

BRILL

# Josephus and Jewish History in Flavian Rome and Beyond

*Edited by*

JOSEPH SIEVERS AND GAIA LEMBI

# Josephus and Jewish History in Flavian Rome and Beyond

# Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism

*Editor*

John J. Collins

The Divinity School, Yale University

*Associate Editor*

Florentino García Martínez

Qumran Institute, University of Groningen

*Advisory Board*

J. DUHAIME — A. HILHORST — P.W. VAN DER HORST

A. KLOSTERGAARD PETERSEN — M.A. KNIBB — H. NAJMAN

J.T.A.G.M. VAN RUITEN — J. SIEVERS — G. STEMBERGER

E.J.C. TIGCHELAAR — J. TROMP

VOLUME 104

# Josephus and Jewish History in Flavian Rome and Beyond

*Edited by*  
Joseph Sievers and Gaia Lembí



BRILL  
LEIDEN • BOSTON  
2005

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

**Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data**

Josephus and Jewish history in Flavian Rome and beyond / edited by Joseph Sievers and Gaia Lembí.

p. cm. — (Supplements to the Journal for the study of Judaism, ISSN 1384-2161 ; v. 104)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 90-04-14179-0 (alk. paper)

1. Josephus, Flavius—Congresses. 2. Jews—History—586 B.C.-70 A.D.  
Congresses. I. Sievers, Joseph. II. Lembí, Gaia. III. Series.

DS115.9J6 J64 2005  
933'.05—dc22

2005050145

ISSN 1384-2161  
ISBN 90 04 14179 0

© Copyright 2005 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands.  
Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill Academic Publishers,  
Martinus Nijhoff Publishers and VSP.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated,  
stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means,  
electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without  
prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use  
is granted by Brill provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to  
The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive,  
Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA.  
Fees are subject to change.

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

## CONTENTS

Preface .....	ix
Abbreviations .....	xv

### PART ONE

#### HISTORIOGRAPHY

The Formation of an Historical Canon of the Greco-Roman Period: From the Beginnings to Josephus .....	3
DORON MENDELS	
La genèse historique des <i>Antiquités juives</i> .....	21
LUCIO TROIANI	
Judean Historiography in Rome: Josephus and History in <i>Contra Apionem</i> Book 1 .....	29
JOHN M. G. BARCLAY	
The Impotence of Titus, or Josephus' <i>Bellum Judaicum</i> as an Example of "Pathetic" Historiography .....	45
FAUSTO PARENTE	
Of Audience and Meaning: Reading Josephus' <i>Bellum Judaicum</i> in the Context of a Flavian Audience .....	71
STEVE MASON	
The Provincial Historian in Rome .....	101
JONATHAN J. PRICE	

### PART TWO

#### LITERARY QUESTIONS

"By the Waters of Babylon": Josephus and Greek Poetry ....	121
HONORA HOWELL CHAPMAN	
The Hellenistic Biographical History of King Saul: Josephus, <i>A.J.</i> 6.45–378 and 1 Samuel 9:1–31:13 .....	147
DETLEV DORMEYER	

Power and Pity: The Image of Herod in Josephus' <i>Bellum Judaicum</i> .....	159
TAMAR LANDAU	
Commonplaces in Herod's Commander Speech in Josephus' <i>A.J.</i> 15.127–146 .....	183
JAN WILLEM VAN HENTEN	

### PART THREE

#### JOSEPHUS AND JUDAISM

Reading the Bible in Rome: Josephus and the Constraints of Empire .....	209
PAUL SPILSBURY	
Josephus' Use of Prayers: Between Narrative and Theology TESSEL JONQUIÈRE	229
Some Observations on Josephus' Description of the Essenian Morning Prayer .....	245
NICLAS FÖRSTER	

### PART FOUR

#### HISTORIES AND HISTORY

Wer dient wem? Die Darstellung des Flavischen Triumphzuges auf dem Titusbogen und bei Josephus ( <i>B.J.</i> 7.123–162) .....	257
BARBARA EBERHARDT	
Josephus on Titus: The Vanquished Writing about the Victor .....	279
JAMES S. McLAREN	
Josephus and the Philosophers of Rome: Does <i>Contra Apionem</i> Mirror Domitian's Crushing of the "Stoic Opposition"? .....	297
GUNNAR HAALAND	
Alexandrien als Drehscheibe zwischen Jerusalem und Rom: Die Bedeutung der Stadt im Werk des Josephus .....	317
GOTTFRIED SCHIMANOWSKI	

Jews, Romans, and Christians: From the <i>Bellum Judaicum</i> to the <i>Antiquitates</i> .....	331
GIORGIO JOSSA	
The Divorces of the Herodian Princesses: Jewish Law, Roman Law or Palace Law? .....	343
BERNARD S. JACKSON	
PART FIVE	
TRANSLATION AND TRANSMISSION	
The Latin Translation of Josephus' <i>Antiquitates</i> .....	371
GAIA LEMBI	
Translating Book 1 of Josephus' <i>Bellum Judaicum</i> : Some Critical Observations .....	383
ANTHONY J. FORTE	
Josephus und das Alphabet der Römer: Überlegungen zur Schreibung Griechischer Eigennamen in Lateinischer Schrift .....	405
FOLKER SIEGERT	
Concluding Remarks .....	425
FOLKER SIEGERT	
List of Contributors .....	431
Index of Ancient Sources .....	433



## 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.<sup>1</sup> 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 Matiyahu, 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*).

---

<sup>1</sup> The proceedings of the first six colloquia have been published as vols. 2, 4, 6, 10, 12, and 14 in the series *Münsteraner 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 (ρώμη) provided the city's name.<sup>2</sup> Josephus employs the same term at least once with an ironic twist. He reports that Gabinius was sent from Rome (έκ Ρώμης) to Syria (57 B.C.E.). Gabinius then rushed to Judea to assist Hyrcanus II, who was unable to withstand the might (ρώμη) of his nephew Alexander, the son of his brother Aristobulus II. The latter, however, was prevented from carrying out his plans by the Romans ('Ρωμαῖοι)<sup>3</sup> who were beginning to make their power felt in Jerusalem. It may be intentional that Josephus does not clarify who these Romans were.<sup>4</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> διὰ τὴν ἐν τοῖς ὅπλοις ρώμην οὕτως ὀνομάσαι τὴν πόλιν (Plutarch, *Rom.* 1.1).

<sup>3</sup> A.J. 14.82–83. This triple play on the word ρώμη is entirely absent in the otherwise closely parallel passage in B.J. 1.160.

<sup>4</sup> Abraham Schalit (*König Herodes: der Mann und sein Werk* [SJ 4; Berlin: De Gruyter, 1969], 31) suggests Roman businessmen; see also Menahem Stern, *Hasmonaean Judaea in the Hellenistic World: Chapters in Political History* (in Hebrew) (ed. Daniel R. Schwartz; Jerusalem: Zalman Shazar Center for Jewish History, 1995; repr. 1999), 219.

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 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 Lembí 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

March 14, 2005

JOSEPH SIEVERS  
Rome



## ABBREVIATIONS

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:

- BJP Brill Josephus Project: *Flavius Josephus. Translation and Commentary*. Ed. Steve Mason (Leiden-Boston-Köln: Brill, 2000–)  
Vol. 3: *Judean Antiquities 1–4; Trans. and Commentary* by Louis H. Feldman (2000)  
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*)
- Schürer, *History* Emil Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ* (rev. Eng. ed. Geza Vermes, Fergus Millar, *et alii*; 3 vols. in 4; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1973–1987)



**PART ONE**

**HISTORIOGRAPHY**



# THE FORMATION OF AN HISTORICAL CANON OF THE GRECO-ROMAN PERIOD: FROM THE BEGINNINGS TO JOSEPHUS\*

DORON MENDELS  
THE HEBREW UNIVERSITY OF JERUSALEM

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,<sup>1</sup> 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.<sup>2</sup> To my knowledge, this question has never been seriously addressed, not even where I would recently have expected it.<sup>3</sup> I would like to make an attempt in this direction.

The term “canon” is a loaded one.<sup>4</sup> 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.<sup>5</sup>

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

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> “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.

<sup>3</sup> J. Marincola, in his recent book, *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).

<sup>4</sup> Michel Foucault, “L’ordre du discours, 10–11,” in *A History of Reading in the West* (ed. G. Cavallo and R. Chartier; Amherst: University of Mass. Press, 1999), 349–52.

<sup>5</sup> 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”;<sup>6</sup>

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;<sup>7</sup>

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.<sup>8</sup> But they, as well as occasional book-

<sup>6</sup> C. H. Roberts and T. C. Skeat, *The Birth of the Codex* (London: The British Academy by Oxford University Press, 1987), 75 ff.

<sup>7</sup> P. A. Brunt, “On Historical Fragments and Epitomes,” *CQ NS* 30 (1980): 477–94.

<sup>8</sup> L. D. Reynolds and N. G. Wilson, *Scribes and Scholars* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 3rd ed., 1991), 23–25 and *passim*.

shops, did not have an influence on the process of canonization. If a certain book was on the shelves, as Aulus Gellius tells us,<sup>9</sup> 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.<sup>10</sup> 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.<sup>11</sup>

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

<sup>9</sup> See Reynolds and Wilson, *Scribes*, 30.

<sup>10</sup> On the literary school *curricula*, see Wilamowitz mentioned in Reynolds and Wilson, *Scribes*, 53, and M. I. Marrou, *A History of Education in Antiquity* (London: Sheed and Ward, 1965).

<sup>11</sup> About *curricula* as canon molders see H. Hunger, *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner*, vol. 1 (Munich: C. H. Beck, 1978), and D. Mendels, “Greek and Roman History in the Bibliotheca of Photius,” in Idem, *Religion and Historiography. Studies in Hellenistic History* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 200–210.

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 extraordinary, 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 historians in antiquity remains, usually with one “main” historian in each period. This is the picture we have today and it was probably similarly 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.<sup>12</sup> 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 outstanding historians.

Let me elaborate. When I say that a historical canon emerged through a gradual process, I mean that several factors, as I have suggested 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 mechanical 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.<sup>13</sup>

<sup>12</sup> Marincola, *Authority and Tradition*, *passim*.

<sup>13</sup> 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 bibliography 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.<sup>14</sup> 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.

<sup>14</sup> H. Bloom, *The Western Canon: The Books and School of the Ages* (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1994), and for recent discussions of literary and musical canons see, for instance: J. Gorak, *The Making of the Modern Canon* (London and Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Athlone, 1991); W. Weber, *The Rise of Musical Classics in Eighteenth-Century England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992); F. E. Court, *Institutionalizing English Literature. The Culture and Politics of Literary Study, 1750–1900* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1992); J. Guillory, *Cultural Capital. The Problem of Literary Canon Formation* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993); T. Ross, *The Making of the English Literary Canon. From the Middle Ages to the Late Eighteenth Century* (Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 1998); R. Alter, *Canon and Creativity. Modern Writing and the Authority of Scripture* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2000).

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.<sup>15</sup> 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 *Bibliotheca*. All these disappeared in the course of time and it was only the *Bibliotheca* 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 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.<sup>16</sup>

<sup>15</sup> E. Rawson, *Intellectual Life in the Late Roman Republic* (London: Duckworth, 1985); and K. S. Sacks, *Diodorus Siculus and the First Century* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1990).

<sup>16</sup> Ch. Wolff, *Johann Sebastian Bach. The Learned Musician* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001).

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 *Lydica* 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*,<sup>17</sup> 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 *Attidographers* who wrote local histories in the fourth and third centuries b.c.e. (the *Attis*) probably provided

<sup>17</sup> E. Badian, *From Plataea to Potidaea: Studies in the History and Historiography of the Pentecontaetia* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1993).

information about the *Pentecontaetia* but they, like their forerunners the *logographoi*,<sup>18</sup> 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.).<sup>19</sup> 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.<sup>20</sup> 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

<sup>18</sup> See, in general, P. Harding, *Androton and the Atthis: the Fragments Translated with Introduction and Commentary* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994).

<sup>19</sup> S. Hornblower, *Thucydides* (London: Duckworth, 1987).

<sup>20</sup> Cf. Marincola, *Authority and Tradition*, 237–38, for a summary of this well-known notion.

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.<sup>21</sup>

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,<sup>22</sup> 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 historical accounts reached 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 Timaeian 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.<sup>23</sup>

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

<sup>21</sup> Rightly G. Schepens, “Jacoby's FGrHist,” in *Collecting Fragments. Fragmente Sammeln* (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).

<sup>22</sup> M. A. Flower, *Theopompus of Chios—History and Rhetoric in the Fourth Century B.C.* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), 184–210.

<sup>23</sup> For this critical attitude see F. Walbank, *Polybius* (Berkeley: The University of California Press, 1972).

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.<sup>24</sup> 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

<sup>24</sup> L. I. Pearson, *The Lost Histories of Alexander the Great* (New York: APA, 1960; repr. Chico, California: Scholars Press, 1983).

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.”<sup>25</sup> 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).<sup>26</sup> 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 innovative 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.<sup>27</sup>

<sup>25</sup> *OCD*, s.v. “Phylarchus”; E. Gabba, “Studi su Filarco,” *Athenaeum* N. S. 35 (1957): 3 ff., 193 ff.

<sup>26</sup> Walbank, *Polybius*, and Marincola, *Authority and Tradition*, 98.

<sup>27</sup> For this work see S. M. Burstein, *Agatharchides of Cnidus: On the Erythraean Sea* (London: Hakluyt Society, 1989).

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.<sup>28</sup> 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).<sup>29</sup> 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.<sup>30</sup> 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

<sup>28</sup> I. G. Kidd, *Posidonius* (3 vols.; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988–1999).

<sup>29</sup> 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)

<sup>30</sup> This aspect of Plutarch's selection methods has often been discussed. See for instance J. Geiger, “Plutarch's Parallel Lives: The Choice of Heroes,” in *Essays on Plutarch's Lives* (ed. B. Scardigli; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), pp. 165–90.

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.<sup>31</sup> 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.<sup>32</sup> 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.<sup>33</sup> The entire work has thus suffered a partial loss.

<sup>31</sup> The best survey on Livy remains P. G. Walsh, *Livy* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1974).

<sup>32</sup> H. W. Peter, *Historicorum Romanorum Reliquiae* (2d ed. Leipzig: Teubner, 1914–1916; repr. Stuttgart: B. G. Teubner, 1967), and H. Beck and U. Walter, *Die frühen römischen Historiker. Bd. I: Von Fabius Pictor bis Gn. Gellius* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2001).

<sup>33</sup> Used by Stephanus of Byzantium: see E. Schwartz, “Dionysios”, PW 5.1 (1903): col. 961.

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."<sup>34</sup> 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,<sup>35</sup> but was partly excerpted by Byzantine scholars. The parts of the *Bibliothekē* 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 Scytobrachion and Matris of Thebes.<sup>36</sup> 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.

<sup>34</sup> See *Cambridge History of Classical Literature* vol. 2 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 269.

<sup>35</sup> Schwartz, "Diodorus," cols. 663–64.

<sup>36</sup> Alongside an extensive use of Timaeus in Books 3–4: see Schwartz, "Diodorus," cols. 676 ff.

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."<sup>37</sup> 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.

<sup>37</sup> R. Mellor, *Tacitus* (New York and London: Routledge, 1993), 33.

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.



# LA GENÈSE HISTORIQUE DES ANTIQUITÉS JUIVES

LUCIO TROIANI

UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI PAVIA

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.<sup>1</sup> 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.<sup>2</sup> Au cours des dernières années du premier siècle apr. J.-C., selon le témoignage de Pline l'Ancien, Jérusalem n'existant tout bonnement plus; les adulateurs de cour célébraient César, régnant avec bonheur, répandre avec férocité les flammes sur la ville sainte.<sup>3</sup> Une guerre longue et

<sup>1</sup> *C. Ap.* 1.27; *B.J.* 1.13–16. *Vita* 40. Cfr. S. Mason, *BJP* 9, 45–46; S. J. D. Cohen, “History and Historiography in the *Contra Apionem* of Josephus,” *History and Theory* 27 (1988): 1–11.

<sup>2</sup> J. M. G. Barclay, *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora: from Alexander to Trajan (323 BCE–117 CE)* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996); S. Mason, “An Essay in Character: The Aim and Audience of Josephus's Vita,” in *Internationales Josephus-Kolloquium Münster 1997* (ed. F. Siegert and J. U. Kalms; Münster: Lit, 1998), 31–77; M. Pucci ben Zeev, *Jewish Rights in the Roman World: The Greek and Roman Documents Quoted by Josephus Flavius* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998); E. Schürer, *Storia del popolo giudaico al tempo di Gesù Cristo (175 a.C.–135 d.C.)* 3.1 (rev. ed. G. Vermes, F. Millar et al.; ed. ital. C. Gianotto; Brescia: Paideia, 1997); P. Spilsbury, *The Image of the Jew in Flavius Josephus' Paraphrase of the Bible* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), L. Troiani, “Il mondo ellenistico,” *Studi Ellenistici* 15 (2003): 215–27.

<sup>3</sup> *GLAJJ* 1:468–81 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’excusus sur le Judaïsme contenu dans le V<sup>e</sup> 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.<sup>4</sup> 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

1:504–5 no. 226 = Valerius Flaccus, *Argonautica*, 1.12–14. E. M. Smallwood, *The Jews under Roman Rule. From Pompey to Diocletian* (Leiden: Brill, 1981), 331–88; L. H. Feldman, *Jew & Gentile in the Ancient World: Attitudes and Interactions from Alexander to Justinian* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993), 84–172.

<sup>4</sup> Tacite, *Hist.* 5.10.2; *GLAJJ* 2:17–63; Flavius Josèphe, *Vita* 424–425: voire le commentaire de Mason, *BJP* 9, 169; *B.J.* 7.437–453; S. Applebaum, *Jews and Greeks in Ancient Cyrene* (Leiden: Brill, 1979), 228–29; 242–60.

exemple Alexandrie, Rome, Babylone.<sup>5</sup> 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».<sup>6</sup> 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.<sup>7</sup> 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, «les pires individus», dans leurs patries respectives d'appartenance, continuent de mépriser les religions natives.<sup>8</sup> Selon Dion Cassius, le terme «Juifs» s'applique «aussi aux autres hommes, ceux qui observent strictement les lois, bien qu'originaires d'autres pays».<sup>9</sup> 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'Aquila, né dans la province du Pont.<sup>10</sup> Écrire l'histoire du Judaïsme, dans les années 90 de notre ère, signifie écrire une histoire qui touche la connaissance

<sup>5</sup> Schürer, *Storia*, 3.1:77–104; CPJ; J. Mélèze Modrzejewski, *Les Juifs d'Egypte de Ramsès à Hadrien* (Paris: Armand Colin, 1997); J. Neusner, *A History of the Jews in Babylonia*, vol. 1 (StPB 9; Leiden: Brill, 1965); H. I. Leon, *The Jews of Ancient Rome* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1995).

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

<sup>7</sup> Philo Alexandrinus, *Spec.* 1.69; Flavius Josèphe, *A.J.* 4.204; Ac 2:6–11; L. Troiani, “Greci ed ebrei, ebraismo ed «ellenismo»,” in *I Greci. Storia, Cultura, Arte, Società* (ed. S. Settis; Torino: Einaudi, 2001), 3:203–30.

<sup>8</sup> Tacite, *Hist.* 5.5.1: *Nam pessimus quisque spretis religionibus patriis tributa et stipes illuc congregebant.* 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*.

<sup>9</sup> Cassius Dio, *Historia Romana* 37.16.5–17.1; GLAJJ 2:353 no. 406.

<sup>10</sup> Ac 18:24; 18:2; L. Troiani, *Henoch* 24 (2002): 359–65.

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 babylonniennes; romaines tout autant qu'alexandrines; éphésiennes 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 phisyonomie et l'articulation de communautés de la Diaspora grecque.<sup>11</sup> Influencés comme nous le sommes, dans la caractérisation historique du Judaïsme antique, par la phisyonomie 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

<sup>11</sup> Par exemple, Rom 4:1; 1 Cor 10:1–4.

anciennes, des «craignant Dieu» à des gentils attirés par le Judaïsme.<sup>12</sup> 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.<sup>13</sup> 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.<sup>14</sup> 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.<sup>15</sup> 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.<sup>16</sup>

<sup>12</sup> G. Jossa, *I gruppi giudaici ai tempi di Gesù* (Brescia: Paideia, 2001), 176–86.

<sup>13</sup> A.-M. Denis, *Fragmenta pseudepigraphorum quae supersunt graeca una cum historicorum et auctorum iudeorum hellenistarum fragmentis* (Leiden: Brill, 1970), 157–60; 171–74. L'auteur a changé opinion dans *Introduction à la littérature religieuse juéo-hellénistique* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2000), 2:966; 1057–58; 1277; Schürer, *Storia*, 3:1:896–901.

<sup>14</sup> Ac 19:33–34; Philo Alexandrinus, *Legat.* 147; *Prov.* 2.66; Arrianus, *Epict. diss.* 2.9.19; *GLAJJ* 1:542–44; E. J. Bickerman, *Studies in Jewish and Christian History* (Leiden: Brill, 1986), 3:342.

<sup>15</sup> Ac 19:9; 1 Cor 16:19; Suetonius, *Tib.* 32.2; *GLAJJ* 2:111–12; Philo Alexandrinus, *Spec.* 1.320–323; 2.62–63.

<sup>16</sup> *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.<sup>17</sup> Et ce, d'autant plus que la Diaspora resta indifférente, à cette occasion, aux raisons des rebelles de Judée (*B.J.* 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 évangéliques 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.<sup>18</sup> 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

<sup>17</sup> Minucius Felix, *Oct.* 33.2–4: *sed Iudeis nihil profuit, quod unum et ipsi deum aris atque templis maxima superstitione coluerunt: ignorantia labens, si priorum aut oblitus aut inscius posteriorum recordaris. Nam et ipsi deum nostrum—idem enim omnium deus est—quamdiu enim eum caste innoxie religioseque coluerunt, quamdiu praeceptis salubribus obtemperaverunt, de paucis innumeri facti, de egentibus divites, de servientibus reges; modici multos, inermi armatos, dum fugiunt insequentes, dei iussu et elementis adniventibus obruerunt. Scripta eorum relege vel si Romanis magis gaudes—ut transeamus veteres—Flavi Iosepi vel Antonii Juliani de Iudeis require: iam scies nequitia sua hanc eos meruisse fortunam nec quidquam accidisse quod non sit ius, si in contumacia perseverarent, ante praedictum.*

<sup>18</sup> L. Troiani, “Gli autori giudaico-ellenistici e la Settanta,” *Annali di Scienze Religiose* 2 (1997): 197–207.

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 héroïenne 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 à 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.<sup>19</sup> 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

<sup>19</sup> W. W. Buehler, *The Pre-Herodian Civil War and Social Debate. Jewish Society in the Period 76–40 B.C. and Social Factors Contributing to the Rise of Pharisees and the Sadducees* (Basel: Reinhhardt, 1974); D. A. Fiensy, *The Social History of Palestine in the Herodian Period. The Land is Mine* (Studies in the Bible and Early Christianity Vol. 20; Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press, 1991); M. Hadass-Lebel, *Jérusalem contre Rome* (Paris: Cerf, 1991); M. Hengel, *Gli Zeloti. Ricerche sul movimento di liberazione giudaico dai tempi di Erode I al 70 d.C.* (ed. ital. G. Firpo; Brescia: Paideia, 1996); G. Jossa, *Gesù e i movimenti di liberazione della Palestina* (Brescia: Paideia, 1980); B. Lifshitz, «Jérusalem sous la domination romaine. Histoire de la ville depuis la conquête de Pompée jusqu'à Constantin (63 B.C.–A.D. 325),» *ANRW* II.8 (1977): 444–89; D. Mendels, *The Rise and Fall of Jewish Nationalism. Jewish and Christian Ethnicity in Ancient Palestine within the Greco-Roman Period* (New York: Doubleday, 1992); L. Troiani, «Osservazioni sopra il quadro storico-politico del Giudaismo del I secolo d.C.,» in *Il Giudaismo palestinese: dal I secolo a.C. al I secolo d.C.* (ed. P. Sacchi; Bologna: AISG, 1993), 231–43.

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.<sup>20</sup> 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.<sup>21</sup> 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'existe-t-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.

<sup>20</sup> Diodorus 40.2; *GLAJJ* 1:185–87. Philo Alexandrinus, *Legat.* 278. Cfr. n. 14.

<sup>21</sup> Persius, *Sat.* 5.176–184; *GLAJJ* 1:435–37; D. Gilula, “La satira degli ebrei nella letteratura latina,” in *Gli Ebrei nell'impero romano. Saggi vari* (ed. A. Lewin; Firenze: Giuntina, 2001), 195–215; L. Troiani, “Il giudaismo negli autori greci e latini dei primi secoli d.C.,” in *Storiografia locale e storiografia universale* (Como: New Press, 2001), 379–91.

JUDEAN HISTORIOGRAPHY IN ROME:  
JOSEPHUS AND HISTORY IN  
*CONTRA APIONEM* BOOK 1

JOHN M. G. BARCLAY  
UNIVERSITY OF DURHAM

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).<sup>1</sup> To write the early history of the Judean people (their “ancient lore,” ἀρχαιολογία) 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.<sup>2</sup> Rather

<sup>1</sup> E.g. R. Laqueur, *Der jüdischer Historiker Flavius Josephus. Ein biographischer Versuch auf neuer quellenkritischer Grundlage* (Giessen 1920; reprint Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1970); W. Weber, *Josephus und Vespasian. Untersuchungen zu dem jüdischen Krieg des Flavius Josephus* (Berlin: Kohlhammer, 1921); H. Lindner, *Die Geschichtsauffassung des Flavius Josephus im Bellum Judaicum* (Leiden: Brill, 1972); T. Rajak, *Josephus. The Historian and his Society* (London: Duckworth, 1983); K.-S. Krieger, *Geschichtsschreibung als Apologetik bei Flavius Josephus* (Tübingen: Franke, 1994). The most recent, and among the most perceptive, is G. Mader, *Josephus and the Politics of Historiography. Apologetic and Impression-Management in the Bellum Judaicum* (Leiden: Brill, 2000).

<sup>2</sup> 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” (ἀπασὶ φανεῖσθαι τοῖς Ἐλλησιν ὀξίαν 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” (ὀξίαν 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”?<sup>3</sup> 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.*

---

*Josephus' Rewritten Bible* (Leiden: Brill, 1998). Cf. P. Villalba i Varneda, *The Historical Method of Flavius Josephus* (Leiden: Brill, 1986); P. Spilsbury, *The Image of the Jew in Flavius Josephus' Paraphrase of the Bible* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998).

<sup>3</sup> Josephus recognises that in dealing with “the long duration of time and antiquity [Moses] would have had a very free hand for fabricated falsehoods (ψευδῶν 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 ἀκριβῆ) in our writings” (*A.J.* 1.17).<sup>4</sup> 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:

έπει δὲ συχνοὺς ὄρῳ ταῖς ὑπὸ δυσμενείας ὑπό τινων εἰρημέναις προσέχοντας βλασφημίαις καὶ τοῖς περὶ τὴν ἀρχαιολογίαν ὑπὸ ἐμοῦ γεγραμμένοις ἀπιστοῦντας τεκμήριόν τε ποιουμένους τοῦ νεώτερον εἶναι τὸ γένος ἡμῶν τὸ μηδεμιᾶς παρὰ τοῖς ἐπιφανέσι τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν ιστοριογράφων μνήμης ἡξιώσθαι, περὶ τούτων ἀπάντων φήθην δεῖν γράψαι συντόμως . . .

