ 61 (1999): 314–19, believe there was an interpolation. Rajak thinks so because the judgment on Ananus is too different from the one in the Bellum (although I believe that this difference can be otherwise explained). Olson thinks so since the reference to the Messiah is unique in Josephus (but Olson accepts Feldman’s translation “Jesus who was called the Christ”).

5 When Nodet (“Jésus et Jean-Baptiste,” 333–34) states that Josephus might have written that Jesus “was the Christ”, he seems to forget that in such a form, for a Jew, the statement is the same as to say that Jesus was the Messiah; and that, if Origen had read this passage, he could not have written of Josephus that he did not believe Jesus to be the Messiah. See also J. P. Meier, “Jesus in Josephus: A Modest Proposal,” CBJ 52 (1990): 82.
other, that he had attracted not only Jews but also Greeks. Since the definition of James as “the brother of Jesus called Christ” presupposes a previous mention of the latter, I believe that a reference of this sort was indeed present in Josephus’ text. Why, then, did he include in the Antiquitates these two episodes that he did not mention in the Bellum? I believe the answer to be in the nature and in the aim of the two works.

Scholars agree on the goals of the Bellum. Josephus aims to offer his own interpretation of the reasons for the revolt, contrasting it with those of other authors, mostly Greek, and basing it on his vantage point as an eyewitness. Jewish people were peaceful: if they went so far as to react against the legitimate power of the Romans, it was because of the presence of a small group of thugs, mainly Zealots and Sicarii, who managed to drag the others into rebellion. The misrule of the last Roman governors, which exasperated the Jews, certainly contributed to the spreading of the rebellion. In such conditions the efforts of the aristocracy, who tried every means available to avoid the war, proved to be in vain. According to Josephus the situation was absolutely clear. On the one hand there was a small group of rebels exploiting the exasperation of the people against the Roman governors. On the other, there were the high priests and the Pharisees’ leaders who made every effort to avoid the war. It is from this simplistic formulation that the identification of the decisive moments of the revolt against the Romans derives.

The beginning of all the calamities suffered by the Jews is indeed identified by Josephus with the appearance of Judas the Galilean, sixty

---

6 The hypothesis of a total interpolation of the text, ascribed to Eusebius of Caesarea, has been recently suggested by Olson (“Eusebius,” 305–22), with interesting arguments which were rejected, however, by Carleton Paget (“Some Observations,” 577–78) in an extremely convincing way. None of these arguments, from the passage’s style (which is absolutely “Flavian”) to the silence of the Fathers (easily explainable), is actually strong. An even more recent re-assertion of the interpolation of the whole Testimonium Flavianum, within, however, an overall interpretation of the usage of Josephus in the ecclesiastical tradition, can be found also in F. Parente, “Sulla doppia trasmissione, filologica ed ecclesiastica, del testo di Flavio Giuseppe: un contributo alla storia della ricezione della sua opera nel mondo cristiano,” Rivista di Storia e Letteratura religiosa 36 (2000): 9–25. Guided as it is by the persuasion of an early apologetic usage of Josephus’ text by the ecclesiastical tradition, suggested by the connection of the destruction of Jerusalem with the death of James, it seems hardly convincing.

7 The most significant passage is no doubt B.J. 2.411–417. It describes a meeting of the principal citizens with the high priests and the leaders of the Pharisees to convince the population not to provoke the Romans.
years before the war. His opposition to the payment of taxes resulted from the fact that Judea had been turned into a Roman province. Josephus does not say much about Judas in this part of the Bellum. He mainly points out the theological reason that served as his inspiration, that is to say the impossibility for the Jews to “have mortal masters besides God” (B.J. 2.118). At the end of the book, however, Josephus identifies Judas as the very founder of the group of the Sicarii, led during the war first by Menahem, and then by Eleazar. About the Sicarii, Josephus not only maintains that they “were the first to set the example of this lawlessness and cruelty to their kinsmen, leaving no word unspoken to insult, no deed untried to ruin, the victims of their conspiracy” (B.J. 7.262 [Thackeray, LCL]), but also that they were completely alien to the Jewish tradition. Judas was in fact “doctor of a particular school who had nothing in common with the others” (B.J. 2.118). Josephus identifies the beginning of all Jewish misfortunes with the appearance of Judas the Galilean; similarly, for him the end of all hopes for peaceful coexistence with the Romans was determined by the murder of Ananus son of Ananus at the hands of the Sicarii. Josephus praises Ananus in the Bellum, both on the moral and political level. He does not simply say: “A man on every ground revered and of the highest integrity, Ananus, with all the distinction of his birth, his rank and the honours to which he had attained, yet delighted to treat the very humblest as his equals”; but he also adds: “Unique in his love of liberty and an enthusiast for democracy, he on all occasions put the public welfare above his private interests” (B.J. 4.319–320 [Thackeray, LCL]). In particular, Josephus believes Ananus’ attempt to give the impression of going along with the revolt, while still controlling “the so-called Zealots” (B.J. 2.651) and strongly suppressing the forces of Simon bar Giora (B.J. 2.653), to have been the only possible chance to avoid war. Therefore he can conclude: “I should not be wrong in saying that the capture of the city began with the death of Ananus; and that the overthrow of the walls and the downfall of the Jewish state dated from the day on which the Jews beheld their high priest, the captain of their salvation, butchered in the heart of Jerusalem” (B.J. 4.318 [Thackeray, LCL]).

Nowadays there is a tendency not to overemphasize the contrast between the Bellum and the Antiquitates, or to see signs of change in
the global attitude of Josephus already in the revisions of Book 7 of the *Bellum*. Nevertheless it must be admitted that the goals, and thus the very nature, of the *Antiquitates* (as well as of the *Vita*) are different. The main goal of the *Antiquitates* is not to explain the causes of the Jewish war and to unmask the people responsible for it, but rather to provide the Graeco-Roman readers with an image of the Jews that can legitimize them as respectable members of their own cultural world, to whom Roman authorities have always granted support and protection. Hence the presentation of Moses as the wisest among the legislators, of the Jewish religion as a form of philosophy, and of the Jewish groups as philosophical schools is more emphasized than in the *Bellum*. Hence the mention of all the measures taken by the Roman authorities in favor of the Jews. On the other hand, compared to the *Bellum*, the *Antiquitates* strongly stress the motif of divine guidance in history and, in particular, of the immediate reward for human actions by God. The issue of the causes of the Jewish War is integrated within an overall conception of human history. The author himself admits that he wants first of all to underline the providential nature of historical events, and support the idea of a divine reward for human actions. God always rewards good people and punishes bad ones. Human happiness can only be measured through moral criteria.

I have already referred to the explanations given in the *Bellum* for the causes of the revolt and to the opinions expressed on the characters of Judas the Galilean and Ananus son of Ananus. In the *Antiquitates* these evaluations have deeply changed. The main cause

---


10 *A.J.* 1.14: “But, speaking generally, the main lesson to be learnt from this history by any who care to peruse it is that men who conform to the will of God, and do not venture to transgress laws that have been excellently laid down, prosper in all things beyond belief, and for their reward are offered by God felicity; whereas, in proportion as they depart from the strict observance of these laws, things (else) practicable become impracticable, and whatever imaginary good thing they strive to do ends in irretrievable disasters”; *A.J.* 1.20: “God, as the universal father and lord who beholds all things, grants to such as follow him a life of bliss, but involves in dire calamities those who step outside the path of virtue” (Thackeray, LCL). These statements refer to the story narrated in the Scriptures, but they may as well refer to the one narrated in the *Antiquitates*, which are, according to the author, the translation and accomplishment of the Scriptures.
of the war is still detected in the action of extremists and, in particular, in Judas' followers (A.J. 18.6–9), whose thinking Josephus deems "unusual" (A.J. 18.9). But if the judgment on them had been already slightly softened in Book 7 of the Bellum, in the Antiquitates Judas' movement is recognized not only as a ὀἰκροβολία, as a school (B.J. 2.118), but even as the "fourth philosophy" (A.J. 18.9, 23) alongside the Essenes, the Pharisees, and the Sadducees already mentioned in the B.J. 2.219. The movement is thought to be, apart from its passionate love for freedom, "in all other respects in agreement with the opinions of the Pharisees" (A.J. 18.23), founded as it was not only by Judas the Galilean, but also by the Pharisee Sadoq (A.J. 18.4, 9). Above all, Josephus admits that "since the populace, when they heard their appeals, responded gladly, the plot to strike boldly made serious progress" (A.J. 18.6 [Feldman, LCL]); that is to say that it became deeply rooted within the population. These admissions are somewhat surprising and extremely significant. Judas is not a doctor with nothing in common with the others, but someone close to the Pharisees, to the school Josephus considered the most influential. The movement Judas founded is similar to that of the Pharisees and therefore deserves the status of a "philosophical school". More importantly, it does not consist of a small group of fanatics without any significant repercussion, but earns major success among the population.

This re-evaluation of Judas is accompanied by an even stronger shift of judgment on Ananus. Many think that his father has been the happiest of human beings since he saw all his five children become high priests. But according to the Antiquitates this is not so: praised in the Bellum as the only one who could have avoided the tragedy of the nation, Ananus is now a reckless man who did not hesitate to lead an illegal trial against a group of fellow citizens, and for this reason aroused feelings of resentment in the hearts of the most moderate and lawful Jews, losing his high priesthood after only three months (A.J. 20.200–203). His moral integrity is highly questionable. In the Vita, Josephus also recalls that the former high priest, now leader of the provisional government of Jerusalem, gave in to the pressures of Simon son of Gamaliel to take Galilee away from Josephus and became corrupted.11 His political role does not appear brilliant

11 Vita 192–194. I do not see how J. S. McLaren, "Ananus, James and early Christianity," JTS 52 (2001): 3–4, can maintain that here Josephus's judgment on Ananus is not negative, and anyway more positive than the one on the Pharisee Simon. I think the reverse is true.
either. Deprived of the high priesthood after only three months due to his actions, considered illegal by king Agrippa and the Roman procurator Albinus, he did not have much influence on the extremists who were increasingly taking over the government of Jerusalem.

Josephus' judgment on Ananus is part of an appraisal of the priestly aristocracy, and more in general of the Jewish authorities, during the years preceding the revolt, one that differs from that given in the Bel
um. It is well known that Josephus modified his judgment on Herod's family in the Antiquitates. Not only Herod the Great, but also Herod Antipas is portrayed in a far less favorable light. His defeat by Aretas is connected to his unjust behavior towards John the Baptist. Only Agrippa I still deserves genuine praises. But it is the priestly aristocracy who receives the harshest judgment. Josephus now recalls how Agrippa II unscrupulously used his prerogatives to appoint and dismiss high priests and to control the temple. He further paints a frightening picture of the priestly caste. He suggests that, at that time, the only way to become high priest seemed by way of paying great sums of money (A.J. 20.213). Of course, this ended up dividing the priestly aristocracy, previously quite united against the lower clergy, into several opposed groups. Josephus says: "There now was enkindled mutual enmity and class warfare between the high priests, on the one hand, and the priests and the leaders of the populace of Jerusalem, on the other. Each of the factions formed and collected for itself a band of the most reckless revolutionaries and acted as their leader" (A.J. 20.180 [Feldman, LCL]). The friction between the priestly aristocracy on the one hand, and the lower priesthood and the Levites on the other, worsened. Josephus reports that the high priests would embezzle the remuneration due to the priests and lead them to starvation (A.J. 20.181, 206–207).

It would perhaps be an exaggeration, as far as the Antiquitates are concerned, to talk about a total reversal of the evaluation of the causes and development of the revolt given fifteen years earlier in the Bel
um. Certainly, however, Josephus' evaluation has become far more nuanced and complex. It is no longer only a small group of violent people that started the rebellion. And there is no longer an absolutely moral and politically correct aristocracy that tried in any way possible to avoid the worst. Extremists were undeniably rooted within the population. And the members of the aristocracy have been utterly incapable to carry out their duties. Internally divided and eager for power, they pursued only their own personal interests and rightly incurred divine punishment.
I am strongly tempted to solve in this way the difficult problem of Josephus’ attitude towards the Pharisees. M. Smith and J. Neusner’s old theory, according to which a radical shift in Josephus’ attitude towards the Pharisees had occurred between the Bellum and the Antiquitates, due to the supremacy of the Pharisaic party in Israel after 70, has been rightly criticized by D. Schwartz and S. Mason. There is certainly no radical change. And more than once the Pharisees are openly criticized. On the other hand, Rabbinism is not to be identified with Pharisaism, therefore it cannot be said that after 70 Pharisaic Judaism has won. However, it is clear to the reader of the Antiquitates (and even more so to one who reads the Vita) that, between the Sadducees and the Pharisees, Josephus now stands by the latter. They are the most rigorous, but also the most moderate, interpreters of the law. They, and not the Sadducees, are closer to the common people and have the greatest influence on them (A.J. 18.15, 17). They are the leaders, even more than the high priests, who could have avoided the war. And that is why the aristocratic priest, undoubtedly linked to the Sadducees by both class and mentality, at the end of his training thinks it appropriate to come close to the Pharisees. There is no need to think that Josephus has become a Pharisee. I also believe that Josephus never really joined the Pharisaic group (especially before and during the war). And he himself states so. The terms used in Vita 12 (πολιτεύεσθαι, ἀκολουθῶν) are different from the ones (ἐμπειρίαν λαβεῖν, δηληθοῦν) with which, in Vita 10–11, he describes the prior experience of the three schools. These terms do not indicate a formal joining. However, stating for the very first time in Vita 12 that, once he had accomplished his religious training at the age of 19, he began to “live according to the rules of the Pharisaic school” (rules that, I believe, are not only “political”), Josephus means that it had been his choice to be closer to the Pharisaic leaders than to the high priests. But this is unlikely, since his patron and hero was at the time the Sadducee Ananus with his colleague Jesus of Gamala.

12 They are therefore those citizens who, in the James episode, openly stand against Ananus (A.J. 20.201).
13 In particular, in Vita 192–194 it is surprising to find a favorable judgment on Simon of Gamaliel, that is to say on the one who was friend with the mortal foe of Josephus, John of Gischala, and who tried, through the leaders of Jerusalem, to take the command of Galilee away from Josephus.
14 According to Vita 204, Jesus was “friendly and on intimate terms” with Josephus.
and not the Pharisee Simon son of Gamaliel with whom, according to *Vita* 192, he was instead on bad terms during the war.

The questionable connection with the Pharisees has a further motive that Josephus only hints at, but that is nonetheless clear. I have mentioned above the efforts made by the historian to present the Jewish religion as a philosophy, and the Jewish groups as philosophical schools. The wider space given to the Essenes, especially in the *Bellum*, compared to the one given to the Pharisees and the Sadducees, is easily understandable from this perspective. The Essenes not only responded perfectly to the ethnographic curiosities of his readers, but also represent the highest model of moral life which even a Greek could not but admire. In order to make such a model more convincing, Josephus now lingers on the philosophical aspects of their thinking (first and foremost their opposition to slavery, *A.J.* 18. 21; but also the way they valued agriculture over sacrificial rites, *A.J.* 18.19), and remembers that the Essenes resemble in their life style the Pythagoreans (*A.J.* 15.371): a significant comparison, since the Pythagoreans are by tradition the highest reference in the evaluation of Greek philosophical thinking. It now becomes clearer why Josephus chooses to mention in the *Vita* how he lived as a Pharisee after completing his religious training, and why he insists on drawing a comparison between Pharisees and Stoics. Josephus aims to be accepted by the Roman aristocracy he wants to be part of. Stoicism was the most popular philosophy within this aristocracy. If Josephus, an aristocratic priest close to the Sadducees, chose to live as the Pharisees, it is just because their behavior is similar, in its rigor, to the Stoics’.

From this modified perspective the attention Josephus now shows towards some events and people, till now overlooked, becomes explainable. They are events and people that, no matter how different one from the other, have clearly something in common. They are all popular movements and people suppressed or condemned by the Jewish authorities.

The first episode is that of John the Baptist: Josephus portrays John as a virtuous man, a preacher of repentance who was unjustly murdered by Antipas for political reasons (*A.J.* 18.116–119). Little does it matter here that his image seems to be interpreted in an extremely simplistic way, devoid of eschatological and apocalyptic connotations, and that it consequently seems less convincing than the one we find in the Gospels. What matters to us is that John the Baptist is in no way connected to Christianity. Even less is he interpreted as being
in contrast with Christianity. His fortunes are told merely in order to show how Herod Antipas could be as unjust as his father, and that eventually he would be punished by God. Josephus uses the Baptist episode as a further example to prove how even rulers cannot escape God’s punishment.

The James episode bears similar features. Josephus had written in enthusiastic terms of Ananus in the Bellum, because of his commitment to try to prevent the revolt. He mentions here, as we have already noted, how Ananus’ father had been regarded as the happiest man because he had seen all his five children rising to the high priesthood. But these evaluations have to be revised. Ananus has done something patently illegal, something that has put all the most rigorous and moderate citizens against him, something for which he is no longer a high priest. This episode, just as the previous one, has nothing specifically Christian. The protagonist is not James but Ananus. Josephus does not even tell us whether James was a Christian. The aim of the story is Ananus’ dismissal, due to his illegality and his clash with the Pharisees.

It is possible, then, to provide an explanation also for the episode of Jesus. Josephus wants to underline the misrule of Pilate. That is why he cannot portray Jesus in a negative way: Josephus means to show the unjust behavior of Pilate and of the Jewish authorities. Jesus has three main positive aspects. He is defined as a wise man (σοφὸς ὁ νήρ), author of extraordinary deeds; he is teaching people who accept the truth gladly (τῶν ἡδονῆς τὰ ἀληθῆ δεχομένων); and he has been appreciated not only by the Jews, but also by the Greeks (τὸ Ἑλληνικόν). I am not attempting to reconstruct the original tone of the passage where Josephus writes about Jesus. I am persuaded that, if it could not possibly contain the statements defined above as “Christian”, it still had to say something else about Jesus. I believe the three aspects I have just mentioned to be authentic. And they tell a lot of Josephus’ attitude. A Christian would never have defined Jesus simply as a wise man, author of extraordinary deeds, as the necessity of the Christian interpolator to add “if indeed one ought to call him a man” shows. The definition must be Josephus’. But that which a Christian would have found an utterly insufficient evaluation, is to Josephus a significant appreciation. He locates Jesus among the wise men of antiquity, from Moses to Solomon (A.J. 8.53) to Daniel (A.J. 10.237), all of them remembered for their exceptional deeds, making him a respectable character. To say “accept gladly”
is, on the other hand, Josephus' typical expression and has no negative implication. It occurs in many other passages of the Antiquitates (17.329; 18.6, 59, 70, 236, 333; 19.127, 185) and always in a positive sense. In particular, it occurs in the same way in the presentation of Judas the Galilean (18.6). And it is indeed only because of this that many scholars have interpreted it in our passage with a negative nuance. I have already mentioned that Judas is presented in the Antiquitates in a less negative way than in the Bellum. In particular, in the Antiquitates Judas's success among the population is recognized. The passage in question is nothing but the confirmation of this new admission. There is therefore no reason to not to accept Josephus as the author of the statement, or to interpret in a negative way (it is the truth that is accepted gladly) an expression that elsewhere is always favorable.

There is a last element to consider: Jesus' favorable reception among the Greeks. This is an element that has always been overlooked. It is, however, an element of great importance, because it contradicts, first of all, the Gospels' presentation. This element appears to be almost certainly authentic and expresses Josephus' personal evaluation. But why does Josephus emphasize this element? And how does it affect his evaluation of Jesus' preaching? I do not think there is any doubt about the answers. In the Antiquitates all his efforts revolve around the aim to present Judaism in a way acceptable to the Greeks. Jewish groups are considered real philosophical schools. Essenes and Pharisees are compared to Pythagoreans and Stoics. The reception of Jesus's message among the Greeks is therefore a clear indication of a positive feature that places Christians very close to the Essenes and the Pharisees. If Josephus mentions it, it is because he appreciates Christianity's open-mindedness to those Greek values Josephus himself shared.

I do not intend to make of Josephus a hidden Christian. But it is difficult to overcome the impression that he, who showed appreciation for the lifestyle of the Essenes, compared to the Pythagoreans, and who admitted to have chosen to live according to the rules of the Pharisees, compared to the Stoics, felt close enough to the (Roman) followers of that wise man received with pleasure by the Jews and welcomed by many Greeks. Roman Christianity was very different from Christianity in Syria or in Asia Minor. A text like Clement of Rome's

---

15 Thus Carleton Paget, "Some Observations," 596, in a way I deem unjustifiable.
First Letter to the Corinthians, written only a few years after the Antiquitates, shows such a level of assimilation of Greek culture and such a strong loyalty towards the Roman Empire\textsuperscript{16} that it can be easily compared to Josephus oeuvre. This Jewish-Hellenistic character of the Roman Church was not so different from the Hellenistic philo-Roman Judaism of our author. At the beginning of the 90s, Josephus, through his patron Epaphroditus, kept trying to gain credit in the literary circles of the Roman aristocracy,\textsuperscript{17} but Domitian’s repressive policy started hitting both Stoics and people at court who would sympathize with Jews and Christians (Flavius Clemens and Flavia Domitilla). Therefore, it is not surprising that, in his more articulate evaluation of the history of his people, Josephus sees in Jesus, as in John the Baptist, positive characters. If it is true that Josephus' judgment of Jesus could not satisfy the Christian readers (which explains both the silence of the Fathers before Eusebius\textsuperscript{18} and the intervention of the unknown interpolator), it also reveals in Josephus something more than the mere neutral attitude many scholars have often ascribed to him:\textsuperscript{19} it expresses the awareness of a solidarity between Jews and Roman Christians as representatives of a wisdom alien to the tyrannical sovereign, but shared by at least one part of the Roman aristocracy.

\textsuperscript{16} G. Jossa, I cristiani e l'impero romano. Da Tiberio a Marco Aurelio (Roma: Carocci, 2000), 82–85. In the evaluation of the life of the community, one could think of the exaltation of ὄμονοια and of the curt condemnation of στάσις.

\textsuperscript{17} Chronological reasons seem to confirm that Josephus’s patron was not Nero’s libertus, whose murder was ordered by Domitian in 95, but the grammarian and owner of a rich library.

\textsuperscript{18} This is the argument most frequently used to prove the non-authenticity of the whole Testimonium Flavianum. Why is it that, until Eusebius, the Fathers never referred to it, and later on they used it so rarely? If one removes the three clearly interpolated passages, it is clear that the text could not but appear insufficient to a Christian reader. That is why the fact that it did not earn much attention is easily explainable.

\textsuperscript{19} E.g., Carleton Paget, “Some Observations,” 609–19. But already P. Winter had recognized that “the impression gained from an intimate study of this report is that he was not on the whole unsympathetic towards Jesus”, but rather that his attitude towards him was “relatively friendly”: see “Josephus on Jesus and James,” in Schürer, History 1:440–41.
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JEWISH LAW, ROMAN LAW OR PALACE LAW?*
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1. Introduction

Josephus refers briefly to the divorces of five Herodian princesses, suggesting in some cases that they were not in accordance with Jewish law. The fullest and most explicit of these accounts concerns the divorce of Salome:¹

But some time afterward, when Salome happened to quarrel with Costobarus, she sent him a bill of divorce (πέμπει . . . αὐτῷ γραμματεῖον) and dissolved her marriage with him (ἀπολυμένη τὸν γάμον), though this was not according to the Jewish laws (κατὰ τοὺς Ἰουδαίους νόμους); for with us it is lawful for a husband to do so; but a wife, if she departs (διαχωρισθεὶσα) from her husband, cannot of herself be married to another, unless her former husband put her away (ἐφίνετο). However, Salome chose to follow not the law of her country, but the law of her authority (ἀλλὰ τὸν [νόμον] ἀπ’ ἐξουσίας ἑλομένη), and so renounced her wedlock; and told her brother Herod, that she left her husband out of her good-will to him, because she perceived that he, with Antipater, and Lysimachus, and Dositheus, were raising a sedition against him . . .²

Josephus is clear here that it was Salome who sent a divorce document to Costobarus, and that this violated Jewish law.³ Nevertheless, he is aware of a form of Jewish divorce initiated by the wife, in the

---

¹ I am indebted to Prof.ssa Daniela Piattelli and Prof. Alfredo Mordechai Rabello for discussion and bibliographical assistance on some of the issues in this paper, especially on points on which they may disagree.

² This is Salome, the sister of Herod the Great, whom Herod gave in marriage to the Idumaean Costobarus, whom he also made governor of Idumaea. Costobarus, however, offered to transfer his loyalty (and the territory) to Cleopatra. Salome interceded with Herod to save his life, but shortly afterwards divorced him: A.J. 15.253–259. See further T. Ilan, Integrating Women into Second Temple History (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1999), 115–25.

sense that the wife may indeed "depart" (διαοχωρισθείση) from her husband, with a view to marrying someone else. But in such a case, he notes, it is still for her former husband to "put her away" (ἐφριέντο). 4

It is just such a divorce—by desertion, but here without any indication of the husband’s participation—which is attributed to Herodias, daughter of Aristobulus and a granddaughter of Herod the Great:

Their sister Herodias was married to Herod, the son of Herod the Great by Mariamme, daughter of Simon the high priest. They had a daughter Salome, after whose birth Herodias, taking it into her head to flout the way of our fathers, married Herod, her husband’s brother by the same father, who was tetrarch of Galilee; to do this she parted from a living husband (διαστάσα ζῶντο). 5

Josephus’ disapproval, in this case, seems directed more at the subsequent marriage with Herod Antipas into which Herodias entered, 6 rather than the manner of termination of the first marriage with Herod Philippos.

when explaining her action to Herod, is designed to tone this down: “It is noteworthy that, according to Josephus, when she explained her step to Herod, she used the expression ἀποστῆναι (aorist 2 of ἀφίσταναι), ‘to part from the husband’. Maybe Josephus thought it unlikely that she herself would draw attention to the gross illegality of her procedure. ‘To part from a husband’, being intransitive, does not necessarily imply a dissolution of marriage by a bill of divorce; it may just signify a wife’s running away.” On this argument, Josephus presents Salome herself as conceiving of her divorce as operating under Jewish, rather than Roman law; whether that is true depends upon the our capacity to attribute Josephus’ terminology to her, which is highly doubtful. On the distinction between participant and author viewpoint, see further infra, pp. 364–66.


5 A.J. 18.136.

6 Daube, New Testament (supra n. 6), 365–66, comments: “Moreover, such criticism as has come down to us seems directed against her marrying her husband’s brother rather than against her remarrying as such. It is, of course, possible that the crime of incest was considered so monstrous that little mention was made of other weak points about her second marriage; or again, her first husband may have divorced her when she left him. But it remains a remarkable affair.” See also S. Rossetti Favento, “Matrimonio e divorzio nel Vangelo di Marco (Mc 10.2–12),” Labeo 31 (1985): 263–302, esp. 273 n. 22, noting that the account in Mark 6:17–18 has John the Baptist lay the blame on Herod Antipas: “It is not lawful for you to have your brother’s wife.”
The three other cases (of Drusilla, Berenice and Mariamme) all involve great-granddaughters of Herod. Drusilla is enticed away from her husband by the procurator Felix, who seemingly merely has to send someone to persuade her to "leave" (καταλιποῦσαν) Azizus:

Not long afterwards Drusilla’s marriage to Azizus was dissolved (διαλύστατοι γάμοι) under the impact of the following circumstances. At the time when Felix was procurator of Judaea, he beheld her; and, inasmuch as she surpassed all other women in beauty, he conceived a passion for the lady. He sent to her one of his friends, a Cyprian Jew named Atomus, who pretended to be a magician, in an effort to persuade her to leave (καταλιποῦσαν) her husband and to marry Felix. Felix promised to make her supremely happy if she did not disdain him . . . She . . . was persuaded to transgress the ancestral laws and to marry Felix.

Though the dissolution of the marriage is probably by virtue simply of Drusilla’s desertion of Azizus, the comment here by Josephus of breach of the laws probably refers to Drusilla’s choice of a Roman as her next husband.