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 (δυσμένεια), 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

---

<sup>4</sup> See commentary by Feldman, *BJP* 3, *ad loc.*

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.<sup>5</sup> 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" ( $\muνήμης \eta\xi\omega\theta\alpha\iota$ ) 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.<sup>6</sup>

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

<sup>5</sup> *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*.

<sup>6</sup> 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.<sup>7</sup> 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.”<sup>8</sup> Josephus’ task is to get the Judeans’ history heard, but he wishes it be heard “essentially on their own terms.”<sup>9</sup>

<sup>7</sup> T. Rajak, “Josephus and the ‘Archaeology’ of the Jews,” *JJS* 33 (1982): 465–77 (repr. in Eadem, *The Jewish Dialogue with Greece & Rome. Studies in Cultural and Social Interaction* [Leiden-Boston-Köln: Brill, 2001], 241–55); cf. her subsequent essay “The Sense of History in Jewish Intertestamental Writing,” *Oudtestamentische Studien* 24 (1986): 124–45 (cf. Eadem, *The Jewish Dialogue*, 11–37).

<sup>8</sup> “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.

<sup>9</sup> “Josephus and the ‘Archaeology’ of the Jews,” 476.

Shaye Cohen's essay on "History and Historiography in the *Against Apion* of Josephus"<sup>10</sup> 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."<sup>11</sup> 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."<sup>12</sup>

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.<sup>13</sup> 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,"<sup>14</sup> an impact which generally compelled them in time to

<sup>10</sup> In *Essays in Jewish Historiography* (ed. A. Rapoport-Albert; History and Theory 27; Middletown, Conn.: Wesleyan University Press, 1988), 1–11.

<sup>11</sup> "History and Historiography," 5.

<sup>12</sup> "History and Historiography," 11.

<sup>13</sup> 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).

<sup>14</sup> "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.<sup>15</sup> 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.<sup>16</sup> 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*.<sup>17</sup>

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

<sup>15</sup> E. Said, *Orientalism: Western Representations of the Orient* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1985 [1978]) may be regarded as the fountainhead of Western postcolonial theory. For an historical survey see R. J. C. Young, *Postcolonialism. An Historical Introduction* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2001).

<sup>16</sup> M. L. Pratt, *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation* (London: Routledge, 1992). Her approach successfully avoids categorising native authors according to the usual binary alternatives: either they offer "authentic" native versions of history, or they "assimilate" and thereby abandon their native identity.

<sup>17</sup> G. Sterling has investigated aspects of this tradition under the heading "apologetic historiography" (*Historiography and Self-Definition. Josephos, Luke-Acts and Apologetic Historiography*, Leiden: Brill, 1992). But its power-dynamics have yet to be explored. On historiography in postcolonial theory, note Césaire's famous statement that "the only history is white". Cf. R. Young, *White Mythologies. Writing History and the West* (London: Routledge, 1990); D. Chakrabarty, "Postcoloniality and the Artifice of History: Who speaks for 'Indian' Pasts?", *Representations* 37 (1992): 1–26.

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.<sup>18</sup> 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.

---

<sup>18</sup> 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.<sup>19</sup> 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,<sup>20</sup> 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 disjunction 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

<sup>19</sup> See, in brief, my essay “Judaism in Roman Dress: Josephus’ Tactics in the *Contra Apionem*” in *Internationales Josephus-Kolloquium Aarhus 1999* (ed. J. U. Kalms; Münster: LIT, 2000), 231–45. Further, on Roman attitudes to Greek historians, A. Wardman, *Rome’s Debt to Greece* (London: Elek, 1976), 74–110.

<sup>20</sup> See A. Wallace-Hadrill, “Greek Knowledge, Roman Power,” *CPh* 83 (1988): 224–33.

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.<sup>21</sup> In such an atmosphere, Josephus might hope that the ancient traditions of the Judean nation would also gain a sympathetic hearing.<sup>22</sup>

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.<sup>23</sup> 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.<sup>24</sup> Since

<sup>21</sup> H. A. Attridge, *The Phoenician History of Philo of Byblos* (Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1981); for this phenomenon, of growing readiness to hear and even accept the traditions of nations on the edges of empire, see G. Bowersock, *Fiction as History* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994), 43–48.

<sup>22</sup> 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.

<sup>23</sup> Cicero, *Div.* 1.36–37; Pliny, *Nat.* 7.56; cf. Diodorus 2.31.9.

<sup>24</sup> See esp. Thucydides 1.1–22; Dionysius, *Thuc.* 5–7; Diodorus 1.3–6; Livy, preface; Sextus Empiricus, *Math.* 1.263–269; cf. Rajak, "Josephus," 465–71. On the relation between "myth" and "history" in the Greek tradition see M. Finley, "Myth, Memory and History," in Idem, *The Use and Abuse of History* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1975), 11–33.

mythology was difficult to control, examine or judge, it threatened the (masculine) control essential to the calling of a historian.<sup>25</sup> 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,<sup>26</sup> 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,

---

<sup>25</sup> This ideology of control is ubiquitous in discussions of the historian’s task in antiquity, which necessarily involves working hard, interrogating the evidence, investigating variant accounts, assessing plausibility, and avoiding at all costs the charge of credulity. Lucian’s tractate *How to write history* is replete with this élite ideology of control, proportion and independence, which is explicitly gendered (e.g. *Hist. Conscr.* 10–13). On ancient historiography and its rhetorics see T. P. Wiseman, *Clio’s Cosmetics: Three Studies in Greco-Roman Literature* (Leicester: University of Leicester Press, 1979); A. Woodman, *Rhetoric in Classical Historiography* (London: Croom Helm, 1988); C. W. Fornara, *The Nature of History in Ancient Greece and Rome* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983); J. Marincola, *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).

<sup>26</sup> Uncritical people receive reports from others ἀβασανίστως (Thucydides 1.20).

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 rubbishing 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 . . .”<sup>27</sup>

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 (*μήτε 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 ἡξίωται*), since there is no accurate line of prophetic succession (*C. Ap.* 1.41).

---

<sup>27</sup> ἀλλὰ μόνων τῶν προφητῶν τὰ μὲν ἀνωτάτω καὶ παλαιότατα κατὰ τὴν ἐπίπνοιαν τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ μαθόντων, τὰ δὲ καθ’ αὐτοὺς 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.<sup>28</sup> 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 ἐπίπνοιαν τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ*), an authority which then leaks over by implication to all the other prophets in the accurate line of succession.<sup>29</sup> It is reinforced by the chain of “learning” (*μανθάνειν*) 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

<sup>28</sup> The role of the Muses in inspiring poetry, and the inspiration of the Sibylline prophets, are the closest analogies in the Greek tradition; but neither of these fit the genre of historiography.

<sup>29</sup> In comparison with the later prophets, Moses has no eyewitness claims to accuracy, nor (despite *C. Ap.* 1.6 ff.) does Josephus refer to records at his disposal. The only way he can know about 3000 years of history (!) is by divine inspiration.

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 (*εὐθὺς 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.<sup>30</sup> 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.

---

<sup>30</sup> 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.<sup>31</sup> 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.<sup>32</sup> 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.<sup>33</sup>

<sup>31</sup> 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.

<sup>32</sup> 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.

<sup>33</sup> See, for instance, the strategy adopted in Eusebius’ *Praeparatio evangelica*.



# THE IMPOTENCE OF TITUS, OR FLAVIUS JOSEPHUS'S *BELLUM JUDAICUM* AS AN EXAMPLE OF “PATHETIC” HISTORIOGRAPHY

FAUSTO PARENTE  
II UNIVERSITÀ DI ROMA, TOR VERGATA

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 ennable 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*.<sup>1</sup>

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

---

<sup>1</sup> Arist. *Poet.* 1631b. K. Meister, *Die griechische Geschichtsschreibung von den Anfängen bis zum Ende des Hellenismus* (Stuttgart-Berlin-Köln: W. Kohlhammer, 1990), 95–102.

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”<sup>2</sup> (ἄπειρος δ' ἦν πανταχοῦ φονευομένων ὁ στόνος, καὶ τὸ αἷμα πᾶσαν ἐπέκλυνε τὴν πόλιν κατὰ πρανοῦς χεόμενον). 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.<sup>3</sup>

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),<sup>4</sup> it would seem to be the official chronicle of the war fought by Vespasian and Titus in Galilee and

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

<sup>3</sup> 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.

<sup>4</sup> W. Weber, *Josephus und Vespasian. Untersuchungen zu dem jüdischen Krieg des Flavius Josephus* (Berlin-Stuttgart-Leipzig: Kohlhammer, 1921), 136 ff.; 207 ff.

Judea—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, uel ut transeamus veteres, Flavi Iosephi uel, si Romanis magis gaudes, Antoni Iuliani de Iudeis require iam scies, nequitia sua hanc eos meruisse fortunam” (47.22–48.2 Halm).<sup>5</sup>

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 (έπίτροπος) of Judea (*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*.<sup>6</sup>

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

---

<sup>5</sup> 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.

<sup>6</sup> See E. Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi* (3d–4th ed.; Leipzig: Hinrichs 1901–1911), 1:58; idem, *History*, 1:33–34, with earlier bibliog.

ἀμφοτέρων διέξειμι) 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.<sup>7</sup>

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*.<sup>8</sup> 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

<sup>7</sup> 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 Prophecie,” *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.

<sup>8</sup> 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.

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.<sup>9</sup>

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<sup>10</sup>—as was instead Tiberius Julius Alexander, who “did not stand by the practices of his people” (*A.J.* 20.100 [Feldman, LCL]), and whom Tacitus called “inlustris eques romanus” (*Ann.* 15.28.3).<sup>11</sup>

Josephus would write his *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 *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” (*Jer* 25:9; 27:6; 34:2), to destroy the First Temple.<sup>12</sup>

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” (*θεός*, with or without the article), sometimes of “Deity” (*τὸ θεῖον*), sometimes of

<sup>9</sup> J. J. Price, *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 *B.J.* 5.564).”

<sup>10</sup> J. A. Montgomery, “The Religion of Flavius Josephus,” *JQR* n.s. 11 (1920–21): 297, states that “Josephus was no trimmer in religion whatever he was in politics.”

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

<sup>12</sup> Also according to rabbinic tradition (as in *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 révolte contre Rome à la lumière du De Bello Judaico de Flavius Josephé,” *Sileno* 9 (1983): 168–71.

“Fate” (*χρεών* and *εἰμαρμένη*), but mostly of “Fortune” (*τύχη*).<sup>13</sup> 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?<sup>14</sup>

<sup>13</sup> See, in general, A. Poznanski, *Über die religionsphilosophischen Anschauungen des Flavius Josephus* (Inaug. Diss. Halle, Halle a.d. Saale, 1887); A. Schlatter, *Wie sprach Josephus von Gott?* (Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie, 14; Gütersloh: Mohn, 1910) = Id., *Kleine Schriften zu Flavius Josephus* (herausg. und eingeführt von K. M. Rengstorff, Darmstadt: Wissenschaft. Buchgesellschaft, 1970), 65–142. Id., *Die Theologie des Judentums nach dem Bericht des Josephus* (Gütersloh: Mohn, 1932); H. Guttmann, *Die Darstellung der jüdischen Religion bei Flavius Josephus* (Breslau: Marcus, 1928); G. F. Moore, “Fate and Free Will in the Jewish Philosophies according to Josephus,” *HTR* 22 (1929): 348–64; G. Stählin, “Das Schicksal im Neuen Testament und bei Josephus,” in *Josephus Studien. Otto Michel zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet* (eds. O. Betz, K. Haacker, M. Hengel; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1974), 319–43; M. Smith, “The Occult in Josephus,” in Feldman and Hata, *Josephus, Judaism and Christianity*, 236–56. In particular: J. H. Shutt, “The Concept of God in the Works of Flavius Josephus,” *JJS* 31 (1980): 170–89.

<sup>14</sup> G. Mader, *Josephus and the Politics of Historiography: Apologetic and Impression Management in Bellum Iudaicum* (Mnemosyne suppl. 205; Leiden-Boston-Köln: Brill, 2000), 123–33, has analysed the reason for the *ἀσέβεια* of the zealots, regarding it as the *idée maîtresse* 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 Iudeis 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.<sup>15</sup>

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 *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:<sup>16</sup> 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);<sup>17</sup> the followers of John of

However, he raises no doubts as to the reliability of the events narrated, the purpose of which was to shock Greco-Roman readers: “But, granted that Josephus’ treatment of the zealots’ ἀσέβεια has transparently hostile intent, it is not for that reason invalidated or even inherently implausible, and indeed the manner in which the impieties of the στασιαστοί, are dramatized is itself calculated to engage Greco-Roman readers on a broad front” (132). However, the behaviour of the “bandits”, as Mader himself acknowledges, was a systematic violation of Jewish law (like eating meat with blood: *B.J.* 6.372) which Greco-Roman readers found of very little interest and whose sacrilegious nature they did not even understand. See Price’s comment cited at n. 9 above.

<sup>15</sup> P. A. Brunt, “Charges of Provincial Maladministration under the Early Principate,” *Historia* 10 (1961): 189–227. That Roman misgovernment was the principal cause of the revolt has been argued by e.g. E. M. Smallwood, *The Jews under Roman Rule* (Leiden: Brill, 1976) 256–57.

<sup>16</sup> Tacitus, *Hist.* 5.12.4, mentions two factions “ita in duas factiones civitas discessit” 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.

<sup>17</sup> Simon bar Giora (שמעון гиорא, b. *Sanh.* 94a, “proselyte”). Josephus always uses νιός Γιώρα. Βαργιορᾶς is in Cassius Dio 65.7.1 and Tacitus, *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);<sup>18</sup> 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).<sup>19</sup> As stated above,

utes the name to John: “*Ioannes quem et Bargioram vocabant*”. On this personage see M. Hengel, *Die Zeloten: Untersuchungen zum jüdischen Freiheitsbewegung in der Zeit von Herodes I. bis 70 n.Chr.* (AGSU 1; Leiden-Köln: Brill, 1961; 2nd ed. 1976; Engl. transl. *The Zealots*, Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1989), 303–4; O. Michel, “*Studien zu Iosephus—Simon bar Giora*,” *NTS* 14 (1967–68): 402–8; M. Stern, “*Zealots*,” *EJ Year Book* 1973: 146–47.

<sup>18</sup> On John of Gischala see Stern, “*Zealots*,” 147–49; U. Rappaport, “*John of Gischala: from Galilee to Jerusalem*,” *JJS* 33 (1982): 479–93; S. Schwartz, *Josephus and Judaean Politics* (Leiden-New York-Köln: Brill, 1990), 32–33; 76–77; Price, *Jerusalem under Siege*, 77–79; 87–89; 202; 205–6; Mader, *Josephus and the Politics of Historiography*, 67–70; 88–92.

<sup>19</sup> Historians have sought to determine the accuracy of Josephus’s descriptions of the “so-called” (*B.J.* 2.651) *zealots* (ζηλωτοί) and the “so-called” (*A.J.* 20.186) *sicarii* (σικάριοι). It is to be noted that Josephus never mentions the zealots by name in the *Antiquitates* and that, although the two terms appear in rabbinic literature, they are not used to refer to distinct entities. *Qannaim* recurs in *Abot de Rabbi Natan* (version A chap. 6 p. 32 Schechter); *sigrim* in *Abot de Rabbi Natan* (version B chap. 7 p. 20 Schechter) and in *b. Gittin* 56a, where mention is made of “*Abba Sigra*” as the leader of the *בָּרִינְגִים*, who were among the defenders of Jerusalem (B. Salomonsen, “Some Remarks on the Zealots with Special Regard to the Term ‘qannaim’ in Rabbinic Literature,” *NTS* 12 [1965–1966]: 164–76). Zealots and *sicarii* have been identified (F. J. Foakes-Jackson and K. Lake, “The Zealots,” in their *The Beginnings of Christianity*, Part I, 1 [London: Macmillan 1920], 421–25) and sharply distinguished (M. Smith, “*Zealots and Sicarii. Their Origin and Relation*,” *HTR* 64 [1971]: 1–19). The zealots have been described as the heirs of the Maccabees driven by an intransigent nationalism (W. R. Farmer, *Maccabees, Zealots and Josephus. An Inquiry into Jewish Nationalism in the Greco-Roman Period* [New York: Columbia University Press, 1956]) or as a party formed in reaction to the Romans’ assumption of direct power in Judaea in 6 b.c.e., for reasons mainly socio-economic (S. Applebaum, “The Zealots: the Case for Revaluation,” *JRS* 61 [1971]: 155–70) or religious, and, in this case, with the principal purpose of instituting divine governance, so that the revolt broke out when the majority of the population embraced the ideas of the zealots (Hengel, *Zeloten*). However, the existence of a real and proper “party” of zealots has been denied. It seemed more correct to talk of a variety of social groups which opposed the Romans in different ways because they were driven by different motives: bandits who had become such for social reasons, claimants to the throne, messianic figures, zealots, *sicarii*. Consequently, the revolt of 66 was a peasant rebellion fuelled by messianic-eschatological expectations (R. H. Horsley, “The Zealots, their Origin, Relationship and Importance in the Jewish Revolt,” *NT* 2 [1986]: 159–92). Overall, however, the socio-economic aspect seems to have prevailed over the religious one (M. Smith, “The Troublemakers,” in *The Cambridge History of Judaism*, 3. *The Early Roman Period* [ed. W. Horbury, W. D. Davies, and J. Sturdy; Cambridge: Cambridge

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).<sup>20</sup> 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 חירות ציון, “freedom of Zion”—which was “not a simple inscription or statement, but a phrase akin to a slogan”, as Meshorer has commented.<sup>21</sup> However, a coin struck in year I (66 c.e.) bore the inscription יְרָשָׁלָם קָדְשָׁה “holy Jerusalem” and one in year II (67 c.e.), יְרוּשָׁלָם הַקָּדָשָׁה, “Jerusalem the holy”, while three coins of year IV (69 c.e.) carry the inscription לְנַאֲלָה צִוָּן “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.<sup>22</sup> 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,<sup>23</sup> “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

University Press, 1999], 501–68), although it is the latter that has received closer attention in more recent studies (L. L. Grabbe, “Eschatology in Philo and Josephus,” in *Judaism in Late Antiquity* [eds. A. J. Avery Peck and J. Neusner; *Handbuch der Orientalistik* 1.49.4; Leiden: Brill, 2000], 174–82).

<sup>20</sup> On Agrippa II’s speech see E. Gabba, “L’impero romano nel discorso di Agrippa II (*Jos. B.J.* II, 345–401),” *Rivista di storia dell’Antichità* 67 (1976–1977): 189–94; M. Stern, “Josephus and the Roman Empire as Reflected in the *Jewish War*,” in Feldman and Hata, *Josephus, Judaism and Christianity*, 71–80.

<sup>21</sup> Y. Meshorer, *Ancient Jewish Coinage*, 2. *Herod the Great through Bar Kokhba* (New York: Amphora Books, 1982), 110.

<sup>22</sup> According to Meshorer, *Ancient Jewish Coinage* 2: 122, “Freedom suggests that the Jews expected the end of Roman domination by their hands. But in the fourth year of the war [when the inscription לְנַאֲלָה צִוָּן appeared] hope no longer focused on the power of the people. Rather, a heavenly redemption was required.”

<sup>23</sup> J. Derenbourg, *Essai sur l’histoire et la géographie de la Palestine: d’après les Thalmuds et les autres sources rabbiniques*. Première partie. *Histoire de la Palestine depuis Cyrus jusqu’à Adrien* (Paris: Imprimerie impériale, 1867), 265.

account of them in the *Bellum*.<sup>24</sup> 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.<sup>25</sup> 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).<sup>26</sup>

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).<sup>27</sup> This, therefore, was the religious

<sup>24</sup> The episode mentioned by Josephus in *B.J.* 5.25–26 of the burning of the grain stores is recounted in similar terms in *Abot de Rabbi Natan* (Version B) 6.1 and in *b. Gittin* 56a. See Hadas-Lebel, “La Tradition rabbinique,” 159–66 and A. J. Saldarini, *The Fathers According to Rabbi Nathan Version B: Translation and Commentary* (SJLA 11; Leiden: Brill, 1975), 65 n. 2 with other references.

<sup>25</sup> S. J. D. Cohen, *Josephus in Galilee and Rome*, 87; S. Schwartz, “The Composition and Publication of Josephus’s *Bellum Judaicum* Book 7,” *HTR* 97 (1986): 373–86.

<sup>26</sup> S. J. D. Cohen, “Masada: Literary Tradition, Archaeological Remains, and the Credibility of Josephus,” *JJS* 33 (1982): 385–405.

<sup>27</sup> 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,<sup>28</sup> 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 zealousness.

<sup>28</sup> The Maccabees fought on the sabbath (1 Macc 2:41). Also during the battle against Cestius Gallus the Jews fought “with no thought for the seventh day of rest, for it was the very sabbath which they regarded with special reverence” (*B.J.* 2.517). See *b. Šabb.* 19a and *t. Erub.* 4:6; M. D. Herr, “The Problem of War on the Sabbath in the Second Temple and the Talmudic Periods,” (*Hebr.*) *Tarbiz* 30 (1961): 242–56.

and of the priests) where the sacrificial altar was located, killing many adversaries, “but also ( . . . ) many of the worshippers” (*πολλοὺς τῶν ἱερουργούντων*) (*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).<sup>29</sup> 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.<sup>30</sup>

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.

<sup>29</sup> 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).

<sup>30</sup> 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.”<sup>31</sup> 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

---

<sup>31</sup> J. S. McLaren, *Turbulent Times? Josephus and Scholarship on Judaea in the First Century CE* (Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha. Supplement Series 25; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 178.

men whom he describes, with an insistence that should alert the reader, as *λησταί*, “bandits.” Brunt espouses Josephus’ thesis by affirming that “brigands and *sicarii* are the scum of the earth”;<sup>32</sup> 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.<sup>33</sup> Josephus’ credibility has been almost universally questioned.<sup>34</sup> 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”,<sup>35</sup> 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.<sup>36</sup> 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

<sup>32</sup> P. A. Brunt, “Josephus on Social Conflicts in Roman Judaea,” *Klio* 59 (1977): 150.

<sup>33</sup> Y. Baer, “Jerusalem in the Times of the Great Revolt: Based on the Source Criticism of Josephus and Talmudic-Midrashic Legends of the Temple’s Destruction,” (*Hebr.*) *Zion* 36 (1971): 127–90 and 37 (1972): 120.

<sup>34</sup> M. Goodman writes “our best source for the origins of the revolt in 66 C.E. is not to be trusted on this subject” (“The Origins of the Great Revolt: A Conflict of Status Criteria,” in *Greece and Rome in Eretz Israel: Collected Essays* [ed. A. Kasher, U. Rappaport, and G. Fuks; Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben Zvi, 1990], 39).

<sup>35</sup> M. Smith, “The Troublemakers,” 548–49.

<sup>36</sup> 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).<sup>37</sup>

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,<sup>38</sup> 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.

<sup>37</sup> Price, *Jerusalem under Siege*, 143. The episode is confirmed by Cassius Dio 65.4.4.

<sup>38</sup> *Tamid* (sc. *qorbān*), 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).<sup>39</sup> Josephus depicts him as a hero assisted by the divinity.<sup>40</sup> “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 revered from afar,” ὃν καὶ Ρωμαῖοι πόρρωθεν 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” (τῶν μέν γε στρατιωτῶν οὐκ ἔστιν ὅστις οὐ μετὰ φρίκης εἰς τὸν ναὸν ἀφεώρα

<sup>39</sup> B. W. Jones, *The Emperor Titus* (London: Croom Helm, 1984), 34–76 and “Titus in Judaea A.D. 67,” *Latomus* 48 (1989): 127–34, greatly scales down Titus’s military capabilities.

<sup>40</sup> 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.

καὶ προσεκύνει τούς τε ληστὰς ηύχετο πρὸν ἀνηκέστου πάθους μετανοῆσαι (*B.J.* 6.123).

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 indulges 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,” *δαιμονίῳ ὅρμῃ τινὶ 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” (ο μὲν οὖν ναὸς οὐτως ἄκοντος Καίσαρος ἐμπίπραται *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),<sup>41</sup> 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).

---

<sup>41</sup> 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 euentendum in primis templum censemant . . . ”.

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 Orbem 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<sup>42</sup> 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 οἰκείων, *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

---

<sup>42</sup> F. Parente, “Sulla doppia trasmissione, filosofica ed ecclesiastica, del testo di Flavio Giuseppe. Un contributo alla ricezione della sua opera nel mondo cristiano,” *Rivista di Storia e Letteratura Religiosa* 36 (2000): 3–51, esp. 17–21.

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).<sup>43</sup>

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.<sup>44</sup>

<sup>43</sup> 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.)."

<sup>44</sup> 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.<sup>45</sup> 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.<sup>46</sup> 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*

*zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch. I. Das Evangelium nach Matthäus* (München: Beck, 1926): 1043–46; M. Haran, *Temples and Temple-Service in Ancient Israel: An Inquiry into Biblical Cult Phenomena and the Historical Setting of the Priestly School* (Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 1985 2d ed.), 152–55; 161–65; 178–79; 183–84 and *passim*.

<sup>45</sup> On this see: J. Lévy, “Tacite et l’origine du peuple juif,” *Latomus* 5 (1946): 331–40; A. N. Sherwin-White, *Racial Prejudice in Imperial Rome* (J. H. Gray Lect. for 1966; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967); Z. Yavetz, “Judeophobia in Classical Antiquity: A Different Approach,” *JJS* 44 (1993): 1–22; P. Schäfer, *Judeophobia: Attitudes toward the Jews in the Ancient World* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1997).

<sup>46</sup> Hadas-Lebel, “La Tradition rabbinique,” 167–71.

*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:<sup>47</sup> 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 irremediably profaned and the Deity had definitively abandoned it. “My

<sup>47</sup> 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 ( $\tauὸ\ θεῖον$ ) 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.<sup>48</sup>

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 whosoever 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).<sup>49</sup>

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

<sup>48</sup> 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. Roš Haš.* 31a; *b. Yoma* 39b. See the commentary on the passage of Tacitus by M. Stern in *GLAJF* 2:60–62. On the *evocatio deorum* (Plin. *Nat.* 28.18 "evocari deum, cuius in tutela id oppidum esset, promittque illi eundem aut ampliorem apud Romanos culatum"): Liv. 5,21.3–7; Plut. *Quaest. rom.* 61; Servius, *Aen.* 2.351.

<sup>49</sup> 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<sup>50</sup> (תִּתְשָׁמֵם זָרֶשׁ) 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.<sup>51</sup>

<sup>50</sup> Rabbinic literature contains numerous accounts of the legends concerning the profanation of the Temple by Titus and his death as a consequence of his *ἱεροσυλία* 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.

<sup>51</sup> On the (Roman) trial of Jesus see R. E. Brown, *The Death of the Messiah* (New York: Doubleday, 1994), with further bibliog., esp. 315–22, 665–71; on the significance of the destruction of the Temple for the Christian tradition see S. G. F. Brandon, *The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church. A Study on the Effects of the Jewish Overthrow of AD 70 on Christianity* (London: SPCK, 1951); E. Fascher, "Jerusalems Untergang in der urchristlichen und altkirchlichen Überlieferung," *TLZ* 89 (1964): 81–98; Ll. Gaston, *No Stone on Another: Studies in the Significance of the Fall of Jerusalem in the Synoptic Gospels* (Suppl. to *NT* 23, Leiden: Brill, 1970).



OF AUDIENCE AND MEANING:  
READING JOSEPHUS' *BELLUM JUDAICUM* IN THE  
CONTEXT OF A FLAVIAN AUDIENCE

STEVE MASON  
YORK UNIVERSITY, TORONTO

Victor Tcherikover's 1956 essay, "Jewish Apologetic Literature Reconsidered,"<sup>1</sup> 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."<sup>2</sup> 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.<sup>3</sup> 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.<sup>4</sup> Although Josephus' use

---

<sup>1</sup> Victor Tcherikover, "Jewish Apologetic Literature Reconsidered," *Eos* 48 (1956): 169–93.

<sup>2</sup> Tcherikover, "Jewish Apologetic Literature," 186.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Per Bilde, *Flavius Josephus between Jerusalem and Rome: his Life, his Works and their Importance* (Sheffield: JSOT, 1988), 71, 92 [under "Literature"].

<sup>4</sup> See for example L. H. Feldman, *Studies in Josephus' Rewritten Bible* (Leiden: Brill, 1998); C. Begg, *Josephus' Account of the Early Divided Monarchy (AJ 8.212–420): Rewriting the Bible* (Leuven: Leuven University Press/Uitgeverij Peeters, 1993); C. Begg, *Josephus' Story of the Later Monarchy* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2000); F. M. Colautti, *Passover in the Works of Josephus* (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 13–83; D. R. Schwartz, "Josephus and Nicolaus on the Pharisees," *JSJ* 14 (1983): 157–71; D. R. Schwartz, *Agrippa I: the Last King of Judea* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1990) 1–38.

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<sup>5</sup> 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 rabbinic leadership at Yavneh, or perhaps at the Yavnean rabbis themselves.<sup>6</sup> 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.<sup>7</sup> 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?”<sup>8</sup>—some scholars have insisted that only

<sup>5</sup> W. Weber, *Josephus und Vespasian: Untersuchungen zu dem jüdischen Krieg des Flavius Josephus* (Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1921 [1973]); cf. H. Lindner, *Die Geschichtsauffassung des Flavius Josephus im Bellum Judaicum* (Leiden: Brill, 1972).

<sup>6</sup> With different emphases and nuances: R. Laqueur, *Der jüdische Historiker Flavius Josephus: ein biographischer Versuch auf neuer quellenkritischer Grundlage* (Giessen: Münchow, 1920; repr. Darmstadt: Wiss. Buchgesellschaft, 1970), 126–27; H. Rasp, “Flavius Josephus und die jüdischen Religionsparteien,” *ZNW* 23 (1924): 46; H. S. J. Thackeray, *Josephus: the Man and the Historian* (New York: Jewish Institute of Religion Press, 1929; repr. New York: Ktav Publishing House, 1967), 27, 52, 56; M. Smith, “Palestinian Judaism in the First Century,” in *Israel: Its Role in Civilization* (ed. M. Davis; New York: Harper & Brothers, 1956), 72; J. Neusner, *From Politics to Piety: the Emergence of Pharisaic Judaism* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1973); S. J. D. Cohen, *Josephus in Galilee and Rome: his Vita and Development as a Historian* (Leiden: Brill, 1979), 86, 145, 209; H. W. Attridge, “Josephus and his Works,” in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus* (ed. M. E. Stone; Assen: Van Gorcum, 1984), 200–203; S. Schwartz, *Josephus and Judaean Politics* (Leiden: Brill, 1990), 10, 199–201.

<sup>7</sup> G. E. Sterling, *Historiography and Self-definition: Josephos, Luke-Acts, and Apologetic Historiography* (Leiden: Brill, 1992), 297–308; Bilde, *Flavius Josephus between Jerusalem and Rome*, 77–78.

<sup>8</sup> Tcherikover, “Jewish Apologetic Literature,” 178.

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.<sup>9</sup>

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 *Legatio* and *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,<sup>10</sup> though he left the *War* unmentioned. But if we apply the same sort of historical logic to Josephus' *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 (*Iουδαῖοι*) in Rome (*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' *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.<sup>11</sup> 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.

<sup>9</sup> E. Migliario, "Per l'interpretazione dell'Autobiografia di Flavio Giuseppe," *Athenaeum* 59 (1981): 92, 96, 136; T. Rajak *Josephus: the Historian and his Society* (London: Duckworth, 1983), 178 (the Jewish Diaspora was Josephus' primary audience).

<sup>10</sup> Tcherikover, "Jewish Apologetic Literature," 183.

<sup>11</sup> S. Mason, "Flavius Josephus in Flavian Rome: Reading on and Between the Lines," in *Flavian Rome: Culture, Image, Text* (ed. A. J. Boyle and W. J. Dominik; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 559–89 (chiefly on the *Antiquities*, though with some attention to the *War*); "Figured Speech and Irony in T. Flavius Josephus," in *Flavius Josephus and Flavian Rome* (ed. J. Edmondson, S. Mason, and J. Rives; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 243–88 (focused on the *War* and *Life*).

## 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.<sup>12</sup> 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,

---

<sup>12</sup> 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 belletristic 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 . . . δέ constructions along with other binary contrasts, and a number of rare words or formations.<sup>13</sup> 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.<sup>14</sup> 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."<sup>15</sup> Josephus also happens to share much of their outlook on issues of internal state (*πόλις*) government and external relations with Rome, and like them he seems to draw much of this from

<sup>13</sup> Rare words: ἀτυχήματα, 1.12; ἐπηρεάζω, 1.13; προιστορέω, 1.15; ἀρχαιολογέω, 1.17; διεξοδικός, 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.

<sup>14</sup> Thackeray, *Josephus*, 104.

<sup>15</sup> I refer the reader to my introduction to the *Bellum* in *BJP* vol. 1a, *The Judean War 1–2* (Leiden: Brill, [forthcoming]).

Polybius.<sup>16</sup> The *War* contains arguably the richest surviving example of the Greek historical prologue (*B.J.* 1.1–30),<sup>17</sup> 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.<sup>18</sup>

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*,<sup>19</sup> 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,<sup>20</sup> 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

<sup>16</sup> See A. M. Eckstein, “Josephus and Polybius: A Reconsideration,” *Classical Antiquity* 9 (1990) for specific parallels; A. M. Eckstein, *Moral Vision in the Histories of Polybius* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995) for Polybius in general.

<sup>17</sup> For the standard tropes of ancient prologues, H. Lieberich, *Studien zu den Proömien in der griechischen und byzantinischen Geschichtsschreibung. I: Die griechischen Geschichtsschreiber* (Munich: J. G. Weiss, 1899); D. C. Earl, “Prologue-Form in Ancient Historiography,” *ANRW* (1972) 1.2: 842–56; and, with (happily) significant attention to Josephus, J. Marincola, *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).

<sup>18</sup> See H. Chapman, “Spectacle and Theater in Josephus’s *Bellum Judaicum*” (Ph.D. diss., Department of Classics, Stanford University, 1998), 208.

<sup>19</sup> Josephus’ last work, however (the *Apion*), returns to a highly polished rhetorical style.

<sup>20</sup> W. R. Connor, *Thucydides* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1984), 12: “the study of the audience of ancient literature is one of the most pressing items in the agenda of classical studies.” For convenient demonstration, one might consider the treatment of each author in E. J. Kenney and W. V. Clausen et al., eds., *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 5 vols., 1982–1989); more generally, C. Salles, *Lire à Rome* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1992); E. Fantham, *Roman Literary Culture: from Cicero to Apuleius* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996)—a detailed survey of literary contexts or audiences—and C. Pelling, *Literary Texts and the Greek Historian* (London: Routledge, 2000), 1–17.

and audiences),<sup>21</sup> 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,<sup>22</sup> 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

<sup>21</sup> See e.g., W. A. Meeks, *The First Urban Christians: the Social World of the Apostle Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983); C. J. Roetzel, *The Letters of Paul: Conversations in Context* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1991).

<sup>22</sup> 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.”<sup>23</sup> 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.<sup>24</sup> Although we lack the space in this essay to explore Josephus’ uses of figured language,<sup>25</sup> 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<sup>26</sup>—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.<sup>27</sup> Book production was dependent largely on the

<sup>23</sup> 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.”

<sup>24</sup> See F. Ahl, “The Art of Safe Criticism in Greece and Rome,” *AJP* 105 (1984): 174–208; V. Rudich, *Political Dissidence under Nero: the Price of Dissimulation* (London: Routledge, 1993) and idem, *Dissidence and Literature under Nero: the Price of Rhetorification* (London: Routledge, 1997); S. Bartsch, *Actors in the Audience: Theatricality and Doublespeak from Nero to Hadrian* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1994).

<sup>25</sup> See my essays “Flavius Josephus in Flavian Rome,” in *Flavian Rome: Culture, Image, Text* and “Figured Speech and Irony,” in *Flavius Josephus and Flavian Rome*.

<sup>26</sup> Tcherikover, “Jewish Apologetic Literature,” 171–74.

<sup>27</sup> See also R. J. Starr, “The Circulation of Texts in the Ancient World,” *Mnemosyne* (series 4) 40 (1987): 213–23.

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.”<sup>28</sup> 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<sup>29</sup> 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.”<sup>30</sup>

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

<sup>28</sup> Tcherikover, “Jewish Apologetic Literature,” 173.

<sup>29</sup> P. White, “The Friends of Martial, Statius, and Pliny, and the Dispersal of Patronage,” *HSCP* 79 (1975): 299; T. P. Wiseman, *Roman Studies: Literary and Historical* (Liverpool: F. Cairns, 1987), 252–56; Starr, “The Circulation of Texts”; W. V. Harris, *Ancient Literacy* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1989), 222–29; Salles, *Lire à Rome*, 94–110; Fantham, *Roman Literary Culture*, 120–21, 183–221; D. S. Potter, *Literary Texts and the Roman Historian* (London; New York: Routledge, 1999), 23–44.

<sup>30</sup> Starr, “The Circulation of Texts,” 215 n. 18.

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.<sup>31</sup> 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.<sup>32</sup> (Letters, poems, and epigrams were another story.) The leisured

<sup>31</sup> See Starr, "The Circulation of Texts," 213.

<sup>32</sup> C. W. Fornara, *The Nature of History in Ancient Greece and Rome* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983), 31; Fantham, *Roman Literary Culture*, 202–3, 214–16; Potter, *Literary Texts*, 106–10.

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.'"<sup>33</sup> 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."<sup>34</sup> 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.<sup>35</sup> 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

<sup>33</sup> Salles, *Lire à Rome*, 156: "La succès d'une œuvre littéraire dépend simultanément de l'activité des cénacles, des lectures publiques, des envois de l'écrivain à ses relations, mais, par ces procédés, la diffusion se fait en «circuit fermé»."

<sup>34</sup> See Salles, *Lire à Rome*, 156.

<sup>35</sup> See Potter, *Literary Texts*, 33–7.

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.<sup>36</sup> 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.”<sup>37</sup>

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 (*ἐκδοσίς*)<sup>38</sup> 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

<sup>36</sup> Potter, *Literary Texts*, 29–33.

<sup>37</sup> Starr, “The Circulation of Texts,” 216–17.

<sup>38</sup> Cf. B. van Groningen, “EKDOSIS,” *Mnemosyne* 16 (1963): 1–17; Potter, *Literary Texts*, 32.

beside the private channels . . .”<sup>39</sup> 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.<sup>40</sup> (Even his younger contemporary Thucydides, the model of dense historical writing, may have recited some of his work.)<sup>41</sup> Although it might seem bizarre to moderns that audiences would sit through sessions long enough to cover much historical narrative,<sup>42</sup> we should remember that in many parts of the world even today it is common to listen to political speeches of several hours’ duration.

<sup>39</sup> Starr, “The Circulation of Texts,” 221.

<sup>40</sup> R. Thomas, *Herodotus in Context: Ethnography, Science and the Art of Persuasion* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2000), 249–69; L. Kurke, “Charting the Poles of History: Herodotus and Thucydides,” in *Literature in the Greek World* (ed. O. Taplin; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 118–22.

<sup>41</sup> S. Hornblower, *Thucydides* (London, Duckworth, 1984), 29; M. Munn, *The School of History: Athens in the Age of Socrates* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000), 315–23.

<sup>42</sup> 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 ἀκούσαντες) 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 evoking 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 βίβλος) 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 [προγμοτείο: 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 (*συνεργοί*) or literary friends<sup>43</sup> in the capital for this massive project, we again witness a

<sup>43</sup> 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 (εὐθύς) delivering (same verb) the *historia* to "many others" (ἄλλοις δὲ πολλοῖς). 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 (πολλοῖς δὲ τῶν ἡμετέρων ἐπίπρασκον). Among these *purchasers* are King Agrippa, the king's brother-in-law Julius Archelaus, and an elusive "most dignified Herod."<sup>44</sup> 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),<sup>45</sup> 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

<sup>44</sup> 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).

<sup>45</sup> Cohen, *Josephus in Galilee and Rome*, 84–90; Schwartz, *Josephus and Judean Politics*.

the 70s (Agrippa and his sister arrived in 75)<sup>46</sup> 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 *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’ *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 *principes*. Obvious candidates are the surviving legionary legates from the war, such as: Sextus Vettulenus Cerialis (*legio V Macedonica*) and M. Titius Frugi (*legio XV Apollinaris*), the former of whom Josephus had once accompanied on a reconnaissance trip (*Vita* 420; cf. *B.J.* 6.236–237); the tribune Nicanor, who had reportedly been a friend of Josephus (*B.J.* 3.344–346); and Masada’s conqueror L. Flavius Silva Nonius Bassus.<sup>47</sup>

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 book-sellers—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.<sup>48</sup> 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

<sup>46</sup> Dio 66.15.3–4; Kokkinos, *The Herodian Dynasty*, 329.

<sup>47</sup> For fuller discussion see W. Eck and H. Cotton, “Josephus’ Roman Audience: Josephus and the Roman Elites,” in *Flavius Josephus and Flavian Rome*, ed. Edmondson, Mason, and Rives (Oxford: Oxford University Press 2005), 37–52.

<sup>48</sup> 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 δημοσιῶσαι προσέταξεν*, *Vita* 363), which may have meant nothing more than deposit in one of the new imperial libraries.<sup>49</sup> 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 προγμάτων), 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.

<sup>49</sup> 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 (*λόγοι*) were included in Rome’s library—which ones, we are not told.

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.<sup>50</sup> 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,<sup>51</sup> 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<sup>52</sup> and it is clearly reflected in Lucian.<sup>53</sup> But all of this happened before

<sup>50</sup> See E. L. Bowie, “The Greeks and their Past in the Second Sophistic,” *Past and Present* 46 (1974): 3–41; S. Swain, *Hellenism and Empire: Language, Classicism, and Power in the Greek World, AD 50–250* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996).

<sup>51</sup> See J. P. V. D. Balsdon, *Romans and Aliens* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1979), 30–54.

<sup>52</sup> See Bowie, “The Greeks and their Past.”

<sup>53</sup> 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*.<sup>54</sup> 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 Πομπαίων ἡγεμονίαν), as a counterpart to the equally vague "upper barbarians" graced with his prior accounts of the conflict in Aramaic.<sup>55</sup> 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.

---

<sup>54</sup> For other readings of *B.J.* 1.13–16, some of which indeed speculate about Josephus' conditions in Rome, see S. Mason, *Flavius Josephus on the Pharisees: a Composition-Critical Study* (Leiden: Brill, 1991), 71–5.

<sup>55</sup> 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.”<sup>56</sup> 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

<sup>56</sup> 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.<sup>57</sup> 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

---

<sup>57</sup> 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.<sup>58</sup> 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!<sup>59</sup> 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. Quintilius] 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.,<sup>60</sup> 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

<sup>58</sup> E.g., *Cambridge History of Classical Literature* 2.3: 39, 57, 93, 102.

<sup>59</sup> Cf. Suetonius, *Tit.* 7 and thereto B. W. Jones and R. Milns, *Suetonius: The Flavian Emperors, A Historical Commentary* (London: Bristol Classical Press, 2002), 107.

<sup>60</sup> 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.<sup>61</sup> 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 (δι’ ὅχλου πᾶσιν ἐστιν) 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.<sup>62</sup> An elite audience in

<sup>61</sup> 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.

<sup>62</sup> 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 Σεβαστός), *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 οἰκεία), 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),<sup>63</sup> and one even tries to interpret the *War* as an ongoing intertextual play vis-à-vis Thucydides.<sup>64</sup> 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 *seditio*, 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 (νοσέω)—a verb commonly applied in Greek and Latin literature to the blight of factionalism.<sup>65</sup> Twice again in the opening prospectus he makes the same link, by distinguishing the Romans from Pompey (1.19) and by mentioning the upheavals (μεταβολαί) 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.

<sup>63</sup> E.g. Rajak, *Josephus*, 91–94; L. H. Feldman, *Josephus's Interpretation of the Bible* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998), 140–48; G. Mader, *Josephus and the Politics of Historiography: Apologetic and Impression Management in the Bellum Judaicum* (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 55–103; cf. J. J. Price, *Thucydides and Internal War* (Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001) on the Thucydidean background.

<sup>64</sup> Cf. Mader in the previous note.

<sup>65</sup> Thucydides 2.48–59; Plato, *Resp.* 5.470c, *Soph.* 228a; Sallust, *Bell. Cat.* 36.5; *Hist.* 2.77m; Tacitus, *Ann.* 1.43.4; *Hist.* 1.26.1; cf. E. Keitel, “Principate and Civil War in the *Annals* of Tacitus,” *AJP* 105 (1984): 320 and n. 32.

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 ἐμφύλιος*), internal factionalism (*διαστασιάζω*) 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,<sup>66</sup> 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

<sup>66</sup> This is, e.g., the dominant theme of Plutarch's *Praecepta gerenda 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”),<sup>67</sup> against the background of a Roman audience's likely knowledge<sup>68</sup> it seems more plausible that Josephus was practicing “the art of safe criticism”<sup>69</sup> through an obvious and excessive flattery.

Audience matters: the stakes are enormous.

<sup>67</sup> Cohen, *Josephus in Galilee and Rome*, 87.

<sup>68</sup> Suetonius, *Dom.* 2; Tacitus, *Hist.* 4.75–85.

<sup>69</sup> See Ahl, “The Art of Safe Criticism.”

## THE PROVINCIAL HISTORIAN IN ROME

JONATHAN J. PRICE  
TEL AVIV UNIVERSITY

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 C.E. 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,<sup>1</sup> 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

---

<sup>1</sup> See now the large assortment of articles in A. J. Boyle and W. J. Dominik, eds., *Flavian Rome: Culture, Image, Text* (Leiden: Brill, 2003), and the excellent discussion by E. Fantham, *Roman Literary Culture from Cicero to Apuleius* (Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996), esp. 183–221. Also useful are L. Homo, *Vespasien, L'empereur de bon sens (69–79 ap. J.-C.)* (Paris: A. Michel, 1949), 347–64; and the two articles in *ANRW* II 32.5 (1986), S. Franchet d'Espéry, “Vespasien, Titus et la littérature,” 3048–86, and K. M. Coleman, “The Emperor Domitian and Literature,” 3087–115.

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.<sup>2</sup> 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.<sup>3</sup> *Roma resurgens* was the motto advertised on Flavian coins.<sup>4</sup> 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*.<sup>5</sup> 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,”<sup>6</sup> 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-

<sup>2</sup> See the interesting discussion of Josephus’ audiences (with the focus more on the *Antiquitates Judaicae*) by G. Sterling, *History and Self-Definition: Josephus, Luke-Acts and Apologetic History* (Leiden: Brill, 1992), 297–308.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. the literature listed in n. 1 above.

<sup>4</sup> British Museum Catalogue of Coins of the Roman Empire II, 87 no. 425.

<sup>5</sup> E.g. AE 1936 no. 128. Quintilian was not unconnected to the Jews, for he represented Berenice in litigation, and was tutor to the children of Flavius Clemens, who was executed for atheism i.e. Judaism in 95.

<sup>6</sup> Fantham, *Roman Literary Culture*, 191.

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,<sup>7</sup> 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.<sup>8</sup> 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

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Pliny, *Ep.* 5.8, Juvenal, *Sat.* 7.98–104, Quintilian, *Inst.* 10.1.

<sup>8</sup> Late Republic and Augustus: fuller list and discussion in G. Bowersock, *Augustus and the Greek World* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965), 122–39; see also K. Sacks, *Diodorus Siculus and the First Century* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990), 187 ff. Timagenes of course fell out of favor with Augustus, but he took refuge in the home of Asinius Pollio; on the phenomenon of subversive historians, see D. Timpe, “Geschichtsschreibung und Prinzipatsopposition,” in *Opposition et résistances à l’empire d’Auguste à Trajan*, (Entretiens vol. 33; ed. Kurt A. Raaffaub; Geneva: Fondation Hardt, 1987), 65–102. Second century: G. Bowersock, *Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969), esp. 113: “Opportunities for historians to make their way in the world were all too numerous.”

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.<sup>9</sup>

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."<sup>10</sup> 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.<sup>11</sup>

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

<sup>9</sup> Bowersock, *Greek Sophists*, 44.

<sup>10</sup> 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.

<sup>11</sup> 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:<sup>12</sup> 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,<sup>13</sup> would have mentioned connections with a prominent Roman family had he been

<sup>12</sup> In *Flavius Josephus and Flavian Rome*, (ed. J. Edmondson, S. Mason and J. Rives; Oxford: Oxford University Press, forthcoming). On emerging élites under Vespasian see in general R. Syme, *Tacitus* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958), 593–97.

<sup>13</sup> G. Mader, *Josephus and the Politics of Historiography: Apologetic and Impression Management in the Bellum Judaicum* (Leiden: Brill, 1997).

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<sup>14</sup> 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.<sup>15</sup> 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

<sup>14</sup> 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.

<sup>15</sup> In addition to Eck, in *Flavius Josephus and Flavian Rome*, cf. C. P. Jones, "Towards a Chronology of Josephus," *SCI* 21 (2002): 113–21, esp. 114–15.

copies, or merely the parts concerning themselves to confirm their veracity, but many works were presented to them by conscientious or enthusiastic authors.<sup>16</sup> 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” (φαῦλοι) 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 (ἀλλόφυλος) 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

---

<sup>16</sup> 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.<sup>17</sup>

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,<sup>18</sup> 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 pre-

<sup>17</sup> GLA77 1:455–57.

<sup>18</sup> *Hist. ecol.* 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*.<sup>19</sup> These chapters represent the typical attitude of the Roman upper classes towards Judaism in Josephus' time and long afterwards.<sup>20</sup> 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).<sup>21</sup>

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.<sup>22</sup> The first sentence is a dazzling *tour de force*—or inordinately long, depending on the reader's taste—containing most of the conventional,

<sup>19</sup> See *GLAJJ* 2:17–63, no. 281, and the extensive bibliog. there.

<sup>20</sup> M. Stern, "Antisemitism in Rome," in *Antisemitism Through the Ages* (ed. S. Almog; Oxford: Pergamon, 1988), 13–25; J. Gager, *The Origins of Anti-Semitism: Attitudes toward Judaism in Pagan and Christian Antiquity* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1983), 35–112; and now P. Schäfer, *Judeophobia: Attitudes towards the Jews in the Ancient World* (Cambridge, Mass. and London: Harvard University Press, 1997), esp. 180–95.

<sup>21</sup> *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).

<sup>22</sup> 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 μέγιστον κίνημα*), the profession of strict accuracy (*ἀκρίβεια*) 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.<sup>23</sup>

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,<sup>24</sup> 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.<sup>25</sup> 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

<sup>23</sup> Lucian, *Hist. conscr.*, esp. 15; and see G. Avenarius, *Lukians Schrift zur Geschichtsschreibung* (Meisenheim/Glan: Anton Hain, 1956), esp. 113–18.

<sup>24</sup> T. J. Luce, “Ancient Views on the Causes of Bias in Historical Writing,” *CP* 84 (1989): 16–31.

<sup>25</sup> J. Marincola, *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 158–74.

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.<sup>26</sup>

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 ιστορίᾳ προσκρινέτω, τὰς δ’ ὄλοφύρσεις 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

---

<sup>26</sup> 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,<sup>27</sup> 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.<sup>28</sup> 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

<sup>27</sup> 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.

<sup>28</sup> But see F. W. Walbank, "The Idea of Decline in Polybius," in idem, *Polybius, Rome and the Hellenistic World: Essays and Reflections* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 193–211; also idem, "Polybius' Last Ten Books," in idem, *Selected Papers: Studies in Greek and Roman History and Historiography* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 325–43.

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

By contrast,<sup>29</sup> 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,<sup>30</sup> 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.<sup>31</sup> 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 στάσις 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

<sup>29</sup> Four recent comparisons of Polybius and Josephus offer conclusions different from the ones presented here: S. J. D. Cohen, “Josephus, Jeremiah and Polybius,” *History and Theory* 21 (1982): 366–81; A. Eckstein, “Josephus and Polybius: A Reconsideration,” *Classical Antiquity* 9 (1990): 175–208; F. W. Walbank, “‘Treason’ and Roman Domination: Two Case-studies, Polybius and Josephus,” in *idem, Polybius, Rome and the Hellenistic World*, 258–76; G. Sterling, “Explaining Defeat: Polybius and Josephus on the Wars with Rome,” in *Internationales Josephus-Kolloquium, Aarhus 1999* (ed. J. Kalms; Münster: Lit, 2000), 135–51.

<sup>30</sup> On Josephus’ theology and its place in the interpretation of the war—relevant for what follows—see T. Rajak, *Josephus: The Historian and his Society* (London: Duckworth, 1983), 78–103; and now P. Spilsbury, “Josephus,” in *Justification and Variegated Nomism* (2 vols.; ed. D. A. Carson, P. T. O’Brien and M. A. Seifrid; Tübingen: Mohr; Grand Rapids: Baker, 2001–2004), 1:241–60, with bibliog.

<sup>31</sup> Note 2 Macc 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).<sup>32</sup> 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

<sup>32</sup> See H. Lindner, *Die Geschichtsauffassung des Flavius Josephus im Bellum Judaicum* (Leiden: Brill, 1972), 21–33; E. Gabba, “L'impero romano nel discorso di Agrippa II,” *Rivista storica dell'antichità* 6–7 (1976–1977): 189–94.

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.<sup>33</sup> 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.<sup>34</sup> Josephus never wrote an encomium

<sup>33</sup> 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.).

<sup>34</sup> 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.<sup>35</sup> 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] “*tyche* had passed over to them from every side—God, who brought dominion round to each nation in turn, now was over Italy.”<sup>36</sup>

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.<sup>37</sup> 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,<sup>38</sup> but the introduction of τύχη as historical explanation had a long tradition, even and especially among the more “scientific”

Tacitus, *Hist.* 4.73–74; Philo, *Leg.* 143–147; both aptly quoted by Stern (previous note), 385.

<sup>35</sup> See e.g. D. Balch, “Two Apologetic Encomia: Dionysius on Rome and Josephus on the Jews,” *JSJ* 13 (1982): 102–22.

<sup>36</sup> μεταβῆναι γὰρ πρὸς αὐτὸὺς πάντοθεν τὴν τύχην, καὶ κατὰ ξένος τὸν θεὸν ἐμπεριόγοντα τὴν ἀρχὴν νῦν ἐπὶ τῆς Ἰταλίας εἰναι (*B.J.* 5.367). Similar statements in *B.J.* 2.360 (Agrippa’s speech) and *B.J.* 3.354 (Josephus as prophet); cf. Sterling, “Explaining Defeat,” 145–46. Oddly, the present passage is not analyzed by R. Shutt, “The Concept of God in the Works of Flavius Josephus,” *JJS* 31 (1980): 171–87, although he examines the relation between God and fortune in Josephus’ writings.