Next, Berenice, having married Polemo king of Cilicia (who was circumcised in order to convert) subsequently deserted him (καταλείπει τὸν Πολέμωνα):

After the death of Herod [of Chalcis], who had been her uncle and husband, Berenice [II] lived for a long time as a widow. But when a report gained currency that she had a liaison with her brother, she induced Polemo, king of Cilicia, to be circumcised and to take her in marriage; for she thought that she would demonstrate in this way that the reports were false. Polemo was prevailed upon chiefly on account of her wealth. The marriage did not, however, last long, for Berenice, out of licentiousness, according to report, deserted Polemo (δι' ἀκολασίαν . . . καταλείπει τὸν Πολέμωνα). And he was relieved simultaneously of his marriage and of further adherence to the Jewish way of life.

The fifth case is that of Mariamme, who, Josephus tells us immediately after recounting the marital history of Berenice, took leave of Archelaus and married Demetrius, an Alexandrian Jew: "At the same time Mariamme took leave of (παρατησομένη) Archelaus and married Demetrius, an Alexandrian Jew who stood among the first in birth and wealth. He also held at that time the office of alabarch."

---

7 A.J. 18.130–132.
Some have viewed these divorces as reflecting the more liberal and egalitarian regime of the Roman or Hellenistic law of divorce.\(^ {11} \)

Yet unilateral divorce by the wife of her husband is not entirely unknown in the Jewish tradition, nor is the Roman capacity for informal divorce entirely unrestricted. It is thus no simple matter to decide whether the Herodian princesses sought to act in accordance with Jewish, Hellenistic or Roman law—or whether, rather, they saw themselves (even if they were not so regarded by Josephus) as "above the law", implementing what we might here call "Palace Law".

In fact, there is reason, both chronological and substantive, to distinguish between the case of Salome, who sent her husband a γράμμα (sefer keritut) by the husband to the wife, and that document is mentioned also in both Isa 50:1 and Jer 3:8. Josephus clearly regards this pro-

---

\(^ {11} \) E.g. A. M. Rabello, "Divorce of Jews in the Roman Empire," JLA 4 (1981): 93: "here [referring specifically to the case of Herodias], as in other cases connected with Herod and his family, one is not dealing with Jewish, but rather with Hellenistic and Roman customs, given the marked assimilation of this family." Rabello stresses that Salome and Herodias, as Roman citizens, could have divorced their husbands under Roman law even against the will of their husbands (op. cit., 100). Elsewhere, however, he describes Salome as having followed "Hellenistic-Roman" and Herodias "Hellenistic" custom: see A. M. Rabello, "Divorce in Josephus," in Josephus Flavius. Historian of Eretz-Israel in the Hellenistic-Roman Period (in Hebrew; ed. U. Rappaport; Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 1982), 198-64, esp. 155-56, even though he maintains that, as Roman citizens, they had the option to divorce according to Roman law (163). See also R. Katzoff in N. Lewis, R. Katzoff and J. C. Greenfield, "Papyrus Yadin 18. I. Text, Translation and Notes (NL), II. Legal Commentary (RK), III. The Aramaic Subscription (JCG)," IEJ 37 (1987): 229-50, 244 n. 41; J. A. Fitzmyer, "The So-Called Aramaic Divorce Text from Wadi Seiyal," Eretz-Israel 26 (1999): 16*-22*, 20*, against B. Brooten, "Konnten Frauen im alten Judentum die Scheidung betreiben? Überlegungen zu Mk 10, 11-12 und 1 Kor 7, 10-11," EvT 42 (1982): 65-80, and see the subsequent debate in EvT 42-43: E. Schweizer, "Scheidungsrecht der jüdischen Frau? Weibliche Jünger Jesu?" EvT 42 (1982): 294-97; H. Weder, "Perspektive der Frauen?" EvT 43 (1983): 175-78; B. Brooten, "Zur Debatte über das Scheidungsrecht der jüdischen Frau," EvT 43 (1983): 466-78. The assumption that the princesses were Roman citizens is not, however, unproblematic: see infra, at nn. 92-94.
procedure as normative, as a necessary condition constitutive of the divorce, and so, it appears, did the Rabbis, from the very beginnings of the halakhic tradition. They were clear, moreover, that a wife was entitled to seek a divorce of her husband only where there was one of a number of relatively narrowly defined “causes.”

However, we encounter divergences from that tradition in two respects: first, the same capacity is sometimes accorded the wife as the husband, unilaterally to divorce their spouse without establishing specific “cause.” Secondly, we find traces, perhaps survivals, of different procedures of divorce, sometimes involving the pronunciation of an oral formula rather than the delivery of a document. The use of an oral formula is reflected in Hos 2:4, and the capacity of a woman to use such a formula—though here, apparently, in the formal setting of the assembly—unilaterally to divorce her husband (i.e., without “cause”) is found in two marriage contracts from Elephantine.

However, by far the closest parallel to the case of Salome is found in the much-discussed P. Hever 13, which (following the view of

---


15 We do not need to take a position, for present purposes, on the controversy regarding the relevance to Jewish practice of CPFJ 144, a Greek divorce agreement of 13 B.C.E., in which we read “Apollonia and Hermogenes agree that they have dissolved their marriage by an agreement made through the same court in the 13th year of Caesar (Augustus), per R. Yaron, “CPJud. 144 et alia,” IURA 13 (1962): 170–75, esp. 171. In opposition to J. M. Modrzejewski, “Les Juifs et le droit hellénistique: Divorce et égalité des époux (CPFJud. 144),” IURA 12 (1961): 162–93, esp. 167–68, Yaron doubts that it is a Jewish document, arguing that, of the seven names in it, only one is indicative of Jewishness. Since it deals with a consensual divorce, CPFJ 144 is not directly relevant to the divorces of the Herodian princesses, although it is relevant to Jewish divorce practice if it does indeed involve the termination of a Jewish marriage by means of a contract rather than delivery of a get: cf. D. Piattelli, “Alcune osservazioni su C.P.J. 144,” IURA 18 (1967): 121–24, esp. 122–23. See also Rabello, “Divorce in Josephus” (supra n. 11), 161.

of Cotton and Qimron) suggests that delivery of a divorce document by wife to husband may indeed have been practiced (as late as the time of Bar Kochba) in some Jewish circles:

I, Shlamzion daughter of Yehosef Qbsn from Ein-Gedi, have no claim against you, Eleazar son of Hananiah, who previously were my husband and who had (have) a deed of abandoning and expulsion from me. You, Eleazar, owe me nothing concerning anything whatsoever. And I accept as binding on me, I, Shlamzion daughter of Yehosef, all (the obligations) written above.

It is generally now agreed that this is not itself a *get*, but rather an acknowledgment by the wife that the divorce settlement has been paid. Nevertheless, it is the husband who is said to have received the “deed of abandoning and expulsion” from the wife. I have argued elsewhere that this is the correct interpretation, though it has been disputed on linguistic grounds and is not entirely unproblematic.\(^\text{17}\)

A second probable reflection of the wife’s right to unilateral divorce occurs in one of the Greek papyri (of the same provenance), P. Yadin 18,\(^\text{18}\) lines 57–60: “Judah called Cimber shall redeem this contract for his wife Shelamzion, whenever she may demand it of him, in silver secured in due form, at his own expense interposing no objection.”

Later rabbinic law forbade a married couple to live together without a *ketubah*:\(^\text{19}\) if some such rule is read back here, the wife’s right to demand that the husband redeem the contract would entail her

---


\(^\text{19}\) Katzoff himself describes an opinion of Rav Hai Gaon, that the woman could collect her *ketubah* money even during the course of the marriage, as an eccentric position, which is credible only if limited to the dowry and additions, but excludes the basic *ketubah* debt of 200 zuz, since by the time of Rav Hai it was settled law that a couple may not live together without this basic obligation: see R. Katzoff, “*Donatio ante nuptias* and Jewish Dowry Additions,” in *Papyrology* (ed. N. Lewis; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 231–44, esp. 240.
divorcing her husband. But again, this is not unproblematic. Nor does it appear to go as far as P. Hever 13. Although the husband promises in the marriage contract that he will "redeem" it "whenever she may demand it of him", we are not told what the remedy would be if he refuses to do so. Indeed, it appears to be implied that the husband still has to take the procedural initiative.

Within decades of these papyri, Justin Martyr writes about a Christian woman who "gave [her husband] what you call a bill of divorce (τὸ λεγόμενον παρ᾽ ὑμῖν ῥεπούδιον δοῦσα ἐξωρίσθη), and was separated from him." The terminology is interesting: he uses the verb δοῦσα rather than the terminology which had previously been standard in Roman sources, namely mittère or remittère. Justin’s terminology is here closer to the Jewish tradition: in Deuteronomy, the husband is said to give (הנה) the document תִּדָּר; the use of δοῦσα by Justin reflects both the LXX of Deuteronomy and Matt 5:31, and this too is echoed in both places by Jerome. As for the noun ῥεπούδιον, Justin identifies it as the terminology of his audience, rather than the woman. Although both Jerome and earlier the Vetus Latina use libellus repudii, this is, as Cohen has noted, far from a literal rendering of either the sefer keritut of Deuteronomy (or the LXX βιβλίον ἀποστασίου) or Matthew’s allusion to Deuteronomy in the Sermon on the Mount, where he uses ἀποστασίον (Matt 5:31); rather,
Cohen suggests, the terminology may reflect "the practice of the Roman provincial law of Palestine of their time."\textsuperscript{23}

What law, then, was this Christian woman invoking, and what audience was Justin addressing, when he wrote that she "gave [her husband] what you call a bill of divorce"? The woman’s very recourse to the institution of divorce would suggest that she was a Judaeo-Christian,\textsuperscript{24} using a non-rabbinic version of Jewish law. The λεγόμενον παρ’ ὑμῖν seemingly implies that this was not the woman’s indigenous language (or terminology) but that it would be familiar to his audience. The audience of the \textit{Apologies} was pagan rather than Jewish,\textsuperscript{25} probably Roman.\textsuperscript{26} Though the use of such a document by a woman to divorce her husband is, as will be argued, unusual at this period, the term \textit{repudiat} is indeed found sooner in Roman sources.\textsuperscript{27}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{23}Cohen, \textit{Jewish and Roman Law} (supra n. 21), 1:385; Derrett, \textit{Law in the New Testament} (supra n. 4) 373, also regards the LXX/NT renditions as "curious", and takes them to imply (simply?) a cessation of cohabitation. The Vetus Latina Database of the Vetus Latina Institute in Beuron (www.brepols.net) overwhelmingly supports \textit{libellum repudii} for Deut 24:1,3, with just two occurrences of \textit{librum repudii}. In Matt 5:31, all the testimonies use either \textit{libellum repudii} or simply \textit{repudium}. Although it is argued below (text at nn. 45–47) that divorce by a wife performed by sending a \textit{repudium} in the Roman juristic sources may reflect Jewish or Judaeo-Christian influence, the terminology of \textit{repudium} itself is clearly Roman, as is indicated by the text of Justin Martyr discussed above.
\item \textsuperscript{24}Perhaps, given Justin’s description of the husband’s behaviour, following Matthew’s \textit{porneia} exception. Justin indicates in the \textit{First Apology} that his native town was Flavia Neapolis in Palestinian Syria, which is close to Shechem. We may note that her action is quite contrary to the approach advocated by Paul to Christian-pagan marriages, in 1 Cor 7:14–16, on which see further Instone-Brewer, "1 Corinthians 7" (supra n. 4), 236–42.
\item \textsuperscript{25}The text occurs in the \textit{Apology} (on which see the \textit{Catholic Encyclopedia} article cited supra n. 21), not in the \textit{Dialogue with Trypho}. Justin lived for some time at Ephesus, before visiting (he indicates for the second time) Rome, where ultimately he was martyred in about 165 C.E. There is indeed a specific Roman addressee of this passage: when the woman’s husband seeks to take revenge against her by denouncing her as a Christian, Justin writes that she “presented a paper to thee (σου), the Emperor, requesting that first she be permitted to arrange her affairs . . .”: 2 \textit{Apol.} 2.8, in A. Roberts and J. Donaldson, eds., \textit{Justin Martyr and Athanagoras} (Ante-Nicene Christian Library 2; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1870), 72.
\item \textsuperscript{26}Eusebius, \textit{Hist. eccl.} 4.18, says that it was addressed to Marcus Aurelius.
\item \textsuperscript{27}On Juvenal and Suetonius, see infra, nn. 34, 39. Nevertheless, E. Levy, \textit{Der Hergang der römischen Ehescheidung} (Weimar: Böhlaus Nachfolger, 1925), 59, finds this written \textit{repudium} first clearly evidenced in Justin and sees it as reflective of his Palestinian and Hellenistic background: “. . . ein schriftliches repudium wird m. W. erstmals in der Mitte des zweiten Jahrhunderts von dem Märtyrer Justinus angedeutet, der, selbst aus Palästina stammend, in hellenistischen Anschauungen aufgewachsen und groß geworden war.” The use of \textit{repudiō} in the papyri appears to be found only in the Byzantine period, and to be used also of bilateral divorce contracts. The earliest appears to be M. Chr. 127 (390 C.E.), on which see R. Taubenschlag, \textit{The Law of Greco-Roman Egypt in the Light of the Papyri 332 B.C.–640 A.D.} (2nd ed.; Warsaw:
Support for the identification of Justin’s Christian woman as a Judaeo-Christian may be derived from a further Jewish source to which Boaz Cohen has directed attention—a dictum attributed to the third-century Palestinian R. Johanan in Genesis Rabbah 18.5: “his wife divorces him and gives him a repudium”. Its context appears to suggest knowledge of diversity of practice amongst different groups of Noahides: in commenting on Gen 2:24, “cleaves to his wife,” the midrash asks how we know that they do not observe (the Jewish) rules of divorce. Three answers are offered, the first two attributed to R. Johanan at second remove, the third directly: (a) they have no divorce; (b) the two parties divorce each other; (c) “his wife divorces him and gives him a repudium”—probably meaning “even his wife may divorce him and gives him a repudium”, rather than “only his wife divorces him and gives him a repudium.” We may attribute (a) to pagan Christians (no divorce), (b) to Hellenistic practice (divorce by mutual consent); (c) to Judaeo-Christians (divorce, which may be unilateral, by delivery of a get).

In short, even the procedure adopted by Salome is not entirely unique in Jewish sources, though it appears far distant from the mainstream normative tradition, which Josephus reflects in his critical comments on it. And in fact, the alternative interpretation of her action, as in conformity with Roman law, is more problematic than is sometimes assumed.

In late Republican Roman sources, we encounter unilateral divorce performed by nuntium (re)mittere. For example, Cicero, Top. 4.19, is aware of such a possibility (si viri culpa factum est divorium, etsi mulier nuntium remisit . . .). But does nuntium refer to a messenger (delivering the message orally) or to the (written) message? Though in general Lewis and Short, s.v. nuntius, take it to be the latter, rendering nuntium
uxori remittere or mittere “to send one’s wife a letter of divorce,”\textsuperscript{30} Robleda rightly takes Cicero’s use of the expression in \textit{De or.} 1.40.183 as referring to communication of the fact that a formal, albeit indirect (oral) declaration had (here, not) been made.\textsuperscript{31} The evidence would appear to support a development from messenger to message.\textsuperscript{32} \textit{Nuntius} is frequently found meaning a messenger, delivering a message (\textit{nuntium}), whether oral or written.\textsuperscript{33} Tacitus even speaks of an oral \textit{repudium}.\textsuperscript{34} And the use of a domestic \textit{libertus} to deliver the message,\textsuperscript{35} as also the requirement of seven witnesses under the \textit{lex Julia},\textsuperscript{36} strongly suggest oral rather than written delivery.\textsuperscript{37} In fact, no such

\textsuperscript{30} Citing Cicero, \textit{De or.} 1.40.183 (on which see further infra, at n. 90); 1.56.238; idem, \textit{Att.} 1.13.3 (\textit{uxori Caesaarem nuntium remississe}, “Caesar has divorced his wife”); idem, \textit{Top.} 4.19 (of a woman who separates from her husband); \textit{Dig.} 24.2.4; 24.3.22; also of the rejection of the marriage contract (\textit{sponsalia}) by the parents and guardians in Plautus, \textit{Truc.} 4.3.74.


\textsuperscript{32} The classical \textit{nuntium remittere} did ultimately come to be identified with the sending of a written \textit{repudium}. By the third century C.E. the jurist Ulpian could use \textit{repudium mittere} and \textit{nuntium mittere} interchangeably: \textit{Dig.} 24.2.4, Ulpianus 26 ad sab.: \textit{Iulianus libro octavo decimo digestorum quaerit, an furiosa repudium mittere vel repudiari possit. et scribit furiosam repudiari posse, quia ignorantis loco habetur: repudiare autem non posse neque ipsam propter dementiam neque curatorem matrimonium: quae sententia mihi videtur vera.} See also \textit{Dig.} 24.3.22.7, Ulpianus 33 ad ed. See further Levy, \textit{Hergang} (supra n. 27), 55–59, and his observation that Tertullian at the end of the second century appears to be the first writer equally familiar with written and oral repudiations, citing (59 n. 8) \textit{Apol.} 6.6 (written); \textit{Mon} 11 (written); \textit{Idol} 6 (oral); \textit{Mon} 10 (both oral and written). He leaves open the question whether this reflects daily life in Tertullian’s environment, Greco-Egyptian custom or the influence of the Latin translation of Deut 24.


\textsuperscript{34} \textit{Ann.} 3.22, \textit{dicere repudium}, cf. Levy, \textit{Hergang} (supra n. 27), 59, citing also Juvenal, \textit{Sat.} 6.146–148, who has the husband’s \textit{libertus} deliver a rather unkind oral message: \ldots \textit{dicet libertus} \ldots (without using the term \textit{repudium}).

\textsuperscript{35} Presupposed even in the divorce procedure required by the \textit{lex Iulia de adulteriis}: see further infra, at nn. 75, 76.

\textsuperscript{36} On which see further infra, sec. 3.

\textsuperscript{37} Some (e.g. Instone-Brewer, “1 Corinthians 7 [supra n. 4]” 105 n. 8; \textit{Encyclopedia Britannica}, 7th ed., 7:454, s.v. “Divorce”) have maintained that the \textit{lex Julia} itself required (in the cases where it applied: see further infra, sec. 3) the sending of a \textit{libellus repudii}. But the evidence for this consists in one highly problematic text (on whether remarriage in the wake of an invalid \textit{repudium missum} constitutes adultery), \textit{Dig.} 48.5.44(43), Gai. 3 ad legem XII Tab.: \textit{Si ex lege repudium missum non sit et idcirco mulier adhuc nupta esse videatur, tamen si quis eam uxorem duxerit adulter non erit} \ldots , discussed in detail by
written *repudia* have survived. Treggiari has noted, moreover, that *repudiare* and *repudium*, found first in the comedians, become the normal prose expressions for unilateral divorce by the husband rather than

---


Despite the fragment’s inscription, it was placed by the compilers in their treatment of the *lex Julia de adulteris*, rather than the Twelve Tables, and the *lex* referred to is commonly identified with the *lex Julia*: see Volterra, *ibid.*, 128; J. A. C. Thomas, “Lex Julia de adulteris coercendis,” in *Etudes offertes à Jean Macqueron* (Aix-en-Provence: Faculté de droit et des sciences économiques d’Aix-en-Provence, 1970), 637–44, esp. 643–44, who supplies a response to the objection of R. Yaron, “De Divortio Varia,” *Tijdschrift voor Rechtsgeschiedenis* 32 (1964): 533–57, esp. 554–57 (who nevertheless acknowledges wide support for Volterra’s view) that Volterra does not seek to explain the inscription. Both Levy, *Hergang* (*supra* n. 27), 19 ff. and Yaron, “Minutiae” (*supra* n. 31), had earlier provided arguments in favour of viewing the text as a later account of a (long obsolete) provision of the Twelve Tables (see also Venturini, *ibid.*, 32–33, 38). A. Watson, “The Divorce of Carvilius Ruga,” *Tijdschrift voor Rechtsgeschiedenis* 33 (1965): 38, follows Yaron in taking Gaius to refer to “some provision on the subject of divorce in the Twelve Tables”, and regards the tradition that Carvilius Ruga, in the third century B.C.E., was the first Roman to divorce his wife as inaccurate, and to be understood as reflecting a change in the financial consequences of divorce in the absence of a matrimonial offence. However, Watson’s arguments regarding the divorce of Carvilius Ruga (on which see also Robleda, “Il divorzio in Roma” (*supra* n. 31), 355–65; I. Nunez Paz, “Alcunas Consideraciones en torno al ‘Repudium’ y al ‘Divortium’,” *Bullettino dell’Istituto di Diritto Romano “Vittorio Scialoja*” 91 (1988): 713–24, esp. 719–21, commenting on M.-E. Fernández Baquero, *Repudium-Divortium. Origen y Configuracion Juridica hasta la Legislacion Matrimonial de Augusto* (Granada: Servicio de Publicaciones, Universidad de Granada, 1987), even if correct, do not entail the view that the *lex* in Gaius is indeed the Twelve Tables.

Even if the identification with the *lex Julia* is correct, it needs to be established that *ex lege repudium missum* refers to a *libellus repudii*. Given the evidence of Tacitus (*supra* n. 34), the allusion may well be to the procedure of oral announcement referred to in *Dig.* 24.2.9 (*infra* n. 75): cf. Volterra, “Intorno a D.48.5.44(43),” 129 (who notes also, at 138, the Byzantine scholion to this text (Bas. 60.37.44), interpreting the role of the witnesses as subscribing their signatures to a *ριποδιόν*: cf. Venturini, “Divorzio informale,” 41 n. 51; 49; Venturini, “Divorzio informale,” 28. And even if not, the oral procedure was clearly available as an alternative. P. E. Corbett, *The Roman Law of Marriage* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1930), 238, concludes that the witnesses attest the despatch of the messenger and would attach their seals to the written message only if there was one. See also W. W. Buckland, *A Text-Book of Roman Law from Augustus to Justinian* (2nd ed.; Cambridge: Cambridge: University Press, 1950), 117. S. A. Treggiari, *Roman Marriage. Iusti Coniuges from the Time of Cicero to the Time of Ulpian* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991), 457, writes: “The attestation by seven witnesses was of the statement of the divorcing party, not that the notice had been served on the other partner”, citing Isid., *Etym.* 9.7.24: *repudium est quod sub testimonio testium vel praesenti vel absenti mittitur*. She observes (ibid.), “The scarcity of sources may suggest that, like marriage ceremonies, a procedure was taken for granted, and that, like marriage ceremonies, it was evidential, not essential.” The text, she notes (at 455–56), renders any legal requirement of *repudium* a *lex minus quam perfecta.*

---

D. Instone-Brewer, “1 Corinthians 7 (*supra* n. 4),” 113: “Only four Latin marriage contracts have survived and no divorce deeds.”
the wife.\textsuperscript{39} In the latter case, unilateral divorce by wives, though possible, appears to have been rare,\textsuperscript{40} and performed by oral declaration or behavioural messages,\textsuperscript{41} rather than delivery of a written document.

Against this, we might be tempted to use the evidence of Josephus’ account of Salome’s divorce of Costobarus. Not only does she send him a γραμματεῖον; the terminology of πέμπει . . . αὐτῷ is closer to the Roman nuntium remittere than to Deut 24:1, 3, where (as noted above, in comparing the terminology of Justin) the husband “puts (ןָּב) it (the sefer keritut) in her hand” rather than simply “sends” it.\textsuperscript{42} But Josephus appears elsewhere to “spin” his account of Jewish institutions with terminology that will be more immediately accessible to a Roman audience: I am thinking, in particular, of his account of the lex talionis.\textsuperscript{43}

A case may thus be made for the view that Salome, in sending a γραμματεῖον to Costobarus, was, despite the strictures of Josephus, following a Jewish rather than a Roman tradition. It is only later, in the writings of the classical Roman jurists,\textsuperscript{44} that we first encounter

\textsuperscript{39} Treggiari, Roman Marriage (supra n. 37), 436–37, citing Suetonius, Tib., 11.4 and Gaius 36.2 for its use when notice of divorce is sent in the husband’s name.

\textsuperscript{40} Treggiari, Roman Marriage, 444, discussing the evidence particularly for the Ciceronian period. Originally, divorce by women appears not to have been possible in Rome: Plutarch, Rom. 22.3 (on which see Watson, “The Divorce of Carvilius Ruga” [supra n. 37], 44–45), claims that in the archaic period (under the regulations of Romulus) only men could divorce. M. McDonnell, “Divorce Initiated by Women in Rome: The Evidence of Plautus”, American Journal of Ancient History 8 (1983): 54–80, reserves judgment (70 n. 3) on whether the evidence of Seneca and Cicero (though not noting Top. 4.19) supports the possibility of divorce by wives independent of paternal participation even in the late Republic, and argues, from an analysis of the five Plautine passages, that there is no valid evidence for it during the period of the middle Republic. Cf. Treggiari, Roman Marriage, ibid., noting that divorce by women, though mentioned as a possibility, never actually occurs in a Plautine comedy.

\textsuperscript{41} Treggiari, Roman Marriage, ibid.: “Already Plautus could portray some wives as able to divorce. They are imagined as turning their husbands out of the matrimonial (but dotal) home or pronouncing a formula of divorce against them”, citing Mil. glor. 1164 ff., Amph. 925; A. Watson, The Law of Persons in the Later Roman Republic (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967), 49–52. But see McDonnell, “Divorce Initiated by Women” (supra n. 40) 59–66, rejecting a Roman context for the divorce scene in the Miles and arguing at length that Alcmena’s declaration in the Amphitruo is a deliberate gender reversal, in which “she utters words which were properly spoken only by men”.

\textsuperscript{42} Though rabbinic law did early come to recognise delivery by an agent.


\textsuperscript{44} Treggiari, Roman Marriage (supra n. 37), 437.
divorce by a wife performed by sending a *repudium*. The earliest instance occurs in the *Institutes* of Gaius, who is thought to have commenced his juristic career in Rome “but then carried on his work in the Eastern provinces”, and to have written the *Institutes* probably in 161 C.E., towards the end of his career. Both the dating and the provenance suggest the possibility of Jewish or Judaeo-Christian influence. Indeed, the case recounted by Justin Martyr (written just before the *Institutes* of Gaius) appears to be the earliest source in which the term *repudium*, referring to a written document, is used of divorce by a wife of her husband. Three further instances are found in the classical juristic writings, from Paul, Ulpian and Marcellus. And in the late Empire, we encounter the terminology of *libellus repudii*, perhaps reflecting versions of Deut 24, and ultimately the

45. *Inst.* I.137a, *repudio missa*, of a wife in a manus (coemptio) marriage. He discusses how she may free herself from the manus after having dissolved the marriage.
48. Dig. 24.1.57.pr, Paulus 7 resp: . . . quaero, an, si eadem titio marito suo repudium miserit.
49. Dig. 24.2.4, Ulpianus 26 ad sab.: *Iulianus libro octavo decimo digestorum quaerit, an furiosa repudio mittere vel repudiari possit.*
50. Dig. 24.3.38, Marcellus l.S. resp.: *Lucius titius cum esset filius familias, voluntate patris uxorem maeviam duxit et dotem pater accepit: maevia titio repudium misit: postea pater repudiati absente filio sponsalia cum ea de nomine filii sui fecit: maevia deinde repudium sponsalibus misit.*
51. By contrast, we do find *libellus divortii* earlier, in Dig. D.24.2.7 (Papinián): “Where someone who was given the other party written notice of divorce regrets having done this and the notice is served in ignorance of the change of mind, the marriage is held to remain valid, unless the person who receives the notice is aware of the change of mind and wants to end the marriage himself. Then the marriage will be dissolved by the person who received the notice.” Its classicity is disputed by Levy, *Hergang* (supra n. 27), 61, but defended by R. Yaron, “Divortium inter absentes,” *Tijdschrift voor Rechtsgeschiedenis* 32 (1964), 54–68, esp. 58, who notes that Levy’s analysis itself indicates that the expression is used nowhere in the Byzantine sources, though *libellus repudii* is used in *Cod. Justin.* 5.17.6 (of 294 C.E.). We may note that the case here discussed is very similar to one in the Babylonian Talmud, b. *Gittin* 33a (which in fact there resulted in annulment instituted by the Rabbis, despite the fact that, like the Romans, they considered the divorce to be in principle ineffective: m. *Gittin* 4:1). The dating of this parallel might speak in favour of Levy, against Yaron, but the issue hardly affects the present argument.
52. See text leading to n. 23, supra.
53. Generally discounted, in this context, is Dig. 48.5.44, on which see n. 37, supra. As late as 294 C.E., according to a Constitution of Diocletianus and Maximianus, a marriage is dissolved even if a *libellus repudii* is not handed over to the other spouse: *Cod. Justin.* 5.17.6: *Licet repudii libellus non fuerit traditus [prob. int.: vel cognitus] marito, dissolvitur matrimonium*, on which see further Yaron, “Divortium inter absentes” (supra n. 51), 56–57, arguing that this does not make a *libellus* mandatory: “the decision would equally apply where a messenger had to convey notice by word of mouth.”
delivery of such a document became mandatory. This (along with other substantial restrictions on divorce in the late Empire) is generally understood to reflect Christian influence.