<sup>37</sup> On the interpretation that follows, I disagree with Eckstein, “Josephus and Polybius,” and G. Stählin, “Das Schicksal im Neuen Testament und bei Josephus,” in *Josephus-Studien* (ed. O. Betz, K. Haacker and M. Hengel; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974), 319–43; cf. Rajak, *Josephus*, 101.

<sup>38</sup> A. Momigliano, “Popular Religious Beliefs and the Late Roman Historians,” in *Quinto contributo alla storia degli studi classici e del mondo antico* (Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 1975), 74–92.

historians like Polybius.<sup>39</sup> 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

---

<sup>39</sup> On Polybius’ concept of τύχη, see F. W. Walbank, *Polybius* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1972), 58–65.

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.<sup>40</sup>

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.<sup>41</sup> 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*,<sup>42</sup> as did other Roman historians writing in Greek, like Dionysius and Appian.

<sup>40</sup> 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.”

<sup>41</sup> 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.

<sup>42</sup> A point nicely made by M. Goodman, “Josephus as a Roman Citizen,” in *Josephus and the History of the Greco-Roman Period: Essays in Memory of Morton Smith* (ed. F. Parente and J. Sievers; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 329–38. Note also the classic article by Z. Yavetz, “Reflections on Titus and Josephus” cited above.

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.”<sup>1</sup> 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.<sup>2</sup>

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.”<sup>3</sup> We, like his audience living under Roman rule, read his extant western account of the war, for which Josephus states that he “used some

<sup>1</sup> V. Nabokov, *Lolita* (New York: Putnam, 1955), essay dated November 12, 1956, in appendix.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> *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: χρησάμενός 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 φωνή 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: “φωνὴ ἀπὸ ἀνατολῆς, φωνὴ 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:

ἔχω γὰρ ὅμολογούμενον παρὰ τῶν ὁμοεθνῶν πλεῖστον αὐτῶν κατὰ τὴν ἐπιχώριον καὶ παρ’ ἡμῖν παιδείαν διαφέρειν καὶ τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν δὲ γραμμάτων καὶ ποιητικῶν μαθημάτων πολλὰ ἐσπούδασα μετασχεῖν τὴν γραμματικὴν ἐμπειρίαν ἀναλαβών, 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.<sup>4</sup>

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 πολλά 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:<sup>5</sup>

<sup>4</sup> *A.J.* 20.263 (trans. Feldman, LCL), with his alternatives in his footnotes.

<sup>5</sup> 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 συνεργός. 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 συνεργοί, or hired the συνεργοί 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."<sup>6</sup> 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.<sup>7</sup> 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."<sup>8</sup> We should, therefore, keep our

<sup>6</sup> *Vita* 40 (trans. Mason, BJP 9).

<sup>7</sup> *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.

<sup>8</sup> L. Ullmann and J. Price, "Drama and History in Josephus' *Bellum Judaicum*," *SCI* 21 (2002): 97–111, here 98.

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,<sup>9</sup> 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,<sup>10</sup> 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-

<sup>9</sup> On this issue, see U. Eco, "Between author and text," in *Interpretation and Overinterpretation* (ed. S Collini; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 67–88.

<sup>10</sup> J. Pucci, *The Full-Knowing Reader: Allusion and the Power of the Reader in the Western Literary Tradition* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998), 52.

tencies of a powerful reader, a task inherited and vigorously developed by Christian littérateurs in late antiquity and the Middle Ages.<sup>11</sup>

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 *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 cultural 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.”<sup>12</sup> This education in Greek literature seems to be considered a prerequisite 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 (*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.’<sup>13</sup>

Writing a truly excellent piece of literature like the *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 succeeded in producing a prose history, the *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

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, 47–48. Pucci combats the notion that allusion is the same as the ancient ideas of *imitatio* or μίμησις on 86.

<sup>12</sup> *Vita* 359, trans. Mason, BJP 9.

<sup>13</sup> Donatus, *Life of Virgil* 186, transl. in D. A. Russell, *Criticism in Antiquity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981), 188–89.

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 oratori esse vitandas. Est enim proxima poetis et quodammodo cōrū 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.<sup>14</sup>

In Quintilian's opinion, historiography can be a *quodammodo cōrū 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<sup>15</sup> permeate Josephus' *Bellum* is indisputable. H. St. J. Thackeray published his famous series of lectures in which he discusses Josephus' use of Attic tragedians,<sup>16</sup> and he also edited the Loeb version of the *Bellum* with an eye towards Josephus' literary borrowings.<sup>17</sup> 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*.<sup>18</sup> Thackeray proceeds to offer briefly specific examples of borrowings in the *Bellum* from Thucydides, Herodotus, Xenophon, Demosthenes, Homer, Sophocles,

<sup>14</sup> 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).

<sup>15</sup> R. Thomas chooses to use the term "reference" instead of "allusion" in his *Reading Virgil and his Texts: Studies in Intertextuality* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1999). W. Petrovitz, "Towards a Grammar of Allusion: A Cross-Linguistic Study of Vergil's Seventh *Bucolic*," *CW* 96.3 (2003): 259–70, conveniently describes recent modern classical scholarship on allusion. Also see S. Hinds, *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998).

<sup>16</sup> H. St. J. Thackeray, *Josephus: the Man and the Historian* (New York: Jewish Institute of Religion Press, 1929).

<sup>17</sup> H. St. J. Thackeray, ed. and tr., *Josephus, The Jewish War, Books I–III* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927), xvi–xix.

<sup>18</sup> Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 1.8, in Thackeray, *The Jewish War*, xvi, n. b.

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*.<sup>19</sup> Feldman's most sweeping study appears in his paper entitled "The Influence of the Greek Tragedians on Josephus,"<sup>20</sup> 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<sup>21</sup> 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":

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  
 Thucydidis, 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.<sup>22</sup>

<sup>19</sup> The sacrifice of Isaac is found in *A.J.* 1.222–236. See L. H. Feldman, "Josephus as Biblical Interpreter: The 'Aqedah,'" *JQR* 75.3 (1985): 212–52, and also his summary of hellenizations in Josephus in his chapter "Mikra in the Writings of Josephus," in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity* (ed. M. J. Mulder; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988), 481–85.

<sup>20</sup> L. H. Feldman, "The Influence of the Greek Tragedians on Josephus," in *The Howard Gilman International Conferences I: Hellenic and Jewish Arts* (ed. A. Ovadiah; Tel Aviv University: RAMOT Publishing House, 1998), 51–80.

<sup>21</sup> For a recent study of Roman education, see R. Cribiore, *Education in Greek and Roman Antiquity* (Leiden: Brill, 2001).

<sup>22</sup> 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:<sup>23</sup> Homer, Pindar, Sophocles, and Euripides.<sup>24</sup> 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.<sup>25</sup> 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

<sup>23</sup> 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."

<sup>24</sup> Ø. 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.

<sup>25</sup> *C. Ap.* 1.12.

lied and said that he was talking about Hector.”<sup>26</sup> 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 δειλοί (“poor wretches!”) derived from both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* and used in Josephus’ own set speech in Book 5.<sup>27</sup> Two decades later Thackeray provided a fine, short list of Homeric words<sup>28</sup> 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 κειμηλίων*).<sup>29</sup> He continues:

τοὺς δὲ ἀρχιερεῖς αὐτοὺς ἦν ιδεῖν καταμωμένους μὲν τῆς κεφαλῆς κόνιν, γυμνοὺς δὲ τὰ στέρνα τῶν ἐσθήτων διερρηγμένων (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 *κειμήλιον* 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.<sup>30</sup> 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.

<sup>26</sup> Suetonius, *Nero* 22.

<sup>27</sup> A. Wolff, *De Flavii Josephi Belli Iudaici Scriptoris Studiis Rhetoricis* (Halis Saxonum, 1908), 9, referring to B.J. 2.347 and 5.376. Wolff does not provide the Homeric citations, but ἀ δειλοί is found at *Il.* 17.201 and *Od.* 20.351.

<sup>28</sup> Thackeray, *The Jewish War*, xviii.

<sup>29</sup> B.J. 2.321.

<sup>30</sup> 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 (*περιρρηξάμενος μὲν τὴν ἐσθήτα, 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,<sup>31</sup> for instance. The verb *καταμάω*, however, is extremely rare in extant Greek literature<sup>32</sup> 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:

ἀμφὶ δὲ πολλὴ  
κόπρος ἔην κεφαλῆ τε καὶ αὐχένι τοῦ γέροντος  
τὴν ρὰ κυλινδόμενος καταμῆσατο χερσὶν ἔησι. (*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 Homer<sup>33</sup> and perhaps even to a choral ode in Sophocles' *Antigone*, which, however, is a highly debated passage.<sup>34</sup> [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

<sup>31</sup> 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.

<sup>32</sup> 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 *κατακούμσονται*.

<sup>33</sup> Achilles leaves Hector's corpse in the dust: *Iliad* 24.18.

<sup>34</sup> Sophocles may have changed the Homeric dung to dust/ash (*κονίς*) 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 *κονίς*, but Jortin suggested *κοτίς*, which was then adopted by later editors.

as an ἀνὴρ ἄριστος<sup>35</sup> 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,<sup>36</sup> 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<sup>37</sup> 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.<sup>38</sup> 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.<sup>39</sup> Josephus then conjures up the following death curse:

ἀναιρούμενος δὲ ὁ Νίγερ τιμωροὺς Ῥωμαίους αὐτοῖς ἐπηράσατο λιμόν τε καὶ λοιμὸν ἐπὶ τῷ πολέμῳ καὶ πρὸς ἀπασι τὰς ἀλλήλων χεῖρας· ἀ δὴ πάντα κατὰ τῶν ἀσεβῶν ἐκύρωσεν ὁ θεός, καὶ τὸ δικαιότατον, ὅτι γεύσασθαι τῆς ἀλλήλων ἀπονοίας ἔμελλον οὐκ εἰς 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.<sup>40</sup> Josephus’ readers could certainly grasp and appreciate the clear allusion to Hector’s death scene in Homer, which would bring with it

<sup>35</sup> *B.J.* 4.359. For instance, Agamemnon is ἄριστος at *Iliad* 2.580, as is Telamonian Ajax at 2.768 (while Achilles is away).

<sup>36</sup> 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.”

<sup>37</sup> Josephus uses ἐσύρετο (from σύρω) here instead of the Homeric ἔλκω. A much later poet, Leontius (6th cent. C.E.), uses both verbs, ἔλκω and σύρω, to describe Hector’s demise: καὶ πάλι ζωστὴρ εἴλκυσε Πριαμίδην δίφρια συρόμενον, “and the belt dragged Hector, who was being dragged behind his chariot” (*Anth.Pal.* 7.152.5–6).

<sup>38</sup> *B.J.* 4.359–360; Hector begs at *Iliad* 22.338–343.

<sup>39</sup> See note above on verbs of dragging. For begging, see *B.J.* 4.360: ικέτευεν; cf. *Iliad* 22.338 λισσομ’ ὑπέρ ψυχὴν κτλ and 22.345 γούνων γουνάζεω.

<sup>40</sup> Homer, *Iliad* 22.358–360.

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 λιμός (famine) and λοιμός (plague), which he has already employed in Herod's speech after an earthquake in Book 1.<sup>41</sup> This is a time-honored pairing in Greek literature dating back to Hesiod, Herodotus, and Thucydides, which his readers would immediately recognize.<sup>42</sup> 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.<sup>43</sup> But λοιμός also recalls the plague<sup>44</sup> 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.),<sup>45</sup> 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."<sup>46</sup> 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

<sup>41</sup> *B.J.* 1.377. At *B.J.* 4.137 Destinon suggests λοιμός for λιμός 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*.

<sup>42</sup> Hesiod, *Op.* 243; Herodotus 7.171; Thucydides 2.54.

<sup>43</sup> Josephus later uses Thucydides' description of the plague in his account of the death of Herod in *A.J.* 17.168, as D. Ladouceur has convincingly shown in "The Death of Herod The Great," *CP* 76 (1981): 25–34.

<sup>44</sup> Homer, *Iliad* 1.43 ff., and 60 for λοιμός.

<sup>45</sup> Hecuba wishes she could do virtually the same with Achilles at *Iliad* 24.212–213.

<sup>46</sup> *B.J.* 4.541: δι’ ὑπερβολὴν ἀγανακτήσεως μονονοχὶ καὶ νεκρῶν γενόμενος τῶν σωμάτων. 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 Quintilian<sup>47</sup> 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.<sup>48</sup> 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.<sup>49</sup> 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.<sup>50</sup> 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,<sup>51</sup> 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, φθόνος,

<sup>47</sup> Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Comp.* 22, at length on Pindar; Quintilian, *Inst.* 8.6.71: *apud principem lyricorum Pindarum*, and 10.1.61.

<sup>48</sup> Pindar was already a major source for the poets of Rome; see, for instance, Horace, *Carm.* 4.2: *Pindarum quisquis studet aemulari*.

<sup>49</sup> 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.

<sup>50</sup> *C. Ap.* 2.239 ff., esp. 244.

<sup>51</sup> Pindar, *Ol.* 1.35–45.

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 τε Ἰωάννου καὶ τῶν παίδων φθόνος ἐγείρει στάσιν τῶν ἐπιχωρίων, καὶ πολλοὶ κατ’ αὐτῶν συνελθόντες οὐκ ἡρέμουν, μέχρι καὶ πρὸς φανερὸν πόλεμον ἐκριπτοθέντες ἡττῶνται. τὸ λοιπὸν δ’ ἐπιβιοὺς ἐν εὐδαιμονίᾳ Ἰωάννης καὶ τὰς κατὰ τὴν ἀρχὴν κάλλιστα διοικήσας ἐν τρισὶν ὅλοις καὶ τριάκοντα ἔτεσιν ἐπὶ πέντε νιοῖς τελευτᾷ, μακαριστὸς ὄντως καὶ κατὰ μῆδὲν ἕάσας ἐφ’ ἑσυτῷ μεμφθῆναι τὴν τύχην. (B.J. 1.67–68)

‘Υρκανῷ δὲ φθόνον ἐκίνησεν παρὰ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἡ εὐπραγία, μάλιστα δ’ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι κακῶς πρὸς αὐτὸν εἶχον, αἵρεσις ὄντες μία τῶν Ἰουδαίων, ὡς καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἐπάνω δεδηλώκαμεν. τοσαῦτην δὲ ἔχουσι τὴν ἰσχὺν παρὰ τῷ πλήθει, ὡς καὶ κατὰ βασιλέως τι λέγοντες καὶ κατ’ ἀρχιερέως εὐθὺς πιστεύεσθαι. (A.J. 13.288; 289–298 on Hyrcanus and the Pharisees and Sadducees)

‘Υρκανὸς δὲ παύσας τὴν στάσιν καὶ μετ’ αὐτὴν βιώσας εὐδαιμόνως καὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν διοικησάμενος ἄριστον τρόπον ἔτεσιν ἐνὶ καὶ τριάκοντα τελευτᾷ καταλιπὼν υἱὸνς πέντε, τριῶν τῶν μεγίστων ἄξιος ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ κριθείς, ἀρχῆς τοῦ ἔθνους καὶ τῆς ἀρχιερατικῆς τιμῆς καὶ προφητείας· συνῆν γὰρ αὐτῷ τὸ θεῖον καὶ τὴν τῶν μελλόντων πρόγνωσιν παρείχεν αὐτῷ τε εἰδέναι καὶ προλέγειν οὕτως, ὥστε καὶ περὶ τῶν δύο τῶν πρεσβυτέρων παίδων ὅτι μὴ μενούσιν τῶν πραγμάτων κύριοι προείπεν. ὧν τὴν καταστροφὴν εἰς τὸ μαθεῖν ὅσον τῆς τοῦ πατρὸς ὑπέβησαν εὐτυχίας ἄξιον ἀφήγησασθαι. (A.J. 13.299–300)

‘Ο δὲ τοῦ Λευεῖ παῖς Ἰωάννης, ὃν ἔφαμεν ἐν τοῖς Γιοχάλοις διατρίβειν, πυθόμενος πάντα κατὰ νοῦν μοι προχωρεῖν, καὶ δι’ εὔνοίας<sup>52</sup> μὲν εἰναί με τοῖς ὑπηκόοις, τοῖς πολεμίοις δὲ δι’ ἐκπλήξεως, οὐκ εὖ τὴν γνώμην ἐτέθη, καταλύσιν δ’ αὐτῷ τὴν ἐμὴν εὐπραγίαν φέρειν νομίζων εἰς φθόνον ἐξώκειλεν οὗτι μέτριον. καὶ παύσειν με τῆς εὐτυχίας ἐλπίσας, εἰ παρὰ τῶν ὑπηκόων μῆσος ἐξάψειεν, ἐπειθεν τοὺς τὴν Τιβεριάδα κατοικοῦντας καὶ τοὺς τὴν Σέπφωριν [νομίζων] πρὸς τούτοις δὲ καὶ τοὺς Γάβαρα, πόλεις δ’ εἰσὶν αὗται τῶν κατὰ τὴν Γαλιλαίαν αἱ μέγισται, τῆς πρὸς με πίστεως ἀποστάντας αὐτῷ προστίθεσθαι· κρείττον γάρ ἐμοῦ στρατηγήσειν αὐτῶν ἔφασκεν. (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.<sup>53</sup> Mason, furthermore, recently has noted the themes found here, including Greek philosophical views on envy, in his commen-

<sup>52</sup> This appears again in Vita 125.

<sup>53</sup> J. Sievers, *The Hasmoneans and Their Supporters: From Mattathias to the Death of John Hyrcanus* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990), 146–52; S. Mason, *Flavius Josephus on the Pharisees. A Composition-Critical Study* (Leiden: Brill, 1991), 213–45.

tary on the *Vita*.<sup>54</sup> 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.”<sup>55</sup> Mason observes that the sentiment expressed in these passages about success breeding envy is a commonplace of Hellenistic historiography and “a characteristic Josephan theme.”<sup>56</sup> 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 εὐπραγία, 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 εύτυχία and εύνοια; εύτυχία has already appeared as an additional element in the frame for the *Antiquitates* passage, and εύνοια 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*:

ὦ Μεγάκλεες, ὑμαί τε καὶ προγόνων.  
νέα δ' εὐπραγία χαίρω τι· τὸ δ' ἄχνυμαι,  
φθόνον ἀμειβόμενον τὰ καλὰ ἔργα. φαντί γε μὰν  
οὕτῳ κεν ἀνδρὶ παρμονίμῳ  
θάλλοισαν εὐδαιμονίαν  
τὰ καὶ τὰ φέρεσθαι. (13–18)

Appearing here are the three terms, εὐπραγία, φθόνος, and εὐδαιμονία, which Josephus has used in the same order to describe John Hyrcanus, his “hero”<sup>57</sup> 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

<sup>54</sup> Mason, *Life of Josephus* (BJP 9), 66, n. 435, and 78–79, n. 591–592.

<sup>55</sup> Sievers, *The Hasmoneans*, 147.

<sup>56</sup> Mason, *Flavius Josephus on the Pharisees*, 225–26.

<sup>57</sup> *Ibid.*, 225.

but altered in the *Antiquitates* 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,<sup>58</sup> 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 *Antiquitates*, has posed real problems of narrative coherence,<sup>59</sup> 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 ὁμφαλός 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."<sup>60</sup> Though Josephus does not mention any temple-related construction projects in

<sup>58</sup> See *Vita* 2 on his connections through his mother to the Hasmoneans.

<sup>59</sup> Mason, *Flavius Josephus on the Pharisees*, 219.

<sup>60</sup> C. M. Bowra, *The Odes of Pindar* (New York: Penguin, 1969), 35, n. 9; Herodotus 5.62.

the *Bellum* passage on John Hyrcanus, the historian does soon mention Hyracanus' 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 subripendi causa, sed palam mutuandi, hoc animo ut vellet agnosci*.<sup>61</sup> 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 Hyracanus' 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 prefacing 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 οίκτείρας πρὸς τὴν μεταβολὴν ἐπεγέλασέν τε ἀκρατῶς καὶ Ἀντιγόνην ἐκάλεσεν· οὐ μὴν ὡς γυναικά γε καὶ φρουρᾶς ἐλεύθερον ἀφῆκεν, ἀλλ’ ὁ μὲν δεθεῖς ἐψυλάττετο (*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

<sup>61</sup> 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,<sup>62</sup> 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)."<sup>63</sup> 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:

πᾶσαν κόνιν σήραντες, ἦ κατεῖχε τὸν  
νέκυν, μυδῶν τε σῶμα γυμνώσαντες εὖ,  
καθήμεθ' ἄκρων ἐκ πάγων ὑπήνεμοι,  
ὅσμὴν 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

---

<sup>62</sup> Feldman, "The Influence of Greek Tragedians on Josephus," 62–75.

<sup>63</sup> *Ibid.*, 66.

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

δεινὴ δὲ ταῖς ἔξῆς ἡμέραις περιεῖχε τὴν χώραν ὁδμή τε καὶ ὄψις· οἱ μὲν γὰρ αἰγιαλοὶ ναυαγίων ἄμα καὶ διοιδούντων ἔγεμον σωμάτων, ἐκκαιόμενοι δὲ καὶ μυδάντες οἱ νεκροὶ τὸν ἀέρα διέφθειρον, ὡς μὴ μόνον οἰκτρὸν Ἰουδαίοις γενέσθαι τὸ πάθος, ἀλλὰ καὶ διὰ μίσους τοῖς δράσασιν ἐλθεῖν (*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 ὁσμή as well as the early or later Greek form ὁδμή, whereas he will use only νεκρός, not the poetic νέκυς, for the word “corpse” in the *Bellum*.]<sup>64</sup> As Feldman has noticed, the verb μυδάω appears again in *B.J.* 4.383 with respect to Judean corpses, but we should note that σῶμα and ὁσμή 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 ἐκέλευνον τὴν ὁσμὴν οὐ φέροντες, ἔπειθ' ὡς οὐ διήρκουν ἀπὸ τῶν τειχῶν ἔρριπτον εἰς τὰς φάραγγας. Περιών δὲ ταύτας ὁ Τίτος ὡς ἐθεάσατο πεπλησμένας τῶν νεκρῶν καὶ βαθὺν ἰχώρα μυδάντων ὑπορρέοντα τῶν σωμάτων, ἐστέναξε τε καὶ τὰς χείρας ἀνατείνας κατεμαρτύρατο τὸν θεόν, ὡς οὐκ εἶη τὸ ἔργον 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 (ἡρᾶτο τοῖσι τούργον ἔξειργασμένοις, line 428), but Titus in his own form of piety swears to God that he did not commit the deed (οὐκ εἴη τὸ ἔργον αὐτοῦ).

<sup>64</sup> νέκυς 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 Polyneices' body<sup>65</sup> back in Book 4 when the survivors of those killed by the rebels "would at night take a little dust<sup>66</sup> 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.<sup>67</sup> 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,"<sup>68</sup> 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

<sup>65</sup> Sophocles, *Ant.* 247 and 429.

<sup>66</sup> See my earlier discussion on *B.J.* 2.322.

<sup>67</sup> 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.

<sup>68</sup> Feldman, "The Influence of the Greek Tragedians on Josephus," 60.

internecine conflict, incest, and tyrannical conduct.”<sup>69</sup> 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:

όρᾶς τὸν Ἀκτέωνος ἄθλιον μόρον,  
ὅν ωμόσιτοι σκύλακες ἀς ἐθρέψατο  
διεσπάσαντο, κρείσσον' ἐν κυναγίαις  
'Αρτέμιδος εἶναι κομπάσαντ', ἐν δργάσιν (*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:

ἴπεσθέ μοι φέροντες ἄθλιον βάρος  
Πενθέως, ἔπεσθε, πρόσπολοι, δόμων πάρος,  
οῖν σῶμα μοχθῶν μυρίοις ζητήμασιν  
φέρω τόδ', εὐρών ἐν Κιθαιρώνος πτυχαῖς  
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”<sup>70</sup> 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

<sup>69</sup> E. Hall, “The sociology of Athenian tragedy,” in *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Tragedy* (ed. P. Easterling; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 101. Hall cites F. Zeitlin, “Thebes: theater of self and society in Athenian drama,” in *Greek Tragedy and Political Theory* (ed. J. P. Euben; Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986), 101–41.

<sup>70</sup> E. R. Dodds, ed., *Euripides Bacchae* (2nd ed; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1960), xxix.

dressed as his big brother Heracles, Aeacus berates him:

ῳ βδελυρὲ κάναίσχυντε καὶ τολμηρὲ σὺ  
καὶ μιαρὲ καὶ παμμίαρε καὶ μιαρώτατε,  
. . . ἦ τὰ σπλάγχνα σου  
διασπαράξει, πλευμόνων τ' ἀνθάψεται  
Ταρτησία μύραινα· τῷ νεφρῷ δέ σου  
αὐτοῖσιν ἐντέροισιν ἥματωμένω  
διασπάσονται Γοργόνες Τειθράσιαι,  
ἔφ' ἄς ἐγὼ δρομαῖον ὄρμήσω πόδα. (*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*.<sup>71</sup>

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.<sup>72</sup> 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:

Πανταχόθεν δὲ τῆς πόλεως πολεμουμένης ὑπὸ τῶν ἐπιβούλων καὶ συγκλύδων μέσος ὁ δῆμος ὥσπερ μέγα σῶμα διεσπαράσσετο (*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

<sup>71</sup> Euripides, *Bacchae* 735, 739, 1104, 1127, 1135, 1220 for the *σπαραγμός*.

<sup>72</sup> See Ullmann and Price, “Drama and History in Josephus’ *Bellum Iudaicum*,” 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,"<sup>73</sup> 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":

ἡ δ' “έμόν,” ἔφη, “τοῦτο τέκνον γνήσιον καὶ τὸ ἔργον έμόν. φάγετε, καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ βέβρωκα. μὴ γένησθε μήτε μαλακώτεροι γυναικός μήτε συμπαθέστεροι μητρός, εἰ δ' ὑμεῖς εὐσεβεῖς καὶ τὴν έμήν ἀποστρέψεσθε θυσίαν, ἐγὼ μὲν ὑμῖν βέβρωκα, καὶ τὸ λοιπὸν δὲ έμοὶ μεινάτω.” (*B.J.* 6.210–211)

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*,<sup>74</sup> 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 as punishment for their blasphemy against him:

<sup>73</sup> See H. Chapman, "Spectacle and Theater in Josephus' *Bellum Judaicum*" (Ph.D. diss., Stanford University, 1998), which also discusses the Hebrew scriptural background, and also "'A Myth for the World': Early Christian Reception of Cannibalism in Josephus, *Bellum Judaicum* 6.199–219," *SBL 2000 Seminar Papers* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2000): 359–378.

<sup>74</sup> 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.

ἄ δ' αὖ παθεῖν δεῖ λαὸν οὐ κρύψω κακά.  
 λίπη πόλισμα, βαρβάροις εἴκων, (ἄκων)  
 πόλεις δὲ πολλὰς εἰσαφίκωνται, ζυγὸν  
 δούλειον (ἀνέλκοντες) οἱ δυσδαιμονες.<sup>75</sup>

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.<sup>76</sup> 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.<sup>77</sup> 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.<sup>78</sup>

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-

<sup>75</sup> This is reconstructed from *Christus Patiens*, lines 1668–1669 and 1678–1679, in Dodds' edition 58–59, lines *de Thebanis*.