3. The Cases of Desertion

Here, Jewish precedents for what the princesses did are very much weaker, consisting only in a number of biblical narratives. Zakovitch has argued that where the wife feared that she had been deserted by her husband, either she or her father might unilaterally terminate the marriage by returning to her original home. The clearest example is that of Samson’s wife. Her father, we may recall, construed the situation as a divorce: “I really thought that you utterly hated her” (Judg 15:2, hatred sometimes being used as a technical term for divorce), and gave his daughter to Samson’s companion, with fatal results. A second example concerns the marriage of David and Michal. Despite having himself occasioned David’s “desertion” of Michal, by attempting to have him killed, Saul then gave “Michal his daughter, David’s wife, to Palti the son of La’ish”. Moses had apparently (the narrative fails to tell us of it at the time) sent Zipporah back to the house of her (Midianite) father, Jethro; when she and


For sources from the Christian Empire, see *Cod. theod.* 3.16.1 (Constantine, 331 c.e.), *Cod. justin.* 5.17.8pr (Theodosius and Valentinian, 449 c.e.), *Cod. justin.* 5.17.9 (Anastasius, 497 c.e.); see further Rabello, “Divorce of Jews” (supra n. 11), 83–90. Clear evidence of a legal requirement for a libellus repudii appears only in the late Empire: cf. J. A. C. Thomas, *The Institutes of Justinian. Text, Translation and Commentary* (Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Co., 1975), 34.


Zakovitch, “Woman’s Rights,” 34–35, viewsוּסָכָה in the Hebrew Bible as referring to a woman not yet a divorcée but whom the husband would like to divorce, and suggests that the technical meaning (even of the verbוּסָכָה) is first found at Elephantine. I think this text, not least with the intensification of the verb, וּסָכָה, speaks against him. On the usage elsewhere (including the *ana ittiśū* series), see further Jackson, “How Jewish” (supra n. 14), nn. 101–4.


Exod 18:2. Zakovitch, “Woman’s Rights” (supra n. 56), 38, notes the rabbinic interpretation of this as divorce, based on the use of the term *shillah.*
her children reappear on the scene, in Exod 18, it appears at first sight to be for family reasons: perhaps Jethro is either seeking a reconciliation or maintenance.\textsuperscript{60} Blenkinsopp acknowledges sources which record that “a woman who could afford to do so simply left her husband,” but maintains nevertheless that “it seems that only the husband could initiate divorce proceedings.”\textsuperscript{61} Of the narratives cited by Zakovitch, we may note that two involve matrilocal marriages (Samson, Moses), both with non-Israelite women. And in the third, the marriage of David and Michal, the termination is very much at the initiative of the father-in-law, rather than Michal herself. It is hard to imagine that normative conclusions for Jewish law were ever derived from these narratives.

There are, however, some hints of divorce by desertion in post-biblical sources, though they hardly amount to a compelling case. Philo’s rather odd version of Deut 24:1–4 contemplates termination of the first marriage by the wife rather than the husband, though with implicit (moral) disapproval and without indicating any procedure other than separation.\textsuperscript{62} Similarly, the New Testament controversy

\textsuperscript{60} It is noticeable that Moses receives Jethro with open arms, but there is no mention of his reception of his wife or children, Exod 18:6–9: “And when one told Moses, ‘Lo, your father-in-law Jethro is coming to you with your wife and her two sons with her,’ Moses went out to meet his father-in-law, and did obeisance and kissed him; and they asked each other of their welfare, and went into the tent. Then Moses told his father-in-law all that the LORD had done to Pharaoh and to the Egyptians for Israel’s sake, all the hardship that had come upon them in the way, and how the LORD had delivered them. And Jethro rejoiced for all the good which the LORD had done to Israel, in that he had delivered them out of the hand of the Egyptians.”

\textsuperscript{61} J. Blenkinsopp, “The Jewish Family in First Temple Israel”, in Families in Ancient Israel (L. G. Perdue, J. Blenkinsopp, J. J. Collins and C. Meyers, eds.; Louisville Ky: Westminster John Knox Press, 1997), 48–103, esp. 65, citing also Judg 19:1–2 and Jer 3:6–7. They are distinct from the three narratives cited by Zakovitch, in that Judg 19 concerns a ἐπωνυμιό, who “became angry with him, and she went away from him to her father’s house at Bethlehem in Judah, and was there some four months”, until the Levite went to retrieve her. There is no suggestion that this was construed by any of the participants as a divorce. Jer 3:6–7 uses the marriage-harlotry-adultery metaphor of Israel’s relationship to God, but has the husband, God, issue a sefer keritut as a result. See further my “The ‘Institutions’ of Marriage, Divorce and Matrimonial Property in the Bible,” forthcoming.

\textsuperscript{62} “Another commandment is that if a woman after parting (ἀπαλλαγείσα) from her husband for any cause whatever marries another and then again becomes a widow, whether this second husband is alive or dead, she must not return to her first husband but ally herself with any other rather than him, because she has broken with the rules (θεσμοίς) that bound her in the past and cast them into oblivion when she chose new love-ties in preference to the old...” (Spec. 3.30 [Colson, LCL]).
with the Pharisees regarding divorce concludes with Jesus observing: 
“Whoever divorces (ἀπολύσῃ) his wife and marries another, commits 
adultery against her; and if she divorces her husband and marries
another, she commits adultery.” He confides this to his disciples, not 
the Pharisees; Mark may well in fact have in mind a gentile audience, 
more familiar with Greco-Roman than Jewish mores as regards divorce. 
Similarly, Daube has noted a difference in Paul’s language to the 
Corinthians according to whether both parties or only one is a 
believer; it is in the former case that he counsels: “the wife should 
not separate (χωρίζεσθαι) from her husband” (1 Cor 7:10-11), and 
this, he argues, is not implied to be constitutive of divorce, in accord­
dance with the rabbinic position. A similar view is taken by some

63 Mark 10:11-12. Derrett, Law in the New Testament (supra n. 23), 392–93, inter­
prets the “deviant” Jewish tradition of divorce on the initiative of the wife as a 
“non-existent conflict between Jewish law and Jewish practice” (comparable to the 
use of the diatheke to avoid the law of intestate succession), the “practice” consist­
ing in possible “collusion or complacent action” by a court, when asked by a wife 
to compel her husband to issue a divorce, though at p. 386 he accepts that “What is 
not available to a woman is a unilateral repudiation of her marriage such as 
would free both herself and her husband for a future legal marriage”: for his view 
of the action of Salome, see infra, n. 97. Aliter, Rossetti Favento, “Matrimonio e 
divorzio” (supra n. 6), 272–73 n. 22, who regards Salome’s divorce of Costobarus 
as an example of abuse of the contemporary practice; she argues (passim, esp. 
279–80, 301) that Mark has a unique presentation of the (natural) parity of man 
and woman, reflected in his adoption of the (egalitarian) P narrative of human cre­
ation, in Gen 1:27, rather than the “rib” model in Gen 2:21–24, and thus that his 
presentation even of the possibility of divorce by the wife of her husband derives 
from this ideology (propounded to the disciples privately: pp. 285–86), rather than 
Greco-Roman practice (pp. 281–82); D. Instone-Brewer, Divorce and Remarriage (supra 
n. 53), ch. 6, esp. 147–52. Daube, New Testament (supra n. 3), 365, has compared 
the terminology here, using the transitive ἀπολύειν, ‘to dismiss’, with Josephus’ account 
of Salome’s divorce, though noting that the (middle, ἀπολύεσθαι) form of the verb—ἀπολυμένη τὸν γάμον—is not quite so strong as the Markan “to dismiss the husband”. However, he tends towards the argument, supported by text-critical consider­
ations, that ἀπολύειν is not here original. See also Rossetti Favento, 
“Matrimonio e divorzio” (supra n. 6), 283–84, 297; Instone-Brewer, “1 Corinthians 7” 
(supra n. 4), 106–7, comparing Josephus’ account of Salome’s divorce with 1 Cor 7.

64 Daube, New Testament (supra n. 3), 362–63: “... with reference to a marriage 
where both parts are believers, Paul uses the intransitive χωρίζεσθαι of the wife 
who ‘separates’, but the transitive ἀφείναι of the husband who ‘dismisses’ his wife. 
This is in perfect agreement with the Jewish ideas on the subject. In the next two 
verses, with reference to a marriage where only one party is a believer, he uses the 
transitive ἀφείναι both of the dissolution of the marriage by the husband and of its 
dissolution by the wife. The latter application of ἀφείναι is justified since the 
procedure he has in mind is a non-Jewish one, Roman or Greek ... In confirmation 
of this analysis it may be pointed out that, in Rabbinic literature, the transitive 
gerash, ‘to expel’, is used once and once only of the wife divorcing her husband, 
and that it is in a discussion of gentle divorce.” In the Jewish context, he suggests,
of the old strategy of including in the marriage contract a clause granting the wife a right of unilateral divorce, which is attested in Roman Palestine and later in 10th and 11th century ketubot found in the Cairo Genizah. Even if such clauses did give the wife an enforceable right to divorce, the means of effecting it appear to have been through court action rather than mere desertion. But we have no information as to the marriage contracts of the Herodian princesses.

Unlike the Jewish position, divorce effected by desertion on the part of the wife is unproblematic in Roman (and Hellenistic) law. According to classical doctrine, the principal legal requirement for marriage (liberum matrimonium) is affectio maritalis, and any clear demonstration by either spouse that this intention to continue in a marital relationship was absent was capable of effecting a divorce. At Athens, divorce by the husband was typically described as ἀπότεμψις ‘to separate’, “may denote the same as ‘to go away’, i.e. actual departure from the common domicile, or merely avoidance of intercourse” and may also be used of a wife who is entitled to “institute proceedings culminating in his being compelled to divorce her. But even then it is the husband who dissolves the bond, though against his will. Of her, it would still be said that she ‘separates’, ‘goes away’ or ‘is let go away’.”

65 Cf. the Elephantine contracts, supra n. 14.


67 M. A. Friedman, Jewish Marriage in Palestine: A Cairo Geniza Study (Tel-Aviv: University of Tel-Aviv, 1981), no. 2 at II.41, 44-45; no. 3 at II.55-56; see further Jackson, “How Jewish” (supra n. 14), § 6.1.

68 R. Katzoff, “Papyrus Yadin 18” (supra n. 11), 245-46, seeks to interpret R. Jose’s clause as dealing only with the financial consequences of divorce, and the Genizah ketubot as still requiring compliance with the normal procedural requirements.

69 Cf. Friedman, Jewish Marriage (supra n. 67), 1:346: “We have traced the development of a rare ketubba clause over a 1500 year period. Jewish law certainly never empowered a wife to issue a bill of divorce unilaterally and thus dissolve her marriage. However, it was stipulated in ketubbot, which, from talmudic times, followed the Palestinian tradition, and the rabbis eventually recognized this as binding law that through the wife’s initiative, if she found life with her husband unbearable, the court would take action to terminate the marriage, even against the husband’s will.”

70 Taubenschlag, Law of Graeco-Roman Egypt (supra n. 27), 122. Taubenschlag suggests Egyptian influence for the capacity of either spouse to divorce the other. On the demotic divorce documents, see infra, n. 73. See also Rabello, “Divorce in Josephus” (supra n. 11), 152.

71 See, e.g., Borkowski, Textbook (supra n. 46), 117. As Yaron, “Divortium inter absentes” (supra n. 51), 59, remarks: “It would certainly not suffice for the divorcing spouse to whisper his declaration into his sleeve.”
(cf. the use of the biblical πλήρωσις) while divorce by the wife was ἀπόλαξις. Indeed, this latter terminology, which Taubenschlag sees as reflected in the ἀπαλλαγή, is close to that employed by Josephus to describe the divorces of two of the younger Herodian princesses: καταλιπώσαν of Drusilla, καταλείπει of Berenice.

There are, however, three possible objections to be considered, before we conclude that these divorces were Roman. The first arises from a change in Roman law between Salome’s divorce of Costobarus and the divorces of Herodias, Drusilla, Berenice and Mariamme. The Augustan lex Julia de adulteriis of 18 B.C.E. appears to have introduced a new formal requirement for Roman divorce: the classical jurists tell us that it now had to be performed in the presence of seven witnesses (not including the libertus of the divorcing party—this latter presumably being the nuntius who conveyed the message), failing...


74 There are no surviving traces of the text of this provision of the lex Julia: see M. H. Crawford, Roman Statutes (London: Institute of Classical Studies, 1996), II.781–86. We rely here on the paraphrases provided by the classical jurists: see nn. 75, 77, infra.

75 Dig. 24.2.9 (Paulus 2 de adult.): Nullum divorcium ratum est nisi septem civibus romanis puberibus adhibitis praeter libertum eius qui divorcium faciet. Yaron, “Divortium inter absentes” (supra n. 51), 59, suggests that the compilers may have generalised the rule by suppressing an original inter absentes: Nullum divorcium <inter absentes> ratum est nisi . . . On the suggestion that the lex Julia required the sending of a repudium, see n. 37, supra.

76 Cf. J. Carcopino, Daily Life in Ancient Rome (ed. H. T. Rowell; trans. E. O. Lorimer; Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1962), 111: “he conceded that the wish of the married pair should, as heretofore, suffice to dissolve the marriage, and
which it was invalid. It is probable, however, that these procedural requirements of the *lex Julia* applied only in the case of adultery on the part of the wife, where Augustus made it mandatory for the husband to divorce his errant spouse, and required him to have done so before instituting criminal proceedings against her. The object of the Augustan legislation was not to make divorce in itself more difficult, but rather to deter adultery (which Roman law, like Jewish law, defined as involving relations with a married woman).

It was therefore now important that divorce should be properly evidenced; otherwise, the husband was not allowed to remarry, and indeed might be subject to criminal penalties: for *lenocinium* (being suspected of at least tacit complicity in his wife's adultery, if not insisted only that this wish should be publicly expressed in the presence of seven witnesses and announced by a message. This message was usually delivered by a freedman of the house.” Carcopino here applies the rule in the context even of divorce by mutual consent; the more common view is that it applied only to unilateral divorce by the husband, and some restrict it to such divorce when occasioned by the wife’s adultery: see further n. 78, infra.

77 Dig. 38.11.1.1 (Ulpianus 47 ad ed.): *item iulia de adulteriis, nisi certo modo divor­tium factum sit, pro infecto habet.*

78 So Volterra, “Intorno a D.48.5.44(43)” (supra n. 37), 129–32, supported by Thomas, “Lex Julia” (supra n. 37), 643–44, and cf. Gardner, *Women in Roman Law* (supra n. 31), 85–86. Volterra is criticised in some respects by Venturini, “Divorzio informale” (supra n. 37), 39–41, who takes the less restrictive view (at 41–42), though this does not necessarily entail interpreting *repudio* in the text as a written document. Others, too, express residual doubts: neither Buckland, *A Text-Book* (supra n. 37), nor Treggiari, *Roman Marriage* (supra n. 37), exclude the possibility that the requirement of seven witnesses applied to any unilateral divorce, and was not confined to divorce on an allegation of adultery. See also Robleda, “Il divorzio in Roma” (supra n. 31), 378–83, reviewing the literature and noting his own increasing doubts about the restrictive interpretation of Volterra.


82 Cf. Yaron, “Divortium inter absentes” (supra n. 51), 60.
actual pimping), and bigamy if he remarried. Indeed, Schulz maintains that absence of the seven witnesses rendered the husband liable to criminal penalties, but the divorce itself remained valid.

On this understanding of the *lex Julia*, the requirement of seven witnesses would not have applied in the cases of the Herodian princesses. In some cases, indeed, there might have been an obligation on the part of their husbands to divorce them for adultery, but the fact that they may have separated from their husbands in order to pursue an adulterous liaison did not entail special procedural requirements if they initiated the divorce. Moreover, even had it done so, the absence of the seven witnesses would not, on Schulz’s understanding, have rendered the divorces invalid.

A second possible objection derives from the general law of divorce, rather than specific legislation. Whatever the precise history of *nuntium remittere*, we need to know whether it was mandatory or not. Was it necessary for the divorcing spouse to inform the other of the cessation of *affectio maritalis*? The view has, indeed, been maintained that a declaration of divorce must be received by the party being divorced. It fits ill, however, with classical doctrine on the nature of marriage, and has been rebutted in detail by Yaron. The better view appears to be that such communication to the spouse was no more than a conventional courtesy, and not a legal requirement, at least in the late Republic and the classical period. Cicero comments on the case of a Roman who abandoned his pregnant wife in Spain without informing her that he was divorcing her (*neque nuntium priori remisisset*), brought another wife with him to Rome and died there intestate.

---

83 Here, too, there appears to be a parallel with Athenian legislation: see Cohen, *Law, sexuality and society* (supra n. 79), 130, who compares Lysias 1.4, where Euphelitus feels compelled to argue that he did not seek to derive a monetary profit from his wife's infidelity, with Dig. 48.5.30.3: “anyone who makes a profit from his wife's adultery is punished, for it is no small crime to have pimped for one's wife.”


86 *Supra*, text at nn. 30–41.

87 Levy, *Hergang* (supra n. 27), passim. The central passages are cited and discussed by Yaron, “Divortium inter absentes” (supra n. 51).


89 Cicero, *De or.* 1.40.183; Gardner, *Women in Roman Law* (supra n. 31), 56. Watson,
Similar is Tacitus’ account of a notorious later incident involving the imperial family. Messalina’s desertion of Claudius in 48 C.E., in favour of her lover Silius (with whom she celebrated a marriage), is described without any mention of Messalina’s having sent notification to Claudius of termination of their marriage; indeed, Claudius is later asked whether he is aware that he has been divorced.\(^{90}\) And a later definition of *repudium*, by Isidore, suggests that there should be witnesses to its despatch, whether the recipient is present (available) or not.\(^{91}\)

Thus, this second possible objection to a Roman understanding of the divorces by desertion on the part of the Herodian princesses also fails. There appears to have been no requirement that they notify their (un)fortunate spouses at all. The news would reach them soon enough, even if they were as dozy as Claudius.

A third possible objection resides in our lack of certainty as to whether Roman citizenship did descend to the members of the Herodian family, whether by virtue of the initial grant to Herod’s father, Antipater,\(^{92}\) or by virtue of Herod’s own status as a *rex*

\(^{90}\) Tacitus, *Ann.* 11.26–27, 30. See further Robleda, “Il divorzio in Roma” (supra n. 31), 385–86; Treggiari, *Roman Marriage* (supra n. 37), 458, suggesting that the story must presuppose that some outward sign of the divorce had been given, such as Messalina’s leaving the palace and removing her personal belongings, or even leaving a written notice on Claudius’ desk while he was at Ostia. Aliter, Gardner, *Women in Roman Law* (supra n. 31), 65 n. 53, 85, arguing that Tacitus (supported by Suetonius and Dio) does not appear to assume the validity of either the “divorce” or the “remarriage”.

\(^{91}\) Etym. 9.7.24: *repudium est quod sub testimonio testium vel praesenti vel absenti mittitur.*

\(^{92}\) Caesar granted citizenship to Antipater, Herod’s father, for services rendered: see *A.J.* 14.137; *B.J.* 1.194; cf. Schürer, *History*, 1:271. S. Applebaum (“Herod I”, *EncJud* 8:383) assumes that this descended to Herod (and, presumably, to his sister Salome). A. Gilboa (“L’octroi de la citoyenneté romaine et de l’immunité à Antipater, père d’Hérode,” *Revue historique de droit français et étranger* 50 [1972]: 613–14) argues for descent to Antipater’s family, in part from the parallel of the grant by Octavian to Seleucus, but without addressing the general issue, much debated by Romanists, on which see E. Volterra, “Sulla condizione dei figli dei peregrini cui veniva concessa la cittadinanza romana,” *Studi in onore di A. Cicu* (Milan: Giuffrè, 1951), 2:643–72, repr. in his *Scritti Giuridici* (Napoli: Jovene, 1991), 2:229–56. Following the argument of Volterra (p. 650/234, and see p. 661/245), to be sure of the citizenship of Antipater’s children, we would need to be confident that his wife had *conubium*, and that the children were born subsequently in *iustae nuptiae*. In fact, Herod was already a young man when the grant was made to his father (age 15 according to *A.J.* 14.158, though he would have been about 25 according to *A.J.* 17.148). Volterra does not address this issue directly, but comments at p. 658/242
However, doubt on this issue does not necessarily entail the conclusion that these divorces, like that of Salome, proceeded in accordance with a non-Rabbinic version of Jewish law. They are more likely to have followed general Hellenistic practice. Indeed, the issue of citizenship may not be crucial: there is evidence that peregrini in the provinces might opt to avail themselves of Roman jurisdiction, as indicated (at least in the second century c.e.) by the Babatha archive.

4. Conclusions

Where, then, does all this leave us? Our review of the sources has, to some degree, conflated three different viewpoints, which ought now to be more clearly distinguished: (1) participant viewpoint: what legal regime was being applied, from the viewpoint of the participants on the Republican tendency to grant citizenship only to men, without extending it to their families; he sees the grant to Seleucus as initiating a new approach (see also his “L’Acquisto della cittadinanza romana e il matrimonio del peregrino,” repr. in Scritti Giuridici 2:257–74, esp. 265–66). He argues (at pp. 663–4/248) from Gaius, Inst. 1.93–94, that Roman citizenship did not extend ipso iure to children born before the grant, but there could be a special grant which included them. Of course, we have no idea whether the grant to Antipater (despite the general tendency in the Republic) included such a clause (for examples of which, see Volterra, Scritti Giuridici 2:269–70). See also Volterra, Lezioni di Diritto Romano. Il Matrimonio Romano (Roma: Edizioni “Ricerche”, Anno Accademico 1960–1961), 249–71, following a more general treatment (230–49) of the status in Roman law of peregrine marriages.

93 Schürer, *History* 1:316–17, prefers to base it on the grant to Antipater: “Possession of Roman citizenship, although explicitly attested only in relation to a few [reges socii], was probably a characteristic of them all. Herod’s family obtained such citizenship through his father, Antipater.” We may note also Augustus’ confirmation of Herod’s will: *A.J.* 17.202; 17.317–323. On Herod’s relationship to Rome, see D. Piattelli, “Ricerche intorno alle relazioni politiche tra Roma e l’ΕΘΝΟΣ ΤΩΝ ΙΟΥΔΑΙΩΝ dal 141 A.C. al 4 A.C.,” *Buletinsto dell’Istituto di Diritto Romano “Vittorio Scialoja”* 74 (1972): 219–347, esp. 323–39; M. R. Cimma, *Reges Socii et Amici Populi Romani* (Pubbl. dell’ Ist. di Diritto Romano, L; Milan: Giuffrè, 1976), 306–13. On his status as a rex socius, see particularly Piattelli, “Ricerche,” 335–36. Cimma, *Reges Socii*, 310, notes that Roman citizenship was conferred on some such kings, and claims (310 n. 44) that Herod obtained it from Antony (but without citing evidence).

THE DIVORCES OF THE HERODIAN PRINCESSES

(Salome, etc.)? (2) author viewpoint: what legal regime was being applied, from the viewpoint of Josephus? (3) juristic (objective?) viewpoint: how would jurists in the respective systems have analysed these particular cases? We have also strayed, slightly, into a wider issue of legal history, on which the formulations of Josephus certainly ought to be taken into account: the interaction between Jewish Law and Roman law, as reflected in both terminology and substantive rules.

As regards participant viewpoint, we naturally lack any direct evidence. Josephus, however, seeks to give his own account of this. For the most part, he seeks to imply reckless indifference on the part of the princesses as to the legal (as well as moral) significance of their actions:95 this is the model I have called "Palace Law" in the title of this paper. The case of Salome, however, is somewhat distinct, given the account Josephus claims that she gave to Herod in order to defend her action. Here, we noted Daube's observation that Josephus attributes to her the use of terminology more consistent with (mainstream) Jewish law.96 But that attempted justification (if indeed genuinely attributable to Salome) does not negate the probability that her own viewpoint was closer to "Palace Law."97

As regards author viewpoint: Josephus remarks three times on violation by the princesses of (his understanding of) contemporary Jewish law—in the cases of Salome, Herodias and Drusilla (though in the latter two cases his criticism appears to be directed primarily against the choice of the next partner, rather than the process of divorce). But these remarks may be taken as incidental to his presentation, designed perhaps to confirm the negative impression which he seeks to convey of their characters (and family?). In those cases where he

95 Thus, Salome "chose to follow not the law of her country, but the law of her authority" (text at n. 2, supra); Herodias, "taking it into her head to flout the way of our fathers" married Herod (text at n. 5, supra); Drusilla succumbed to the promises of Felix "to make her supremely happy if she did not disdain him. . . . She . . . was persuaded to transgress the ancestral laws and to marry Felix" (text at n. 8, supra); Berenice is reputed to have acted "out of licentiousness" (text at n. 9, supra); Mariamme's attitude (text at n. 10, supra) is not disclosed.

96 Supra, n. 3.

97 Derrett, Law in the New Testament (supra n. 4), 387, observes: "... there was no practical reason why a Jewish woman of standing should not arrogate to herself the right to divorce her husband by mere notice or intimation, which is exactly what Salome did . . . What is shocking about such conduct is, as usual, the brazen assumption that what is illegal or against the theory of the law but tolerated indirectly could be practised openly as if it were legal." Cf. Instone-Brewer, "1 Corinthians 7" (supra n. 4).
makes no remarks about conformity with the law, we are not to assume that he thought that they did conform. We may add that Josephus also had a personal axe to grind in this respect: he had himself been deserted by his own first wife.\textsuperscript{98}

As regards the juristic viewpoint, we have to distinguish the case of Salome from those of the later princesses. There is reason to believe that the sending of a document of divorce by Salome to her husband was in conformity with the understanding of Jewish law in some circles, albeit that the best evidence for this comes from the second century C.E. On the other hand, such a procedure does not appear to conform to that of contemporary Roman (or Hellenistic) practice, which at this period appears to have consisted of the sending of an oral rather than a written message. By contrast, the simple acts of desertion by the later princesses, though not entirely without precedent in both Jewish and Christian sources, would have been regarded as sufficient to manifest the intention to divorce (and thus to divorce) according to both classical Roman doctrine and Hellenistic practice. For sure, there is no indication either of the seven witnesses of the \textit{Lex Julia}, or even of receipt by the husband of a declaration of divorce (whether written or oral). However, on what appears the best view of the \textit{lex Julia}, the seven witnesses were not required in these situations, and, even if they had been, their absence would not have rendered the divorces invalid. All this assumes that the princesses were indeed Roman citizens. If not, the arguments from the \textit{lex Julia} do not apply at all, but they might still have followed Roman/Hellenistic practice, confident that it would, if necessary, be applied in local Roman courts, despite the fact that they were \textit{peregrini}.

But is this kind of juristic analysis entirely appropriate? One may doubt to what extent marriage and divorce were, at this period (and especially in the provinces), truly “juridical” relationships, ones in which people expected to be guided by (positivistically-defined) legal rules, as opposed to a more flexible social practice. Indeed, that very flexibility comes to be incorporated within the juristic formulations of the rules, once these are taken over by the classical Roman jurists. In this context, we may note some observations of Yaron.\textsuperscript{99}

\textsuperscript{98} \textit{Vita} 415, on which see further \textit{infra}, nn. 101–2.