<sup>76</sup> For authors before Pseudo-Hegesippus, see H. Chapman, “‘A Myth for the World’,” 370–78.

<sup>77</sup> Pseudo-Hegesippus, *De Excidio* 5.40.2: “*hoc est prandium meum, haec vestra portio, videte diligenter 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.*”

<sup>78</sup> See Dodds, *Euripides Bacchae*, 57 for the quote from Apsines. Notice that in *Christus Patiens* 1470, as reported in Dodds, *ibid.*, 58, *iδού* 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.<sup>79</sup>

### 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<sup>80</sup> 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."<sup>81</sup> 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."<sup>82</sup> 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

<sup>79</sup> C. P. Jones, "Greek Drama in the Roman Empire," in *Theater and Society in the Classical World* (ed. R. Scodel; Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1993), 51, n. 29, cites Eutrop. 7.21.1, Suda T 691, *Tr GF* 12 no. 183, for evidence of Titus as tragedian.

<sup>80</sup> D. Wright, *Iwo Jima 1945* (Oxford: Osprey, 2001), 13.

<sup>81</sup> 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.

<sup>82</sup> *Ibid.*, 334–35; cf. *B.J.* 3.362–382, especially 374, for Josephus' comments on the soul when facing possible death by suicide.

this childish trick and did not set ourselves against them.”<sup>83</sup> 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.<sup>84</sup> 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 adversary.”<sup>85</sup> 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.

<sup>83</sup> Wright, *op. cit.*, 71; cf. *B.J.* 3.344 ff. on Roman invitations to Josephus to surrender.

<sup>84</sup> 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.

<sup>85</sup> Wright, *op. cit.*, 74; cf. *B.J.* 3.347 on Vespasian’s supposed admiration for Josephus.

# THE HELLENISTIC BIOGRAPHICAL HISTORY OF KING SAUL: JOSEPHUS, *A.J.* 6.45–378 AND 1 SAMUEL 9:1–31:13

DETLEV DORMEYER  
UNIVERSITÄT DORTMUND

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.<sup>1</sup> Josephus took over this episodic structure.

---

<sup>1</sup> H. W. Hertzberg, *Die Samuelbücher* (7th ed., ATD, 10; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986), 103–106, 197–200; Hertzberg starts with 1 Sam 7:2 (48–51); K. Baltzer, *Die Biographie der Propheten* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1975), 71–83, begins with 9:1 and names the whole story “biography of the prophet” (“Prophetenbiographie”). The biographical pattern normally consists of three parts: (1) ancestry, childhood and youth; (2) public life with fame; (3) old age and death; D. Dormeyer, *Evangelium als literarische und theologische Gattung* (EdF, 263; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1989), 59–60, 160–194 (bibliog.); R. H. Burridge, *What are the Gospels? A Comparison with Graeco-Roman Biography* (SNTS MS, 70; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 145–147; D. Frickenschmidt, *Evangelium als Biographie. Die vier Evangelien im Rahmen antiker Erzählkunst* (TANZ, 22; Tübingen/Basel: Francke Verlag, 1997), 192–210; D. Dormeyer, *Das Markusevangelium als Idealbiographie von Jesus Christus, dem Nazarener* (2nd ed., SBB, 43; Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 2002), 8–9, 268–86; for Josephus' *Vita* see S.J.D. Cohen, *Josephus in Galilee and Rome: His Vita and Development as a Historian* (CSCT, 8; Leiden: Brill, 1979), 102–3; P. Bilde, *Flavius Josephus between Jerusalem and Rome. His Life, his Works and their Importance* (JSPSup, 2; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1988), 107; S. Mason, *Life of Josephus. Translation and Commentary* (BJP 9; 2001), xxii–xxiii; D. Dormeyer, “Die Vita des Josephus als Autobiographie eines gescheiterten Herrschers”, in *Internationales Josephus-Kolloquium Dortmund 2002* (ed. J. U. Kalms and F. Siegert; MJSt,

He smoothed the style and added some reflections. The result was a biographical history very closely related to the Hellenistic biographical history.<sup>2</sup> 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:

- (1) Josephus' retelling of 1 Samuel 9:1–31:13
- (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)<sup>3</sup>

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.<sup>4</sup> In this final sentence of book 6, βίος signifies,

14; Münster: LIT-Verlag, 2003), 15–34, esp. 20–21. Saul's biographical history has only part 2 and 3. The omission of Part 1 (childhood and youth) is usual for the most ancient biographies (Frickenschmidt, *Evangelium*, 253 ff; J. Kügler, *Pharao und Christus?* (BBB, 113; Bodenheim: Philo, 1997), 133–85; Dormeyer, *Markusevangelium*, 268–86). The ancestry of Saul was told in *A.J.* 6.45–46.

<sup>2</sup> On biographical history see T. J. Luce, *Die griechischen Historiker* (Düsseldorf/Zürich: Artemis & Winkler Verlag, 1998; Engl. London/New York: Routledge, 1997), 160–162; for some related examples, including the encomiastic biography of Euagoras by Isocrates see Louis H. Feldman, "Josephus' Portrait of Saul," *HUCA* 53 (1982): 45–99, esp. 46–47.

<sup>3</sup> The translation of the *Antiquitates* is throughout this article taken from Flavius Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities*, (trans. H. St. J. Thackeray, R. Marcus, A. Wikgren, and L. H. Feldman; LCL; Cambridge, M.A.: Harvard University Press, 1930–1965).

<sup>4</sup> D. Wördemann, *Der bios nach Plutarch und das Evangelium nach Markus. Eine Untersuchung zur literarischen Analogie des Charakterbildes des Helden und des Christusbildes im Evangelium Jesu Christi* (Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums, NF 1,19; Paderborn: Schöningh, 2002), 32–42.

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.<sup>5</sup> Therefore Baltzer determines rightly the Saul story as “prophetic biography.”<sup>6</sup> 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” (*πλεῖστον ἀν βασιλεῦσαι 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.<sup>7</sup>

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

<sup>5</sup> F. Leo, *Die griechisch- römische Biographie nach ihrer literarischen Form* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1901); A. Diehle, *Studien zur griechischen Biographie* (AAWG. PH, 3, 37; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1956); Dormeyer, *Evangelium*, 168–90; Burridge, *Gospels*; D. Dormeyer, *Das Neue Testament im Rahmen der antiken Literaturgeschichte. Eine Einführung* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1993), 205–28; translated by R. Kossow, *The New Testament among the Writings of Antiquity* (Biblical Seminar, 55; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 220–43; W. Eckey, *Das Markus-Evangelium. Orientierung am Weg Jesu. Ein Kommentar* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1998), 24–27.

<sup>6</sup> Baltzer, *Biographie*, 71–83.

<sup>7</sup> Feldman, “Saul,” 85.

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 encomion 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.<sup>8</sup> 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-

<sup>8</sup> E. Plümacher, *Lukas als hellenistischer Schriftsteller. Studien zur Apostelgeschichte* (SUNT, 9; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972), 9–32; K. Meister, *Die griechische Geschichtsschreibung. Von den Anfängen bis zum Ende des Hellenismus* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1990), 95–102; O. Lendl, *Einführung in die griechische Geschichtsschreibung. Von Hekataios bis Zosimos* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1992), 180–206; Eckey, *Markus-Evangelium*, 24–27.

dience against God (*A.J.* 6.343–351). The first sin against God—the sparing of the Amalekites—is slightly different from the biblical parallel. 1 Sam 15:9 reads: “But Saul and the army spared Agag (the Amalekite king) with the best of the sheep. . . .” Josephus divides this action: Saul spared the King, while the crowd spared the animals for the sacrifice: “But he also took prisoner the enemy’s king, Agag, whom out of admiration for his beauty (κάλλος) and his stature (μέγεθος) he accounted worthy to be saved” (*A.J.* 6.137). Saul gave preference to the Hellenistic ideal of *kalokagathia* over against the will of God: “For God so hated (ἐμίσησε) the race of the Amalaketes . . .” (6.138). But a pious Jew does not have the right to oppose the explicit will of God. Therefore Saul is rejected by God and destined to soon lose his kingship (*A.J.* 6.150).

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.<sup>9</sup> 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.<sup>10</sup>

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:

<sup>9</sup> Quoting Homer, Feldman explains the importance of “physical attractiveness” for Saul as well as for “his bodyguards” (“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 bodyguards (*Ant.* 6.130)” (“Saul,” 87).

<sup>10</sup> “Nach den zuletzt untersuchten Texten ist Saul nur auf einem Teilgebiet, als Anführer des Heerbanns, Nachfolger Samuels. Durch diese Teilung der Funktion ist es möglich, dass Samuel auch den Nachfolger Sauls noch einsetzt und damit legitimiert. Da Samuel nicht wirklich zurücktritt, konnte das Bild eines kontinuierlichen Amtes unabhängig vom Königtum entstehen. Samuel wird zum Träger und Garant der Legitimation des Königtums” (Baltzer, *Biographie*, 82–83). Josephus strengthened this sharp distinction between the king and the prophet as archaic institution.

But now I shall touch on 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.”<sup>11</sup> 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.<sup>12</sup>

## 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.<sup>13</sup> 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).

<sup>11</sup> Doron Mendels, *Identity, Religion and Historiography. Studies in Hellenistic History* (JSPSup, 24, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 22.

<sup>12</sup> Mendels, *Identity, Religion and Historiography*, 13–35. Saul is a hellenistic model for kings (Feldman, “Saul,” 76). Aune concurs that “Louis H. Feldman has recently demonstrated that Josephus, in his retelling of the biblical narratives from Genesis to 2 Kings (blended with the work of the Chronicler), introduced hellenistic biographical concerns into the narrative. His portrait of Saul, for example, emphasizes the traditional Greek moral qualities of wisdom, courage, temperance, and justice” (David E. Aune, *The New Testament in Its Literary Environment* [Philadelphia: Westminster, 1987], 42).

<sup>13</sup> “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 (*Zοροβάθηλος* 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.<sup>14</sup> 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.

---

<sup>14</sup> 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.<sup>15</sup> 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 refund the constitution?

Josephus adds two appendices to his *Antiquitates*: *Vita* and *Contra Apionem*. The *Vita* recommends Josephus himself as ruler,<sup>16</sup> *Contra Apionem* promotes him as restorer of the law.<sup>17</sup> 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 (κυρτός) Matthias (*Vita* 4).<sup>18</sup> 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.*

<sup>15</sup> 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.

<sup>16</sup> Dormeyer, “Vita des Josephus,” 16–26. Like the biblical Joseph he shares the fate of the suffering and exalted righteous ruler.

<sup>17</sup> D. Dormeyer, “Des Josephus zwei Suasoriae (Übungsreden) *Über das Volk der Juden*. Die beiden Vorworte (Proömien) *Contra Apionem* 1,1–5; 2,1,1–7 und die beiden Vorworte Lk 1,1–4; Acta 1,1–4”, in *Internationales Josephus-Kolloquium Amsterdam 2000* (ed. J.U. Kalms; MJSt, 10, Münster: LIT-Verlag, 2001), 241–262.

<sup>18</sup> For the family tree of Josephus see Mason, *Life* (BJP 9), 3–12; F. Siegert, H. Schreckenberg, and M. Vogel, *Flavius Josephus: Aus meinem Leben (Vita), krit. Ausgabe, Üb. u. Komm.*, (Tübingen: Mohr, 2001), 23–25.162; Dormeyer, “Vita des Josephus,” 14–15.

11.73–76). In the time of the Second Temple the dynasty of the Hasmoneans did not cause as much evil as the dynasty of Herod.<sup>19</sup>

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 *Vita* (8ff). The only respectable member of the Herodian dynasty, Agrippa II, has just died (*Vita* 359).<sup>20</sup> Josephus already gave a negative assessment of the Herodian dynasty in *A.J.* 18:

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 (*A.J.* 18.127–128).<sup>21</sup>

Josephus, by contrast, is capable of leading a law reform, being qualified for this task since the age of fourteen (*Vita* 9).<sup>22</sup> He also gives evidence of this qualification in the second appendix, usually called *Contra Apionem*.<sup>23</sup>

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.<sup>24</sup>

## CONCLUSION

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

<sup>19</sup> D. Lambers-Petry, “Shelamzion ha-malka. The Hasmonean Queen and her Enigmatic Portrayal by Josephus,” in *Internationales Josephus-Kolloquium Dortmund 2002* (ed. J. U. Kalms and F. Siegert; MJSt, 14; Münster: LIT-Verlag, 2003), 65–78. For Josephus’ assessment see *A.J.* 16.183–187.

<sup>20</sup> Siegert, Schreckenberg, and Vogel, *Vita* 180.

<sup>21</sup> “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” (*A.J.* 18.129). The addition of this favorable portrait of Agrippa I, however, cannot change the negative image of the Herodian dynasty.

<sup>22</sup> Dormeyer, “Vita des Josephus,” 15–23.

<sup>23</sup> Dormeyer, “Suasoriae.”

<sup>24</sup> Dormeyer, *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.<sup>25</sup>

---

<sup>25</sup> Did therefore only Luke use and emphasize the unknown Jewish equivalent "Saul" for "Paul" in Acts?



POWER AND PITY:  
THE IMAGE OF HEROD IN JOSEPHUS'  
*BELLUM JUDAICUM*

TAMAR LANDAU  
OXFORD AND TEL AVIV

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.<sup>1</sup>

This paper is just a glimpse into a broader analysis of Josephus' use of rhetorical devices in the Herod narratives.<sup>2</sup> 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-

<sup>1</sup> 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 ornaments 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.

<sup>2</sup> The fuller and comparative analysis is in T. Landau, *Out-Heroding Herod: Josephus, Rhetoric and the Herod Narratives* (D.Phil. thesis, Oxford, 2003).

tory" style account of the history of the Jewish people, does not focus on any particular period but emphasises the prevalence and virtuousness of Jewish religion and law (*πολιτεία*). Why Herod, then?

My question, in fact, is a second tier question. I choose not to focus here on the historical Herod<sup>3</sup> but rather on his historiographical image. In other words, I am not asking "what is the importance of the historical Herod?" but "why has Josephus chosen to dedicate ample space and attention to Herod, despite his otherwise different interests in both the *Bellum* and the *Antiquitates*?"

Any historian, no doubt, would have been grateful for obtaining material such as the accounts of Herod's life and reign. Not only does the subject matter contain elements worthy of relating in many aspects (Herod's turbulent political career, and his even more turbulent private life), but also the abundance and detail of the available source (the writings of Nicolaus of Damascus, Herod's aide and court historian) suggest a temptation almost impossible to resist.

Born a commoner, and of Idumean descent, Herod had risen to be Judea's king and Roman protégé and reigned over Judea for nearly 40 years. A perceptive and flexible politician, he wisely crafted an alliance with Augustan Rome which, despite Josephus' favourable contentions, proved to be a double edged sword for Judea. It brought prosperity and resulted in better facilities and extensive rebuilding projects (including the major refurbishment of the Temple in Jerusalem). However, it also caused internal strife, distrust and tension which grew under Herod's increasingly tyrannical rule.<sup>4</sup> Herod's troublesome family affairs and his extreme paranoia resulted in the short-lived and even more tyrannical rule of his son Archelaus which, in turn, brought about direct Roman rule over Judea: this effectively put an end to Judean autonomy, achieved by the (pro-Roman) Hasmoneans in the second century B.C.E. and maintained, almost intact, until the end of Archelaus' rule in 6 C.E. In relation to both

<sup>3</sup> Modern scholarship has indeed tended to focus on the historical Herod, e.g. A. Schalit, *Hordos Ha-Melekh* (in Hebrew; Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1964; rev. German ed. with introduction by D. R. Schwartz; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2001); M. Grant, *Herod the Great* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1971); M. Stern, *The Kingdom of Herod* (in Hebrew; Tel Aviv: Ministry of Defense, 1992); P. Richardson, *Herod: King of the Jews and Friend of the Romans* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1999); N. Kokkinos, *The Herodian Dynasty* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998).

<sup>4</sup> 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 *ethnos*.

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<sup>5</sup> 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

<sup>5</sup> 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<sup>6</sup> which seem to have come down to Josephus in a much fuller form than we have them today.<sup>7</sup>

There is no way to determine exactly how much of Nicolaus' vast corpus was available for Josephus, but most scholars<sup>8</sup> conjecture that Nicolaus was indeed the source Josephus had used for the history of Herod.<sup>9</sup> 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

---

<sup>6</sup> More on the life and works of Nicolaus in B. Z. Wacholder, *Nicolaus of Damascus* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1962), R. J. H. Shutt, *Studies in Josephus* (London: SPCK, 1961), 79–92; M. Stern, "Nicolaus of Damascus as a Source for Jewish History in the Hasmonean and Herodian Periods," (in Hebrew) in *The Mikra and Jewish History: Studies in Mikra and Second Temple Literature in Memory of Jacob Liver* (ed. B. Uffenheimer; Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University, 1972), 375 ff.; M. Toher, "On the Use of Nicolaus' Historical Fragments," *CA* 8.1 (1989): 159–72.

<sup>7</sup> 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.

<sup>8</sup> 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: München, 1920) contended on the contrary that the *Antiquitates* narrative was not dependent on Nicolaus. Their arguments, however, are not consensual.

<sup>9</sup> 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,<sup>10</sup> more recent research sees Josephus' writing in a new light and credits him with a greater degree of compositional authenticity and originality.<sup>11</sup>

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.<sup>12</sup>

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.<sup>13</sup> Therefore, there is no reason to attribute them to Nicolaus.<sup>14</sup> 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

<sup>10</sup> E.g. Thackeray, *Historian* (assistants), and Hölscher, "Josephus" (earlier sources). See also Shutt's criticism of the German predisposition towards *Quellenkritik: Studies*, 89–90.

<sup>11</sup> Among these are T. Rajak, *Josephus: the Historian and his Society* (London: Duckworth, 1983; 2d ed., 2002); P. Bilde, *Flavius Josephus Between Jerusalem and Rome: His Life, his Works and their Importance* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1988), and S. Mason's introductions to the BJP volumes: *Flavius Josephus: Translation and Commentary*, vol. 3: *Judean Antiquities 1–4*; vol. 9: *Vita* (ed. S. Mason; Leiden: Brill 2000–2001). Stern, "Nicolaus of Damascus," suggests an affinity of style and thematic concerns between Nicolaus and Josephus but agrees that Josephus treated his source according to his specific needs in both works. Shutt, *Studies*, 83–84, compares between Josephus' and Nicolaus' life circumstances. Toher, "Nicolaus," 162–63, does not draw an explicit parallel between the two historians but his observations on Nicolaus' historiographical preferences and rhetorical skill could also be applied to Josephus.

<sup>12</sup> 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.

<sup>13</sup> See Thackeray, *Historian*, and Shutt, *Studies*, and more recently L. H. Feldman, "The Influence of the Greek Tragedians on Josephus," in *Hellenic and Jewish Arts: Interaction, Tradition and Renewal* (ed. A. Ovadia; Tel Aviv: RAMOT Publishing House, 1998), 51–80; J. J. Price and L. Ullman, "Drama and History in Josephus' *Bellum Judaicum*," *SCI* 21 (2002): 97–114; D. R. Schwartz, "On Drama and Authenticity in Philo and Josephus," *SCI* 10 (1989/90): 113–29.

<sup>14</sup> That is despite his penchant for pathetic embellishment. See Toher's analysis of Nicolaus' fragments ("Nicolaus," 164–72).

Wacholder<sup>15</sup> 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,<sup>16</sup> 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.<sup>17</sup> 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

<sup>15</sup> Wacholder, *Nicolaus*, 58 ff.

<sup>16</sup> 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.

<sup>17</sup> *AJ* 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."<sup>18</sup>

Bal essentially modifies the model devised by G. Genette in his *Figures III* (1972)<sup>19</sup> and later revised in *Nouveau discours du récit*.<sup>20</sup> What

<sup>18</sup> M. Bal, *Narratology: Introduction to the Theory of Narrative* (2d ed.; Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997), 3.

<sup>19</sup> G. Genette, *Narrative Discourse* (trans. J. E. Lewin; Oxford: Blackwell, 1980).

<sup>20</sup> G. Genette, *Narrative Discourse Revisited* (transl. J. E. Lewin; Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1988).

stands at the basis of the analyses of Genette, Bal and Shlomith Rimmon-Kenan<sup>21</sup> 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,<sup>22</sup> 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.<sup>23</sup>

Using narratology in the analysis of historical texts (as opposed to fiction) poses a few problems and requires certain modifications.<sup>24</sup> A

<sup>21</sup> S. Rimmon-Kenan, *Narrative Fiction: Contemporary Poetics* (2d ed.; London: Routledge, 2002).

<sup>22</sup> S. Chatman, *Story and Discourse: Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1978).

<sup>23</sup> 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.

<sup>24</sup> Narratologists have already pointed out that the differences between fiction and non-fiction (or 'factual' narratives) raise several questions regarding the application of narratology to the latter. Both Genette, "Fictional Narrative, Factual Narrative," in his *Fiction & Diction* (trans. C. Porter; Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993), 54–84, and also in *Poetics Today* 11.4 (1990): 755–74) and D. Cohn, "Signposts of Fictionality: A Narratological Perspective," *Poetics Today* 11.4 (1990): 775–804,

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.<sup>25</sup>

The questions concerning author and audience, narrator and narratees, and the relations between them become more acute when applying narratology to historical texts.<sup>26</sup> 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)

---

point out the generic difference on the one hand, and the possible flexibility of narratology on the other, and view fiction and non fiction as part of a continuum rather than two discrete genres.

<sup>25</sup> T. C. B. Rood, *Thucydides: Narrative and Explanation* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), 10.

<sup>26</sup> J. P. Sullivan points out some of the issues that arise in relation to author-audience relationship in antiquity, as well as some of the problems entailed in the application of modern literary theories to classical texts when it comes to those issues, in his introduction to I. J. F. de Jong & J. P. Sullivan (eds.), *Modern Critical Theory and Classical Literature* (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 10–11. On classical authors and their audiences see T. Woodman and J. Powell, *Author and Audience in Latin Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993); J. Marincola, *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 19–33, and M. J. Wheeldon, "'True Stories': The Reception of Historiography in Antiquity," in *History as Text: The Writing of Ancient History* (ed. A. Cameron; London: Duckworth, 1989), 35–64.

audience, constructed or real: an educated, Western, Greek-speaking readership for *Bellum*,<sup>27</sup> and probably Roman aristocrats with a penchant for Judaism (joined, perhaps, by Greek-speaking Diaspora Jews) for *Antiquitates*.<sup>28</sup> 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.<sup>29</sup> 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.

---

<sup>27</sup> *B.J.* 1.3 designates them as “subjects of the Roman Empire,” τοῖς κατὰ τὴν Ρωμαϊκῶν ἡγεμονίᾳ.

<sup>28</sup> 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.

<sup>29</sup> 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.

### HOW HEROD IS PORTRAYED

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<sup>30</sup> 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.<sup>31</sup> 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.<sup>32</sup> 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).

<sup>30</sup> 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.

<sup>31</sup> This has been noted by many scholars. See most recently Ullman and Price, "Drama," esp. 98–99, and T. Rajak, "Whose Herod? Josephus and Nicolaus on the Reign of Herod the Great" (paper presented at the Herod conference of the British Museum, April 2001, publication forthcoming).

<sup>32</sup> 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 ὑπαίθρους εὐπραγία η τύχη κατ' οἴκον ἀνιαροῖς ἐνεμέσθησεν*). 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.<sup>33</sup> 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."<sup>34</sup> 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.<sup>35</sup> 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

<sup>33</sup> Ancient biography, by contrast, often tends to include accounts of early childhood and upbringing (*ἀγεωνί*) 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.

<sup>34</sup> 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.

<sup>35</sup> Josephus only includes a reference to Herod's young age when achieving his first political role, the governor of Galilee (*νέον*, 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).<sup>36</sup> 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" (*ἀμήχανον δ' ἐν εὐπραγίαις φθόνον διαφυγεῖν*, 1.208),<sup>37</sup> 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.<sup>38</sup>

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,

<sup>36</sup> 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 *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.

<sup>37</sup> 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 *Bellum* and the *Antiquitates*.

<sup>38</sup> As they would be in Roman politics, too. Cf. *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.<sup>39</sup> 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.<sup>40</sup> 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

<sup>39</sup> As Ullman and Price, "Drama," 98–105, convincingly demonstrate, Herod's tendency to "react, rather than control" events is prevalent in the second part of the narrative as well.

<sup>40</sup> This echoes earlier Greek historiographical tendencies to portray characters, human or non human, as tragic heroes. See most notably F. M. Cornford's reading of Thucydides in his *Thucydides Mythistoricus* (London: Arnold, 1907), *passim*. On a smaller scale, the tendency to attribute tragic qualities to historical figures in order to enhance the dramatic effect of the narrative is not uncommon in Greco-Roman historiography, e.g. Herodotus' Croesus in book 1 and in a more complicated manner his portrait of Xerxes in books 7–9. More on tragedy and history in C. B. R. Pelling, ed., *Greek Tragedy and the Historian* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997) and M. Ostwald, "Tragedians and Historians," *SCI* 21 (2002): 9–25. On Aristotle's definitions of tragic characters (e.g. *Poetics* 13, 1452b34–1453a17) see Ostwald, "Tragedians," 12–13; A. W. Gomme, "Aristotle and the Tragic Character," in *Idem, More Essays in Greek History and Literature* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1962), 194–213. See also P. E. Easterling, "Constructing Character in Greek Tragedy," in Pelling, *Greek Tragedy*, 83–99.

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.<sup>41</sup> 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.”<sup>42</sup> 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.<sup>43</sup> 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.<sup>44</sup>

<sup>41</sup> 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.”

<sup>42</sup> Ostwald, “Tragedians,” 25.

<sup>43</sup> 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.

<sup>44</sup> More on the possible dramatic (both Greek and Roman) influences on the Herod narrative in Ullman and Price, “Drama,” esp. 103–9. See also H. H. Chapman, *Spectacle and Theater in Josephus' Bellum Judaicum* (Ph.D. diss., Stanford, 1998).

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 torments 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.<sup>45</sup>

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.<sup>46</sup> 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

<sup>45</sup> An interesting comparison from tragedy might be that of Xerxes in Aeschylus' *Persae*. There, too, the impression is that Xerxes' ὕβρις 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.

<sup>46</sup> 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<sup>47</sup> in his narrative.<sup>48</sup>

However: the excess of pathos seems to create an opposite effect to the expected rise in pity and fear.<sup>49</sup> 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

<sup>47</sup> 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.

<sup>48</sup> 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 (*τοῖς ἐμαντοῦ πάθεσι*, 1.9, and *τὰς δ' ὀλοφόρσεις*, 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.

<sup>49</sup> The *locus classicus* is of course Aristotle, *Rhet.* 1382a21–22 (fear, *φόβος*) and 1385b13–15 (pity, *ἔλεος*). M. Heath, *The Poetics of Greek Tragedy* (London: Duckworth, 1987), 11–17, provides a concise and illuminating summary of the place and function of pity and fear in tragedy.

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.<sup>50</sup>

Another uniting element is Herod's static character.<sup>51</sup> 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."<sup>52</sup> Herod, says Josephus, was both blessed in his public life and most unfortunate (*ἀτυχέστατος*) 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.<sup>53</sup> Biblical portraits of kings are also abundant in personal misfortune.<sup>54</sup>

<sup>50</sup> Cf. Pliny's comments about the changing fortunes of Augustus in *Nat.* 7.155.

<sup>51</sup> 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.

<sup>52</sup> κοί κατὰ μὲν τὰ ἄλλα πάντα τύχη δεξῆ χρησάμενος, εἰ καὶ τις ἄλλος, ὅστις κατεκτήσατο βασιλείου ιδιώτης ὃν καὶ τοσούτῳ χρόνῳ φυλάξεις ιδίοις τέκνοις κατέλιπεν, ἐν δὲ τοῖς κατ' οἴκον ἀτυχέστατος (*B.J.* 1.665).

<sup>53</sup> Again, Herodotus' Croesus and Pliny's Augustus (*Nat.* 7.155) are good examples.

<sup>54</sup> 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.<sup>55</sup> 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.<sup>56</sup> 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.<sup>57</sup> This calling, whose strength often blinds heroes in

<sup>55</sup> Heath, *Poetics*, 90–98.

<sup>56</sup> Heath, *Poetics*, 92–93.

<sup>57</sup> 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)<sup>58</sup> 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,<sup>59</sup> not his thoughts. Josephus does not allow Herod to take

---

is done to the best of their knowledge and ability; what they do not realize until after they have acted is their own frailty, the fact that in acting they have encountered limits they cannot trespass with impunity. This is the condition I should like to name 'tragic'." This may help to illuminate one aspect of Herod's un-tragicness, namely the lack of retrospective remorse, but Ostwald may tend to generalise here: his analysis may suit some tragic figures like Deianeira, but others (*Medea*, *Antigone*) do not come to acknowledge any "frailty," and are certainly aware of limits before they set out to action. Still, there is no doubt concerning their ability to arouse pity and fear.

<sup>58</sup> On "fear for" tragic characters as stemming from a feeling of equality see Arist. *Poet.* 1453a4–6 and Heath, *Poetics*, 12–14.

<sup>59</sup> 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.<sup>60</sup>

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 narratee, and less so within the story frame of the narrative. Characters are usually not using irony themselves.<sup>61</sup> Josephus exercises his power as narrator to

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

<sup>61</sup> 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.<sup>62</sup> 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.

<sup>62</sup> More on the two kinds of irony in Josephus in S. Mason, "Figured Speech and Irony in T. Flavius Josephus," in *Flavius Josephus and Flavian Rome* (ed. J. Edmondson, S. Mason and J. Rives; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 243–88.



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

JAN WILLEM VAN HENTEN  
UNIVERSITY OF AMSTERDAM

## 1. INTRODUCTION<sup>1</sup>

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.<sup>2</sup> 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/Canat(h)a,<sup>3</sup> if

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> 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.

<sup>3</sup> *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.<sup>4</sup> 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).<sup>5</sup> 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.<sup>6</sup> 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.

<sup>4</sup> Schalit, *König Herodes*, 122–23.

<sup>5</sup> 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.

<sup>6</sup> T. Landau, *Out-Heroding Herod: Josephus, Rhetoric and the Herod Narratives* (D. Phil. diss., Oxford, 2003).

do with the commander speeches he reported.<sup>7</sup> In that case, Josephus probably used a source that contained the speech, perhaps Herod's memoirs, mentioned in *A.J.* 15.174.<sup>8</sup> 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 *A.J.* 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.

---

<sup>7</sup> R. Leimbach, *Militärische Muster rhetorik: 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.

<sup>8</sup> 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.* 15.127–1462.1. *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 symbouleutikon*).<sup>9</sup> *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.<sup>10</sup>

The speech's introduction clearly indicates Herod's intention: he has chosen to encourage his soldiers (*παρακαλέσαι προειλόμην*) and to instruct them, in order to keep up their spirits (*A.J.* 15.128).<sup>11</sup> 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).<sup>12</sup> It concerns, therefore, a matter of war and peace, one of the five subjects of deliberative speech discussed by Aristotle.<sup>13</sup> The key word *παρακαλέω* in the introduction is one of the formal indications that the speech is a commander's speech, a *παρακλητικὸς λόγος*.<sup>14</sup> Other vocabulary in

<sup>9</sup> Aristotle, *Rhet.* 1.3.3 1358b. D. R. Runnals, “The Rhetoric of Josephus,” in *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period 330 B.C.–A.D. 400* (ed. S. Porter; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 737–54, esp. 742–46. See for this type of speech: H. Lausberg, *Handbook of Literary Rhetoric: A Foundation for Literary Study* (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 32–33 and 97–103. Other deliberative speeches in Josephus: *A.J.* 4.177–193; *B.J.* 4.162–192; 5.376–419; 6.99–110; 7.323–388.

<sup>10</sup> See the accusations against the Arabs and the *dikaios*-vocabulary. Overlaps between deliberative and forensic speech are common, Lausberg, *Handbook of Literary Rhetoric*, 97.

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

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

<sup>13</sup> Aristotle, *Rhet.* 1.4.7–9 1359b–1360a.

<sup>14</sup> Polybius 12.25i.3 attributes the introduction of political, hortatory and ambassadorial speeches to Timaeus (*τῶν συμβουλευτικῶν καὶ παρακλητικῶν, ἐτὶ δὲ προεβεντικῶν 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 *παρακλένεσις* (“exhortation”) and *παραίνεσις* (“exhortation”). Thucydides uses the verbs *παρακελεύεσθαι* or *παραινεῖν*, 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<sup>15</sup> and the setup of several other deliberative speeches in Josephus:

- 1) Introduction (*exordium*, 127–128).
- 2) Statement (*propositio*, 129).
- 3) Proof (*argumentatio*, 130–145).
- 4) Conclusion (*peroratio* with *recapitulatio* and *affectus*, 146).<sup>16</sup>

The introduction includes a common formula to call for the soldiers' attention (*οὐκ ἀγνοῶ μὲν, ὁ ἀνδρες, ὅτι . . .*, *A.J.* 15.127),<sup>17</sup> 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 δέ*), anticipating Herod's proof for both of them (*βούλομαι ἐπιδεῖξαι . . . μετὰ δέ τοῦτο δεῖξαι*). The two topics are:

- 1) The battle that has to be fought is just (*δικαίως πολεμεῖν*) 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

<sup>15</sup> Aristotle, *Rhet.* 3.13.4 1414b. Also Cicero, *Part. or.* 27.

<sup>16</sup> Runnals, "The Rhetoric of Josephus," 746–47; P. Villalba i Varneda, *The Historical Method of Flavius Josephus* (ACJU 19; Leiden: Brill, 1986), 108, proposes a composition in three sections: 1) introduction (*A.J.* 15.127–129), 2) corpus of the speech (130–143), and 3) conclusions (144–146). *B.J.* 1.373–379 has a rather loose composition.

<sup>17</sup> 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 ὃν λέγω, *A.J.* 15.130). His list of the Arabs' wicked deeds (*A.J.* 15.130–134) includes references to:<sup>18</sup>

- 1) their lawlessness (παρανομία; cf. 136; 140; 156);
- 2) their unfaithfulness (ἀπίστως διακειμένων; cf. 110; 130; 132; 134; 140);
- 3) their greed (πλεονεξία; cf. κερδαίνω, 134);
- 4) their jealousy (φθόνος);
- 5) their cowardly way of fighting (ταῖς 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)<sup>19</sup> 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 δεῖ λέγειν;).<sup>20</sup> 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. φίλοι and πίστις; 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 (τοὺς ἀδίκους τιμωρήσασθαι . . . τοῦ θεοῦ

<sup>18</sup> The ἄρξομαι 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.”

<sup>19</sup> Cf. Aristotle, *Rhet.* 3.16.11 1417b about *narratio* in deliberative speech.

<sup>20</sup> Exactly the same phrase is found in Demosthenes, *Pant.* 12, in a *narratio*. Phrases like τί δεῖ λέγειν can indicate a transition, see, e.g. Thucydides 1.73.2 and Dionysius, *Ant. Rom.* 10.6.

βουλομένου μισεῖν τὴν ὕβριν καὶ τὴν ἀδικίαν . . . οὐ μόνον δίκαιον ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀναγκαῖον πόλεμον, 134–135), repeating the statement in *A.J.* 15.129.<sup>21</sup> 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." (*ἴνα δὲ καὶ τὰ καθ' ἑαυτοὺς ἔξετάσωμεν*), or at 138 with "At this point, someone will perhaps say . . ." (*ἴσως τοίνυν ἐρεῖ τις . . .*).<sup>22</sup> 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.<sup>23</sup>

<sup>21</sup> Cf. ἄδικος (*A.J.* 15.134, 146), ἄδικέω (134, 144), ἄδικία (135, 140), δίκαιος (135, 137, 138 twice, 145, 146), δίκαιώς (129).

<sup>22</sup> The introduction of an anonymous and hypothetical other speaker, a case of *sermocinatio*, Lausberg, *Handbook of Literary Rhetoric*, 366–69, only supports Herod's own argument.

<sup>23</sup> 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.<sup>24</sup> 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 (*παραπινέσας*) to the men to choose the better." (8.83, trans. De Sélincourt). 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.<sup>25</sup> 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.

<sup>24</sup> E.g. Herodotus 1.206–207; 6.9–12; 6.109; 7.8–11; 8.57–60; 8.68.

<sup>25</sup> O. Luschnat, *Die Feldhermreden 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).<sup>26</sup> 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.<sup>27</sup> 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 αὐτοὺς τὰ πρέποντα τῷ καιρῷ*).<sup>28</sup> Polybius,

<sup>26</sup> Further references: Leimbach, *Militärische Musterrhetorik*, 90.

<sup>27</sup> P. Pédech, *La méthode historique de Polybe* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1964), 256–59; 276–302; F. W. Walbank, *A Historical Commentary on Polybius* (3 vols; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957–1979), 1.13–14.

<sup>28</sup> 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 παρακαλῶν τοὺς ἄνδρας εὐθαρσείς εἶναι, διότι νικῶσι 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,<sup>29</sup> and the speeches by Publius Scipio, which parallel those of his adversary Hannibal, were most probably not created by Scipio himself.<sup>30</sup> 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.<sup>31</sup>

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.<sup>32</sup> 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.<sup>33</sup> 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.<sup>34</sup> 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).

<sup>29</sup> Aemilius Paullus' speech before the battle at Cannae (3.108.3–109.12), Pédech, *La méthode historique de Polybe*, 274.

<sup>30</sup> Pédech, *La méthode historique de Polybe*, 274–75.

<sup>31</sup> Another argument for displaying great courage in this speech is Rome's wealth as the huge reward (Polybius 3.63.1–14).

<sup>32</sup> E. Cary, *The Roman Antiquities of Dionysius of Halicarnassus* (7 vols.; Loeb Series, London: Heinemann/Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1937–1950), 1.xiii.

<sup>33</sup> S. Usher, "The Style of Dionysius of Halicarnassus in the 'Antiquitates Romanae,'" *ANRW* 2.30.1: 817–38, esp. 822.

<sup>34</sup> 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.<sup>35</sup> 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.<sup>36</sup> 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 (*ἀτάκτως*) 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).<sup>37</sup> 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)<sup>38</sup>

<sup>35</sup> 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.

<sup>36</sup> Luschnat, *Die Feldhermreden*, 113; 117.

<sup>37</sup> Leimbach, *Militärische Muster rhetorik*, 87–89. Cf. Thucydides 4.10.

<sup>38</sup> 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 τὸν παρεστῶτος καιροῦ*, 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 (*οἰκείως δὲ τῆς ὑποκειμένης περιστάσεως*, 15.10.1),<sup>39</sup> but the speech offers, in fact, hardly more than a cluster of commonplaces.<sup>40</sup> 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" (*νικᾶν ή θνήσκειν*, 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.<sup>41</sup> 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.<sup>42</sup> *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

<sup>39</sup> Cf. 3.54.2–4; 3.111.1–11.

<sup>40</sup> Walbank, *Commentary*, 2.456.

<sup>41</sup> *B.J.* 1.380 refers to Philadelphia (above).

<sup>42</sup> 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 ἄμα τῇ παρακελεύσει ἐποιύμην) in an attempt to satisfy you on the most important points.”<sup>43</sup> 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).<sup>44</sup> 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.<sup>45</sup>

<sup>43</sup> The translation of Thucydides’ passages is from R. Warner, *Thucydides. History of the Peloponnesian War* (London: Penguin, 1972).

<sup>44</sup> Luschnat, *Die Feldhermnreden*, 71–72; 107–9.

<sup>45</sup> 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.<sup>46</sup>

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 (*τὰ ἀπὸ τῆς τύχης οὐκ ὀλίγα ἐναντιωθῆναι*, 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 (*ἀνδρεία*) (2.87.3–5). One should learn from the mistakes in the past (*νῦν αὐτὰ ταῦτα προσγενόμενα διδασκαλίαν παρέξει*, 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 (*τῶν νεωστὶ γεγονότων συμπτωμάτων*) in his speech before the battle at Cannae (216 B.C.E.) against Hannibal (Polybius 3.108.3–109.13). He counters them by discussing their causes (ignorance, haste, bad visibility). This is the prelude to his argument that the current circumstances were exactly the opposite of the soldiers' former situation (3.108.10–109.5).

Herod's reasoning to counter the adversities is triple. He uses the fact that the people who informed the Arabs of the Jews' misfortune because of the earthquake indulged in amplifying it, implying that the Arabs would overestimate the earthquake's impact on Herod's soldiers, which was a relative advantage for the Jews' (A.J. 15.142–143). Herod's second device is purely rhetorical: it would be illogical if the fact just stated turned the Arabs into audacious fighters and Herod's soldiers into cowards (A.J. 15.142). And thirdly, the adversities were just co-incidental and were not to be considered as punishment by God (A.J. 15.144, below).

### 3.5. *Multitude* (*πλῆθος*) *and/or courage* (A.J. 15.138)<sup>47</sup>

The transition in A.J. 15.138 contrasts holiness and justice with a great number of soldiers and courage: "At this point, someone will perhaps say: 'while holiness and justice are with us, they [our ene-

<sup>46</sup> Cf. B.J. 1.377–378.

<sup>47</sup> This argument is absent in B.J. 1.373–379.

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.

Herodotus 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 (ὁ θεός) 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 τοιόνδε), 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 (*ἀπειρίᾳ*) and courage (*ἀτολμίᾳ*, 2.89.7).<sup>48</sup> 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

---

<sup>48</sup> 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.<sup>49</sup> 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).<sup>50</sup> 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 πλείους τοῖς ἀριθμοῖς*), but by those who are superior in valor (*οἱ κρείττους ἀρετῇ*)” (6.8.1).

Herod's speech departs from the way in which number and courage are usually contrasted in commander speeches.<sup>51</sup> 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.<sup>52</sup>

### 3.6. *The Battle is Just and Necessary*

Herod's speech is the prime text for the notion of just war in Josephus.<sup>53</sup> 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 . . . δίκαιώς (129)
- τὸ μὲν ὄσιον καὶ δίκαιόν ἔστι μεθ' ἡμῶν (138)
- μεθ' ὧν τὸ δίκαιον ἔστι μετ' ἐκείνων ὁ θεός (138)
- τὸν δὲ πόλεμον . . . δίκαιον οἶδεν (145)

<sup>49</sup> Luschnat, *Die Feldherrnreden*, 59; Leimbach, *Militärische Musterrhetorik*, 79–80.

<sup>50</sup> Cf. Thucydides 2.87.6; 7.61.3. Luschnat, *Die Feldherrnreden*, 60–61; 133 (references).

<sup>51</sup> I thank Jonathan Kirkpatrick (Oxford) for pointing this out to me.

<sup>52</sup> 1 Macc 3:19; Jdt 9:11; Josephus, *A.J.* 8.280, 295. The motif occurs already in Judg 7 about Gideon's 300 fighters defeating the Midianites with God's help. L. Sementchenko, “On the Two Conceptions of Just War in the ‘Jewish Antiquities’ of Flavius Josephus,” *REA* 103 (2001): 485–95, esp. 491. In *Ant. rom.* 6.8.1–3 Dionysius also connects number with courage.

<sup>53</sup> Mantovani, *Bellum iustum*, 86, argues that Josephus combined the biblical notion of holy war commanded by God with non-Jewish conceptions of just war.

— ἐπεξέλθετε δικαίαις ἀνδραγαθίαις τοὺς ἀδίκους μὲν πρὸς φιλίαν, ἀσπόνδους δὲ ἐν ταῖς μάχαις, ἀνοσίους δὲ εἰς πρέσβεις (146).<sup>54</sup>

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*, *ὅσιος* or *ἱερός*; with the Latin equivalents *bellum iustum* and/or *pium*).<sup>55</sup> 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 (*ἀήθης*) acts against other Greeks by attacking their land and destroying it (Thucydides 2.11.2, 7–9).<sup>56</sup> 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 Marcus warns Tullus not to attack

<sup>54</sup> 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 (*δικαίους καὶ ὅσιους*). 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 δίκαιοι τοὺς ὁμοφύλους πολεμεῖν*). See also A.J. 14.63; *Vita* 22; B.J. 2.399; 2.582; ἄγων *δίκαιος* in Eleazar’s speech at Masada (B.J. 7.355). Sementchenko, “Two Conceptions of Just War.”

<sup>55</sup> 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*.

<sup>56</sup> Leimbach, *Militärische Musterrhetorik*, 19–20; 33.

Rome immediately, but to establish deliberately a righteous and just ground for war (*αιτίαν . . . δεῖν εὐσεβῆ καὶ δικαίαν 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 δικαίαν*).

Coherent theoretical reflections about just war started only with Cicero,<sup>57</sup> 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 (*ὕβρις*) 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.<sup>58</sup>

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.<sup>59</sup> Roman sacral law (*ius fetiale*) 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.<sup>60</sup> In the republican period the priestly role of the *fetiales* declined already and was taken over by envoys from the senate.<sup>61</sup> 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.<sup>62</sup>

<sup>57</sup> 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 Caesar’s *De bello Gallico*,” *Athenaeum* 89 (2001): 145–70.

<sup>58</sup> Albert, *Bellum iustum*, 17–18; Mantovani, *Bellum iustum*, 1–84.

<sup>59</sup> J. Oehler, “Keryx,” *PRE* 11.349–57, esp. c. 355.

<sup>60</sup> Albert, *Bellum iustum*, 12–16.

<sup>61</sup> Albert, *Bellum iustum*, 15; Mantovani, *Bellum iustum*, 60–61.

<sup>62</sup> 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.<sup>63</sup> 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).<sup>64</sup>

### 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).<sup>65</sup> 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.<sup>66</sup>

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).<sup>67</sup> 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

<sup>63</sup> Cf. necessity in Josephus' own speech (*B.J.* 3.361) and Eleazar's Masada speeches (*B.J.* 7.323–388), H. Lindner, *Die Geschichtsauffassung des Flavius Josephus im Bellum Iudaicum* (AGJU 12; Leiden: Brill, 1972), 35–37.

<sup>64</sup> Luschütz, *Die Feldherrnreden*, 35–36; 76–77; 133; Leimbach, *Militärische Muster rhetorik*, 97.

<sup>65</sup> 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.

<sup>66</sup> 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.

<sup>67</sup> 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,<sup>68</sup> 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.<sup>69</sup> Dionysius points at outrageous acts by the enemy before the war with the stock phrase ἡ ὕβρις 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.<sup>70</sup>

### *3.6.2. Improper enemy practices in connection to warfare customs (A.J. 15.130, 139–140)<sup>71</sup>*

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,<sup>72</sup> 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

<sup>68</sup> Cf. Josephus, *B.J.* 1.379.

<sup>69</sup> Cf. Polybius 5.104.1–5; Herodotus 7.5, 9.

<sup>70</sup> Cf. Dionysius 5.45.1 about a very insolent embassy, which the Romans receive from the enemy (*παρὰ τῶν πολεμίων πρεσβείᾳ πολλὴν ὕβριν ἔχοντη*) and Fabius’ opening words in his speech in 9.9.

<sup>71</sup> Cf. *B.J.* 1.375.

<sup>72</sup> Josephus refers to other unannounced wars in *B.J.* 1.269; 2.30; *C. Ap.* 1.318. Mantovani, *Bellum iustum*, 94.

(above).<sup>73</sup> In Herodotus 5.81.2 such a war (*ἀκήρυκτος πόλεμος*) is seen as a crime.<sup>74</sup>

### 3.6.3. *It is natural to fight against barbarians (A.J. 15.130, 136)*<sup>75</sup>

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 *A.J.* 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.<sup>76</sup> But Herod was a non-Greek too. The additional reference to the God of the Jews in *A.J.* 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 (ώς εἰκὸς ἔχειν τὸ βάρβαρον καὶ ἀνεγνόητον 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 *A.J.* 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.<sup>77</sup> 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).<sup>78</sup>

<sup>73</sup> Mantovani, *Bellum iustum*, 60–70.

<sup>74</sup> Cf. *B.J.* 1.269; 2.30; *C. Ap.* 1.318.

<sup>75</sup> Such an argument is absent from Herod’s speech in the *Bellum*.

<sup>76</sup> E. Lévy, “Naissance du concept de barbare,” *Klema* 9 (1984): 5–14.

<sup>77</sup> The *locus classicus* is Herodotus 8.142.5. Mantovani, *Bellum iustum*, 21–23.

<sup>78</sup> Leimbach, *Militärische Muster rhetorik*, 80.

### 3.7. *The Divine Factor*<sup>79</sup>

The Hebrew Bible, as well as the Septuagint additions, frequently presents wars as authorized by God.<sup>80</sup> 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.<sup>81</sup> In Herod's speech too, God's help is closely related to the just war theme (*A.J.* 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).<sup>82</sup>
- 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.<sup>83</sup> 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 (πιστεύσοντας 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).

<sup>79</sup> Herod's speech in the *Bellum Judaicum* does not mention God's interference.

<sup>80</sup> E.g. 1 Sam 17:47; 18:17.

<sup>81</sup> Mantovani, *Bellum iustum*, 86. God's support is essential in other speeches in Josephus: *B.J.* 2.345–401, esp. 388–391; 3.472–484, esp. 484; 4.163–192, esp. 190–191; 5.362–419, esp. 367–369; 376–378; 401–414; 7.323–336, 341–388, esp. 318–319; 327–332; 358–359. Lindner, *Geschichtsauffassung*, 28; Villalba i Varneda, *Historical Method*, 93–101 and 105.

<sup>82</sup> Herod goes to the very edge here by hinting at God's injustice.

<sup>83</sup> 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.<sup>84</sup> 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 εἴ τῷ θεῷ ἐπίφθονοι ἐστρατεύσαμεν, ἀποχρώντως ἥδη τετιμωρήμεθα*)” (7.77.3).<sup>85</sup> 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 *topoi* 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

<sup>84</sup> 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.

<sup>85</sup> Luschnat, *Die Feldherrnreden*, 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.”<sup>1</sup> In this study of

<sup>1</sup> John M. G. Barclay, “The Empire Writes Back: Josephan Rhetoric in Flavian Rome,” in *Flavius Josephus and Flavian Rome* (ed. J. Edmondson, S. Mason and J. B. Rives; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 315–32. I am very grateful to Professor Barclay for making this paper available to me prior to its publication.

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."<sup>2</sup> 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."<sup>3</sup> 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.<sup>4</sup> 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.<sup>5</sup>

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."<sup>6</sup> 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,

<sup>2</sup> Barclay, "Empire."

<sup>3</sup> Barclay, "Empire."

<sup>4</sup> Barclay, "Empire."

<sup>5</sup> Barclay, "Empire."

<sup>6</sup> Barclay, "Empire."

but in the ways he turns and shapes those values to his own interests.”<sup>7</sup> 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.”<sup>8</sup> 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.<sup>9</sup> His reading of the Bible is central to his construction of identity both for himself and for his entire community.<sup>10</sup> 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.<sup>11</sup> 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.<sup>12</sup> Traditional exegesis and Hellenistic sources have been studied with good effect to gain an

<sup>7</sup> Barclay, “Empire.”

<sup>8</sup> Barclay, “Empire.”

<sup>9</sup> On the complexities of discerning Josephus’ target audience, see Steve Mason’s chapter in the present volume.

<sup>10</sup> See Paul Spilsbury, *The Image of the Jew in Flavius Josephus’ Paraphrase of the Bible* (TSAJ 69; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 42–50.

<sup>11</sup> On this point see further Louis H. Feldman, *Judean Antiquities 1–4: Translation and Commentary* (BJP 3, 2000), 3 n. 4.

<sup>12</sup> See for example the numerous studies of L. H. Feldman and C. T. Begg. Feldman’s studies are now conveniently collected in two volumes: *Josephus’s Interpretation of the Bible* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998); *Studies in Josephus’ Rewritten Bible* (JSJSup 58; Leiden: Brill, 1998). See also Spilsbury, *Image*.

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.”<sup>13</sup>

### *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” ( $\mu\eta\ \mu\o\nov\ \P\omega\mu\alpha\iota\o\zeta\ \pi\o\le\mu\o\nu\tau\epsilon\zeta\ \alpha\ll\alpha\ \kappa\o\ \tau\hat{\omega}\ \theta\epsilon\hat{\omega}$  *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

---

<sup>13</sup> Barclay, “Empire.”

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.<sup>14</sup> 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,<sup>15</sup> Abraham resorted to prayer rather than to military action, thus enlisting the aid of "the invincible Ally" (τὸν

<sup>14</sup> Roman φιλανθρωπία 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*]).

<sup>15</sup> This statement is an embellishment of Gen 14:14 which speaks of 318 trained men born in Abram's house.

ἀνίκητον . . . βοηθόν) on behalf of the “those Hebrews beloved by God” (*τοὺς θεοφιλεῖς Ἐβραίους*, Thackeray, LCL). 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 (*βασιλεῦσιν 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 ἀρπασμένων ἔθνος* [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 re-building 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.

*The Antiquitates Judaicae*

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*<sup>16</sup>

It is a well known 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.<sup>17</sup> 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.<sup>18</sup> 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,

<sup>16</sup> For a fuller treatment of this subject see Paul Spilsbury, "God and Israel in Josephus: A Patron-Client Relationship," in *Understanding Josephus: Seven Perspectives* (ed. S. Mason; JSPSup 32; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 172–91.

<sup>17</sup> Betsy Halpern Amaru, "Land Theology in Josephus' *Jewish Antiquities*," *JQR* n.s. 71 (1980–1981) 201–29.

<sup>18</sup> Halpern Amaru, "Land Theology," 229.

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.”<sup>19</sup> 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.<sup>20</sup> 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.*”<sup>21</sup>

<sup>19</sup> Halpern Amaru, “Land Theology,” 229.

<sup>20</sup> Harold W. Attridge, *The Interpretation of Biblical History in the Antiquitates Judaicae of Flavius Josephus* (HDR 7; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1976), 79.

<sup>21</sup> 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."<sup>22</sup> 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."<sup>23</sup> 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; *C.Ap.* 2.296),<sup>24</sup> 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 ὑμᾶς ἀνθρώπους ἐφορῶντος 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" (*οἱ πάντων μᾶλλον ἀνθρώπων ἔσχε 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

<sup>22</sup> Attridge, *Interpretation*, 83.

<sup>23</sup> Attridge, *Interpretation*, 86–87.

<sup>24</sup> See also Seth Schwartz, "Josephus in Galilee: Rural Patronage and Social Breakdown," in *Josephus and the History of the Greco-Roman Period: Essays in Memory of Morton Smith* (eds. F. Parente and J. Sievers; SPB 41; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1994), 292–93; J. H. Neyrey, "Josephus' *Vita* and the Encomium: A Native Model of Personality," *JSJ* 25 (1994): 196–97. M. Goodman, "Josephus as a Roman Citizen," in *Josephus and the History of the Greco-Roman Period*, 332–33.