\textsuperscript{99} Yaron, “\textit{Divortium inter absentes}” (\textit{supra} n. 51), 63. Cf., for classical Athens, Cohn-Haft, “\textit{Divorce in Classical Athens}” (\textit{supra} n. 72), 3 n. 8, stressing the private nature of the actions required to constitute both marriage and divorce (at least where ini-
A discussion of the ways in which classical Roman marriage terminated is to some extent hampered by a surprising lack of sources outside of Justinian's compilation. The elementary writings of the classical and early post-classical periods which have reached us, such as the Institutes of Gaius, Ulpian's Epitome, Paul's Sentences, do not deal with the termination of marriage. The two first-mentioned consider marriage only obiter, in the context of the creation of a patria potestas, in order to elucidate the meaning of iustum matrimonium, the prerequisites of potestas. The Sentences . . . do not discuss its termination . . .

On the Jewish side, too, there appears to have been a slow process of "juridification" of the marital relationship, which may be seen even in the financial arrangements accompanying marriage, such as the emergence of a clear distinction between bride price and dowry. 100

It may be, then, that "Palace Law" should not be seen simply as an abuse on the part of the aristocracy, but rather as one reflection of the still-weak institutionalisation of marriage and divorce at this period. Indeed, Josephus' own marital history may well reflect this same phenomenon. He remarks, of his first marriage, that "she did not remain long with me but left me (ἀπαλλαχθή)." 101 Daube observes: "It is clear that it was she who wanted and effected the separation; in fact she stayed behind in Palestine when he followed Vespasian to Egypt. Whether he put a formal end to the marriage by giving her a bill of divorce remains uncertain, but no doubt he did." 102 I would suggest that this is optimistic.

---

100 B. S. Jackson, "Problems in the Development of the Ketubah Payment: The Shimon ben Shetah Tradition," in *Rabbinic Law in its Roman and Near Eastern Context* (ed. C. Hezser; Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 2003), n. 41 and text at n. 51. On the distinction between legal and social institutions in this context, see my "The 'Institutions' of Marriage, Divorce and Matrimonial Property in the Bible", forthcoming.

101 *Vita* 415. See further Rabello, "Divorce in Josephus" (*supra* n. 11), 157–58.

102 Daube, *New Testament* (*supra* n. 3), 371. See further Rabello, "Divorce of Jews" (*supra* n. 11), 93–95, commenting also on Josephus' account of his dissolution of a subsequent marriage (*Vita* 426), where he indicates his disapproval of his wife's conduct: "At this period I divorced my wife, being displeased at her behaviour . . ." (Thackeray, LCL), leading some to view this as reflecting the approach of the School of Shammai.
Yet even if our instances of "Palace Law" reflect a more general phenomenon of weak institutionalisation, they also have a significance of their own. We are familiar today with the phenomenon of reaction in the public sphere to the well-publicised peccadilloes of the rich and famous. The divorces of the Herodian princesses may be viewed in a similar light. They may well form the background to a tightening of rabbinic divorce law against the wife, on the grounds that the earlier law made it too easy for her to terminate her marriage when she chanced to "to look at another man."\(^{103}\)

---

\(^{103}\) *m. Nedarim* 11:12; see Jackson, "Some Reflections" (*supra* n. 17), 163–64. On the *lex Julia* as a response to aristocratic moral decline in Rome, see Rabello, "Divorce in Josephus" (*supra* n. 11), 151–52.
PART FIVE

TRANSLATION AND TRANSMISSION
The history of the transmission of Josephus' works has fictional features, to the point that in a recent essay, devoted to the equally complicated transmission of Photius' Bibliotheca, Luciano Canfora could briefly retell how Arlenius was able to copy part of Josephus' Antiquitates in Venice, drawing on a copy of Photius' Bibliotheca then owned by Diego Hurtado Mendoza. It was to Mendoza, by the way, that Arlenius dedicated the Praefatio appended to the editio princeps of the Greek text of Josephus' Antiquitates, published by Froben in 1544. In his Praefatio, Arlenius expressly recognizes that Mendoza has the merit of having taken care of collecting manuscripts as precious as rare: dum labores infinitos ac sumptus maximos in exquisitissimos inventuque rarissimos codices insumeres: quos tum in Italia tum in Graecia defossos quasi thesauros aliquos eruendos, ac in tuam pulcherrimam bibliothecam deferendos curasti.

Up to that time, it should not have been so easy to read Josephus in Greek, if only one thinks that ten years before Gelenius could still complain of the shortage—and thus of the difficult availability—of Greek manuscripts, a shortage that forced him to propose a Latin

---

*I owe thanks to Prof. Daniel R. Schwartz for having revised my English and both to Prof. Bruno Chiesa and Prof. Daniel R. Schwartz for their useful comments on a draft of this paper.

1 See L. Canfora, Convertire Casaubon (Milano: Adelphi, 2002), 33: "Quando il 'Photio' fu presso di lui [scil. Hurtado Mendoza], il suo intraprendente Arlenio, scorrendo attentamente l'indice del manoscritto, notò che vi erano capitoli che per il suo datore di lavoro erano una vera benedizione del cielo: il romanzo di Eliodoro e quello, ben più audace, di Achille Tazio, peraltro anche un po' di aristotelici quali Temistio e Giovanni Filopono (...). E notò anche Flavio Giuseppe, che poteva interessare lui" (Italics added).

2 A. P. Arlenius, ed., ФЛАБИОУ ΙΩΣΗΠΟΥ Ιουδαιικης άρχαιοιογιας λόγοι κ. Ιουδαιικής αλώσεως λόγοι ζ. Περί άρχαιοτητος Ιουδαιιαν κατα Απώνος λόγοι β. Εις τους Μακαβαιους λόγος. ή περι αυτοκρατορος λογισμού (Basileae: Froben, 1544).

3 Arlenius, ФЛАБИОУ ΙΩΣΗΠΟΥ, 2r.
translation improved only through the comparison of various Latin manuscripts:4

Igitur Antiquitatum interpretationem ad vetera exemplaria latina duntaxat, ob Graecorum inopiam contulimus: coeperimusque ut minus mendarum (fortassis ob argumentum vulgatius) quam in belli Iudaici historia: ita stylum interpres tanto inelegantiorem, ut haudquaquam credam ab eodem utrunque opus latinitate donatum: vel hac coniectura, quod in concionibus, quum Iosephus ubique sui similis sit, quoties in opere Antiquitatum incidunt, miram balbutiem videbis: contra in sequentis operis orationibus interpres, Rujinus opinor, propius Iosephum adsequitur, eiusque declamatoriam quondam facultatem longe magis quam ille alter, quisquis est, exprimit.5

2. Modern Scholarship on the Latin Josephus

A similar situation can be noticed, nowadays, as regards the history of the Latin translation of Josephus' Antiquitates. The study of the Latin translation has been almost totally neglected in the last decades: suffice it to say that nearly fifty years have passed since Blatt's publication of the Latin text of the first five books of the work6—publication that, although criticized from various points of view,7 represents the last attempt to supply a critical edition of this translation.

Consulting the reference works of Josephan studies, it is hard to understand what really happened along the direct as well as the indirect tradition of the Latin text.

For instance, Schreckenberg's study of the Latin tradition is a gold mine as regards the indirect tradition, i.e. quotations or references to Josephus' works—mainly the Bellum, by the way—from the Patristic age until the end of the Middle Age, but as regards the direct tradition his contribution is somewhat limited, which is not surprising, given the fact that very few studies have been devoted to the subject.8

---

4 S. Gelenius, ed., FLAVII JOSEPHI ANTIQUITATUM IUDAICARUM libri XX, ad vetera exemplaria diligenter recogniti. DE BELLO IUDAICO libri VII, ex collatione Graecorum codicum castigatiiores quam unquam ante redditi. CONTRA APIONEM libri II, pro corruptis antea, iam ex Graeco itidem non solum emendati, sed etiam suppleti. DE IMPERIO RATIONIS sive DE AIACHABEIS liber unus à DES. ERASMO Roterodamo recognitus. Cum Indice copiosissimo (Basileae: Froben, 1534).
5 Gelenius, FLAVII JOSEPHI, 2r–2v.
7 For references to reviews of Blatt's work see L. H. Feldman, Josephus and Modern Scholarship (Berlin-New York: W. de Gruyter, 1984), 43–44.
8 H. Schreckenberg, Rezeptiongeschichtliche und textkritische Untersuchungen zu Flavius
The most relevant piece of information appears to be the reference to a ms from the Phillips Collection, now at the Bibliotheca Bodmeriana (Cologny-Genève), containing the Latin translation of Books 1 to 6 of the *Antiquitates* and dated to the second half of the eighth century.9

As for Feldman’s bibliography,10 although no one could deny its usefulness and completeness, it should be pointed out—at least as a methodological warning—that much was written regarding this subject also before 1937.

In this respect, it seems more useful to turn to handbooks that deal in *primis* with classical philology—a field in which by definition Greek and Latin walk hand in hand, so that a lack of esteem for the Latin translation is not to be expected. To mention only a few, one can read the studies of Graesse11 and Oberthür.12

3. Usefulness of the Latin Translation

It seems that the Latin translation has been taken into account mainly for its relevance as regards the history of the Latin language in late antiquity and the Middle Ages; the technique of translation; and, last but not least—given the valuable miniatures often furnished by its manuscripts—the history of art. It stands to reason that a systematic and complete examination of this translation, which should take into account—as they deserve—all the philological aspects, could shed light on the different ways in which the *Antiquitates* were utilized during the Middle Age and the Renaissance, at least until the publication of the *editio princeps* of the Greek text. This holds good

---


10 This manuscript was unknown to Blatt and—it seems—to everyone else, even after Schreckenberg’s notice.


in particular for the second half of the work, since scholars that have recently dealt—in a way or another—with the Latin translation focused mainly on the biblical section, i.e. the first ten books.\textsuperscript{13}

In this connection, special attention should be devoted to the importance of the Hebrew \textit{Josippon} as an indirect witness to the Latin text of Josephus' \textit{Antiquitates}. Leaving aside the very complicated question of when and by whom it was composed, it is certain that its author had on his desk both the Latin \textit{Vulgata} (i.e. Jerome's Bible) and a manuscript of the Latin Josephus containing Books 1 to 16 of the \textit{Antiquitates} and the \textit{Hegesippus} (composed more or less around 370 C.E. by a converted Jew—at least according to the late D. Flusser).\textsuperscript{14} It happens that we still have four manuscripts containing Books 1 to 16 of the \textit{Antiquitates} and the \textit{Hegesippus} together—all of them written in Italy,\textsuperscript{15} "the homeland of \textit{Josippon}."

According to Flusser, this particular branch of the Latin Josephus tradition originated somewhere in Italy—perhaps in the Monte Cassino Monastery—between the sixth century and 953 C.E., when a manuscript of this kind reached the author of the \textit{Josippon}.\textsuperscript{17} It may be interesting to note that the original \textit{Josippon} was revised first as regards style—and this revision is the basis of the \textit{editio princeps} (Mantua, 1480); it was, however, a second, enlarged and longer version (Constantinople, 1510; repr. Venice, 1540) that became the \textit{vulgata}.\textsuperscript{18}

In this second version Josephus (re)appears as the real author of the


\textsuperscript{16} So Flusser, "Der lateinische Josephus," 128: "der Heimat des Josippon."


book. Significantly enough, the longer Josippon opens with the statement of Josephus about the historical methodology as given at the very beginning of A.J. 14.19


Going back to the textual difficulties, there are good reasons to believe that non Latin words have been copied as they were from the Greek uncial manuscripts and afterwards read as if they were Latin. I will present here three examples from A.J. 14.33–36.

4.1. Παπυρῶνα

"Then Scaurus again withdrew to Damascus, while Aristobulus with a large force marched against Aretas and Hyrcanus, and on engaging them at a place called Papyron, defeated them in battle . . ." (A.J. 14.33 [Marcus, LCL]).20

Schalit, noticing that this place name in Josephus takes the definite article, suggested as a possible meaning "Papyrus land", but since 1) the diffusion of such a plant is not otherwise attested in the area, and 2) the Latin has capiron—and we would add that interestingly enough also the Josippon has יָרִיד—the, he wonders whether the original reading could not have been the Hebrew (כוס) or Aramaic (סָפָרָם, pl. יָרִיד) name for the cyprus flower,22 this plant being nothing else than the henna (Lawsonia inermis), a tropical shrub mentioned not only by Dioscorides (1.95)23 and the Anthologia Palatina (4.1.42),


21 Cf. Flusser, Josippon, 151.


but also in the Bible (Cant 1:14; 4:13) as well as in B.J. 4.469—always in connection with the Jericho area.\(^{24}\)

Schalit concludes that, as in many other instances, also in this case the Latin appears to be the best textual witness to Josephus’ text: “in der Tat erweist sich bei näherem Zusehen der Latinus wie in vielen anderen Fällen so auch in diesem als vorzüglicher Tradent.”\(^{25}\)

4.2. \(\Phi\alpha \lambda \lambda \iota \omega\nu\)

In the same paragraph Josephus states that among the men who perished in the battle there was also Phallion, the brother of Antipater—καί \(\Phi\alpha \lambda \lambda \iota \omega\nu\) ὁ Ἀντιπάτρου ἀδελφὸς.\(^{26}\)

As Marcus notices, this name is not mentioned elsewhere—except in B.J. 1.130 which reads τὸν ἀδελφὸν τὸν Ἀντιπάτρου \(\Phi\alpha \lambda \lambda \iota \omega\nu\alpha;—, but some of the Greek manuscripts and the Latin version of the Antiquitates have a different reading, viz. Cephalon.

Yet it must be pointed out that Marcus’ text and \textit{apparatus criticus} are rather confused and confusing: in the text the reading is given as καί \(\Phi\alpha \lambda \lambda \iota \omega\nu\), but the \textit{lemma} in the apparatus is καί Θαλλίων, which in a way must have been the reading “unconsciously” preferred by Marcus, since in n. c to the translation he remarks that in the \textit{Bellum} we have Phallion.\(^{27}\)

In fact, the reading Θαλλίων was to be adopted by Schalit:\(^{28}\) the name, the equivalent of the Latin \textit{Florus}, would have been the Hellenistic name of the brother of Antipater. Later on, however, Schalit changed his opinion: the reading καί \(\Phi\alpha \lambda \lambda \iota \omega\nu\)—the one cho-


\(^{26}\) A.J. 14.33.

\(^{27}\) In Haverkamp’s footnote to the passage, it is stated that a manuscript has in fact the expected τοῦ, but according to the same editor this (unusual) use of the definite article is typical of Josephus. Cf. S. Haverkamp, ed., \textit{Flavii Josephi quae reperiri potuerunt opera omnia graece et latine, cum notis et nova versione Joannis Hudsoni . . .} (Amsterdam: Wetstein; Leiden: Luchtmans; Utrecht: Broedeleit, 1726).

\(^{28}\) There are no variant readings as regards the text of the \textit{Bellum}.

\(^{29}\) A. Schalit, \textit{King Herod. Portrait of a Ruler} (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1960), 347, n. 24 [in Hebrew].
sen by Niese and the other editors—will have originated from a mis-
reading, on the part of a Byzantine scribe, of an original \( \text{ΚΕΦΑΛΑΙΩΝ} \)
as \( \text{ΚΑΙ ΦΑΛΛΙΩΝ} > \text{ΚΑΙ ΦΑΛΛΙΩΝ} \).\(^{30}\) The reading \( \text{Κεφαλλίων} \) of LA\(^2\) would be, then, the hypocoristic form of the "authentic" form pre-
served only by the Latin, viz. \( \text{Cephalon—Κεφάλων} \) (cf. Pausanias, Descr.
1.3.1)—and, time and again, by the \( \text{Josippon} \), which has \( \text{κέφαλος} \).\(^{31}\)

It must be added that this same reading—in the form \( \text{Caephalion} \)—
was the one already preferred by Noldius\(^{32}\) and Hudson—even if
only in a footnote to the text.\(^{33}\) Noldius pointed out also that the
mistake seemed to be very ancient since it appeared already in the
\( \text{Hegesippus} \), not to mention the \( \text{Bellum} \).\(^{34}\)

One wonders, then, if the "mistake" shall not be ascribed to
Josephus himself—leaving aside that the wording in the \( \text{Bellum} \) (τὸν
\( \text{ἀδελφόν} \) τὸν ‘Ἀντιπάτρον \( \text{Φαλλίων} \)) excludes completely the possibil-
ity of the phenomenon we are used to call \( \text{itacism} \), since here there
is no \( \text{καί} \) before the name. Taking into account the meaning of
\( \text{Φαλλίων} \) in Greek, \( \text{i.e. φαλλοφόρος} \),\(^{35}\) it is not to be excluded that
the reading \( \text{kefal-} \) with all of its variants was dictated by the sensi-
tivity of a very polite scribe....

4.3. Strabo on Pompeius and a Fine Gift (\( \text{A.J.} \) 14.34–36)

"Aristobulus sent him [i.e. Pompey] a fine gift, a golden vine worth
five hundred talents. This gift is also mentioned by Strabo of
Cappadocia in the following words: ‘There also came from Egypt

\(^{30}\) Schalit, \( \text{König Herodes} \), 7: «Der byzantinische Kopist mißdeutete die vermutlich
in einigem Abstand von \( \text{ΦΑΛΛΙΩΝ} \) befindlichen Buchstaben \( \text{KE} \) als gleichbedeutend
mit \( \text{ΚΑΙ} \)—der Diphtong \( \text{AI} \) wurde E gesprochen—und schrieb \( \text{καί} \ \text{Φαλλίων} \).» Cf.
Idem, \( \text{ Namenworterbuch, s.v. Κεφαλίων} \).

\(^{31}\) Cf. Flusser, \( \text{Josippon}, \) 151.

\(^{32}\) C. Noldius, "Historia Idumaeae seu De vita et gestis Herodum, diatribe
Accesserunt hinc inde Notae in Josephum ut & pro eo vindicae & responsiones
contra Baronium, Serarium, Salianum, & Alios," in Haverkamp, \( \text{Flavii Josephi quae
reperiri potuerunt} \), 1:333–401.

\(^{33}\) Cf. Haverkamp, \( \text{Flavii Josephi quae reperiri potuerunt} \), 1:686.

\(^{34}\) Noldius, "Historia Idumaeae," 339 (nr. 5): «Josepho etiam Bell. Jud. I c. 5
\( \text{Φαλλίων} \) appellatur. Pro quō Hegesippus Excid. I c. 14 scribit Fallion. Ad locum
Papyrus (Heg. 1. cit. male Paparionem) occubuit». In fact, in Ussani’s edition of
the \( \text{Hegesippus} \) (22,10), we find: \( \text{Aristobolus autem uix dudum idoneus propulsando periculo
manum collet}, hostem insequitur et ad \( \text{Papyrus} \), id uocabulum loco, VI militia hostium
simul et fratrem Antipatris Fallionem proelio fudit.

\(^{35}\) See \( \text{LSJ}, \) s.v.
an embassy and a crown worth four thousand pieces of gold, and from Judaea either a vine or garden; τερπωλή (delight) is what they called this work of art. Moreover, we ourselves have examined this gift, which has been set up in the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus at Rome, and has an inscription reading ‘From Alexander, the king of the Jews . . .’” [Marcus, LCL].

Leaving aside the many questions which this passage raises, we should like to focus our attention on the term τερπωλή.

The nature of this δημιουργία is far from clear. According to Josephus it was an ἀμπελον χρυσῆν; according to Strabo εἴτε ἀμπελος εἴτε κῆπος, a very strange assessment on the part of an eyewitness! Even stranger is the addition they used to call this work of art τερπωλή, with the name of the work given in Greek.

According to Marcus (n. a, ad loc.), the Hebrew reflected by the Greek τερπωλή would have been ‘eden and the artefact a plastic reproduction of the paradise.

Now, not only the term τερπωλή does not appear elsewhere either in Josephus or Philo or the Septuagint—in which we have παράδεισος τῆς τρυφῆς (Gen 3:23) for παράδεισος—but what one would expect is an Aramaic or Hebrew name, certainly not a Greek one. Moreover, it is difficult to understand its connection with the vine, even if in a late Jewish tradition the prohibited fruit of the paradise is identified with the vine (b. Ber. 40a; Gen. Rab. 19:5).

Moreover, in the Septuagint ἀμπελος is the usual translation for κάστρο; only once does it stand for γάμος (Lam 2:6) and three times for δοῦλος. The idea of delight seems then to be excluded.

In an attempt to clarify the question, K. Galling suggested that what we have here is an allusion to the so-called Adonis gardens, 'Αδώνιδος

---

36 ἔπεμψε γὰρ αὐτῷ μέγα δώρον Ἀριστόβουλος ἀμπελον χρυσῆν ἐκ πεντακοσίων ταλαντῶν. μέμνηται δὴ τοῦ δώρου καὶ Στράβων ὁ Καππάδος λέγων οὕτως· ἥλθεν δὲ καὶ ἐξ Αἰγύπτου προσβεία καὶ στέφανος ἀπὸ χρυσῶν τετρακεχιλίων καὶ ἐκ τῆς Ἰουδαίας εἴτε ἀμπελος εἴτε κῆπος· τερπωλήν ὄνομαζον τὸ δημιουργία. τούτῳ μέντοι τὸ δώρον ἱστορήκαμεν καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀνακείμενον εἰς Ῥώμην ἐν τῷ ιερῷ τοῦ Δίως τοῦ Καππαδοίου ἐπιγραφῇ ἔχον Ἀλεξάνδρου τοῦ τῶν Ἰουδαίων βασιλέως.
κῆποι, the key being the very term κῆπος. In particular, the gift would have been the one described by Pliny, *Nat.* 37.14, as follows: . . . montem aureum quadratum cum cervis et leonibus et pomis omnis generis circumdata vite aurea.

As regards the term τερπωλή, Galling’s suggestion is to interpret it as a transcription of a semitic word הֵרָסֶל (terpol—tarpol), with a final -l functioning as diminutive, the root being מָרָל, which in Arabic (and in Hebrew?) means *to be fresh.* To sum up, the reference was to the *fresh, novel plantation,* constitutive of the so-called *Adonis gardens.*

Galling, however, did not pay much attention to the textual situation. The Latin has here *terpon* (or *terpon* id est *delectabile,* the same reading of the *Josippon* (ת"א or ת"א, according to the ms Jerusalem, JNUL 8°41280, f. 34v). As is apparent, the Latin translator did not understand the Greek term and *terpon* was nothing else than a faithful transcription of TEPION. Later on, the term—which does not exist in Greek—was interpreted as the Greek adjective τερπνόν, “delightful.” Hence the variant reading and the gloss *id est delectabile.* The addition is an attempt to clarify this difficult term, *once read as a Greek one.* In fact, thanks to the Latin we are entitled to suggest that the word in question was the Aramaic תרָסֶל, which appears in *b. Niddah* 20a, and means “foliage, leaves.”

5. The Translation of Josephus’ *Antiquitates* as Part of a Broader Cultural Program

If the author of the Latin translation remains unknown, it seems anyway certain that the translation was sponsored by Cassiodorus. This translation was surely part of a broader agenda, in which Josephus has to function—so to say—like a *trait d’union* between Biblical writings and classical authors, mainly Livy. This was in accordance with a long tradition that considered Josephus exactly as *Graecus Livius:* we are lucky enough to have a few manuscripts which contain Livy

---


44 Cf. *De institutione divinarum litterarum* 1.17.
alongside Josephus—just as, on the other hand, it is not so aston­
ishing to find a work ascribed to Josephus as part of the Syriac Old 
Testament. Thus, Josephus’ works were utilized not only for apolo­
getic purposes, but as a constitutive element of a wide-ranging cultural 
project aiming at the preservation of the cultural legacy of the past.

How seminal this project must have been, can easily be grasped 
from the fact that for almost a century since the invention of print­
ing, the Latin text was edited several times before the publication 
of the Greek one by Arlenius. Its fortune is testified to as well by 
the large number of manuscripts copied between the thirteenth and 
the fifteenth centuries.

I was lucky enough to be able to peruse three of them, kept in 
the National and University Library in Turin. In one case, the 
manuscript (I-I-10) has huge dimensions and the big characters in 
which it was written induce one to think that it was not intended 
for private use, but for teaching and common reading. On the other 
hand, the other two manuscripts, of smaller size, are carefully illu­
minated. Curiously enough, one of them (D-II-8) shares with the 
largest one the shaping of the initial headings, for instance the shap­
ing of the opening letter of Book 15 as a snake—the name in ques­
tion is Sossius.

The fortune of both the Latin and vernacular translations of 
Josephus was even increased in the following two centuries, espe­
cially in Italy, due to the withdrawal of the Bible from the hand of 
the Christian communities. Josephus became its natural succedaneum:

46 Cf. S. Castelli, “Riferimenti a Flavio Giuseppe nella letteratura siriaca,” Henoch 
47 Cf. Graesse, Trésor de livres rares; Oberthür, “De Flavio Iosepho.”
49 I-I-10 (= Ta; cf. Blatt, Latin Josephus, 41; G. Pasini, Codices manuscripti bibliothe­
cae regii taurinensis atenaei per linguas digesti, & binas in partes distributi, in quam primum 
hebraei, & graeci, in altera latini, italicci, & gallici [Torino: Stamperia Reale, 1749], 125); 
K-II-2 (= ta; cf. Blatt, Latin Josephus, 85–86; Pasini, Codices manuscripti, 126); D-II-8 
(= tr; cf. Blatt, Latin Josephus, 39; Pasini, Codices manuscripti, 171).
50 On the illuminated manuscripts of Josephus’ works cf. H. Schreckenberg, 
“Josephus in Early Christian Literature and Medieval Christian Art,” in H. Schreck­
enberg and K. Schubert, Jewish Historiography and Iconography in Early and Medieval 
Christianity (Assen/Maastricht: Van Gorcum; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991), 
7–138, esp. 87–130; U. Liebl, Die illustrierten Flavius-Josephus-Handschriften des Hochmittelalters 
(Frankfurt a. M.: Peter Lang, 1997).
51 Cf. S. Castelli, “Die Bibel und die italienischen Übersetzungen des Josephus 
and A. Winkelmann; Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2003), 90–107.
this was perfectly in line on one hand with the tendency to supply the Latin Bible with a full set of correspondences to the Josephan works and, on the other hand, with the tendency to re-order the books of both the Antiquitates and the Bellum so as to create a historical continuum from the creation of the world to the destruction of the Temple. Thus, the Vatican manuscript Vat. Lat. 1994 contains Josephus' books in the following order: A.J. 1 to 12; B.J. 1 and 2; A.J. 18–20; B.J. 3 to 7.

To conclude, I should like once more to underline the importance of the indirect tradition with an example that, although not drawn from the Latin version of Josephus, demonstrates how important it is to collect every piece of information before formulating a well-grounded philological hypothesis. It happens that an anonymous treatise against the Jews, dating to the sixth century, constitutes the oldest post- Eusebian witness in Greek to the Testimonium Flavianum. Even though the text was published in a generally available series—the Corpus Christianorum (Series Graeca)—, nobody seems to have taken notice of it, including the author of a recent monograph on the Testimonium.

I hope I have made a good case against “the Horatius method”, as David Flusser labelled the tendency to go into superfluous details, instead of seeing the common denominator. I mean that it is time to reassess as it deserves the indirect tradition of Josephus' works and especially its main branch, viz. the Latin translation.

---

56 Cf. J. Blau, “Hebrew versus other Languages of the Traditional Medieval Jewish Society,” Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam 27 (2002): 348–55: 348, n. 1: “one is liable to go into superfluous details and, instead of seeing their common denominator, to try and explain away their affinities one by one (the late David Flusser dubbed this the Horatius method", since the last surviving Horatius killed the three Curatius brothers one by one; thus a scholar who faces contradictory details, finds for every one separate excuses, ‘killing, so to say, one by one’).”
TRANSLATING BOOK 1 OF JOSEPHUS’ BELLUM JUDAICUM: SOME CRITICAL OBSERVATIONS

ANTHONY J. FORTE
PONTIFICAL BIBLICAL INSTITUTE

In the prologue to his Bellum Judaicum, Josephus declares that he is a “Hebrew by birth” (γένετι Ἑβραῖος) and claims that there was another version of his work. He wrote:

I have proposed to make available to those who live under Roman domination a history rendered into Greek (Ἐλλάδι γλώσσῃ μεταβαλών) from the work which I previously composed in my native tongue (τῇ πατρίῳ συντάξας) for the barbarians in the interior (τοῖς ἀνω βαρβάροις).¹

It is generally accepted that Josephus’ “native tongue” was Aramaic, not Hebrew. The “barbarians in the interior” of B.J. 1.3 are defined by Josephus in B.J. 1.6 as “Parthians and Babylonians and the most remote tribes of Arabia... beyond the Euphrates and the inhabitants of Adiabene.”² Gohei Hata has argued that Josephus used μεταβάλλω “to indicate some radical change, that is, rewriting, and not merely translation”.³ If he is correct, and I suggest that he is, one must critically re-examine Josephus’ Greek of the Bellum in light of this, namely that Josephus’ text is not a translation, but a work that has been re-written and polished by competent Greek writers. The reflections that follow are limited to the Greek of the first book of the Bellum Judaicum.

Josephus states that his first version of the Bellum was done assiduously and with accuracy to acquaint his fellow Jews with the “origin of the war, the various phases of calamity through which it passed and its conclusion.”⁴ Historians have argued that Josephus did not simply

¹ Προειδόμενη ἐγὼ τοῖς κατὰ τὴν Ῥωμαίων ἡγεμονίαν, Ἐλλάδι γλώσσῃ μεταβαλὼν ἡ τοῖς ἀνω βαρβάροις τῇ πατρίῳ συντάξας ἀνέπεμψα πρὸτερον (B.J. 1.3).
² Πάρθους μὲν καὶ Βαβυλωνίους Ἀράμῳ τις πορρωτάτῳ καὶ τὸ ὑπὲρ Ἑὐφράτην ὁμόφυλον ἦμιν Ἀδιαβηνοῦς.
⁴ γινόταν διὰ τῆς ἐπιμελείας ἀκριβῶς, ὅθεν τε ἦρξατο καὶ δι᾿ ὅσων ἐχώρησεν παθῶν ὁ πόλεμος καὶ ὅπως κατέστρεψεν (B.J. 1.6).
want to provide his fellow Jews with information about the war, but
that he rather desired to inform them of the perils of an uprising
to avenge the Romans for the destruction of Jerusalem and the
Temple. For, if Josephus’ account grew out of an urgent desire to
give some kind of a warning to his fellow Jews living “beyond the
Euphrates”, it is very unlikely that the first version contained the
lengthy colorful descriptions of personages such as Herod the Great
and his entourage that we read in Book 1 of the Bellum. Josephus’ first
version was probably very different from the highly conventional Hellen­
istic historical narrative that we have in our version of the Bellum.

In the Contra Apionem, Josephus states that he had some help in
the composition of his Greek version. This comment is interesting
because he does not mention a “translation”, but simply some assistants
for the Greek. In introducing Josephus to the readers of his Ecclesiastical
History, Eusebius of Caesarea refers to not only the Greek version
of the Bellum Judaicum that Josephus left behind, but also to the ver­
sion in Josephus’ native language. There is no indication here that
a Greek “translation” was made of the first version.

The view of this translator is that the Bellum Judaicum is a highly
polished representation of good Hellenistic-Atticistic Greek of the first
century that was probably reworked, and not translated from an
Aramaic original, by Josephus with the aid of native Greek speak­
ers. The Greek of the Bellum is quite elegant and sophisticated at
times. It is certainly not a literal translation from a Semitic language.

---

6 For example, see B.7 1.396-397: "For this reason, when Caesar reached Egypt, after the death of Cleopatra and Antony, not only did he confer additional honors on Herod, but he also annexed to his realm the land that had been appropriated by Cleopatra; and beyond it Gadara, Hippos and Samaria, plus the maritime towns of Gaza, Anthedon, Joppa and Strato’s Tower. He also gave him 400 Gauls as a bodyguard, who were previously protecting Cleopatra. And nothing drove him so much to grant these favors as the magnanimity of their beneficiary."
7 Χρησιμοποίησα τις πρὸς τὴν Ἐλληνίδα φωνὴν συνεργοὺς ὀύτως ἐποιησάμην τῶν πρά­
ξεως τὴν παράδοσιν (C.Ap. 1.50).
8 οὕτως δὴ πάσαν τὴν Ἰουδαϊκὴν ἀρχαιολογίαν ἐν ὅλοις εἴκοσι κατατείθεται συγ­
γράμμασιν, τὴν δ’ ἱστορίαν τοῦ κατ’ αὐτὸν Ῥωμαϊκοῦ πολέμου ἐν ἑπτά, ἃ καὶ οὐ μόνον τῇ Ἐλληνίδῃ, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῇ πατρίᾳ φωνῇ παραδοθοῦναι αὐτὸς ἐαυτῷ μαρτυρεῖ (Hist. eccl. 3.9.3). “Then he put the whole ancient history of the Jews in twenty volumes, and the history of the Roman War in his own time in seven volumes; he testifies that he left behind these works not only in the language of the Greeks but also in his native language.” [my translation]
It is quite different from the "Jewish Greek" or Semitic phraseology that one encounters in the New Testament and in the Septuagint. There is not even one attestation of καὶ ἐγένετο.

Josephus' Greek contains many of the elements that appear in any good Greek writer. For example, there are chiasitic structures, frequent word-plays, alliteration and assonance, asyndeton, etc. What is most striking to this translator is the abundance of hapax legomena which often appear in clusters. I will return to the problem of the hapaxes below.

* * *

The modern translator of Josephus into English has an abundance of tools that have been provided by scholars of Josephus over the centuries. For the translator of Josephus, the 1927 English translation by H. St. J. Thackeray in the Loeb series is at times of great value. In his second volume of this nine-volume translation of Josephus, Thackeray mentioned Whiston's now rather antiquated translation of Josephus as a "pioneering version." Despite other more recent English translations of Josephus, modern scholars have been inclined to look upon Thackeray's work as the standard, if not the authoritative translation of Josephus into English. Steve Mason made reference to Thackeray's rendition of the Vita in the introduction to his own translation and commentary and wrote as follows:

"Thackeray's translation for the Loeb was excellent, inspired in places. Sometimes, as I had struggled for the best English word or phrase, I

---

9 B.J. 1.400: ὑπὸ μὲν Καίσαρος ἐφιλεῖτο μετ’ Ἀγρίππαν, ὡς Ἀγρίππα δὲ μετὰ Καίσαρα.
10 B.J. 1.511: δωρεῖται . . . δώροις.
12 B.J. 1.393: διάδομα δόματι διεσήματο τὴν δωρεάν.
13 B.J. 1.557: τῷ πρεσβύτερῳ τῶν ἄδελφῶν Αλεξάνδρου παιδίῳ.
14 Note the beginnings of B.J. 1.197, 199, 210.
would finally consult Thackeray and find that his choice, nearly eight decades ago, served the purpose admirably. In general, however, Thackeray's translation is not literal, and so would have caused problems for the commentator.\textsuperscript{19}

This writer agrees with Mason's evaluation that Thackeray's rendition was "inspired in places", but would argue that the inspiration came not from a Muse, but from the French version of Dr. Théodore Reinach,\textsuperscript{20} whose work Thackeray acknowledged with gratitude in his introduction to the \textit{Bellum}:

The translator must finally express his grateful acknowledgement for the assistance which he has received from the labours of many previous workers . . . and last, but not least, [to] Dr. Théodore Reinach and his collaborators (for his French translation and invaluable notes . . .). Dr. Reinach has graciously permitted me to make use of this work with its admirable commentary, and my constant indebtedness to this brilliant scholar will be evident to the reader from the references in the footnotes throughout this volume.\textsuperscript{21}

What Thackeray did not state is that Reinach's translation is frequently the source of his choice of words, his "mot juste." The Muse, however, has occasionally been the source of many of Thackeray's inaccuracies and facile solutions to some difficult Greek passages. I will limit my comments to Book 1 of the \textit{Bellum}, yet a rapid perusal of Reinach's French translation of other parts of the \textit{Bellum} will result in some very curious similarities with Thackeray's translation.\textsuperscript{22}

Thackeray frequently presents an almost literal English translation of Reinach's French, and he also slavishly follows Reinach's sentence structure and punctuation. For example, see \textit{B.J.} 1.253.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Niese)</th>
<th>(Reinach)</th>
<th>(Thackeray)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>253 ένστάσης δ' ἔορτῆς, ἤ πεντηκοστῆ καλεῖται, τά τε περὶ τὸ</td>
<td>Comme la fête de la Pentecôte approchait, tous les lieux voisins</td>
<td>When the feast called Pentecost came round, the whole neighbour-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{21} Thackeray, \textit{Josephus}, vol. 2, xxx–xxxi.
\textsuperscript{22} This paper has served as the point of departure for a forthcoming article to be published in \textit{SCI} entitled "Caveat Lector: Notes on Thackeray's Translation of the \textit{Bellum Judaicum}" by Lisa Ullmann and Jonathan J. Price. The authors have applied my theory about Thackeray's translation to Book 2 of the \textit{Bellum}.
Thackeray altered only one element of Reinach’s version above by translating the word καλείται. Thackeray renders the genitive absolute ἐνστάσης ἐροτής in exactly the same way as Reinach and the prepositional phrase περὶ τὸ ἱερὸν is rendered loosely by both Thackeray and Reinach. The only particle that is translated by both Reinach and Thackeray is the καὶ after πάντα. One could simply argue that the particles in the above passage are indeed interpreted as formal connectives and that they defy translation. For example, the initial δὲ is simply a copulative δὲ that marks a transition as does the καὶ before Φασάηλος. Both particles are used as connectives. In the same way, the particles μὲν and δὲ that accompany Φασάηλος and Ἦρωδῆς are interpreted by Reinach’s semicolon which Thackeray appropriates.

Another example of Thackeray’s dependance on Reinach’s French translation is the following text, B.J. 1.509.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Niese)</th>
<th>(Reinach)</th>
<th>(Thackeray)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>φαμένου δὲ τοῦ βασιλέως δόρον ἐξεῖν παρ’ οὐτοῦ τὸν υἱόν, εἰ μὴ λύσειν τὸν γάμον, ὄντων μὲν αὐτοῖς ἥδη καὶ τέκνων, στεργομένης δ’ οὕτως ύπὸ τοῦ μειρακίου τῆς γυναικός, ἢν παραμένουσιν μὲν ἔσσεσθαι δυσώπημα τῶν ἀμαρτιμάτων, ἀπορρογεῖσαν δὲ αἰτίαν τῆς εἰς ἀπάντα ἀπογνώσεως· μαλακω-</td>
<td>Le roi repartit que ce serait vraiment lui rendre son fils que de consentir à ne pas rompre le mariage, d’autant qu’ils avaient déjà des enfants et que le prince aimait beaucoup sa femme : si elle reste auprès de lui, elle lui inspirera le regret de ses fautes ; si on la lui arrache, on le plongera</td>
<td>To this the king replied that Arche- laus, by consenting not to break the marriage, would really be giving his son back to him, seeing that they already had children and that the young man was so deeply attached to his wife; if she remained with</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Greek of the first and last sentences of this paragraph is rather difficult, and both Reinach and Thackeray have offered an acceptable translation. The genitive absolute φαμένου δὲ τοῦ βασιλέως seems to introduce a sentence that remains incomplete. Thackeray copies Reinach’s translation of the protasis εἰ μὴ λύσειν τὸν γάμον, namely, Reinach’s “de consentir à ne pas rompre le mariage” becomes Thackeray’s “by consenting not to break the marriage.” Thackeray, following Reinach, then adds the adverb “really” (“vraiment”) with the intention of rendering some clarity to the apodosis. The continuation of Thackeray’s translation of this paragraph is an almost literal translation of Reinach’s French, and the adversative force of the second μὲν . . . δὲ construction is lost. What is most striking is Thackeray’s rendering of πάθεσιν οἰκείως as “domestic affections”, a clear borrowing of Reinach’s “affections domestiques”. I suggest that the difficult last sentence, μαλακωτέρας γὰρ γίνεσθαι τὰς τόλμας πάθεσιν οἰκείως περισσωμένας, is perhaps better translated as follows: “For reckless behavior comes about less likely if it is checked by family ties.”

This next section, B.J. 1.514–517, is an interesting example of Thackeray’s dependence on Reinach’s French version. Thackeray’s translation, however, is at times at variance with that of Reinach. For example, he offers an alternate translation in his footnote of the genitive absolute at the beginning of paragraph 517.²³

²³ Thackeray on Josephus, B.J. 1.517 (LCL), note b: “Or possibly ‘Trying in turn all the parts in the play.’ This translation of πάντων δ’ ἀποπειραθείς τῶν προσώπων is very similar to that of Ricciotti, ‘Facendo allora tutte le parti in commedia.’ See Giuseppe Ricciotti, La Guerra Giudaica, v. 2, (Torino: Società Editrice Internazionale, 1937), 165.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Niese)</th>
<th>(Reinach)</th>
<th>(Thackeray)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>λαμπρά δ’ Ἦρωδη δώρα προσενεγκόν ἰνάδειαρ ὄν ἐθηράτο καὶ παραχρήμα πολλαπλασίω λοβδὸν οὐδὲν ἤγετο τὴν καθαρὰν δόσιν, εἰ μὴ δι’ αἵματος ἐμπορεύεσται τὴν βασιλείαν.</td>
<td>Il vint, apportant à Hérode de magnifiques présents, amorce de ceux qu’il espérait en retour ; en effet, il en reçut de beaucoup plus considérables, mais ce don pur et simple lui paraissait sans valeur, s’il ne trafiquait du royaume au prix du sang.</td>
<td>He brought with him magnificent presents for Herod, as a bait to secure his quarry, and instantly found them returned with interest; but he accounted a pure and simple gift as nothing, if he failed to make merchandise out of the realm at the price of blood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>515 . . . φίλος ἐν τοῖς πρώτοις γίνεται· καὶ γὰρ ὁ βασιλεὺς διὰ τὴν πατρίδα καὶ πάντες οἱ περὶ αὐτὸν ἡδέως προετίμων τὸν Σπαρτιάτην.</td>
<td>515. . . et compota bientôt parmi ses principaux amis ; en effet, le roi et toute la cour prenaient plaisir à honorer particulièrement ce Spartiate, en considération de sa patrie.</td>
<td>515. . . he was soon numbered among his principal friends; indeed the king and the whole court were delighted to show special honour to this Spartan, out of regard for his country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>516 Ὁ δ’ ἐπεὶ τὰ σοφρά τῆς οἰκίας κατέμαθεν, τὰς τε τῶν ὁδελφῶν διαφορὰς καὶ ὅπως διέκειτο πρὸς ἕκαστον ὁ πατήρ,. . . ἐταῖρον ἐκατόν εἶναι καὶ ᾿Αρχελάου πάλαι.</td>
<td>516 Quand il connut la pourriture de la maison royale, les différends des frères, les sentiments de leur père à l’égard de chacun d’eux, Eurycles . . . un ami éprouvé . . .</td>
<td>516 When he had learned everything about the rottenness that was sapping the royal house, the quarrel between the brothers and their father’s disposition towards each of them, Eurycles, . . . a proved friend . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>517 πάντων δ’ ἀποπειραθεὶς τῶν προσώπων ἄλλως ὑπῆκε, γίνεται δὲ προηγομένος μισθοτός Ἀντιπάτρου καὶ προδότης ᾿Αλεξάνδρου, τῷ μὲν ὀνείδιζον, εἰ προσβύτατος δὲν περιόρισται τοὺς ἐφεδρώντας αὐτοῦ ταῖς ἐλληνίσιν, ᾿Αλεξάνδρῳ δὲ, εἰ γεγενημένος ἐκ βασιλίδος καὶ βασιλίδι</td>
<td>517 Prenant tour à tour les visages, il s’insinuait de façons diverses auprès de chacun ; mais de préférence il se fit l’espion d’Antipater et le traître d’Alexandre. Au premier il faisait honte de négliger, lui l’aïné, les intrigues de ceux qui complotaient contre ses espérances;</td>
<td>517 Exploiting in turn all the various personages, he insinuated himself into favour with each by a different method; but he chiefly acted as a hireling of Antipater and a traitor to Alexander. To the former he represented how disgraceful it was</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
that he, the eldest son, should overlook the intrigues of persons who had an eye upon his prospects; to Alexander, that he, the son of one princess and husband of another, should suffer the son of a woman of no station to succeed to the throne, especially when he had in Archelaus such powerful support behind him.

The above translation also demonstrates that Thackeray did not simply render Reinach’s French into English. His reference to Reinach’s footnote at the end of paragraph 515 is not precise,24 but at least here he does credit the source of his note. What is alarming is that Thackeray sometimes freely appropriates Reinach’s notes and explanation of his translation. For example, see B. J. 1.329:

24 See Reinach 104, footnote 1: “Peut-être à cause de la prétendue parenté des Spartiates et des Juifs; cf. Ant. XII, 226.” Thackeray on Josephus, B. J. 1.515 (LCL), note a wrote: “Perhaps, as Reinach suggests, because of the pretended relationship of Spartans and Jews, 1 Macc. xii. 21 ; Jos. A. xii. 226.”
Reinach’s translation of οὐ περιμείνας ἡμέραν as “sans attendre le jour,” is unacknowledged, nor does Thackeray cite the French scholar as the source for his own translation, “without waiting for daylight.” Reinach’s footnote reads as follows:

La phrase οὐ περιμείνας ἡμέραν est équivoque (on pourrait entendre : sans tarder d’un jour), mais le sens résulte de Ant., § 452, où l’on voit que la marche eut lieu de nuit.25

Thackeray simply noted:

The Greek might mean ‘without a day’s delay’; but the rendering above seems fixed by the parallel in A. xiv. 452 (νυκτὸς ἀναστάς). . . .26

Thackeray seems to misunderstand the French on occasion and renders the French translator’s dubious interpretation even more unacceptable. For example, at B.J. 1.421, Josephus recounts Herod’s building of two palaces called Herodium. The context is important for understanding the first line of B.J. 1.421. My translation of B.J. 1.420 is as follows:

Herod surrounded the summit of the hill with round towers, and filled the enclosure with splendid palaces, so that not only the interior of the buildings had a magnificent appearance, but also the outer walls, the partitions, and the roofs were covered with wealth in superabundance. In addition, he brought in from a distance, and at a great expense, an abundance of water, and provided access to the palace by a staircase of 200 steps made of the whitest marble; for the hill was moderately high and entirely artificial.

The problematic translation of both Reinach and Thackeray occurs at the beginning of B.J. 1.421.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Niese)</th>
<th>(Reinach)</th>
<th>(Thackeray)</th>
<th>(Forte)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>κατεσκεύασεν δὲ καὶ περὶ τὰς ρίζας ἀλλὰ βασίλεια τὴν τε ὑποσκευὴν καὶ τοὺς φίλους δέξασθαι δυνάμενα.</td>
<td>Au pied du coteau, il bâtît un autre palais pouvant abriter un mobilier et recevoir ses amis.</td>
<td>Around the base he erected other palaces for the accommodation of his furniture and his friends.</td>
<td>At the foot of the hill, he also built other buildings, suitable for accommodating his household and his friends.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25 See Reinach 67, footnote 1.
26 Thackeray on Josephus, B.J. 1.329 (LCL), note a.
Reinach’s incorrect rendering of ἀποσκευὴ in this passage as “mobilier” (“movable property”) is in turn appropriated by Thackeray.\(^{27}\) In the context of the passage at hand, it is this translator’s view that the word “household” more faithfully encompasses its Greek meaning and that the text should be translated as follows: “other buildings, suitable for accommodating his household and his friends.” The entry for ἀποσκευὴ in this passage in the Complete Concordance renders it as “court,” yet I think that term is perhaps too restrictive.\(^{28}\) LSJ offer several interpretations.\(^{29}\) The entry includes a reference to the LXX and this gave me the impetus to seek another possible meaning elsewhere in the LXX. Indeed, ἀποσκευὴ takes on the following meanings: baggage, household (Num 16:27); a man’s wife, children and other members of the household (Exod 10:24); all persons apart from the full-grown men or apart from the men fit for military service (Exod 12:37); impedimenta (Jdt 7:2).\(^{30}\) The meaning in the passage from Exod 10:24 seems to be most appropriate for our text of the Bellum.

There are times, however, when Josephus’ Greek is somewhat difficult and Thackeray seems to have realized that Reinach’s translation has missed the mark. What I have observed is that when the French translation is too free, often due to the complexity of the Greek syntax, Thackeray, likewise, renders the Greek rather loosely.

\(^{27}\) It is true that Whiston’s 1737 English translation also renders ἀποσκευὴ as “furniture”: “He also built other palaces about the roots of the hill, sufficient to receive the furniture that was put into them, with his friends.” The Oxford English Dictionary, 1933, v. 4, 616, n. 7 defines “furniture” in its “prevailing sense” as “movable articles, whether useful or ornamental, in a dwelling-house, place of business, or public building.” Since there seem to be very few instances of Thackeray’s appropriation of Whiston’s translation, I suggest that Thackeray’s rendering is a direct borrowing from Reinach. A. Bailly, Dictionnaire grec-français, (Paris: Hachette, 1969), 242, offers the following translations of ἀποσκευὴ: bagages, mobilier, meubles. Bailly’s renderings fail to capture the meaning of ἀποσκευὴ in the context of B.J. 1.421.

\(^{28}\) See K.H. Rengstorf, A Complete Concordance to Flavius Josephus (Leiden: Brill, 1973–1983). The entry for ἀποσκευὴ reads: “A 18, 41 = removal—baggage, movable property—B 1, 421; A 18, 377 = stores of the royal court, court; B 5, 179 (plural) = furnishings, equipment / A 18, 41 = Beseitigung—Gepäck, Troß, bewegliche Habe—B 1, 421; A 18, 377 = was zur Hofhaltung gehört, Hofhaltung; B 5, 179 (Plural) = Einrichtungsgegenstände, Ausstattung.” [Note that the page numbers to the Complete Concordance listed below correspond to the two volume edition published in 2002.]

\(^{29}\) See LSJ, ἀποσκευὴ, 217: “removal, riddance, i.e. assassination, J A† 18.2.4 II) baggage in sg. and pl., Plb. 2.3.7, Plu. 2.174a, etc.; household stuff, LXX Ge. 34.29 . . . III) ordure, filth, v. 1. Str. 14.1.37.”

The following passage, which includes three *hapax legomena* in the Josephan corpus, is one of many examples. Thackeray’s translation of the first sentence of this paragraph follows the French word for word. When the language becomes more complicated, Thackeray’s English translation departs from Reinach’s French.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B.J. 1.405</th>
<th>(Reinach)</th>
<th>(Thackeray)</th>
<th>(Forte)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Niese)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

 espos ημερις εἰς ἀπειρον ὑψος ἀνατείνεται, παρά δὲ τὴν ὑπόρειον λαγόνα συνηρεῖτο ἀντρον ὑπανιγεί, δι' οὗ βαραθρώδης κρημνός εἰς ὑμέτερον ἀπορρίγια βαθύνεται πλῆθει τε ὑδάτων ὀσματοῦ καὶ τοῖς καθιμὼσιν τι πρὸς ἐρευναν γῆς οὐδὲν μήκος ἐξαρκεῖ.

Une montagne y dresse son sommet à une immense hauteur et ouvre dans la cavité de son flanc un antre obscur, où plonge jusqu’à une profondeur inaccessible un précipice escarpé; une masse d’eau tranquille y est enfermée, si énorme qu’on a vainement essayé par des sondages d’atteindre le fond.

At this spot a mountain rears its summit to an immense height aloft; at the base of the cliff is an opening into an overgrown cavern; within this, plunging down to an immeasurable depth, is a yawning chasm, enclosing a volume of still water, the bottom of which no sounding-line has been found long enough to reach.

There, a mountain peak rises to an overwhelming height, and near the foot of the side of the mountain a dark cave opens from below, through which a precipitous chasm plunges down into an immense depth. No length of rope is sufficient to reach the great quantity of stagnant water and measure the bottom.

The student of Josephus is aware that the *Antiquititates* often elaborate or expand upon certain details of the *Bellum*. For the translator the parallel texts are an invaluable source of information. Sometimes a parallel text in the *Antiquititates* can provide a clue as to the possible

---

31 This entire section, B7 1.401–430, contains 19 hapaxes: πρόσθεσις (404); ὑπανοίγω (405); βαραθρώδης (405); ὀσαλευτος (405); ὑπερεκχέω (407); προδομέω (412); ἐνομιζω (413); νάγμα (413); κολοσσός (2x : 413, 414); θήλορον (420); περιστύλον (422); λειμών (422); ἐπετήσιος (423); γυμνοσιαρχία (423); φευκτός (425); ἐπεξεκυμνίζω (428: an absolute hapax in all of extant Greek literature); συντρόφος (429); ὄναγρος (429); προτέρημα (430).

32 ὑπανοίγω is a *hapax* in Josephus.

33 βαραθρώδης is a *hapax* in Josephus.

34 ὀσαλευτος is a *hapax* in Josephus.
meaning of a word in the Bellum. The following passage from the Bellum, seen together with its parallel text in the Antiquitates, is not without interest.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B.J. 1.311</th>
<th>A.J. 14.423</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Niese)</td>
<td>(Forte)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Niese)</td>
<td>(Forte)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τοὺς γονὸν ἀλκί-</td>
<td>λάρνακας ἔπ'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μους καθιμῶν ἐν</td>
<td>αὐτούς πηξάμενος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λάρναξιν ἐνίει</td>
<td>καθεὶ ταύτας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τοῖς στομίοις.</td>
<td>σιδηροῖς ἀλύσεσιν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ἐκδηλεμένας διὰ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>μηχανής ἀπὸ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>κορυφῆς τοῦ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ὀρους.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He lowered his</td>
<td>He built containers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>most valiant men</td>
<td>and lowered them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in containers and</td>
<td>(the containers) on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thus gave them</td>
<td>the men with iron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>access to the</td>
<td>chains as they were</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>entrances of the</td>
<td>suspended by a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>caves.</td>
<td>machine from the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>top of the hill.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the Complete Concordance,\textsuperscript{35} καθιμῶ means "to lower down by means of ropes". Liddell-Scott-Jones render the verb in the same way: "to let down by a rope," citing two passages from Aristophanes, Vespae 379 and 396, as well as one passage from Aristotle's Mechanica 857b.\textsuperscript{36} Thackeray, following Reinach's "il fit descendre d'en haut à l'aide de cordes,"\textsuperscript{37} translates the verb "by means of ropes he lowered." The question is: should the translator here be influenced by A.J. 14.423, where in the parallel passage there is the addition of σιδηροῖς ἀλύσεσιν, "iron chains", and therefore exclude the interpretation of καθιμῶ that entails "ropes"? I suggest that in light of A.J. 14.423, where Josephus seems to purposely attempt to make his account even more clear, it would perhaps be better to translate καθιμῶ simply as "he lowered." Josephus' explicit reference to the "iron chains" in A.J. 14.423 excludes the need to specify "ropes" in our translation of B.J. 1.311.

* * *

\textsuperscript{35} Rengstorf, 402.
\textsuperscript{37} Bailly, Dictionnaire 994, translates: "faire descendre au moyen d'une corde; faire descendre (en gén.)."
The first element of Josephus’ Greek that I would like to reflect upon is his use of simple and compound verbs. Often Josephus uses of the same word or verbal root with different meanings in the same sentence or paragraph. This is most evident in the way Josephus uses simple and compound (or even double compound) verbs in parallel passages of the Bellum and the Antiquitates. Sometimes the events of the Bellum are rewritten for a particular purpose, perhaps even to refine the author’s style and/or diction. Josephus frequently varies the simple and compound forms of the verb, but their meanings are not always significantly different. The reader of biblical Greek is accustomed to the frequent pairing of simple and compound forms of verbs. There is often no difference in meaning between the two forms. For example, at 2 Cor 7:10 we read: ἢ γὰρ κατὰ θεὸν λόπη μετάνοιαν εἰς σωτηρίαν ἁμεταμελήτων ἐργάζεται. ἢ δὲ τοῦ κόσμου λόπη θάνατον κατεργάζεται. The verbs ἐργάζομαι and κατεργάζομαι, “to work out, effect, produce,” seem to be synonymous in this passage. We simply have a varietas locutionis. Sometimes we encounter compound verbs in biblical Greek that would seem to have no different meaning, had the author employed the simple form. For example, at Eph 1:12, we read: εἰς τὸ εἶναι ἡμᾶς εἰς ἔκαστον δόξης αὐτοῦ τοῦ προηλπικότας ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ. The question here is whether the compound form προελπίζω has the same meaning as the simple form ἔλπίζω. The fact is that prepositions which function as prefixes in biblical Greek often do little more than give emphasis to the main thought of their verb.