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,<sup>25</sup> it is telling that he so clearly affirms the social separateness of the descendants of Abraham.<sup>26</sup> While the accusation of unsocial-bleness ( $\delta\mu\epsilon\varsigma\alpha$ ) 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)<sup>27</sup> 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

<sup>25</sup> In *A.J.* 1.192 Josephus states, “The reason for our practice of circumcision I shall expound elsewhere.” This is a reference to Josephus’ often mentioned but apparently never completed work “On Customs and Causes” (cf. *A.J.* 1.25, 214; 3.94, 143, 205, 218, 230, 257, 259; 4.198, 302; 15.371; 20.268; *C.Ap.* 1.92).

<sup>26</sup> On this understanding of the rite of circumcision among other Jews in antiquity, see John J. Collins, “A Symbol of Otherness: Circumcision and Salvation in the First Century,” in “*To See Ourselves as Others See Us:* Christians, Jews, “Others” in Late Antiquity (eds. J. Neusner and E. S. Frerichs; Chico: Scholars Press, 1985), 163–86.

<sup>27</sup> 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.<sup>28</sup> Moses is referred to regularly as νομοθέτης,<sup>29</sup> or as the subject of the verb νομοθετέω.<sup>30</sup> 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.<sup>31</sup> While the laws are still construed as a gift from God,<sup>32</sup> 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

<sup>28</sup> On this subject see further, G. Vermes, "A Summary of the Law by Flavius Josephus," *NT* 24 (1982): 289–303; B. Schröder, *Die "väterlichen Gesetze": Flavius Josephus als Vermittler von Halachah an Griechen und Römer* (TSAJ 53; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996).

<sup>29</sup> 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.

<sup>30</sup> *A.J.* 3.266, 268, 317.

<sup>31</sup> Wayne A. Meeks, *Prophet-King: Moses Traditions and the Johannine Christology* (NTSup 14; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1967), 132; T. Rajak, "Flavius Josephus: Jewish History and the Greek World," (D.Phil. diss., Oxford University, 1974), 2: 88, n. 7.

<sup>32</sup> E.g. *A.J.* 3.223; 4.316, 318. In these references Moses is the mediator of the laws rather than their author. The notion of Moses as mediator of the Law is prominent in Exodus, e.g. 19:3–9. On the notion of the Law as the gift of God during the Second Temple period see William Horbury, "Ezekiel Tragicus 106: δωρήματα," *VT* 36 (1986): 40–42.

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 περιὸν αὐτοῦ 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<sup>33</sup> in order to create rapport with a Hellenized audience.<sup>34</sup>

Along the same lines, we might also notice that Josephus presents the Law of Moses as a political constitution, or *πολιτεία*.<sup>35</sup> 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, BJP]). 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).<sup>36</sup> 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.

<sup>33</sup> Josephus draws direct comparisons with Lycurgus, Solon and Zaleucus of Locri in *CAp* 2.154, and with Minos in *CAp.* 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*.

<sup>34</sup> For a fuller treatment of Josephus’ portrait of Moses, see L. H. Feldman, *Josephus’s Interpretation of the Bible* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998), 374–442; also idem, “Josephus’ Portrait of Moses,” *JQR* 82 (1991–92): 285–328; 83 (1992–1993): 7–50, 301–30.

<sup>35</sup> On Josephus’ use of *πολιτεία*, see Y. Amir, “*Theokratia* as a Concept of Political Philosophy: Josephus’ Presentation of Moses’ *Politeia*,” *SCI* 8–9 (1985–1988): 83–105; H. Cancik, “Theokratie und Priesterherrschaft: Die mosaische Verfassung bei Flavius Josephus contra Apionen 2.157–98,” in *Religionstheorie und politische Theologie. III. Theokratie* (ed. J. Taubes; Munich: Fink, 1987) 65–77; Federico M. Colautti, *Passover in the Works of Josephus* (JSJSup 75; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 224–29; S. Mason, “Should Any Wish to Enquire Further” (*Ant* 1.25): The Aim and Audience of Josephus’s “*Judean Antiquities/Life*” in *Understanding Josephus*, 80–87; T. Rajak, “Continuities in Josephus’ Political Thought,” in *Understanding Josephus*, 222–46; D. R. Schwartz, “Josephus on the Jewish Constitution and Community,” *SCI* 7 (1983–1984) 30–52; P. Spilsbury, “*Contra Apionem* and *Antiquitates Judaicae*: Points of Contact,” in *Josephus’ Contra Apionem: Studies in its Character and Context with a Latin Concordance to the Portion Missing in Greek* (eds. L. H. Feldman and J. R. Levison. AGJU 34; Leiden: Brill, 1996), 362–66; L. Troiani, “The *Politeia* of Israel in the Greco-Roman Age,” in *Josephus and the History of the Greco-Roman Period*, 11–22.

<sup>36</sup> 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).<sup>37</sup> 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.<sup>38</sup> 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).<sup>39</sup> 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.<sup>40</sup> The discussion in Polybius (*Hist.* 6.3.1–9.14),<sup>41</sup> 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 (ἀσέβεια) and hubris of the demand (*A.J.* 6.88–89). The desire for a king constituted a betrayal of his worship and his religion (τὴν

<sup>37</sup> On this matter, see L.H. Feldman, *Judean Antiquities*, 397 n. 575.

<sup>38</sup> On this subject, see further Spilsbury, *Image*, 160–71.

<sup>39</sup> On the continuity between *A.J.* and *C.Ap.* on this point see P. Spilsbury, "Points of Contact," 362–66.

<sup>40</sup> On current constitutional debates in Rome at the time of Josephus' writing, see especially Mason, "Should any Wish to Enquire," 81–84.

<sup>41</sup> On whether Josephus knew Polybius or not, see S. J. D. Cohen, "Josephus, Jeremiah and Polybius," *History and Theory* 21 (1982): 366–81.

θρησκείαν καὶ τὴν εὐσέβειαν *A.J.* 6.90). 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*<sup>42</sup>

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 ἀρχήν) 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).<sup>43</sup> In this vision successive empires are represented by different metals. Josephus not only accepts this as indicative of God's

<sup>42</sup> 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.

<sup>43</sup> On Josephus' treatment of the Daniel material, see especially, F. F. Bruce, "Josephus and Daniel," *ASTI* 4 (1965): 148–62; L. H. Feldman, "Josephus' Portrait of Daniel," *Henoch* 14 (1992): 37–96; S. Mason, "Josephus, Daniel, and the Flavian House," in *Josephus and the History of the Greco-Roman Period*, 161–91; P. Spilsbury, "Rise and Fall;" G. Vermes, "Josephus' Treatment of the Book of Daniel," *JJS* 42 (1991): 149–66.

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.<sup>44</sup> 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]).<sup>45</sup>

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

<sup>44</sup> The third kingdom, which comes “from the west” (*A.J.* 10.208) is clearly that of Alexander the Great. The biblical author probably intended the fourth kingdom to be understood as Alexander; cf. John J. Collins, *A Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), 166, n. 136. In *A.J.* 10.276 Josephus states explicitly that Daniel predicted the Roman Empire. Josephus was not alone in identifying Daniel’s fourth kingdom with Rome; see Collins, *Commentary*, 66–170.

<sup>45</sup> On this important speech in the *Bellum*, see T. Rajak, “Friends, Romans, Subjects: Agrippa II’s Speech in Josephus’ *Jewish War*,” in *Images of Empire* (ed. L. Alexander. JSOTSup 122; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991), 122–34.

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

TESSEL JONQUIÈRE  
UNIVERSITEIT UTRECHT

## 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.<sup>1</sup>

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.<sup>2</sup> 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.<sup>3</sup> 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

<sup>1</sup> See *int. al.* H. W. Attridge, *The Interpretation of Biblical History in the Antiquitates Judaicae of Flavius Josephus* (HDR 7; Missoula (Mont.): Scholars Press, 1976), 17–27, 182, and L. H. Feldman, *Josephus's Interpretation of the Bible* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998), 17, 129–31.

<sup>2</sup> M. Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism. Studies in their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period* (London: SCM Press Ltd, 1974), 77.

<sup>3</sup> See *int. al.* T. Rajak, *Josephus. The Historian and his Society* (London: Duckworth, 1983), 4, 46–64; P. Bilde, *Flavius Josephus between Jerusalem and Rome: his Life, his Works and their Importance* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1988), 21, 62.

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.<sup>4</sup>

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.<sup>5</sup> 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

<sup>4</sup> As, for example, Chairemon the Stoic or Alexander Polyhistor.

<sup>5</sup> See the essay by Jonathan Price in this volume.

Polybius, 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.<sup>6</sup> 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.

<sup>6</sup> 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.<sup>7</sup> 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;<sup>8</sup> 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.<sup>9</sup>

A second example again concerns Moses in the desert with the Israelites. At Rephidim, the people complain that they are thirsty.<sup>10</sup> 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.<sup>11</sup> 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.<sup>12</sup> 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

<sup>7</sup> *A.J.* 2.334; Exod 14:10–12.

<sup>8</sup> *A.J.* 2.335–337; Exod 14:13–14.

<sup>9</sup> 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.

<sup>10</sup> *A.J.* 3.33–38; Exod 17:1–6.

<sup>11</sup> *A.J.* 3.34; Exod 17:4.

<sup>12</sup> *A.J.* 5.39–41; Josh 7:7–9.

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.<sup>13</sup>

Another example is Samson's prayer:<sup>14</sup> 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,<sup>15</sup> 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

<sup>13</sup> For another approach on the presentation of Joshua in Josephus' work see also Feldman, *Josephus's Interpretation*, 443–60.

<sup>14</sup> *A.J.* 5.302; *Judg* 15:18.

<sup>15</sup> *A.J.* 11.143–144; *Ezra* 9:6–15 and *1 Esd* 8:71–87.

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;<sup>16</sup> but Esther's prayer in particular has been completely changed:<sup>17</sup> 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,<sup>18</sup> 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.<sup>19</sup> 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.<sup>20</sup> Moreover, some prayers have been used to give the story a different twist. For instance, when telling the story of Noah:<sup>21</sup> 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.<sup>22</sup>

<sup>16</sup> *A.J.* 11.229–230; Add Esth 4:17<sup>b–h</sup>.

<sup>17</sup> *A.J.* 11.231–233; Add Esth 4:17<sup>k–z</sup>.

<sup>18</sup> These commentaries are to be included in my doctoral dissertation (Universiteit Utrecht), tentatively titled “Prayer in the Writings of Josephus.”

<sup>19</sup> *A.J.* 2.275.

<sup>20</sup> *A.J.* 3.78.

<sup>21</sup> *A.J.* 1.77–103; Gen 6–8.

<sup>22</sup> *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:<sup>23</sup> 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."<sup>24</sup>

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.<sup>25</sup> Much could be said about this prayer, but I shall concentrate on Josephus' remarkable choice of words in one particular part of it.<sup>26</sup>

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

<sup>23</sup> *A.J.* 8.335–346; 1 Kgs 18:20–46.

<sup>24</sup> *A.J.* 8.343; 1 Kgs 18:39.

<sup>25</sup> *A.J.* 1.272–273.

<sup>26</sup> 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.”<sup>27</sup> In asking God to protect his son “graciously,” he uses the word εὐμενῆς. Throughout Josephus’ work, εὐμενῆς and εὐμένεια are the words most commonly used to express God’s benevolence and mercy: εὐμενῆς 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.<sup>28</sup> 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 (εὐμενῆς).” 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 (εὐμενῆς) goddess.”

Another word that stands out in Isaac’s prayer is εὐδαίμων: Isaac asks for a happy life (βίος εὐδαίμων) for his son.<sup>29</sup> 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.<sup>30</sup> 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.”<sup>31</sup> This idea was fundamental to popular Greek religion. Plato and Aristotle wrote a great deal about it,<sup>32</sup> 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 εὐδαιμονία is examined in all three

<sup>27</sup> *A.J.* 1.273.

<sup>28</sup> 2 Macc 12:31 and 13:26 (εὐμενῆς); 2 Macc 6:29 (εὐμένεια) and Wis 6:16 (εὐμενῶς).

<sup>29</sup> *A.J.* 1.273.

<sup>30</sup> For literature on the use of εὐδαιμονία I refer to P. Boned Colera, ed., *Repertorio Bibliográfico de la Lexicografía griega* (Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, Instituto de Filología 1998), 287.

<sup>31</sup> A. A. Long, *Hellenistic Philosophy: Stoics, Epicureans, Sceptics* (2nd ed.; Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986), 42.

<sup>32</sup> E.g. Plato, *Resp.* 621c1–d3; *Pol.* 311b7–c6; Aristotle, *Eth. nic.* 10.6–8.

main branches of Hellenistic philosophy, Scepticism, Epicureanism and Stoicism.<sup>33</sup> Moreover, Seneca wrote a work entitled *De vita beata*, the Latin equivalent of εὐδαιμονία, and Cicero, too, wrote about it.<sup>34</sup>

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.<sup>35</sup> 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.<sup>36</sup> In Hellenistic Judaism, the word gained more common currency. Philo, for instance, wrote an entire work entitled *De providentia*; unfortunately, however, only two large fragments of it have survived.<sup>37</sup>

Harold Attridge has undertaken a detailed study of Josephus' frequent use of the concept of πρόνοια.<sup>38</sup> 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.<sup>39</sup>

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,<sup>40</sup> as may be seen, for instance,

<sup>33</sup> Long, *ibid.*, 6.

<sup>34</sup> See for example Cicero, *Tusc.* 4.84, 5.119–120.

<sup>35</sup> A.J. 2.336.

<sup>36</sup> 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.

<sup>37</sup> Philo, *De providentia, apud Eusebius, Praep. ev.* 7.21 and 8.14; F. A. Colson, *Philo* (LCL 363, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1941), pp. 447–507.

<sup>38</sup> Attridge, *Interpretation, passim*.

<sup>39</sup> R. L. Gordon, "Pronoia," in: *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible* (ed. K. van der Toorn, B. Becking and P. W. van der Horst; 2nd extensively revised edition; Leiden: Brill, 1999) 664–67, esp. 664.

<sup>40</sup> Gordon, *ibid.*, 664.

when Cleanthes writes in his *Hymn to Zeus*, “Nothing supervenes, Lord, on earth, in the divine vault of heaven or the sea, without you.”<sup>41</sup> 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.<sup>42</sup>

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.<sup>43</sup> 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.<sup>44</sup>

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.

<sup>41</sup> H. von Arnim, *Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta*, 4 vols. (Leipzig: Teubner 1903–1924), 1:537, 15–16.

<sup>42</sup> A. T. Kraabel, “Pronoia at Sardis,” *Té’uda* 12 (1996): 75–96, esp. 80–82.

<sup>43</sup> *A.J.* 2.230.

<sup>44</sup> Attridge, *Interpretation*, 71–107.

### 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 βασιλεὺς τῶν ὅλων, “king of the universe” (which is an equivalent of the Hebrew מֶלֶךְ הָעוֹלָם<sup>45</sup>) or δεσπότης παντὸς αἰώνος, “master of the whole world.”<sup>46</sup> 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, οἵς αὐτὸν ἐκόσμησε (“creator of human and divine things with which he adorned himself”);
- (c) προστάτης τε καὶ κηδεμὸν γένους τῶν Ἑβραίων καὶ τῆς τούτων εὐδαιμονίας ἡς 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:<sup>47</sup> the first part presents God as the origin of all things; the second

<sup>45</sup> Onias, *A.J.* 14.24.

<sup>46</sup> Isaac's blessing, *A.J.* 1.272.

<sup>47</sup> 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.<sup>48</sup> 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.’”<sup>49</sup>

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.<sup>50</sup> The second occasion is the invocation in Isaac’s prayer, which was discussed earlier, and in which he refers to God as δημιουργὸς τῆς ὄλης οὐσίας, “creator of all being.”<sup>51</sup> 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 *Josephus. Jewish Antiquities, Books I–IV* (LCL; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1930), xv–xvi, who ascribes the technique to the “Sophoclean assistant.”

<sup>48</sup> H. B. Huffmon, “Father,” in van der Toorn, Becking and van der Horst, *Dictionary*, 326–28, esp. 327–28. Parallels for the use of πατήρ in the Apocrypha: Wis 2:16; 3 Macc 5:7; 6:4, 8; 7:6 and 4 Macc 7:9.

<sup>49</sup> Aristobulus fr. 4, *apud* Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 13.12.3 (trans. A. Yarbro Collins, *OTP* 2:840); C. R. Holladay, *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors*, in 4 vols., vol. 3: *Aristobulus* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995), 162–63.

<sup>50</sup> *A.J.* 1.155.

<sup>51</sup> *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.<sup>52</sup>

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.”<sup>53</sup> Plato uses three different words here to refer to God as creator of the universe: *ποιητής* (maker), *τεκταινόμενος* (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.<sup>54</sup>

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?”<sup>55</sup> 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.<sup>56</sup> In classical Greek literature, on the other hand, it is much more

<sup>52</sup> Hebr 11:10.

<sup>53</sup> Plato, *Tim.* 28c–29a (Bury, LCL).

<sup>54</sup> See also Plato, *Tim.* 28a, 31a and 40c.

<sup>55</sup> Epictetus, *Diatr.* 2.8.21.

<sup>56</sup> 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 translated as “leader,” “ruler,” “administrator,” but also as “one who stands before and protects.” It is also occasionally used as an epithet 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 (‘Απόλλω προστάτων!)” This is similar to Clytaemnestra in *Elektra* 637: “Ο Phoebus<sup>57</sup> our defender (Φοῖβε προστάτηρε), may you now listen to my prayer.” The word κηδεμών, “protector,” which occurs only once in the Septuagint,<sup>58</sup> was commonly used in the Greek-speaking world. God is also called “protector” in the Old Testament, but the Hebrew נָשַׁׁע is generally rendered in the Septuagint by a form of the verb φυλάσσειν; the word for “leader” is more commonly ἄρχων 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 dedication 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.<sup>59</sup>

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.”<sup>60</sup> 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.<sup>61</sup>

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

<sup>57</sup> Phoebus is one of Apollo’s epithets.

<sup>58</sup> 2 Macc 4:2.

<sup>59</sup> 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.

<sup>60</sup> *A.J.* 8.107.

<sup>61</sup> Long, *Hellenistic Philosophy*, 150.

is ἀπροσδεής: he does not need anything.<sup>62</sup> Ever since Xenophanes, certain qualities were attributed to the gods, qualities that were considered worthy of a god;<sup>63</sup> 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.<sup>64</sup> At a later date, a sort of reversal took place, and divine nature was viewed from a different perspective: what qualities were *un*worthy 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.

<sup>62</sup> 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.

<sup>63</sup> Fragments of Xenophanes: 21B11–21B18, in H. Diels & W. Kranz, eds., *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*, vol. 1 (6th ed.; Zürich: Hildesheim, 1951), 132–33.

<sup>64</sup> Oskar Dreyer, *Untersuchungen zum Begriff des Gottgeziemenden in der Antike* (Olms: Hildesheim, 1970), 22–23.



# SOME OBSERVATIONS ON JOSEPHUS' DESCRIPTION OF THE ESSENIAN MORNING PRAYER

NICLAS FÖRSTER  
GEORG-AUGUST-UNIVERSITÄT, GÖTTINGEN

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.<sup>1</sup> 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,

<sup>1</sup> H. Dörrie, "Der nachklassische Pythagoreismus," PW 24, cols. 268–77, esp. 269.

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:<sup>2</sup> “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.<sup>3</sup> 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.<sup>4</sup>

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.<sup>5</sup> 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*.<sup>6</sup> He remarked on Pythagorean piety: “Look, said the

<sup>2</sup> VP § 256 (Jamblich, ΠΕΡΙ ΤΟΥ ΠΥΘΑΓΟΡΕΙΟΥ ΒΙΟΥ, *Pythagoras: Legende—Lehre—Lebensgestaltung* [Eingel., übers. u. interpret. von M. v. Albrecht et al.; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchges., 2002], 200–201): ώμοτρόπως δὲ μηδ' ἐκ τῆς κλίνης ἀνίστασθαι ὑστερον ἡ τὸν ἥλιον ἀνίσχειν (...) ἀλλὰ τὸν μὲν παρατηρεῖν ὅπως ἀνιόντα προσεύξωνται.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. W. Burkert, *Weisheit und Wissenschaft. Studien zu Pythagoras, Philolaos und Platon* (Erlanger Beiträge zur Sprach- und Kulturwissenschaft 10; Nürnberg, 1962), 89.

<sup>4</sup> 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.

<sup>5</sup> U. v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Der Glaube der Hellenen* (Berlin, 1932), 2:258; W. Spoerri, *Späthellenistische Berichte über Welt, Kultur und Götter. Untersuchungen zu Diodor von Sizilien* (Schweizerische Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft 9; Basel, 1959), 167–68.

<sup>6</sup> 11.27 (LCL): Οἱ Πυθαγόρειοι ἔωθεν εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀφορᾶν, ἵν' ὑπομιμησκώμεθα τῶν ἀεὶ κατὰ τὰ ἀντὰ καὶ ὀσαντῶς τὰ ἑαυτῶν 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.<sup>7</sup> 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.<sup>8</sup> 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.<sup>9</sup> His description of the island bears similarities to Ceylon which became known to the Greeks after

<sup>7</sup> G. J. D. Aalders, *Political Thought in Hellenistic Times* (Amsterdam, 1975), 65; N. Holzberg, *Der antike Roman* (Artemis Einführungen 25, München, Zürich, 1986), 20–21; B. Kytzler, “Zum utopischen Roman der klassischen Antike,” in *Groningen Colloquia on the Novel* (Groningen, 1988), 1:12–13.

<sup>8</sup> E. Schwartz, “Diodoros,” PW 5, cols. 663–704, esp. 678; M. Fusillo, “Jambulos,” DNP 5, cols. 856–57; W.-W. Ehlers, “Mit dem Südwestmonsun nach Ceylon. Eine Interpretation der Jambul-Exzerpte Diodors,” *Würzburger Jahrbücher für die Altertumswissenschaft* NF 11 (1985): 73–84, esp. 73.

<sup>9</sup> E. Rohde, *Der griechische Roman und seine Vorläufer* (Darmstadt, 1960; reprint of 3rd ed., Leipzig 1914), 243; J. Ferguson, *Utopias of the Classical World, Aspects of Greek and Roman Life* (London, 1975), 125; Ehlers, *Mit dem Südwestmonsum*,” 74–77.

Alexander's campaign.<sup>10</sup> 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.<sup>11</sup> 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,<sup>12</sup> merchants' tales and traces of myth from the Golden Age.<sup>13</sup> 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.<sup>14</sup> 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."<sup>15</sup> Diodorus completes his excerpts with the following notes about the inhabitants' feasts:<sup>16</sup> "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.<sup>17</sup> Neither animal sacrifices, nor existence of temples designed for worship were mentioned by Iambulus.<sup>18</sup>

<sup>10</sup> W. Kroll, "Jambulos," PW 9, cols. 681–83, esp. 681; Rohde, *Der griechische Roman*, 256; Ferguson, *Utopias*, 126; Ehlers, "Mit dem Südwestmonsun," 78–79.

<sup>11</sup> D. Mendels, "Hellenistic Utopia and the Essenes," HTR 72 (1979): 207–22, esp. 212.

<sup>12</sup> Rohde, *Der griechische Roman*, 253; Ferguson, *Utopias*, 127.

<sup>13</sup> C. Mossé, "Les utopies égalitaires à l'époque hellénistique," Revue historique 141 (1969): 297–308, esp. 301.

<sup>14</sup> Kroll, "Jambulos," 683; R. v. Pöhlmann, *Geschichte der sozialen Frage und des Sozialismus in der antiken Welt*. 3rd ed. rev. F. Oertel, München 1925, 2:306; J. Ferguson, *Utopias*, 127.

<sup>15</sup> Diodorus Siculus 2.59.2 (Oldfather, LCL): σέβονται δὲ θεοὺς τὸ περιέχον πάντα καὶ ἥλιον καὶ καθόλου πάντα τὰ οὐράνια.

<sup>16</sup> Diodorus Siculus 2.59.7 (Oldfather, LCL): ἐν τε ταῖς ἑορταῖς καὶ ταῖς εὐωχίαις λέγεσθαι τε καὶ ἔδεσθαι παρ' αὐτοῖς εἰς τοὺς θεοὺς ὕμνους καὶ ἐγκώμια, μάλιστα δὲ εἰς τὸν ἥλιον, ἀφ' οὗ τάς τε νήσους καὶ ἑαυτοὺς προσαγορεύουσι; on this cf. Rohde, *Der griechische Roman*, 248; Ferguson, *Utopias*, 127.

<sup>17</sup> Pöhlmann, *Geschichte*, 307.

<sup>18</sup> Mendels, "Hellenistic Utopia," 218.

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 εὐδαίμων 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.<sup>19</sup> 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<sup>20</sup> "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.<sup>21</sup> 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."<sup>22</sup> Here Josephus explicitly

<sup>19</sup> Cf. A. Adam, *Antike Berichte über die Essener* (Kleine Texte für Vorlesungen und Übungen 182; 2nd ed. rev. Ch. Burchard; Berlin, 1972), Nr. 8, 39, 23; on Synesius cf. Bauer, "Essener," PW Suppl. 4:386–430, esp. 411.

<sup>20</sup> *Nat.* 5.73 (Rackham, LCL): *gens* ( . . . ) *in toto orbe praeter ceteras mira.*

<sup>21</sup> T. Rajak, "Ciò che Flavio Giuseppe vide: Josephus and the Essenes," in *Josephus and the History of the Greco-Roman Period. Essays in Memory of M. Smith* (ed. F. Parente and J. Sievers; Leiden, 1994), 141–60, esp. 144, 158.

<sup>22</sup> *A.J.* 15.371 (Marcus, LCL): γένος δὲ τοῦτον ἔστιν διαίτη χρώμενον τῇ παρ' "Ελλησιν

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.”<sup>23</sup> In this passage, Josephus probably thought of the traditional Jewish morning prayer that could be the *Shema*.<sup>24</sup> 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.<sup>25</sup>

---

ἵππο Πυθαγόρου καταδεδειγμένη; cf. Bauer, “Essener,” 396; R. Bergmeier, *Die Essener-Berichte des Flavius Josephus. Quellenstudien zu den Essenertexten im Werk des jüdischen Historiographen* (Kampen, 1993), 82.

<sup>23</sup> B.J. 2.128 (Thackeray, LCL): Πρός γε μὴν τὸ θεῖον εὐσεβεῖς ιδίως· πρὶν γὰρ ἀνασχεῖν τὸν ἥλιον οὐδὲν φθέγγονται τῶν βεβῆλων, πατρίους δέ τινας εἰς αὐτὸν εὐχάς, ώσπερ ικετεύοντες ἀνατείλαι; cf. Bauer, “Essener,” 400; E. Zeller, *Die Philosophie der Griechen in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung* 3. Teil, 2. Abteilung. *Die nacharistotelische Philosophie*, 2. Hälfte, (Darmstadt, 1963), 334, 368; Lévy, *La légende*, 132, 277; Ch. Burchard, “Die Essener bei Hippolyt. Hippolyt, Ref. IX 18, 2–28, 2 und Josephus, Bell. 2., 119–161,” *JSS* 8 (1977): 1–41, esp. 35; Bergmeier, *Die Essener-Berichte*, 84–85, 96; W. Fauth, “Salutatio Solis orientis. Zu einer Form der Heliolatrie bei Pythagoreern, Manichäern, Therapeuten und Essener,” in *Geschichte—Tradition—Reflexion. FS M. Hengel* (ed. H. Cancik, H. Lichtenberger, P. Schäfer; vol. 2, *Griechische und Römische Religion* ed. H. Cancik; Tübingen, 1996), 41–54, esp. 52–53; Rajak, “Ciò che Flavio Giuseppe,” 145.