38 For example, καθίστημι is used by Josephus 4 times in close vicinity with different meanings. κατέστησαν “appointed” (B.J. 1.202); καθίστατο “organize” (B.J. 1.203); καθίστησεν “appointed” (B.J. 1.203); καθιστάμενος “rendered” (B.J. 1.206).
39 “For godly grief produces a repentance that leads to salvation and brings no regret, but worldly grief produces death.” (RSV).
40 “We who first hoped in Christ... to live for the praise of his glory.” (RSV).
41 Other examples of compound verbs whose meaning seems to be no different than that of the simple form can be found at Rom 1:2: ὁ προετοιμασάτω διὰ τῶν προηλπίσας αὐτοῦ ἐν γραφαῖς ἀγίαις and Col 1:5: διὰ τὴν ἐλπίδα τὴν ἀποκειμένην ὑμῖν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, ἢν προηλπίσατε ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τῆς ἀληθείας τοῦ εὐαγγελίου.
42 The change from the simple to the compound form of the verb is quite common in the LXX. For example, see 1 Esd 4:19, καὶ ταῦτα πάντα ἀφέντες εἰς αὐτὴν ἐγκύψαναι καὶ ἔσεσθαι τὸ σῶμα ἑνεμοῦσιν αὐτὴν κτλ. This phenomenon is most especially evident in the Lucianic Recension. See Bruce M. Metzger, “The Lucianic Recension of the Greek Bible,” in idem, Chapters in the History of New Testament Textual Criticism (Leiden: Brill, 1963), 1-41.
This same phenomenon can be said, too, of Josephus’ use of many compound verbs. The following texts of the Bellum contain some examples of simple or compound verbs that have parallels either in the Bellum itself or in the Antiquitates. The meanings of the verbs are often similar, yet there are occasionally some striking differences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B.J. 1 (Niese)</th>
<th>B.J. 1 (Forte)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>292. . . Ἡρώδης ἐκδραμὼν μετ' ὀλίγου στίφους τρέπεται ταχέως καὶ Σίλωνα διασώζει.</td>
<td>292 . . . Herod, with a small band of soldiers, rushed out at them, quickly drove them back, and rescued Silo, . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295 Στρατοπεδευσάμενος δὲ κατὰ τὸ πρῶς δύσιν κλίμα τοῦ ἄστεος οἱ ταύτῃ φύλακες ἐτόξευον τε καὶ ἐξηκόντιζον αὐτούς.</td>
<td>295 When the troops had pitched camp on the west side of the city, the guards stationed there attacked them with arrows and javelins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297 . . . ἐπίσκευασάμενος γὰρ πολλοί τῶν στρατιώτῶν σπάνιν ἐπιτηδείων ἀναβοῦν καὶ χρήματα εἰς τροφὰς ἀπαιτεῖν ἀπέγει τε σφᾶς χειμερισοῦτας εἰς τοὺς ἰδίους τόπους, ἐπειδὴ τὰ περὶ τὴν πόλιν ἦν ἔρημα πάντα τῶν περὶ Ἄντιγονον προανεσκευασμένων.</td>
<td>297 . . . For he incited a large number of soldiers to decry the scarcity of supplies, to demand money for provisions, and to be marched to their own winter quarters, since Antigonus’ men had packed up and carried away previously</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

43 ἐκδραμὼν (< ἐκτρέχω = “to run/rush out, run forward; to sally forth; make raids”). See B.J. 1.253 for the double compound form of the verb, ἐπεκδραμὼν (< ἐπεκτρέχω = “to rush out against, make a raid against, attack”).

44 διασώζει κακῶς ἀμυνόμενον (< διασώζω = “to save, spare”). The parallel passage at A.J. 14.397 uses the simple form of the verb, σώζει.

45 ἐξηκόντιζον (< ἔξακοντίζω = “to throw spears (at someone)”). The compound verb is a hapax in Josephus. See B.J. 1.332, ἀκοντίζεται (“to hurl (a javelin), attack with javelins; to hit, wound”), for an example of the simple form. See also the parallel in A.J. 14.401, ἰκόντιζον.

46 ἀναβοῦν (< ἀναβάω = “to shout, call out, clamour; to cry out against, complain loudly over”). The parallel in A.J. 14.406 has καταβοῦν (“to cry out, inveigh [against someone], revile, abuse; to complain loudly; to demand [loudly]”).

47 ἀπαιτεῖν (< ἀπαίτεω = “to demand back, reclaim; to require”). The parallel in A.J. 14.406 uses the simple αἰτεῖν.

48 The double compound form προανεσκευασμένων (< προανεσκευάζωμαι = “to pick up and carry away previously”) is used here, while the parallel in A.J. 14.406 has the compound ἄνεκεννασθαί (< ἄνεκενναζωμαι = “to snatch up, carry off”).

49 ὀρμήσας (< ὀρμᾶω = “to set out, depart for (in haste), start out, go”). The parallel in A.J. 14.408 uses the compound ἐξορμήσας (< ἐξορμάω = “to rush, start (rapidly), march out, move (out)”).
Upon making his request, he immediately set out for the country and brought back such a super-abundance of supplies for them so as to undercut Silo’s pretexts.

Hearing this, Antigonus had orders passed along the country to obstruct and lay an ambush for the supply columns.

They took up positions round about the hills, as they were on the lookout for the conveyers of the supplies.

He arrived in Jericho and found the city deserted.

The second element that I would like to mention briefly is Josephus’ use of particles. This translator has been most puzzled by the elegant employment of particles which nicely balance Josephus’ sentences and paragraphs. Everyone in the field knows that the Greek particle can express a distinct relation between two or more ideas and that Greek particles, in the broad sense, include some sentence adverbs and conjunctions. Sometimes the particles tighten up the discourse as well as artfully embellish the text. For example, the particle καί sometimes functions as an adverb and sometimes as a conjunction.

50 διέπεμψεν ("to send, make known"); διέπεμψεν κελεύων = “he had orders passed along, he issued (sent) orders”) περὶ τὴν χώραν. The parallel passage in A.J. 14.409 uses the verb ἀπέστειλεν (“to send out, dispatch, forward; to send back”) and κατὰ τὴν χώραν. εἴργεν καὶ λοχάν ("to obstruct and lay an ambush"). The parallel passage in A.J. 14.409 uses two participles, εἰρέσοντας καὶ λοχήσοντας.

51 διεκαθέζοντο (a hapax < διεκαθέζομαι = “to take up positions round about”). The parallel passage in A.J. 14.409 has καθεσθέντες (< καθέζομαι = “to sit down, settle, take a seat”).

52 διεκαθέζοντο (< καθεσθέντες = “to leave behind; abandon”) εὑρίσκει. The parallel in A.J. 14.410 has ἐκκαθέζεις (< ἐκκαθέζομαι = “to leave, abandon”) καταλαβὼν (< καταλαμβάνω = “to come upon, meet, encounter, find”).
In Hellenistic Greek it is not uncommon to encounter a long series of clauses and sentences connected by καί (parataxis), where there seems to be a conscious attempt on the part of the author to give emphasis or bring an element of liveliness to his discourse. Josephus’ Greek is often more polished, and instead of the monotonous string of καί . . . καί . . . καί, ever-present in late Greek, one regularly encounters particles such as τε, καί, μέν and δέ used individually, in various combinations, or within a grammatical arrangement of words in dependent or subordinate relationships (hypotaxis). The postpositive particle γάρ, too, is not always easy to render into English. It is used to express cause, inference, continuation, and it also functions to explain something. Γάρ, like καί, is employed as a conjunction and as an adverb. It can be confirmatory, explanatory; it can be used as δέ to express a continuation or a connection. Γάρ can likewise be adversative, resumptive, or can be employed as a way to answer questions. The problem of rendering the Greek particle into English is not unique to translating Josephus’ Greek, since the force of certain Greek particles cannot be translated.

What is problematic for this translator is that the significance of many particles distributed throughout Josephus’ text remains elusive. Some of the best translators of Josephus simply ignore the particles. It is true that a particle is often interpreted by the way one punctuates a text or by simply not translating it. Josephus’ Greek assistants surely did not simply add the particles as fillers in his text. It has been this translator’s concern to offer some interpretation for each particle. Let us look at B.J. 1.233:

'Επεγέλα δ' ἂρα τὸ χρέων αὐτοῦ τοῖς ἐλπίσιν. ὁ γαὖν Ἡρώδης προειδόμενος αὐτοῦ τὴν ὁμήν τὸν τε Ὑρκανὸν κάκεινον ἐπὶ δείπνον ἐκάλει, παραστήτας ἐπείτα τῶν οἰκετῶν τινας πρὸς αὐτὸν εἰσέπεμψεν ώς ἐπὶ τὴν τοῦ δείπνου παρασκευήν, τῷ δὲ δντὶ προειπεῖν τοῖς χιλιάρχοις ἐξελθεῖν ἐπὶ τὴν ἐνέδραν.

But Fate smiled upon his hopes. At all events, Herod foresaw his motive and invited both Hyrcanus and him to dinner. Then he dispatched some of his domestic servants to his house, seemingly to prepare the dinner, but actually to order his captains to come out for the ambush.

Does the particle ἂρα have a connective, confirmatory or inferential meaning here? The particle δέ is used in the above text twice with an adversative force. The restrictive particle γαὖν functions to give an explanation of the previous clause. Instead of using a καί . . . καί
construction to connect 'Υρκανῶν and ἐκεῖνον, the more elegant combination of τε and καί unites the two elements. It seems that in this passage, ἀρα defies translation and its exact meaning remains elusive.

In this next paragraph the author has employed a series of particles that seem to give his text a more polished tone. For example, at B.J. 1.209 we read the following:

They said that [Hyrcanus] had ceded his power to Antipater and his sons, and ended up with only the title of king, which was destitute of any authority. And indeed, how long would he be misled in rearing kings to his own detriment? For they were no longer feigning to hold the office of procurator, but were openly the masters, having pushed aside that [Hyrcanus], arguing namely that since he [Hyrcanus] had neither given written orders nor sent a messenger, Herod had killed so many people in violation of Jewish law. If he, [Herod], were not king, but still a commoner, he ought to be brought to trial and answer to him [Hyrcanus] and to his country’s laws, which did not permit the killing of anyone who had not had the benefit of a trial.

The particle καί functions not only as a copulative conjunction (‘Ἀντιπάτρῳ καὶ τοῖς υἱοῖς αὐτοῦ), but can even have an adverbial sense in combination with μέχρι: καὶ μέχρι could be rendered “and yet,” “and however,” “and of course,” or as “yes, of course.” The γὰρ (οὖν γὰρ εἰρωνεύεσθαι) is most likely explanatory, while δέ, marking a contrast with what precedes, is clearly adversative. In Josephus’ elegant combination of εἰ γε μὴτε . . . μὴτε, the intensive particle γε, by its close proximity to εἰ, influences the entire clause with the double μὴτε, and later picks up εἰ μὴ of the next sentence. Just as the δέ above functioned as an adversative, the ἀλλα of ἀλλα ἐτι ἰδιώτης is an adversative conjunction, even stronger than δέ. Finally, the elegant combination of τε καί, as opposed to a simple καί, serves to unite the two complements, Hyrcanus and his country’s laws (αὐτῷ τε καὶ τοῖς πατρίοις νόμοις).
There is also some technical Latin and Greek administrative or poli­tical terminology that remains problematic to the translator. Let me simply point out one example found in B.J. 1.399 where we encounter the technical term ἐπίτροπος.\(^{54}\)

κατέστησεν δὲ αὐτὸν καὶ Συρίας ὅλης ἐπίτροπον ἔτει δεκάτῳ πάλιν ἔλθὼν εἰς τὴν ἐπαρχίαν, ὡς μηδὲν ἔζειναι δίχα τῆς ἐκείνου συμβουλίας τοῖς ἐπίτροποις διοικεῖν.

Then, when he came back to this province ten years later, he also made him [Herod] procurator of all Syria, so that the other procurators were permitted to take no action without obtaining the latter’s consent.

Is an ἐπίτροπος, a word used at least fifty times by Josephus, a simple rendering of the Latin word procurator? Is not the same Greek word used by Josephus to describe Ramesses’ brother Harmais as the praefectus of Egypt\(^{55}\) and L. Volusius Saturninus as the legatus of Syria in the above passage, B.J. 1.399? Does not Josephus use other language when referring to legati? B.J. 1.538 contains another term for the Latin legatus, πρέσβυς, instead of the more frequently attested presebvetis.

προκαθίζουσιν τε οἱ ἡγεμόνες γραφέν αὐτοῖς ἵνα Καίσαρος, Σατορνίνος τε καὶ οἱ περὶ Πεδάνιον πρέσβεις, σὺν οἷς καὶ Ωυδολύμνιος ἐπίτροπος.

The Roman administrators, whom Caesar had designated in writing, presided, namely Saturninus and the legates in Pedanius’ party, among whom was Volumnius the procurator.

The Latin term legatus usually designates an “assistant to a Roman magistrate.” A precise and consistent rendering of such terms remains problematic. In my translation, I have attempted to offer an explanation of the technical language in a footnote, lest the reader conclude that the Latin and Greek terms are synonymous.

* * *

On occasion Josephus associates a person with one word or idea. δωδοδοκία, defined by Rengstorf’s Complete Concordance as “bribe,
bribery, corruptibility; Bestechung, Bestechlichkeit”, appears only six times in the entire Josephan corpus. Of these six attestations, four appear in relation to Silo. Apart from B.J. 1.297: “Ἐνθα δὴ καὶ Σίλων ἀπεκαλύψατο τὴν δωροδοκίαν: “At that point Silo openly displayed his corruption,” see the parallel in A.J. 14.406, Τότε καὶ Σίλων ἀπεκαλύψατο τὴν δωροδοκίαν, and also B.J. 1.302 ἐπέτυχεν δὲ καὶ Ἀντίγονος παρὰ τῆς Σίλωνος δωροδοκίας ὑποδέχασθαι τοῦ στρατοῦ μοίραν ἐν Λύδδοις θεραπεύων Ἀντώνιον: “By bribing Silo, however, Antigonus saw to it that a unit of his troops be received in Lydda as a way of flattering Antony.” Its parallel is at A.J. 14.412, ἐπέτυχεν δὲ καὶ Ἀντίγονος παρὰ Σίλωνος ἀντὶ τῆς δωροδοκίας ὑπετέχεσθαι τοῦ στρατοῦ μοίραν ἐν Λύδδοις θεραπεύων Ἀντώνιον. It is important that the translator be aware of such a phenomenon so that there be, if possible, a certain consistency and uniformity in rendering such terms into English.

* * *

It is not without interest that certain sections of Josephus’ narrative are replete with hapax legomena. Let me briefly comment on B.J 1.401–430, where Josephus recounts in some detail Herod’s numerous architectural projects: the reconstruction of the Temple; the building of Antonia’s fortress and the royal palace; the foundation of Sebaste in Samaria; the construction of the temple of Augustus at Paneion; the structures erected to honor Augustus; the description of Caesarea and its harbor; the description of the buildings called the Herodium; the account of Herod’s generosity to numerous foreign cities; Herod’s endowment of the Olympic games and a laudatio of Herod’s own athletic abilities.

At first, I assumed that this material could not be original Josephus material, and my curiosity was further peeked when I found some of the hapaxes found in Josephus in the works of Nicolaus of Damascus, Herod’s well-informed historian, who clearly knew the intricacies of Herod’s court, and some of whose works, fragmenta, are preserved in the compilation of the Byzantine emperor, Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus. Nicolaus is frequently mentioned in the Antiquitates

for having provided material for the *Bellum* (1.31–2.116).\(^{57}\) According to many scholars, the *Historiae* of Nicolaus constitute the primary source of the *Bellum* for the period between Antiochus Epiphanes and the accession of Archelaus.\(^{58}\) Scholars have argued that the very favorable presentation of Herod in the beginning of the *Bellum* is perhaps the prime factor for attributing Josephus’ account to Nicolaus.\(^{59}\) This favorable bias is apparent in *BJ* 1.401–430, where Herod’s generosity and prowess are praised.

Does the presence of so many hapaxes indicate that Josephean authorship of such sections should be put into question? I think not. The style, word order, use of particles and conjunctions is overwhelmingly Josephean and not that of Nicolaus. It is the view of this translator that Josephus might have had many sources for the technical information and language of architecture and construction, but the narrative is that of Josephus. This problem will be the topic of another paper.

* * *

Another difficulty that the modern translator has to confront is Josephus’ descriptions of geographical places. Josephus’ fellow Jews were probably acquainted with Palestine thanks to their religious pilgrimages to Jerusalem. There are some geographical places that still remain obscure. At *BJ* 1.408–414, the description of Caesarea and its harbor, after having narrated the completion of the underwater foundation and the breakwater, Josephus informs the reader that there was a stone wall which encircled the harbor. *BJ* 1.413 describes the \(\psi\alpha\lambda\iota\delta\varepsilon\zeta\) that are situated within the wall that arose from the harbor.

---

\(^{57}\) A.J. 14.9, 68, 104.


There were numerous crypts which served as landing places for those putting into harbor, while the entire circular quay in front of the crypts formed an extensive promenade for those disembarking. The entrance of the harbor is from the north, because in this region it is the north wind that is the most favorable.

Ψαλίς is defined by the Complete Concordance as a “vault providing shelter at a harbour-basin.” Reinach renders ψαλίδες as “chambres voûtées”, while Thackeray translates the word as “inlets”. Without acknowledging Reinach’s interpretation, Thackeray notes that ψαλίδες could be rendered as “vaulted chambers” or as “crypts.” The point here is that the translator must actually visualize the geographical layout of that which is being described lest the translation remain unintelligible.⁶⁰

* * *

In conclusion, despite some of the criticisms mentioned above concerning Thackeray’s rendition of Book 1 of the Bellum Judaicum, especially his over-reliance on Reinach’s French translation, the Loeb translation is the work of a highly competent Greek scholar and is a very good read. Thackeray’s work will continue to be so for future generations of readers of Josephus. Our more literal translation, in accordance with the guidelines established by Steve Mason and the Brill Josephus Project, will, however, be more accurate than that of Thackeray and will be more faithful to the Greek. The notes accompanying our translation will provide the reader with an insight into some of the complexities of translating Josephus into Greek, and will allow the reader to realize that no single translation of Josephus will ever be a substitute for the Greek original.

1. DAS ANLIEGEN: VERMEIDUNG VON HYBRIDEN


Schon bei der Herausgabe der *Vita*\(^1\) hat sich das Münsteraner Team Gedanken machen müssen, wie in der beizufügenden Übersetzung mit solchen ebenso traditionsreichen wie unschönen Gebilden umzugehen sei wie „Ionathes“ oder „Iotapata“. Bloßes Umschreiben griechischer Buchstaben in lateinische, wie bisher geschehen, ergibt ja noch keine aussprechbaren Namen. Die beiden eben angeführten Beispiele, denen viele zur Seite gestellt werden könnten, lassen den Leser, die Leserin völlig im Unklaren, wie viele Silben und welche Betonung der betreffende Name haben soll. Viele weitere Beispiele liefert die derzeit noch in Arbeit befindliche Apologie *Contra Apionem*.


In Fällen wie den zitierten, die aus dem Hebräischen kommen, sind wir in unserer deutschen Wiedergabe stärker als bisher üblich auf die


2. PROBLEMEN GRIECHISCHER NAMEN IN LATEINISCHER SCHRIFT

Bis hierher war die Anwendung des lateinischen Alphabets unproblematisch. Sie wird es nun aber paradoxerweise bei der Wiedergabe griechischer Namen. Hier tut sich nämlich, gerade wegen der Ähnlichkeit der Alphabete, eine Alternative auf zwischen zwei Dingen, die man nicht zugleich haben kann: der Wiedergabe des Schriftbildes und der des Klanges.

Die Römer haben sich von Anfang an, seit ihrem ersten Kontakt mit den Griechen, für die Wiedergabe des Klanges entschieden. Ihr Alphabet, im Gegensatz etwa zum ägyptischen, war konsequent

---


3 Die heutige hebräische Vokalisation ist „Makkabi“; die Quellen aber setzen noch die aramäische Form „Makkabai“ voraus. Gleiches gilt für den Frauenname Σαλαμίσιων für eine Tochter des Herodes: In heutigem Hebräisch sagt man Selamsion; die von Josephus transkribierte beruht jedoch auf einer alten aramäischen Vokalisation: Šalamsiôn.

Wie zu erwarten, sind die römischen Transkriptionsregeln, was auswärtige Namen betrifft, akustischer Natur. Die Römer gaben das Griechisch wieder, das sie hörten. Dieses ist nicht identisch mit späteren Stufen des Griechischen und auch nicht mit den mehr oder weniger künstlichen Rekonstruktionen der Neuzeit. Ein Beispiel: Für Φιδίας (Josephus nennt ihn in A.J. 19.8) fand man Phidias. Der dem Lateinischen fremde Laut φ (damals p+h) erhielt ein Doppelgraphem, ph. Das folgende i hingegen gibt einen Vokal wieder, den die Lateiner als einen der ihren wiedererkannten und schon damals nicht als Diphthong hörten (so hieß er auch nur im Hinblick auf seine Schreibweise, ei), sondern als helles [eː], nahe bei [i]. Das Zeichen ist meist i, seltener e. Diese Aussprache ist kein Latinismus, sondern ist griechisch, wie wir aus zahlreichen Schreibfehlern der Inschriften, auch schon aus klassischer Zeit, wissen. Das Doppelgraphem ei diente für einen Laut, der zwischen e und i lag, so wie ou für einen Laut zwischen o und u. Bei den Römern ist das anders. In Wörtern wie Pompeius oder deinde (bei Poeten zweisilbig) hört man ei als e + i.

4 Hinweis darauf sind in seinem Text die Prosarhythmen, wie in unserer Vita-Ausgabe S. 10f. bemerkt.


6 Historisches zur Aussprache des Griechischen s. Allen, Vox Graeca, dem ich in allem zu folgen vermochte, auch auf die hier nicht relevanten Vorschläge für englische Schulen.

7 So auch in Allens Analysen, denen ich im Weiteren folge.

8 So haben wir noch heute neben Hera-klit einen Poly-klet (beides -κλειτος), vermutlich in Abhängigkeit von den umgebenden Vokalen.
Wenn nun im späten 18. Jh. bei uns in Deutschland angefangen wurde, „Pheidias“ zu schreiben (davon unten),
9 geschah das in der unbelegten Annahme, ein Doppelgraphem sei stets auch ein Dop­

Inzwischen muss man sagen: Die damals eingeführten „altgriechi­
schen“ Neuerungen sind in vieler Hinsicht verfehlt gewesen und zumindest inkonsequent. Denn die Regel war offensichtlich, nur solche Laute zuzulassen, die auch das Deutsche kannte,10 bzw. umgekehrt: griechische Grapheme einfach mit deutschen zu identifizieren. Auch moderne Fremdsprachen hat man damals oft so ausgesprochen, wenn man z.B. seinen „Shaksper“ zitierte (vgl. unten Anm. 29). So ent­
standen nunmehr, was das vorgebliche Altgriechisch betrifft, Hybriden von mehreren Sorten:

- Alt- und Neugriechisch werden vermischt, weil man dem Graphem ph keinen eigenen Laut zubilligte, es vielmehr mit lat. f identifizierte (hier war das Latein nun wieder recht).
- Der Akzent wurde seinerseits neugriechisch (s.u. 6.), wenn man nunmehr „Pheidias“ auf der Paenultima mit einem Druckakzent versah. Das sind bereits zwei neugriechische Einschläge in einem angeblich altgriechischen Klangbild.


Griechisch wird seither vermischt mit Deutsch, wenn nun die meisten, die so ein Wort in Lateinschrift sehen, dabei aber deutsche Rechtschreibregeln anlegen, irgendetwas wie |faudios| lesen. Diesen Namen, kann man ehrlich sagen, hat es vor dem 19. Jh. nicht gegeben.


Rücken wir dem Komplex zu Leibe, auch wenn es schwer ist, gegen etwas zu argumentieren, was niemand verteidigt, aber doch alle richtig finden – eine Gewohnheit.

3. EIN LÖSUNGSVORSCHLAG – NATIONAL UND INTERNATIONAL

Gibt es ein Zurück aus diesem Wildwuchs? – Voraussichtlich nur um den Preis, erneut zu entscheiden, was man denn will: den antiken Klang wiedergeben, so gut das lateinische Alphabet es ohne neue Sonderzeichen zulässt, oder das griechische Schriftbild übertragen.


Ein modernes Kunstgebilde wie „Pheidias“ werden wir also vermeiden. Gleichzeitig werden wir allerdings, da unsere Zielsprache Deutsch ist und nicht Latein, für die Endungen eigene Entscheidungen treffen – wie Josephus selbst verfährt, wenn er fremdsprachige Namen, den seinen eingeschlossen, in seinen Text einfügt (s.u. 5.). Bei „Phidias“ – wie wir nun schreiben werden—hat man kein Problem. Wie aber

11 Wir haben uns auch bei semitischen Namen für nur wenige Sonderzeichen entschieden (für Kehllaute), die zur Not auch als einfache Zeichen gelesen oder ignoriert werden können, wie schon die Römer taten.

Will man deutsch-griechische Sprachmischung vermeiden, ist dies die beste Lösung. Als nächstbeste Alternative kämen nur die lateinischen Formen in Frage, die immerhin ein kulturelles Erbe sind, ein älteres sogar, und die, linguistisch gesehen, auch nur Benachbartes und Zeitgenössisches miteinander mischen.


Das hier vorgeschlagene Verfahren ist nicht nur relativ frei von Hybriden (also von Sprachmischung), sondern auch besonders geeignet für die Schriften des Josephus, des Römers aus Jerusalem. Ein Name wie Aiveictq, zunächst aus der Ilias bekannt (5.305 u.ö.), dann aber aus Vergil (in der Schreibweise Aeneas), kommt auch bei ihm vor.


Ja wir möchten sogar für den internationalen Gebrauch die Form „Aeneas“ als die beste vorschlagen. Denn in einer Zeit, wo mehr und mehr deutsche Autoren und Autorinnen sich englisch äußern, wird man einen Schauder kriegen bei der Vorstellung, was aus dem Graphem Aineias wird, wenn man es englisch ausspricht . . .

Ehe dann aber, wenn wir „Phaedra“ schreiben, „Aeneas“ und „Irenaeos“, ein Aufschrei durch die gelehrte Presse geht, wir konnten wohl kein Griechisch oder zeigten es zumindest nicht gebührend, sei hier noch ein Stück weiter ausgeholt und an einige Grundbegriffe der Philologie erinnert.

4. Transkription und Transliteration

Nicht jeder Herausgeber antiker Texte in (oder mit) Übersetzung pflegt sich Gedanken zu machen über den Unterschied zwischen Transkription und Transliteration. Erstere entspricht der phonetischen Option, die wir als die römische oben dargestellt haben, letztere der grafischen. Wenn Josephus jetzt unter uns weilte und wollte unser editorisches Problem verstehen, würden wir es ihm anhand des Unterschiedes zwischen seinen beiden Sprachen, Hebräisch und Griechisch, anschaulichen. Josephus selbst wäre nie auf den Gedanken gekommen, den Namen יְהֹונָטָן etwa mit Žwntn wiederzugeben o.ä. (Transliteration), sondern er schreibt 'Ioναθῆς (Transkription), wobei er, zur Einfügung in den griechischen Kontext, das Wortende praktischerweise flektierbar macht. Für seinen Zweck war das die beste Lösung, war auch die einzige ihm vorgegebene.

In einer ähnlichen Lage wie er sind nun wir mit griechischen Namen im Deutschen. Eine wissenschaftliche Transliteration – mit oder ohne Vokale im Hebräischen, mit oder ohne Akzente und Sonderzeichen im Griechischen – kommt aus praktischen Gründen nicht in Frage. Sie würde nicht nur die Lesbarkeit unserer deutschen Übersetzung beeinträchtigen, sondern wäre für Griechisches überhaupt überflüssig, da

---

15 So wir: „Jonatan“, Genitiv „Jonatans“. Mit „Ionathes“ o.ä. hätten wir uns, zu allem andern, unnötige Umstände für die deutsche Syntax eingehandelt.
ja der Urtext gegenüber steht. Wir haben also schon in der *Vita* griechische Namen niemals transliteriert, sondern transkribiert, u.Z. in Anlehnung an das antike Latein, dessen Alphabet wir ja benützen und das mit der Phonetik des Altgriechischen durchaus besser übereinkommt als die deutsche Schulaussprache. So gilt es schon für die klassische Epoche (mit der die humanistischen Gymnasien sich ziemlich aus- schließlich zu beschäftigen pflegen); es gilt nicht minder für die hellenistische und die Kaiserzeit. Wir können schweigen von späteren Epochen: Wenn in der deutschsprachigen Byzantinistik Namen wie „Herakleios“ geschrieben werden, ist das am ehesten begreiflich als Imponiergeste von Akademikern, die trotz ihres unklassischen Forschungsgebiets als Altp hilologen gelten wollen.


5. GESCHICHTLICHES

Wie kann das sein, fragt man sich, in Deutschland, dem Stammland der historischen Philologie? – Nun, die historische Philologie, deren

---

16 Eine Ausnahme ist das rätselhafte *Homonoia* in *Vita* 281, ein Wort, das im Text kursiv stehen sollte (eine elektronische Panne). Die Kursive zeigt an, dass Schreib- und Sprechregeln gelten, die nur innerhalb einer bestimmten Wissenschaft gültig sind.


Das Hauptmotiv, aus dem heraus Grimm sich zu derlei Überlegungen drängen ließ, nachdem er lange Zeit mit bloßem Vergleichen von Graphemen zufrieden gewesen war, ist dies, dass erst nach dem Aufstellen einer für eine bestimmte Sprache zu einer gegebenen


19 Noch das von ihm begonnene, 1986 erst fertig gewordene Deutsche Wörterbuch lässt nicht erkennen, wie die manchmal schwindelerregenden Etymologien phonetisch funktionieren sollen. – Grimm selbst lernte, ja schrieb Spanisch, ohne je einen Spanier gehört zu haben: Ginschel, Der junge Jacob Grimm, 383.

20 In der 7. Auflage (Berlin 1824) S. 9.

21 Ginschel, Der junge Jacob Grimm, 362: „Erst von der Entdeckung des deutschen i-Umlauts an ist die historische Betrachtungsweise unveräußerlicher Bestandteil der Grimmschen Sprachforschung, erst vom Herbst 1816 an gibt es eine historische Sprachwissenschaft.“


Auf Erasmus kann sich die neue Praxis nur sehr ungefähr berufen. Erasmus hatte in seinem Literalismus auch von ou diphthongische Aussprache gefordert – was in deutschen Gymnasien offenbar nur deshalb unterblieb, weil der germanische ou-Diphthong im Deutschen zu au geworden war, auch graphisch (und sein Umlaut zu |ɔː|, geschrieben äu). Mit Erasmus, d.h. mit dem Holländischen, kam dann auch |œː|, dt. |ɔː|, für eu in Gebrauch; altgriechisch wäre |eu|, neugriechisch ist es |ev| bzw. |ef|. Das war eine willkommene Bequemlichkeit, wo wir landessprachlich ja auch |ɔɾɔpa| sagen. Das altüberlieferte ev in Wörtern wie „Evangelium“ ist demgegenüber jedoch korrekt und lässt uns Josephus-Herausgeber überlegen, ob

wir nicht „Evergetes“ schreiben sollen statt des künstlichen „Eu-
ergetes“ (mit unantikem Hiat).

Im Laufe des 19. Jh. verschwand aus dem Hochdeutschen dann auch der alte |ei|-Diphthong, indem er mit ai zusammenfiel. Nur selten aber wird darüber nachgedacht, was das Graphem ei in transkribierten griechischen Namen dann noch wert ist.


Wenn Martin Luther einst in seinen Tischgesprächen bemerkt hat, das Griechische sei dem Deutschen näher als das Latein, dachte er offenbar an Dinge wie das k vor hellen Vokalen und an die sog. „Diphthonge“ wie ā und ō, die Umlaute also nach unserer Terminologie – wobei sein ā natürlich, nach der damals gültigen, byzantinischen Aussprache, das οι war und sein ō das οι. Das ζ vergleicht er mit dt. stimmhaftem s (ganz wie Josephus und vor ihm schon die Septuaginta es für T nehmen) und findet auch Laute wie χ (als Rei-belaut) und den Vokal u (Reuchlins Aussprache hatte hierfür durchaus noch ein ü) nur im Deutschen wieder, nicht im Latein.

24 Deutsches Wörterbuch, Bd. 3, Sp. 73 unter EI.
25 In der Vita hatten wir mit „Gischala“ ein analoges Problem; nach unseren Grundsätzen haben wir jedoch „Giš-Ḥalab“ geschrieben.
26 Nr. 3748 und 4018 in Luthers Werke in Auswahl, Bd. 8: Tischreden (hg. O. Clemen, Berlin 1930), Nummern wie in WA Tischreden.
27 Für dieses Graphem hatte er offenbar die Aussprache |o| erlernt. Hellenistisch und in Reuchlins Aussprache wäre es eher γ: äquivalent langem u, mit welchem dieses Graphem in Manuskripten und auf Inschriften ja auch häufig verwechselt wird.
6. DAS VERMEIDEN VON WILDWUCHS


28 Homer, *Ilias* und *Odyssey*, in der Übertragung von Johann Heinrich Voß (1793 bzw. 1781, München 1957). Lichtenberg (nächste Anm.) zitiert hierzu Voß: „Ich schreibe nach griechischer Aussprache (Gerechter Himmel was für Pedanterei!), und meine Gründe hat noch niemand widerlegt.“


Zweihundert Jahre ist es her, dass der Diphthong |ei| aus der deutschen Schriftsprache verschwunden ist; warum ihn dann noch schreiben für eine Buchstabengruppe des Griechischen, die ihrerseits in der Regel kein |ei| war, und schon gar kein |ou|?

Auch in rein wissenschaftlichen Publikationen verdienten solche Schreibungsfragen mitunter etwas mehr Überlegung. Im Inhaltsverzeichnis von Menahem Sterns *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism* liest man Autorennamen und Buchtitel meist in ihrer lateinischen Form, dazwischen dann aber einen Buchtitel „Schoinometresis Syriae“. Da hat man nun Fisch und Fleisch auf demselben Teller.32 Das Gleiche, sogar noch inniger vermischt, begegnet in solchen pseudo-antiken Buchtiteln wie *Paraleipomena Jeremiou*:33 Das zweite dieser Wörter ist in sich falsch, denn J ist weder als Buchstabe noch als Laut im Altgriechischen vorhanden.34 Nicht besser wird es in der jüngsten deutschen Übersetzung desselben Textes, betitelt *Paralipomena Jeremiou*:35 Die erste Form ist nach lateinischen, die zweite nach gar keinen Regeln transkribiert. Das J ist nun mal nicht griechisch, und das ou nicht Latein. Wen wundert es da, dass selbst unser Josephus (Ἰωσηπος) schon „Josephos“ genannt worden ist?36

7. DAS VERMEIDEN NEUGRIECHISCHER BETONUNG


---

32 GLAJJ l:x. Wir würden schreiben: *Schoenometresis Syriae*, in diesem Fall also ganz Latein, und uns der Kursive bedienen. Für Buchtitel ist die lateinische, auch neulateinische, Konvention bei weitem die einfachste und wird es wohl auch bleiben.

33 R. Kraft und A.-E. Purinton (Hg.), *Paraleipomena Jeremiou* (SBLTT 1; Missoula, Mont. 1972).

34 Das Neugriechische hat ihn, schreibt ihn aber nach Möglichkeit γι.

35 B. Schaller (Übers. u. Komm.), *Paralipomena Jeremiou* (JSHRZ, 1, 8; Gütersloh 2002).

FOLKER SIEGERT

phonetisch durchaus nichts zu tun hat mit dem Akut oder dem Zirkumflex\textsuperscript{37} des klassischen oder hellenistischen Griechisch, weiß nach jahrelanger Gewöhnung an die deutsche Schulaussprache in der Regel niemand mehr.

Umso geeigneter ist dann dieser Druckakzent, das kunstvolle Quantitätensystem des Altgriechischen durcheinander zu bringen. Man sagt |homìlia| für ōμìlia und hält das für Altgriechisch, ohne noch zu wissen oder wiederrzugeben, welcher von diesen vier Vokalen kurz ist und welcher lang.\textsuperscript{38} Dies trotz der durchaus korrekten Angabe des oben zitierten Buttmann:\textsuperscript{39} „Jedes Wort und jede Form hatte für jede Silbe (mit wenigen Ausnahmen) feststehende Quantität, welcher die Aussprache des gewöhnlichen Lebens folgte, und die man daher kennen muss, um richtig auszusprechen.“

Ebenso kommt nun, was Namen betrifft, ein |di'onnysos| – statt griechisch Diònysos (mit langem y\textsuperscript{40} und einem lediglich im Ton gehobenen o) – zustande, und vieles dergleichen.\textsuperscript{41} Dies wiederum trotz Buttmann: „So lange und soweit es nun dem Studium nicht gelingt, diesem Mangel abzuhelfen, und Quantität und Ton neben einander hörbar zu machen, kann man die für uns wichtigere Quantität im Lesen vorwalten lassen.“

Dies ist für antike Namen nach wie vor eine beherzigenswerte Regel. In der Anglophonie wird sie, bei allen sonstigen Lautwandeln, durchaus korrekt befolgt. Die Hybridisierung des Altgriechischen mit dem Neugriechischen bei uns Deutschen führt hingegen umgekehrt zu dem Glauben, die aus der Antike über das Latein überlieferte Aussprache |'so:krates| sei ein Latinismus – wo wir doch wir gar nicht wissen, ob überhaupt eine der drei Silben dieses Namens im Altgriechischen lautere gesprochen wurde. Wir wissen nur, dass die

\textsuperscript{37} Der Gravis, Abwesenheit eines Akuts oder, anders gesagt, Zeichen der unverändernten Stimmlage, braucht hier nicht erwähnt zu werden.
\textsuperscript{38} Die Struktur ist ~~~~. Die Betonung in dt. „Homilie“ ist übrigens, wie so oft, französisch.
\textsuperscript{40} Die Alternativform Διώνυςος bestätigt ja nur diese Quantitätenfolge.
\textsuperscript{41} Im Italienischen werden die griech. Akzentsilben grundsätzlich gelängt, die von Natur langen aber nasaliert. Das Ergebnis ist für den Schreiber dieser Zeilen völlige Unverständlichkeit.
mittlere höher klang, und versuchen uns das zu merken durch unsere eigene Betonung. Die vom Latein herkommende Traditionsaussprache \( |ˈsɔːkrates| \) bringt die Quantitätenstruktur dieses Namens durchaus besser zum Ausdruck als das gymnasiale \( |sɔˈkrates| \) (ngr. \( |sɔˈkraːtɪs| \)) oder, was auch nicht besser ist, \( |sɔːˈkrattes| \). Wir sagen ja auch mit gutem Grund \( |hɔˈmeːr| \), was weder Latinismus ist noch Gallizismus, sondern auf die altgriechische Quantitätenfolge in diesem Wort zurückgeht.

Ironischerweise sind die hier kritisierten Hybridaussprachen mittlerweile geradezu ein Zeichen humanistischer Bildung geworden. Dem Schreiber dieser Seiten ist dies erstmals aufgefallen, als ein Arzt beim Anblick seiner Haartracht eine calvities Hippocrates diagnostizierte, mit einem betonten und langen \( a \) (offenbar wegen \( |ɪπικρατης| \)). Oder ein ernsthafteres Beispiel: Der Komponist Carl Orff, stolz auf seine humanistische Bildung, hat eine seiner Kompositionen Antigonae benannt (was wir vermutlich \( |ˈantiˈgonəː| \) aussprechen sollen), worin kein gerin­gerer als Friedrich Hölderlin sein Vorgänger gewesen ist. So ein Name ist, man verzeihe mir das Wort, ein Barbarismus, und komme er auch aus der besten Schule. Wiederum: So hat die Griechin \( ˈἈντιγόνη \) in ihrem Lande, und auch bei den Römern, nie geheißen.

8. Gemischte Namen; Verschiedenes; Kompromisse

Sind nun Leitlinien gefunden, die eine gewisse editorische Konsistenz auch auf den deutschen Seiten einer künftigen Josephus-Ausgabe gewährleisten, so sei abschließend von den nötigen Kompromissen und Ausnahmen gesprochen.

---

42 Lateinisch, genau genommen, mit langem \( e \) am Schluss. Doch für Schlusssilben und Endungen hat jede Sprache eigene Regeln. So auch Josephus im Umgang mit nichtgriechischen Namen in griechischem Kontext (oben Abschn. 1).

Wir werden den Ortsnamen „Caesarea“ gebrauchen, so wie er bekannt und üblich ist, ohne K, aber auch ohne deutsches ä. Gleich gebildet wäre eigentlich der Name „Alexandria“ (Άλεξάνδρεια), wobei aber – schon im alten Rom – nur Kenner des Griechischen Ἀλεξάνδρια gesprochen haben werden; für die übrigen gilt vocalis ante vocalem corripitur, hier also die Verkürzung des vorvokalischen i. Solche Unterschiede sind für unsere deutsche Übersetzung uninteressant; so werden wir, die ursprüngliche Pluralbildung nachahmend, Formen verwenden wie „Alexandrien“, „Samarien“ usw., die ganz nach deutschem Sprachgefühl betont werden können. Freilich werden wir nicht sagen „Seleukien“, sondern es bei „Seleukia“ belassen, wie immer das dann betont werden wird.


reduzierbaren Varianten strotzen. Das hängt damit zusammen, dass die ägyptische Schrift, wie eingangs schon gesagt, zur Phonetik nur eine lose Beziehung unterhält, und überdies damit, dass das Ägyptische in so viele Dialekte zerfällt, dass die Schrift es gar nicht erst versucht, eine bestimmtes Klangbild für jedes Wort festzuhalten.

Keine Schreibregelung für so etwas Komplexes wie ein übersetztes Geschichtswerk lässt sich mit Konsequenz durchführen. So schön die Konsequenz wäre, weil sie die Irritation sich widersprechender Praktiken vermeidet, so sehr stößt sie sich dann wieder an unlösbare Problemen orientalischer Philologien einerseits und an der Bekanntheit gewisser Namen und ihrer Verbindung mit überliefer ten Schreibweisen andererseits. Im Laufe von zweitausend Jahren hat es zu den verschiedensten Zeitpunkten Entlehnungen antiker Namen ins Deutsche gegeben; das sieht man den Schreibweisen manchmal noch an. Für Josephus' eigenen Namen hat sich eine Schreibung eingebürgert, die weder hebräisch ist noch griechisch (Josephus statt 'Icbar'), dafür aber allbekannt; sie macht unseren Autor unverwechselbar mit seinen vielen antiken und modernen Homonymen.

Das kann auch gut so bleiben. Wo aber ein Entscheidungsspielraum oder gar -bedarf besteht, werden wir transkribieren im Sinne der hier dargelegten, der Praxis des Römers Josephus durchaus ähnlichen Regeln.


Für Kritik und hilfreiche Hinweise danke ich Herrn Prof. Dr. Herwig Görge manns, Heidelberg, und Herrn Dr. Dr. Eberhard Güting, Wallenhorst.
ANHANG: DER STAND DES MÜNSTERANER JOSEPHUS-PROJEKTS


Was die Antiquitates (künftig deutsch: die Alte Geschichte) des Josephus betrifft, so ist eine Übersetzung ins Deutsche am Institutum Judaicium Delitzschianum der Universität Münster begonnen worden, freilich nur dies. Mehr als eine Übersetzung wird an diesem Werk von unserer Seite nicht geleistet werden können – keine Neubewertung


CONCLUDING REMARKS

FOLKER SIEGERT
INSTITUTUM JUDAICUM DELITZSCHIANUM, MÜNSTER

It may be risky to pronounce a conclusion on the basis of fresh impressions. Personally I do not feel old enough to be something like a senior adviser of Josephus studies. The Münster Josephus project, however, with which the series of Josephus Colloquia began in 1997, has come of age. Officially it has even died, being now reduced to a very modest kind of afterlife. Maybe this very situation entitles me to give a retrospective sine ira et studio on what we have exchanged and gained in these three days.

I

First and foremost, the Roman setting of this conference has brought about a particular sensitivity for Josephus as a historian, and more precisely, as a politician. More than one contribution to this colloquium has pointed out a very Roman feature of Flavius Josephus, namely his pragmatism. Josephus speaks on behalf of Jewish interests, as he understands them.

On a more intellectual level, I venture to say that in his writings there is no "philosophy serving as a handmaid of theology," but theology serving as a handmaid to politics. Theologia ancilla politices. I shall return to the theological aspects of Josephus' writings in more detail at the end of my remarks. In our colloquium, other aspects came to the foreground.

II

We spoke very concretely about Josephus' art of writing. Writing in Greek meant for him a new chance, but also a new risk. Greek, in

---

1 This is a slightly revised version of the remarks delivered at the conclusion of the Josephus Colloquium. Thanks are due to Mr C. de Vos and to the editors of this volume for additions and corrections.
contradistinction to Aramaic, was a language with an immense vocabulary, part of which was charged with allusions to previous writings, classical and (in Josephus’ day) also post-classical. It was up to Josephus to play with the possibilities of double talk inherent in such a language. These possibilities exceeded even those of the Hebrew language as it was used by the Qumran covenanters because their allusions were only referring to the Holy Writ, whereas Josephus could make allusions to a wealth of writings, religious (or almost so, like Homer), or secular.

So Josephus was confronted with an opportunity as well as with a danger. He had a chance to tell things without seeming to tell them; but he could also unintentionally tell more than he wanted to. For example, Josephus could depict the clementia of Titus in terms that were so far from any probability, that Jewish readers could smile or even laugh at it. Psychologically speaking, this might have had a healthy effect on the hearers of his texts, given the fact that they were not—or no longer—bound to approve of everything Titus had done. To represent Titus as a warrior constantly fighting with his own weapon may have contributed to enhance this irony—the irony of the vanquished—to grotesque proportions.²

On the other hand, Josephus may tell us more than he intended to. To speak of God’s πρόνοια automatically implied the assertion of the πρόνοια βασιλέως, i.e. imperial politics, since there was an intimate symbolic link between the two. One could not exist without the other, unless the cosmos fell into disorder. It is difficult to see how Josephus’ allegiance to his much-cited Book of Daniel can coexist with his use of πρόνοια—a notion which forced him to renounce any Jewish apocalyptic distance from the prevailing political power. The reason may be found in Josephus’ own aspirations to be called to power by Power itself, as represented by the Romans.

III

What kind of a historian can Josephus have been for his time? Can we tell, in ancient Roman terms, how his writings could have been received and appreciated? This question is all the more necessary as

² We may think here of the Gospel of John and of its ironies as another instance of the bitter laughter of the rejected. In first- and second-century Asia Minor, Christianity was in a minority situation, even compared with Judaism.
the only readers known to have appreciated Josephus’ efforts were the Christians. The imperial approbation of Josephus’ *Bellum* did not serve as a recommendation of his other writings. Besides a few allusions to some details of his *Bellum*, there is no mention or use of his writings in pagan historians. Only some half-oriental philosophers like Jamblichus show some readiness to appreciate him as an author.

The Christians’ appreciation for him chiefly depends, as it seems, on his naming Jesus, John the Baptist and Jesus’ brother James in neutral or even positive terms. Josephus’ references to Christianity seem to call upon the Christians as a kind of *claqueurs* to Judaism, just as he sometimes appeals to the God-fearers in order to give applause to the excellence of the Jewish way of life. Unfortunately for him, the Christians did not restrict themselves to play that role. Josephus’ success with the Christians depends on his colourful account of the fall of Jerusalem. All this is well known; so our question was: How could a pagan Roman audience possibly have appreciated Josephus’ manner of writing history?

We have been ready to acknowledge that Josephus did a good job as a historian. His *Bellum*, for one thing, seems to have satisfied the demands both of Titus himself and of the Jewish would-be king Agrippa II, as is attested at the end of the *Vita*. Even the accord of one of his accounts with the Titus arch can be interpreted in terms of dependence of the latter on Josephus’ text. But what about Josephus’ later writings, especially the *Antiquitates* and the apology Περὶ τῆς Ἰουδαϊῶν ἄρχαιότητος (*Contra Apionem*)? Here, the only traces of a reception are found with the Christians. So, politically speaking, Josephus has found the wrong allies; he has been cherished by those from whom he wanted only some applause, but nothing more.

He might now personally appear among us and protest by saying: “This was not my fault. I wanted to speak to Romans, if possible to aristocrats, and I did my best to be heard by them!” This may well be; Josephus is an awfully gifted storyteller, able to use typically Greek double-talk in order to have the laughers on his own side; and he masters the beauties of Greek prose so well that his texts can be read as a kind of prose poem, including the appropriate Greek rhythms. If he failed, this is to be counted as an irony not of his own, but of history.

Josephus’ failure to be appreciated by the Roman aristocracy may be explained by that aristocracy’s unwillingness to recognize an individual coming from the Orient as one of its members. An important
obstacle surely was Josephus’ Jewish way of life. Another one was the rise of a new, non-priestly aristocracy in Judaea. The voyage of the four Judean Rabbis to Rome in the 90s of the first century c.e. may have been destined to warn the Romans against giving too much influence to their resident Josephus, who seems to have aspired to supreme dignities as a representative of the Jewish people.

Once discarded from Rome’s political plans or πρόνοια, Josephus no longer was an interesting author of the early imperial period. He would have been quickly superseded by Tacitus and some others, had there not been the Christians’ interest. Josephus’ writings were not included in the canon of historical works to be copied and handed down in the Roman world.

IV

Even if there is no doubt about Josephus’ ability as a writer and a politician (politicians, even able ones, may fail), there are doubts as to his integrity as a human person acting on behalf of a community and/or a set of philosophical and religious values.

You may agree with me that it is difficult to feel sympathetic towards Flavius Josephus. For example, he has no problem with what John Barclay has called “the politics of contempt,” as long as it is directed against Egyptians and not against Jews. To his mind, the Egyptians, cultivating a crude polytheism, are not even worthy to be called “humans” (C. Ap. 2.66).

The explanation we found consists in the fact that there was no Roman pity for the Egyptians or their neighbours. Josephus is even able to approve of Socrates’ execution by the Athenians; for there was not much Roman sympathy for the Greeks either, and especially not for Greek philosophers in the reign of Domitian. Josephus’ rhetoric may even become self-defeating in that he has Herod, a semi-barbarian king, justify the killing of barbarians as something natural. The humane values the Rabbis learnt from the Torah do not seem to be his.

---

As to the theological aspect of Josephus’ writing, I think he played it down in order not to repel Roman readers. Sure, he frequently allows for direct divine intervention and influence on the fate of his people; and it is not Jupiter, but the unnamed God, to whom this influence is attributed. Josephus managed to formulate these confessional elements in a way (I believe) quite inoffensive to Roman readers. As may be seen in a study of his revelation language, he never uses it in a pathetic way; instead, he plays the role of a rationalistic philosopher sometimes commenting on riddles of history. So he maintains a Jewish stance while using 100% Hellenistic expressions (the one case of γενεσις in a non-Greek sense, which was discussed in this conference, makes for less than one percent).

So I agree with the majority who said that there is no hybridizing of Judaism in Josephus in the sense of a bad compromise—except where he makes political concessions involving Moses and pagan beliefs alike. We already saw this in his use of the term προνοια. Josephus wished to partake in the power he admired. He was an aristocrat who had lost his function and wanted to obtain a new one, if not a better one.

To be sure, his aim was to re-establish the Temple cult. We should not forget that the Temple’s walls were still standing, and the Temple vessels were deposited and preserved in Rome. Only a pragmatic attitude—he must have thought—might lead to a restoration of what had been damaged, but not yet lost.

But alas, the same pragmatism which dominated his thought all the way prevented Josephus from clearly saying what he wanted. The term theocracy—probably coined by Josephus himself—veils what he wished to happen, so that not even Jewish readers might have said in what measure this was to be brought about according to the Torah, according to some halakhah, hinted at in the Bellum or in his apology Contra Apionem, or according to Roman political conceptions.

Josephus’ unwillingness to tell his opinion of Herod is symptomatic. To his mind, coming back to a Herodian policy might have been a good option, if ever possible. Or, to put it in Biblical terms, by

---

not condemning Saul, as Samuel did, Josephus reserved for himself the option to become a new Saul—since, to his view, a new David, i.e., the Messiah, had not yet come. So he left further religious developments to those who either believed to have found the Messiah—or kept waiting for him.
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>90, 92</td>
<td>1.270</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>95, 97</td>
<td>1.270</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1.270</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>95, 280</td>
<td>1.270</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>1.301</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.27-28</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>1.301</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1.301</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1.301</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>1.301</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>1.301</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.31-2.116</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>1.301</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>1.301</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.36-37</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>1.301</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>1.301</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.67-68</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>1.301</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.69-70</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>1.301</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.118</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1.301</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.120</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>1.301</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.138-152</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>1.301</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page Range</td>
<td>Index Numbers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.375</td>
<td>202, 202 n. 71</td>
<td>2.1–117</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.377</td>
<td>132 n. 41, 385 n. 11</td>
<td>2.10–11</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.377–378</td>
<td>196 n. 46</td>
<td>2.24–38</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.378</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>93, 95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.379</td>
<td>202 n. 68</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>202 n. 72, 203 n. 74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.380</td>
<td>184, 194</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.388–392</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>2.66–79</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.393</td>
<td>385 n. 12</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.396–397</td>
<td>384 n. 6</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.398</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.399</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>2.90–110</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.400</td>
<td>93, 385 n. 9</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.401–430</td>
<td>171, 385 n. 15, 393 n. 31, 401, 402</td>
<td>2.118</td>
<td>334, 336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.404</td>
<td>393 n. 31</td>
<td>2.119</td>
<td>95 n. 62, 336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.405</td>
<td>393, 393 n. 31</td>
<td>2.119–166</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.407</td>
<td>393 n. 31</td>
<td>2.204–217</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.408–414</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>2.220</td>
<td>323 n. 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.412</td>
<td>393 n. 31</td>
<td>2.222</td>
<td>323 n. 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.413</td>
<td>393 n. 31, 402, 403</td>
<td>2.245–251</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.414</td>
<td>393 n. 31</td>
<td>2.247</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.420</td>
<td>391, 393 n. 31</td>
<td>2.254</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.421</td>
<td>92, 393 n. 31</td>
<td>2.287</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.422</td>
<td>393 n. 31</td>
<td>2.309</td>
<td>323 n. 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.423</td>
<td>393 n. 31</td>
<td>2.313</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.425</td>
<td>393 n. 31</td>
<td>2.321</td>
<td>129 n. 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.427</td>
<td>393 n. 31</td>
<td>2.322</td>
<td>129, 140 n. 66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.428</td>
<td>393 n. 31</td>
<td>2.336</td>
<td>237 n. 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.429</td>
<td>393 n. 31</td>
<td>2.345–401</td>
<td>114, 204 n. 81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.429–430</td>
<td>170 n. 32</td>
<td>2.346</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.430</td>
<td>393 n. 31</td>
<td>2.347</td>
<td>129 n. 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.430–431</td>
<td>160, 170</td>
<td>2.356–357</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.431</td>
<td>170 n. 32</td>
<td>2.360</td>
<td>54, 116 n. 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.431–673</td>
<td>170, 174</td>
<td>2.385–386</td>
<td>318 n. 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.444</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>2.386</td>
<td>318 n. 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.448–449</td>
<td>179 n. 59</td>
<td>2.388–391</td>
<td>319 n. 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.457–466</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>2.390</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.467–497</td>
<td>385 n. 15</td>
<td>2.399</td>
<td>199 n. 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.500</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>2.411–417</td>
<td>333 n. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.509</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>2.487</td>
<td>324 n. 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.511</td>
<td>385 n. 10</td>
<td>2.490–498</td>
<td>324 n. 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.513–533</td>
<td>385 n. 15</td>
<td>2.491</td>
<td>324 n. 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.514</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>2.492</td>
<td>324 n. 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.515</td>
<td>389, 390, 390 n. 24</td>
<td>2.499</td>
<td>324 n. 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.516</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>2.517</td>
<td>56 n. 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.517</td>
<td>388, 388 n. 23, 389</td>
<td>2.540</td>
<td>199 n. 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.538</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>2.601</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.556–558</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>2.651</td>
<td>53 n. 19, 334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.557</td>
<td>385 n. 13</td>
<td>2.653</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.650</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>326 n. 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.665</td>
<td>160, 177 n. 52</td>
<td>2.128</td>
<td>251 n. 23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INDEX OF ANCIENT SOURCES**

**437**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Page Range</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>61, 327 n. 57</td>
<td>4.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.35–44</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>4.440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.59–109</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>4.469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>327 n. 57</td>
<td>4.491–502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>4.496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.70–71</td>
<td>ix</td>
<td>4.510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.70–109</td>
<td>46, 49, 294</td>
<td>4.541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>4.545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.103</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>4.545–549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.108</td>
<td>49, 113</td>
<td>4.558–563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.141–408</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>4.560–562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.341</td>
<td>146 n. 84</td>
<td>4.586–587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.344</td>
<td>146 n. 83</td>
<td>4.596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.344–346</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>4.599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.346–351</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>4.605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.347</td>
<td>146 n. 85</td>
<td>4.612–613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.354</td>
<td>116 n. 36</td>
<td>4.616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.362–382</td>
<td>145 n. 82</td>
<td>318 n. 15,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.362–419</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>325 n. 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.374</td>
<td>145 n. 82</td>
<td>4.622–629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.400–401</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>4.627–629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.445</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>4.630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.472–484</td>
<td>204 n. 81, 281</td>
<td>4.630–655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.484</td>
<td>61, 204 n. 81</td>
<td>4.656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.485</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>4.656–663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.495–496</td>
<td>281, 51–26</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.503</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>5.1–26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.522</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.530</td>
<td>138, 139</td>
<td>321 n. 26,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>327 n. 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.39–48</td>
<td>186 n. 11</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.70–82</td>
<td>290, 5.5</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>46, 58</td>
<td>5.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.92–111</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>5.14–16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.112–116</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>5.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.137</td>
<td>132 n. 41</td>
<td>5.25–26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.161</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>5.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.162–192</td>
<td>186 n. 9</td>
<td>5.30–34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.163–192</td>
<td>204 n. 81</td>
<td>5.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.172</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>5.44–46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.190–191</td>
<td>204 n. 81</td>
<td>5.45–46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.208</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>5.56–59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.233–333</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>5.67–84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.317</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>5.71–97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.318</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>5.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.319–320</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>5.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.332</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>5.81–84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.339</td>
<td>131 n. 35</td>
<td>5.86–87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.359–360</td>
<td>131 n. 38</td>
<td>5.87–88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.360</td>
<td>131 n. 39</td>
<td>5.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.361–362</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>5.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.383</td>
<td>138, 139</td>
<td>5.109–114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.399–404</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>5.109–135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INDEX OF ANCIENT SOURCES

<p>| 5.121–128 | 286 | 5.446 | 286 |
| 5.136–229 | 92  | 5.469–472 | 60 |
| 5.169   | 319 n. 21 | 5.479–485 | 286 |
| 5.205   | 325 n. 50 | 5.486 | 287 |
| 5.212   | 65  | 5.491–496 | 286 |
| 5.215   | 65  | 5.510 | 325 n. 50 |
| 5.258–330 | 96  | 5.518 | 60 |
| 5.275–287 | 286 | 5.518–519 | 139 |
| 5.276   | 286 | 5.519 | 138, 231 n. 6 |
| 5.287   | 319 n. 20, 325 n. 50 | 5.550–552 | 58 |
|         | 281 | 5.564 | 50 n. 9 |
| 5.289   | 286 | 5 | 46 |
| 5.290   | 62  | 6.2 | 132 n. 41 |
| 5.291–295 | 286 | 6.12–92 | 72 |
| 5.295   | 281 | 6.33–53 | 281 |
| 5.316   | 286, 294 | 6.38 | 51 |
| 5.316–318 | 54  | 6.39–41 | 294 |
| 5.318   | 324 n. 45 | 6.68 | 287 |
| 5.318–329 | 286 | 6.93 | 60, 62 |
| 5.326–327 | 411 | 6.94 | 60, 63 |
| 5.331–341 | 286 | 6.94–95 | 60 |
| 5.334   | 60, 61 | 6.94–110 | 281 |
| 5.346   | 286 | 6.95 | 60 |
| 5.348–356 | 286 | 6.99–110 | 96, 186 n. 9 |
| 5.361   | 201 n. 63 | 6.107 | 118 n. 40 |
| 5.362–419 | 204 n. 81, 281 | 6.109–110 | 69, 294 |
| 5.363   | 61  | 6.123 | 62, 231 n. 6 |
| 5.367   | 116 n. 36, 224 | 6.124–128 | 96 |
| 5.367–369 | 204 n. 81 | 6.128 | 61 |
| 5.372   | 213 | 6.129–192 | 96 |
| 5.375–419 | 212 | 6.131–133 | 287 |
| 5.376   | 129 n. 27 | 6.132 | 287 |
| 5.376–378 | 204 n. 81 | 6.149 | 286 |
| 5.376–419 | 186 n. 9 | 6.155 | 286 |
| 5.378   | 212 | 6.193–219 | 96 |
| 5.380–381 | 214 | 6.199–219 | 143 |
| 5.380–382 | 213 | 6.210–211 | 143 |
| 5.381   | 116 | 6.212 | 132 n. 46 |
| 5.382–383 | 214 | 6.214–216 | 294 |
| 5.384–386 | 214 | 6.220 | 286 |
| 5.388   | 214 | 6.236–237 | 87 |
| 5.389   | 214 | 6.236–243 | 62, 281 |
| 5.390   | 214 | 6.237 | 50 n. 11 |
| 5.391–398 | 291 | 6.237–242 | 325 n. 50 |
| 5.401–414 | 204 n. 81 | 6.238 | 47, 319 n. 20 |
| 5.402   | 61  | 6.239 | 62 |
| 5.409   | 92 n. 57 | 6.240 | 62 |
| 5.409–410 | 61 n. 40 | 6.241 | 62 |
| 5.412   | 68, 212 | 6.245 | 281 |
| 5.421   | 58  | 6.248 | 62 |
| 5.432   | 57  | 6.249 | 62 |
| 5.433–435 | 57 n. 30 | 6.250 | 62 |
| 5.435   | 57  | 6.251 | 64 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEX OF ANCIENT SOURCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.252 62, 64 7.144 270, 271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.254 62 7.148 66, 265 n. 42, 272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.256 63, 287 7.148-149 265 n. 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.258 63 7.148-150 270, 276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.259 46 n. 3 7.149 272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.260 65 7.149-150 265, 269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.260-262 287 7.150 63, 272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.261 63 7.151 269, 270, 272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.262-265 63 7.152 266 n. 47, 269, 272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.265 64 270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.266 63 7.153 270, 272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.267-270 291 7.153-156 269, 272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.286-287 67 n. 47 7.154 270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.299 68 7.155 231 n. 6, 270, 273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.299-300 68 n. 48 273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.300-309 67 n. 47 7.156 273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.301 122 7.157 98, 269, 273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.324 213 n. 14 7.158 270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.328-350 281 7.158 270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.337-350 213 n. 14 7.158-162 98, 269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.337 52 n. 14 7.158-159 269, 274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.339 319 n. 17 7.159 274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.387 65 n. 43 7.160 269, 274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.388 65 7.161 274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.389 65 7.161-162 65, 269, 270, 276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.399 ix 7.162 270, 274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.406 46 n. 3 7.162 63, 270, 274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.421 132 n. 41 7.256 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.435-442 291 7.262 334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 46 7.270 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.33-53 186 n. 11 7.272 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.67 56 7.318-319 204 n. 81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.73 231 n. 6 7.323 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.85-88 100 7.323-336 204 n. 81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.117 320 n. 25 7.323-388 186 n. 9, 201 n. 63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.123 269, 270, 273, 328 n. 64 7.327-332 204 n. 81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.123-131 268 7.341-388 204 n. 81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.123-162 257, 268, 269, 270, 275, 276 7.344 314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.124 270 7.355 199 n. 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.128 270, 273 7.358-359 204 n. 81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.128-129 231 n. 6 7.389-397 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.129 270 7.409 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.130 270, 273 7.410 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.130-133 268 7.417 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.132-133 268 7.418 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.132-138 271 7.437-453 22 n. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.132-152 268 7.447-448 320 n. 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.134-138 268 7.455 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.136 269, 271, 272 Antiquitates Judaicae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.139-147 269, 271 1-12 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.142-147 271 1.1-17 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.143-145 275 1.5 30, 31, 91, 211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.143-146 269 1.5-13 215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.14-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.77-103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.97-98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.191-193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.222-236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.272-273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.140-159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.268-269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.335-337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.33-38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.44-46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.87-88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.139-143</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INDEX OF ANCIENT SOURCES

4.137 151 3.288 134
4.138 151 3.289-298 134
4.150 151 3.299-300 134
4.259-261 151 4.1-3 375 n. 19
4.262-269 151 4.8-9 165 n. 17
4.327-342 149 4.9 402 n. 57
4.337 139 n. 4 4 39 n. 45
4.340-342 150 4.33 375, 376 n. 26
4.343-351 151, 152, 154 4.33-36 375, 377
4.358-377 149 4.63 199 n. 54
4.378 148 4.68 402 n. 57
7.46 153 4.82-83 x n. 3
7.119-120 201 n. 5 4.104 402 n. 57
7.267 153 n. 13 4.137 363 n. 92
7.294-296 153 4.158-17.199 159
7.373 227 4.158 363 n. 92
7.380 218, 239 4.188 330 n. 70
7.380-381 239 4.248 411
8.53 340 4.375 326 n. 56
8.107 242 n. 60 4.397 396 n. 44
8.116-117 217 4.401 396 n. 45
8.223 199 n. 54 4.406 396 n. 46,
8.262 220 396 n. 47,
8.280 198 n. 52 401
8.295 198 n. 52, 4.408 396 n. 49
199 n. 54 4.409 397 no. 50-52
8.327 324 n. 45 4.410 397 no. 53
8.335-346 235 n. 23 4.412 401
8.343 235 n. 24 4.423 394
10.143 153 4.452 391
10.195-210 224 15.77 183
10.207 226 15.107 183
10.208 225 n. 44 15.109 183
10.209 225 15.110 183, 188
10.210 225 15.116-119 184
10.217 231 n. 6 15.121 183
10.237 340 15.121-124 184
10.276 225 n. 44 15.125 186
11.1-12 154 15.126 186
11.3 224 15.127 187
11.31 231 n. 6 15.127-128 187
11.73 154 15.127-129 187 n. 16
11.73-76 156 15.127-146 183, 185,
11.111 154 n. 14 186, 187,
11.111-112 154 205
11.143-144 233 n. 15 15.128 186, 195
11.212 220 15.129 187, 189,
11.229-230 234 n. 16 189 n. 21, 198
11.231-233 234 n. 17 15.130 188, 188 n. 18,
11.334 224 202, 203
12.226 390 n. 24 15.130-134 187, 188
13.171 311 n. 66 15.130-137 187
13.171-172 252 n. 29 15.130-143 187 n. 16
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEX OF ANCIENT SOURCES</th>
<th>443</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15.130–145</td>
<td>187, 195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.131–134</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.132</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.133</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.133–134</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.134</td>
<td>188, 189 n. 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.134–135</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.135</td>
<td>189 n. 21, 198, 201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.136</td>
<td>188, 189, 203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.136–138</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.137</td>
<td>189 n. 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.138</td>
<td>187, 189, 189 n. 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>194, 196, 198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.139</td>
<td>189, 195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.139–140</td>
<td>189, 202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.140</td>
<td>187, 188, 189, 189 n. 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>187, 189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.141</td>
<td>189 n. 21, 196, 204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.142</td>
<td>187, 196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.142–143</td>
<td>189, 196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.143</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.144</td>
<td>189 n. 21, 196, 204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.144–145</td>
<td>187 n. 16, 204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.145</td>
<td>189 n. 21, 198, 204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.146</td>
<td>187, 189 n. 21, 196, 204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.147</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.147–160</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.149</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.155</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.156</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.161</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.174</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.253–259</td>
<td>343 n. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.259</td>
<td>343 n. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.371</td>
<td>220 n. 25, 250 n. 22, 339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>220 n. 25, 250 n. 22, 339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.21</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.148</td>
<td>363 n. 92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.168</td>
<td>132 n. 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.202</td>
<td>364 n. 93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.226</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.234</td>
<td>139 n. 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.317–323</td>
<td>364 n. 93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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20.261 123 424–425 22 n. 4
20.263 89, 105, 118 n. 40, 428–429 219
122, 123 430 218
20.264 123 Contra Apionem
20.266 123 1.1 31, 215
20.267 298 1.1–218 312
20.268 220 n. 25 1.2 39
20.269 Vita 1.2–3 31
2 136 n. 58 1.5 40
4 155 1.6 36
8 156 1.6–14 36
8–9 171 n. 35 1.6–27 39, 40
9 156 1.6–29 37
9–10 311 n. 66 1.6–59 33, 34, 36
10–11 338 1.8 37
12 338 1.10 41
16 218 1.12 128 n. 25
17–19 209 1.14 41
22 199 n. 54 1.15 41
40 21 n. 1, 48 n. 8, 1.16 40
89, 123 n. 6 1.20 40
45 123 n. 7 1.23 41
122–123 134 1.23–24 89
125 134 n. 52 1.26 34
138 130 n. 31 1.27 21 n. 1
175–176 48 1.29 37, 40, 215
180 156 n. 20 1.30–36 40
192 339 1.37 40, 40 n. 27, 41
192–194 336 n. 11, 1.37–38 215
338 n. 13 1.37–41 40
204 338 n. 14 1.41 40
214 326 n. 53 1.42–43 41
215 322 1.42–45 41
229 326 n. 53 1.43 42, 313 n. 78,
281 412 n. 16 313 n. 79
343 46, 48 1.46–49 85
358 46, 49, 1.46–56 84
95 n. 62 1.47–56 29, 32
359 86, 125 n. 12, 156 1.48 322 n. 32, 322 n. 34
359–361 328 n. 66 1.50 85, 89, 107, 122,
361–362 86 320 n. 24, 384 n. 7
361–363 90, 281 1.50–51 106, 281, 328 n. 66
361–366 84, 106 1.51 72, 106
363 47, 88 1.51–52 86, 90
364 320 n. 24 1.52 86
364–366 85 1.53 91, 107
412 321 n. 27 1.54 311 n. 67
415 360 n. 73, 1.56 95 n. 62
366 n. 98, 1.60–68 39
367 n. 101 1.69 39
420 87 1.69–160 37
422–429 218 1.82 420
423 209 1.92 220 n. 25
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Justin</td>
<td>Apologia ii</td>
<td>349 n. 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenal</td>
<td>Satirae</td>
<td>6.146–148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livy</td>
<td>Ab urbe condita</td>
<td>praefatio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livy</td>
<td>5.235</td>
<td>258 n. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livy</td>
<td>5.235</td>
<td>329 n. 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livy</td>
<td>6.416–418</td>
<td>352 n. 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livy</td>
<td>7.98–104</td>
<td>103 n. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucan</td>
<td>Pharsalia</td>
<td>8.490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucian</td>
<td>De historia conscribenda</td>
<td>10–13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lysias</td>
<td>De caede Eratosthenis</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcus Aurelius</td>
<td>Meditations</td>
<td>11.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minucius Felix</td>
<td>Octavius</td>
<td>33.2–4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicolaus of Damascus</td>
<td><em>Vita Caesaris</em></td>
<td>1-14 171 n. 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.4-5 171 n. 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19.58-66 172 n. 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25a-b 171 n. 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onasander</td>
<td><em>Strategicus</em></td>
<td>1.1 284 n. 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.19-25 284 n. 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 284 n. 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6-7 283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.1 283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.3 283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.4 283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.8 283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.9 284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.1 283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.2 283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14.1 284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15-22 283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21.9 283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22.2 283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23 284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24 283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25 284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27-28 284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30 284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31 283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32 284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33.6 284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34 284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35 284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38.1 284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40-41 283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42.3 283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42.8 284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Origen</td>
<td><em>Contra Celsum</em></td>
<td>4.31 32 n. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.36 32 n. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orosius</td>
<td><em>Historiarum adversus paganos libri VII</em></td>
<td>7.9.5-6 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pausanias</td>
<td><em>Graeciae descriptio</em></td>
<td>1.3.1 377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.15.5 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persius</td>
<td><em>Satirae</em></td>
<td>5.176-184 28 n. 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pherecrates</td>
<td><em>Fragmenta</em></td>
<td>121 130 n. 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philo</td>
<td><em>Legatio ad Gaium</em></td>
<td>143-147 116 n. 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>147 25 n. 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>278 28 n. 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philostratus</td>
<td><em>Vita Apollonii</em></td>
<td>2.38 247 n. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.27 328 n. 63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.10 247 n. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.31 247 n. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.2 306 n. 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.488 306 n. 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photius</td>
<td><em>Bibliotheca</em></td>
<td>33 123 n. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>84 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pindar</td>
<td><em>Olympian Odes</em></td>
<td>1.35-45 133 n. 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.470c 97 n. 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>621c1-d3 236 n. 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8-9 175 n. 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plato</td>
<td><em>Leges</em></td>
<td>941a 201 n. 66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>311b7-c6 236 n. 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>228a 283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28c-29a 241 n. 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31a 241 n. 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40c 241 n. 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sophista 97 n. 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Respublica</em> 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Timaeus</em> 236 n. 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28a 241 n. 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>925 354 n. 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Miles gloriosus 1164 354 n. 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plautus</td>
<td><em>Amphitruo</em></td>
<td>5.176-184 28 n. 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petronius</td>
<td><em>Satyricon</em></td>
<td>2 127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Page Numbers</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Truculentus</strong></td>
<td>4.3.74</td>
<td>352 n. 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pliny the Elder</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Naturalis Historia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>21 n. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>250 n. 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.56</td>
<td>38 n. 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.155</td>
<td>177 n. 50, 177 n. 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28.18</td>
<td>68 n. 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34.27</td>
<td>262 n. 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37.14</td>
<td>379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pliny the Younger</strong></td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>298 n. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>104 n. 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>298 n. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>103 n. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.17</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.17.3</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.17.15</td>
<td>81, 91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.33</td>
<td>305 n. 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.11.2</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.13</td>
<td>306 n. 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plutarch</strong></td>
<td>32.2–34.8</td>
<td>259 n. 9, 261 n. 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aemilius Paullus</td>
<td>5.1–4</td>
<td>259 n. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td></td>
<td>259 n. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Herodoti malignitate</td>
<td>855d</td>
<td>30 n. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucullus</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcellus</td>
<td>37.1–4</td>
<td>259 n. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22.1–4</td>
<td>259 n. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcus</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.25i.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.10.1–4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelopidas</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.10.1–7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>285</td>
<td>205 n. 84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pompeius</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.11.6–13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.35</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>16.5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>259 n. 9</td>
<td>23.2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quaestiones romanae et graecae</td>
<td>28.4.2</td>
<td>186 n. 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>68 n. 48</td>
<td>29.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romulus</td>
<td></td>
<td>36.1.1–7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>36.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.5–6</td>
<td>258 n. 5</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.5–8</td>
<td>259 n. 9</td>
<td>5.40.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>258 n. 4</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>354 n. 40</td>
<td>1.4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Polybius</strong></td>
<td>1.1–4</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historiae</td>
<td>1.32.8</td>
<td>191 n. 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quintilian</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Institution oratoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sallust <em>Bellum Catilinae</em></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>95 n. 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>97 n. 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seneca the Elder <em>Suasoriae</em></td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>301 n. 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servius <em>In Vergilii Aeneidos libros</em></td>
<td>2.351</td>
<td>68 n. 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.2-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sextus Empiricus <em>Adversus mathematicos</em></td>
<td>1.263-269</td>
<td>38 n. 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophocles <em>Antigone</em></td>
<td>247</td>
<td>130 n. 34, 140 n. 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>256</td>
<td>130 n. 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>407-440</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>409</td>
<td>130 n. 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>409-412</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>428</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>429</td>
<td>130 n. 34, 140 n. 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>601</td>
<td>130 n. 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>602</td>
<td>130 n. 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>637</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>643</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strabo <em>Geographica</em></td>
<td>12.3.21</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.3.31</td>
<td>129 n. 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.1.13</td>
<td>323 n. 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulpicius Severus</td>
<td><em>Chronica</em></td>
<td>2.30.6 64, 5.5.1 23 n. 8, 5.5.2 23 n. 8, 5.10.1 52, 5.10.2 22 n. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tacitus</td>
<td><em>Agricola</em></td>
<td>2 298, 5.12.3 52 nn. 16–17, 2.4 304 n. 30, 5.12.4 52 n. 16, 4 301 n. 17, 5.13.1 68 n. 48, 18 285, 20 284, 22 284, 45 298 n. 7, 299 n. 14, 6.6 352 n. 32, De <em>idolatria</em> 6 352 n. 32, De <em>monogamia</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annales</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.3 93 n. 60, 1.43 93 n. 60, 1.43.4 97 n. 65, 1.55 93 n. 60, 1.57–62 93 n. 60, 1.65 93 n. 60, 1.71 93 n. 60, 2.41 93 n. 60, 2.45 93 n. 60, 2.59 320 n. 24, 3.22 352 n. 34, 4.34 5 2.11.1–4 191, 11.18–20 284 2.11.2 199, 11.26–27 363 n. 90 2.11.7–9 191, 199, 201, 11.30 363 n. 90 2.39 140, 12.53 94 2.48–59 97 n. 65, 13.35–39 284 2.54 132 n. 42, 14.57 304 n. 33 2.86.6 186 n. 14, 15.26 284 2.87 193, 196, 15.28.3 50 2.87.1–2 196, 15.64 306 n. 44 2.87.2–3 205 n. 84, 16.21–22 302 n. 22 2.87.3–5 196, 16.34 306 n. 40 2.87.5 198 n. 50, 16.34–35 305 n. 39 2.87.6–7 193, Dialogus de oratoribus 2.87.7 195 n. 45, 3 83, 84 2.89 197, 12.5 127 n. 22 2.89.2 191, Germania 2.89.5 191, 37.5 93 n. 60 2.89.7 197, Historiae 2.89.9 191, 1.4 94 2.90.1 186 n. 14, 1.11 323 n. 41 3.2 195, 1.26.1 97 n. 65 3.82–84 97, 3.3 323 n. 42 4.9.4 186 n. 14, 2.82.3 318 n. 12 4.10 193 n. 37, 4.73–74 116 n. 34 4.10.1 201, 4.75–85 100 n. 68 4.10.3–5 193 n. 38, 4.81 328 n. 63 4.11.1 186 n. 14, 5.1.1 320 n. 25 4.12 197, 327 n. 59 4.92 204, 5.2–3 31, 43 4.92.1–2 191, 204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDEX OF ANCIENT SOURCES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.92.7 191, 204</td>
<td>7.77.3 205</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.95.3 191</td>
<td>7.77.5 201</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.98.7 201 n. 66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.126 195, 203</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.126.1 203</td>
<td>1.12–14 22 n. 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.126.2 198</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.8.5 195</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.9.1 191</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.9.3–6 193</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.9.9 191</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valerius Flaccus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argonautica</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.77.3 205</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.77.5 201 n. 66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.77.9 201</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.78.1 205 n. 84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.78.1–3 201</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xenophanes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.78.1 205 n. 84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.78.1–3 201</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virgil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aeneid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.78.1 205 n. 84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.78.1–3 201</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2203.4 351 n. 27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2203.12 351 n. 27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2692.9 351 n. 27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4957 (= OGIS 669) 50 n. 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI 944 262 n. 29, 288</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.1123 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144 347 n. 14, 351 n. 29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153.85–95 25 n. 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.Cairo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67121 351 n. 27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67154.r, 2, 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67154.r, 2, 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.Yadin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 348, 349 n. 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.Hever</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 347, 349</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.London (= P.Flor 93.5, 14) 713.9 351 n. 27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1713.22 351 n. 27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.Oxyrhynchus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129 351 n. 27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3511.15–16 351 n. 27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.Rylands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154 360 n. 73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.Tebtunis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.104 360 n. 73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.Yadin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 348, 349 n. 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Biblical Literature

#### Hebrew Bible/Old Testament

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>Page References</th>
<th>Judges</th>
<th>Page References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Genesis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:27</td>
<td>358 n. 63</td>
<td>15:2</td>
<td>356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:21–24</td>
<td>358 n. 63</td>
<td>15:18</td>
<td>233 n. 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:24</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>357 n. 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:23</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>19:1–2</td>
<td>357 n. 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6–8</td>
<td>234 n. 21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:14</td>
<td>213 n. 15</td>
<td>1 Samuel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>7:2</td>
<td>147 n. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27:28</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>9:1</td>
<td>147 n. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9:1–15:35</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exodus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:13</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:37 [LXX]</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>15:9</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:10–12</td>
<td>232 n. 7</td>
<td>16:1–31:13</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:13–14</td>
<td>232 n. 8</td>
<td>17:4</td>
<td>204 n. 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:1–6</td>
<td>232 n. 10</td>
<td>18:17</td>
<td>204 n. 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:4</td>
<td>232 n. 11</td>
<td>25:44</td>
<td>356 n. 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:2</td>
<td>356 n. 59</td>
<td>31:1–13</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:3–9</td>
<td>221 n. 32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:3–6</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1 Kings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25:23–30</td>
<td>265 n. 42</td>
<td>18:20–46</td>
<td>235 n. 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25:31–40</td>
<td>265 n. 43</td>
<td>18:39</td>
<td>235 n. 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29:38–42</td>
<td>60 n. 38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37:10–16</td>
<td>265 n. 42</td>
<td>1 Chronicles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37:17–24</td>
<td>265 n. 43</td>
<td>27:31</td>
<td>241 n. 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29:6</td>
<td>241 n. 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:9 [LXX]</td>
<td>326 n. 52</td>
<td>2 Chronicles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:27 [LXX]</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>8:10</td>
<td>241 n. 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28:3–8</td>
<td>60 n. 38</td>
<td>24:11</td>
<td>241 n. 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deuteronomy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:7–10</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>9:6–15</td>
<td>233 n. 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:3</td>
<td>274</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:11–14</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>Esther</td>
<td>130 n. 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:21</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>4:1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>352 n. 31, 356</td>
<td>4 Job</td>
<td>130 n. 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n. 55</td>
<td>1:20</td>
<td>130 n. 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24:1</td>
<td>346, 350 n. 23,</td>
<td>2:12</td>
<td>130 n. 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>354</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24:1–4</td>
<td>357</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24:3</td>
<td>346, 350 n. 23,</td>
<td>Qohelet</td>
<td>69 n. 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>354</td>
<td>5:8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:7–9</td>
<td>232 n. 12</td>
<td>1:14</td>
<td>376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:22 [LXX]</td>
<td>326 n. 52</td>
<td>4:13</td>
<td>376</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Cantúles

- 7:7–9: 232 n. 12, 1:14: 376
- 22:22 [LXX]: 326 n. 52, 4:13: 376
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biblical Work</th>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Isaiah</td>
<td>50:1</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2:33</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremiah</td>
<td>3:6-7</td>
<td>357 n. 61</td>
<td>2:42-43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25:9</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27:6</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34:2</td>
<td>45, 50, 50 n. 12</td>
<td>2:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3:8</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>5.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamentations</td>
<td>2:6</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>1:13 [LXX]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezekiel</td>
<td>9:3</td>
<td>68 n. 48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Testament</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>6:17–18</td>
<td>344 n. 6</td>
<td>7:14–16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10:11–12</td>
<td>358 n. 63</td>
<td>10:1–4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>5:31</td>
<td>349, 350 n. 23</td>
<td>1:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5:31–32</td>
<td>361 n. 79</td>
<td>2:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19:9</td>
<td>361 n. 79</td>
<td>7:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>7:35</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts</td>
<td>2:6–11</td>
<td>23 n. 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18:2</td>
<td>23 n. 10</td>
<td>1:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18:24</td>
<td>23 n. 10</td>
<td>1:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19:9</td>
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