<sup>24</sup> T. S. Beall, *Josephus' Description of the Essenes Illustrated by the Dead Sea Scrolls* (SNTSMS 58; Cambridge, 1988), 52.

<sup>25</sup> G. Hölscher, “Josephus,” PW 9, cols. 1934–2000, esp. 1991; Mendels, “Hellenistic Utopia,” 208–209.

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.<sup>26</sup> The latter claimed that Pythagoras "was imitating and appropriating the doctrines of Jews and Thracians."<sup>27</sup> 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.<sup>28</sup> 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.).<sup>29</sup> 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,

<sup>26</sup> On Hermippus cf. Heibges, "Hermippus, der Kallimacheer," PW 8, cols. 845–52, esp. 846–47, 851; Dörrie, "Der nachklassische Pythagoreismus," 269; F. Montanari, "Hermippus aus Smyrna," DNP 5, cols. 439–40, esp. 439.

<sup>27</sup> C. Ap. 1.165 (Thackeray, LCL): ταῦτα δὲ ἐπράττε καὶ ἔλεγε τὰς Ἰουδαίων καὶ Θρακῶν δόξας μιμούμενος καὶ μεταφέρων εἰς ἑαυτόν.

<sup>28</sup> C. Ap. 1.162 (Thackeray, LCL); cf. H. H. Bietenhard, "Die Handschriftenfunde vom Toten Meer (Hirbet Qumran) und die Essener-Frage. Die Funde in der Wüste Juda," ANRW II.19.1: 704–78, esp. 729; M. Smith, "The Occult in Josephus," in *Josephus, Judaism, and Christianity* (ed. L. H. Feldman and G. Hata; Leiden, 1987), 236–56, esp. 249.

<sup>29</sup> A.J. 13.171–172.

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**



WER DIENT WEM?  
DIE DARSTELLUNG DES FLAVISCHEN TRIUMPHZUGES  
AUF DEM TITUSBOGEN UND BEI JOSEPHUS  
(*B.J.* 7.123–162)

BARBARA EBERHARDT  
UNIVERSITÄT ERLANGEN

1. EINLEITUNG

Zwei Hauptdokumente gibt es, die den Triumphzug der Flavier anlässlich des Sieges über das jüdische Volk bezeugen: zum einen den literarischen Bericht des Flavius Josephus in *B.J.* 7.123–162, zum anderen die bekannten Reliefs im Durchgang des Titusbogens, die heute noch im Osten des Forum Romanum bewundert werden können.<sup>1</sup> Die beiden Zeugnisse erzählen die Geschichte des Triumphzuges auf ganz unterschiedliche Weise. Im folgenden sollen die spezifischen Aussagerichtungen der Triumphzugsdarstellungen auf dem Titusbogen und bei Josephus unter Beachtung des jeweiligen Kontexts herausgearbeitet werden. Zuvor gehe ich jedoch kurz auf den historischen Hintergrund der römischen Triumphzüge ein.

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,<sup>2</sup> teilweise auf ein latinisches

---

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> Vor allem Versnel vertrat die These, dass die Wurzeln des römischen Triumphs in einem vorderasiatischen Neujahrsfest zu finden seien, in dem der König als Teil der Gottheit agierte. Vermittelt über die Etrusker sei das Fest bei den Römern zu einem Siegesfest entmythologisiert worden. Vgl. dazu Hendrik Simon Versnel, *Triumphus: An Inquiry into the Origin, Development and Meaning of the Roman Triumph*. Leiden: Brill, 1970, 396–97 und pass.

Ritual.<sup>3</sup> Allem Anschein nach gab es Triumphzüge schon seit der römischen Königszeit.<sup>4</sup> Davon zeugen auch die so genannten *fasti triumphales*, steinerne Listen, die früher an den Hauptpfeilern 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<sup>5</sup> 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 *fasti* von einer langen Triumphzugstradition, die zur Zeit des Augustus eine besondere Wertschätzung erfuhr.<sup>6</sup>

Waren die römischen Triumphzüge zunächst wahrscheinlich Feiern, die anlässlich eines Sieges zu Ehren Jupiters abgehalten wurden, so vermischtet sich im Laufe der Zeit die Verehrung des römischen Hauptgottes mit der Verehrung des Triumphators.<sup>7</sup> 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.<sup>8</sup> Der letzte Triumphzug fand 303 unter Kaiser Diocletian statt.

<sup>3</sup> Vgl. Walther Eder, „Triumph, Triumphzug,“ *DNP* 12/1 (2002), 836–37.

<sup>4</sup> Livius (1,38,3) und Plutarch (*Rom.* 16,8) verbanden den Beginn der römischen Triumphzugstradition mit dem fünften römischen König Tarquinius Priscus (6. Jh. v.Chr.); vgl. Ambros J. Pfiffig, „Tarquinius,“ *Der kleine Pauly* 5 (1979), 524–26; bes. 525. Nach Ernst Künzl (*Der römische Triumph. Siegesfeiern im antiken Rom.* München: Beck, 1988, 97), hat sich „die uns kenntliche Fassung des Triumphes mit dem Triumphator in der Quadriga und dem Opfer an Iuppiter auf dem Capitol . . . aller Wahrscheinlichkeit nach unter den etruskischen Tarquinierkönigen Roms im 6. Jh. v.Chr. herausgebildet.“

<sup>5</sup> Romulus unternahm nach Plutarch (*Rom.* 16,5–6) mit seinem Heer zu Fuß einen Triumphmarsch durch die Stadt Rom und wurde so der erste Triumphator, auch wenn es sich noch nicht um einen eigentlichen Triumphzug handelte.

<sup>6</sup> Zu den Triumphalfasti vgl. Künzl, *Triumph*, 58–61; Georg Schön, „Fasti,“ *PW* 6:2015–46, bes. 2043 ff.

<sup>7</sup> Vgl. z.B. Livius, 5,23,5; Eder, „Triumph,“ 837; Künzl, *Triumph*, 94–96.

<sup>8</sup> Vgl. Mary Beard, „The Triumph of Flavius Josephus,“ in: *Flavian Rome. Culture, Image, Text*, (hg. von A. J. Boyle und W. J. Dominik), Leiden: Brill, 2003, 543–58, insbes. 551–52; Künzl, *Triumph*, 109.

## 2.2. *Quellen*

Die antiken Quellen über Triumphzüge sind nicht sehr zahlreich. Mehrmals berichtet Plutarch (ca. 50–120 n.Chr.) über Triumphzüge,<sup>9</sup> ebenso Sueton<sup>10</sup> (\* ca. 70 n.Chr.). Einzelne Berichte finden sich bei Diodor<sup>11</sup> (1. Jh. v.Chr.), Livius<sup>12</sup> (ca. 59 v.Chr.–17 n.Chr.), Appian<sup>13</sup> (2. Jh. n.Chr.) und Cassius Dio<sup>14</sup> (ca. 155–ca. 235 n.Chr.).

Die Schilderung des Triumphzuges der Flavier 71 n.Chr. durch Josephus ist der einzige erhaltene Bericht eines Zeitgenossen über einen Triumphzug. Allein deshalb, aber auch wegen seiner relativen Ausführlichkeit, ist er von großer Bedeutung, die oft unterschätzt wurde.<sup>15</sup> Offen bleibt allerdings die Frage, ob Josephus tatsächlich Augenzeuge des Triumphzuges war,<sup>16</sup> und wenn ja, an welchem Ort er das Schauspiel erlebte. War er einfacher Zuschauer? Oder waren seine Verbindungen mit der kaiserlichen Familie bereits so weit gediehen, dass er einen Ehrenplatz zugewiesen bekam? Oder war er, ganz anders, einer der zur Schau gestellten jüdischen Gefangenen? Wie auch immer

<sup>9</sup> *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.).

<sup>10</sup> *Caes.* 37,49,51 (Summarium über fünf Triumphe 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).

<sup>11</sup> Diodor 31,7,9–12 (über den Triumphzug des Lucius Aemilius Paullus 167 v.Chr.).

<sup>12</sup> Livius 34,52,2–12 (über den dreitägigen Triumphzug des Titus Quinctius Flaminius, 194 v.Chr.).

<sup>13</sup> Appian, *Hist. rom.* 12,17,116–117 (über den Triumphzug des Pompeius 61 v.Chr.).

<sup>14</sup> Cassius Dio 51,21,2–22,3 (über die Triumphzüge des Octavian 29 v.Chr.).

<sup>15</sup> Vgl. dazu Beard, „Triumph“, 544 ff.

<sup>16</sup> Wilhelm Weber (*Josephus und Vespasian. Untersuchungen zu dem Jüdischen Krieg des Flavius Josephus*, Berlin: Kohlhammer, 1921, 283–84), beispielsweise scheint die Teilnahme des Josephus am Triumphzug anzuzweifeln, indem er den Bericht des Josephus über den Triumphzug als nachlässiges Abschreiben aus einer anderen Quelle qualifiziert. Auch Otto Michel und Otto Bauernfeind (*Flavius Josephus: De Bello Judaico. Der Jüdische Krieg, Zweisprachige Ausgabe der sieben Bücher*, Band II,2, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1969, 242 [Exkurs XX]), nehmen an, dass Josephus beim Triumphzug nicht anwesend war, da er sonst „eine unglückliche Rolle gespielt hätte“.

man diese Fragen beantwortet, es dürfte unumstritten sein, dass Josephus 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 Vorstellung vom Kaiser als ewigem Triumphator heraus.<sup>17</sup> 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.<sup>18</sup>

### 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.<sup>19</sup> Dort stellte sich der Zug am nächsten Morgen auf. Durch das Triumphtor wurde die Stadt betreten.<sup>20</sup> 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.<sup>21</sup> Nach diesem offiziellen Ende des Zuges waren weitere Aktionen obligatorisch. Dazu gehörte die Veranstaltung eines Mahls für ausgewählte Gäste, sowie oft auch Geldzuwendungen an Soldaten und römische Bürger.<sup>22</sup>

<sup>17</sup> 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.

<sup>18</sup> Vgl. Künzl, *Triumph*, pass.

<sup>19</sup> 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.

<sup>20</sup> 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.

<sup>21</sup> Vgl. Künzl, *Triumph*, 16.82; Eder, „Triumph, Triumphzug“, 837–38 mit Karte und Legende, 839 ff.

<sup>22</sup> Vgl. Künzl, *Triumph*, 83–84.

Im ersten Teil des Zuges wurde die Beute des Feldzuges samt den Gefangenen zur Schau gestellt. Auch Bilder vom Kampf, einige Soldaten, vor allem verdiente Offiziere, und die Opfertiere befanden sich in den verschiedenen Gruppierungen dieses Zugteils, der – wie Künzl annimmt – „nicht schematisch gruppiert, sondern durch das notwendige Personal, die Träger der Anzeigetafeln, durch die eingefügten Triumphalgemälde und andere Motive aufgelockert“<sup>23</sup> war. Im zweiten Teil folgte der Triumphator mit den Behördenvertretern, im dritten Teil schließlich marschierten Teile der Lieder singenden Armee hinterher.<sup>24</sup>

Neben den einfachen Triumphzügen, die nur einen Tag dauerten, gab es – gerade in der Zeit der späten Republik – auch mehrtägige.<sup>25</sup> Die Zuschaumermenge zur Kaiserzeit wird von Künzl auf 300 000 bis 400 000 geschätzt.<sup>26</sup>

#### *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.<sup>27</sup>

<sup>23</sup> Künzl, *Triumph*, 79.

<sup>24</sup> In der Kaiserzeit durfte die Armee meist nur aus Truppenteilen oder Abordnungen bestanden haben; vgl. Künzl, *Triumph*, 81. Eine etwas detailliertere Triumphzugsabfolge findet sich bei Michael Pfanner (*Der Titusbogen, Beiträge zur Erschließung hellenistischer und kaiserzeitlicher Skulptur und Architektur* 2, Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 1983, 86), der sich jedoch vor allem auf die Dokumente über den flavischen Triumphzug stützt.

<sup>25</sup> Vgl. z.B. Livius 34,52,2–12; Plutarch, *Aem.* 32,2–34,8.

<sup>26</sup> Vgl. Künzl, *Triumph*, 72.

<sup>27</sup> Mary Beard nennt es in einem originellen Vergleich mit heutigen Zeremonien „the official launch party and press night of the Flavian dynasty“ (Beard, „Triumph,“ 548). Zur Bedeutung des Triumphzugs für die Einführung der flavischen Dynastie s. auch Marion Roehmer, *Der Bogen als Staatsmonument. Zur politischen Bedeutung der römischen Ehrenbögen des 1. Jhs. n.Chr.* (Quellen und Forschungen zur Antiken Welt 28), München: tuduv, 1997, 219–21, 249.

### 3. DIE DARSTELLUNG DES TRIUMPHZUGES AUF DEM TITUSBOGEN

Dem nur zwei Jahre als Kaiser regierenden Vespasianssohn Titus waren in Rom mindestens zwei Ehrenbögen<sup>28</sup> gebaut worden. Einen davon ließ Titus selbst 80/81 am Südostende des Circus maximus errichten. Die nur in einer Abschrift erhaltene Bogeninschrift verkündete den Sieg des Titus über das „Volk der Juden“.<sup>29</sup>

Berühmt ist der zweite, erhaltene Titusbogen, der heute noch östlich des Forum Romanum zu sehen ist. Er wurde posthum für Titus errichtet, vermutlich durch seinen Bruder Domitian.<sup>30</sup> Die neuere Forschung ist sich einig darüber, dass das Ziel des Bogens die Herausstellung der Vergöttlichung des Titus ist.<sup>31</sup> Dies wird zum einen durch die Bogeninschrift deutlich, die die Gottheit der beiden verstorbenen Flavier unterstreicht: SENATUS POPULUSQUE ROMANUS DIVO TITO DIVI VESPASIANI F VESPASIANO AUGUSTO (Senat und Volk von Rom dem göttlichen Titus Vespasianus Augustus, dem Sohn des göttlichen Vespasianus). Zum anderen ist im Scheitelrelief des Bogendurchgangs die Apotheose des Titus dargestellt. Eine den Bogen passierende Person, die den Blick nach oben erhebt, sieht die Abbildung der Himmelfahrt des Titus auf dem Rücken eines Adlers.

<sup>28</sup> Die Bezeichnung „Ehrenbogen“ eignet sich besser als der Terminus „Triumphbogen“ zur Erhellung der Bedeutung des Bogens in der flavischen Zeit. Vgl. Plinius d. Ä., *Nat.* 34,27: „Der Sinn der Säulen war es, die sterblichen Menschen über die anderen hinauzuheben, und derselbe Sinn liegt den Bögen zugrunde, die ein neuerer Entwurf sind.“ Zur Bedeutung von Triumphbögen als offizielle politische Monamente, die unter den verschiedenen Kaisern seit Augustus bestimmte Botschaften vermittelten vgl. Röhmer, *Bogen*, pass.

<sup>29</sup> *CIL VI* 944. Die Abschrift stammt aus dem 9. Jh. Und lautet nach der Übersetzung Künzls: *Senat und Volk von Rom, dem imperator Titus Caesar Vespasianus Augustus, dem Sohn des vergöttlichten Vespasianus, dem höchsten Priester, zum zehnten Mal Inhaber der tribunizischen Gewalt, zum siebzehnten Mal imperator, zum achten Mal consul, dem Vater des Vaterlandes, seinem princeps: weil er nach Vorschrift und Anweisung und unter der Oberleitung seines Vaters das Volk der Juden bezwang und die auf ihn von allen Feldherrn, Königen und Völkern entweder vergeblich belagerte oder gar nicht angegriffene Stadt Hierosolyma [Jerusalem] zerstört hat.* Zu Bogen und Inschrift vgl. Hans Ulrich Institinsky, „Der Ruhm des Titus,“ *Phil* 97 (1948), 370–371; Künzl, *Triumph*, 16–19; Roehmer, *Bogen*, 234–43.

<sup>30</sup> Eine genaue Datierung des Bogens aufgrund äußerer Merkmale ist nicht möglich. Es ist jedoch wahrscheinlich, dass Domitian den Titusbogen in der Anfangszeit seiner Regierung errichten ließ, um durch die Ehrung seines vergöttlichten Bruders seine eigene Machtposition zu stärken. Vgl. dazu Pfanner, *Titusbogen*, 91–92; Roehmer, *Bogen*, 257–259.

<sup>31</sup> Vgl. Pfanner, *Titusbogen*, 98–99; Künzl, *Triumph*, 21; Roehmer, *Bogen*, 258; John Henderson, “Par Operi Sedes: Mrs. Arthur Strong and Flavian Style, the Arch of Titus and the Cancelleria Reliefs,” in: *Flavian Rome. Culture, Image, Text* (hg. von A. J. Boyle und W. J. Dominik), Leiden: Brill, 2003, 229–54, insbes. 237.

Die beiden Reliefs im Bogendurchgang zeigen programmgemäß ein Ereignis im Leben des Titus, das seine Erhebung zur Gottheit bereits ankündigt: den Triumphzug der Flavier nach dem Krieg gegen das jüdische Volk im Jahr 71 n.Chr.<sup>32</sup> Auf der nördlichen Bogeninnenwand ist Titus als Triumphantor auf der Quadriga zu sehen, das Relief der südlichen Bogeninnenwand zeigt die Präsentation der jüdischen Beutestücke. Beide Reliefs sollen im folgenden auf ihre Intention hin untersucht werden. Dabei sollen vor allem die theologischen Implikationen berücksichtigt werden.

### 3.1. Das „Triumphatorenrelief“

Das Hauptthema des „Triumphatorenreliefs“ ist unzweifelhaft der Imperator Titus selbst, der auf der Triumphatorenquadriga steht. Er ist von zwölf Liktoren<sup>33</sup> umgeben, die an ihren mit Lorbeer umwundenen Rutenbündeln, den sogenannten *fasces*, erkennbar sind. Die Liktoren repräsentieren den Magistrat, die *fasces* sind Symbole ihrer Amtsgewalt. Ein römischer Herrscher hatte das Recht, von zwölf Liktoren begleitet zu werden. Dass Titus von dieser maximalen Anzahl von Liktoren umgeben dargestellt wird, betont die Ehre, die ihm erwiesen wird.

Auf der rechten Seite des Reliefs sind drei Personen in traditioneller Toga abgebildet. Dabei handelt es sich wahrscheinlich um Vertreter der Behörden.<sup>34</sup> Vor ihnen befindet sich ein Jüngling mit nacktem Oberkörper, der den Imperator neben dem Wagen begleitet. Aufgrund des Kontextes und durch Vergleiche mit anderen Darstellungen ist seine Identifizierung mit Honos, dem römischen Gott der Ehre, naheliegend,<sup>35</sup> zumal Honos auch auf dem westlichen Schlussstein des Bogens zu sehen ist.<sup>36</sup> Der römische Gott der Ehre ist somit auf dem

<sup>32</sup> Der Triumphzug ist auch Thema des langgezogenen Frieses über dem Durchgang; s. dazu Pfanner, *Titusbogen*, 82–90; Künzl, *Triumph*, 21–24.

<sup>33</sup> Liktoren nannte man die Amtsdiener 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.

<sup>34</sup> Vgl. Künzl, *Triumph*, 88: Der Triumphantor wurde meistens von Konsuln, Prätoren, Quästoren Ädilen und Senatoren begleitet. Pfanner, *Titusbogen*, 71, zieht auch persönliche Begleiter des zukünftigen Kaisers in Betracht.

<sup>35</sup> Gegen die in der älteren Forschung verbreitet Meinung, die Gestalt repräsentiere den Genius Populi Romani, argumentiert überzeugend Pfanner, *Titusbogen*, 69–71. Ihm folgen Künzl, *Triumph*, 22, und Roehmer, *Bogen*, 255.

<sup>36</sup> 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.

Die einzige Person, die sich mit Titus auf der Quadriga befindet, ist wiederum eine Gottheit: Die Siegesgöttin Victoria, dargestellt mit Doppelflügeln, hält dem Triumphator den goldenen Siegeskranz, die sogenannte *corona triumphalis* aus Eichenblättern mit Binden und Edelsteinen, über den Kopf. Damit nimmt sie eine Stelle ein, die beim Triumphzug normalerweise ein Staatssklave innehatte.<sup>37</sup> Die Gottheit selbst dient dem Kaiser dabei, seine Sieghaftigkeit vor dem Volk herauszustellen.

Vor der Quadriga ist eine weitere Göttin abgebildet. Als Gespannführerin nimmt auch sie den Platz eines Sklaven ein. Dabei handelt es sich um Virtus,<sup>38</sup> 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 beigestanden hatte.

Zusammenfassend kann festgestellt werden, dass Titus auf diesem Relief als der dominierende Imperator dargestellt wird. Alle anderen Figuren – Menschen wie Götter – sind einzig dazu da, ihn zu ehren. Die drei abgebildeten Gottheiten Victoria, Virtus und Honos umgeben den späteren Kaiser und dienen ihm wie Sklaven ihrem Herrn. Damit ist einerseits angedeutet, dass bereits das irdische Leben des Titus göttliche Dimensionen besaß. Andererseits zeigt das Bild, dass die Römer keine Scheu hatten, Götter in einer rein dienenden Funktion darzustellen. Der verstorbene Kaiser ist es, dem auf diesem Relief allein Ehre zuteil wird.

### 3.2. Das „Beuterelief“

Das „Beuterelief“ zeigt einen Ausschnitt aus dem Triumphzug, der in logistischer Hinsicht der im „Triumphatorenrelief“ dargestellten

<sup>37</sup> 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.

<sup>38</sup> Die Identifizierung der Gottheit mit Virtus ist aufgrund der Zusammenstellung mit Victoria und vor allem Honos zwingend. Gegen die Interpretation, es handle sich bei der Figur um Roma, argumentiert überzeugend Pfanner, *Titusbogen*, 67–69. Virtus ist ebenfalls, Honos korrespondierend, auf dem östlichen, der Stadt abgewandten Schlussstein des Titusbogens abgebildet. Ernst Künzl interpretiert, Virtus repräsentiere „das tapfere, pflichtbewußte Verhalten . . . im Felde“, Honos dagegen „das ehrenvolle . . . Verwalten der Stadt und der Staates“ (Künzl, *Triumph*, 22).

Szene vorausgeht.<sup>39</sup> Im Mittelpunkt des Reliefs stehen die prestigeträchtigen Beutestücke aus dem Krieg gegen das jüdische Volk. Sie werden auf Tragebahnen, den so genannten *fercula*, von jeweils acht Trägern<sup>40</sup> getragen. Auf Tafeln wird angekündigt, um welche Objekte es sich dabei handelt.<sup>41</sup> Das erste, auf der rechten Bildhälfte dargestellte Beutestück ist der Schaubrottisch<sup>42</sup> aus dem Jerusalemer Tempel, der zusammen mit zwei Bechern und zwei Posaunen dem Publikum vorgeführt wird. Als nächstes folgt der ebenfalls aus dem Tempel stammende siebenarmige Leuchter.<sup>43</sup> Welchen Gegenstand das Schild am linken Rand des Relief ankündigt, ist unklar, da der Ausschnitt des Triumphzugs hier endet und die Aufschrift nicht erhalten ist. Nach der Beschreibung des Josephus in *B.J.* 7.149–150 würde die Tora folgen. Möglicherweise fand sie im Relief keine Berücksichtigung, weil die Gesetzesrollen für nicht-jüdische Beobachter keine große Kostbarkeit darstellten.<sup>44</sup>

<sup>39</sup> Zu den verschiedenen Triumphzugsteilen s.o. 2.c).

<sup>40</sup> Beim siebenarmigen Leuchter musste ein Träger auf dem Relief ausfallen, da eine zusätzliche Figur – nach Pfanners Vermutung ein verdienter Zenturio – eingefügt wurde und so für den Träger kein Platz mehr war. Pfanner führt diesen kompositorischen Fehler auf die mangelnde Fähigkeit der für das Relief verantwortlichen Künstler zurück, vorgegebene Bildmuster den speziellen Erfordernissen gemäß abzuändern. Vgl. dazu Pfanner, *Titusbogen*.

<sup>41</sup> 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.

<sup>42</sup> Die Beschreibung des Schaubrottisches in Ex 25,23–30; 37,10–16 und bei Josephus, *B.J.* 7.148; *A.J.* 3.139–143 deckt sich in etwa mit der Darstellung auf dem Titusbogen.

<sup>43</sup> Im großen und ganzen stimmt die biblische Beschreibung des Leuchters in Ex 25,31–40; 37,17–24 mit der bei Josephus, *B.J.* 7.148–149; *A.J.* 3,144–146 und der Darstellung im Relief überein. Allerdings fehlt bei den genannten Texten die Erläuterung der Gestalt des Leuchterfußes. Der auf dem Titusbogen dargestellte doppelte achteckige Sockel mit Tierdarstellungen war daher in der Forschungsgeschichte Anlass für eine breite Diskussion. Während er von vielen Forschern als Zeichen der Hellenisierung der Jerusalemer Oberschicht unter den Hasmonäern gedeutet wurde, unter denen die im Jüdischen Krieg erbeutete Menora angefertigt wurde, sahen ihn andere als freie künstlerische Äußerung des Bildhauers, der das Relief am Titusbogen geschaffen hatte. Pfanner schließlich argumentierte, der doppelstöckigen Kasten sei überhaupt nicht als Leuchterbasis anzusehen, sondern es handle sich dabei um ein kunstvoll angefertigtes *ferculum*, da die Tragestangen durch das untere Oktagon hindurchgehen. Zur Diskussion vgl. Walther Eltester, „Der Siebenarmige Leuchter und der Titusbogen“, in: *Judentum – Urchristentum – Kirche* (hg. von Walther Eltester), BZNW 26, Berlin: Töpelmann, 1960, 62–76; Th. A. Busink, *Der Tempel von Jerusalem. 2. Band: Von Salomo bis Herodes*, Leiden: Brill 1980, 1158–60; Pfanner, *Titusbogen*, 72–74; Rachel Hachlili, *The Menorah, the Ancient Seven-Armed Candelabrum. Origin, Form and Significance*, JSJSup 68, Leiden: Brill, 2001, 49–50; Stefan Schreiner, „Leuchter. I. Hebräische Bibel und Judentum“, *RGG* 5, 4. Auflage (2002), 288–89 (mit Lit.).

<sup>44</sup> 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.<sup>45</sup>

Erst auf den zweiten Blick lassen sich auf dem „Beuterelief“ dargestellte Gottheiten erkennen. Sie befinden sich auf dem Bogen, der am rechten Rand des Reliefs zu sehen ist. Zum einen ist die Göttin Victoria im Archivoltzwinkel rechts des Bogendurchgangs abgebildet. In der rechten Hand hält sie den Siegeskranz, in der linken einen Palmzweig. Unter ihren Füßen ist die Krone einer Dattelpalme zu erkennen. Die Palme ist aus Münzen der flavischen Zeit als Symbol für den Sieg der Römer in Judäa bekannt,<sup>46</sup> so dass Victoria hier wie bereits im „Triumphatorenrelief“ den Sieg der Flavier über das jüdische Volk unterstreicht. Die zweite abgebildete Göttin befindet sich in der Figurengruppe, die den Bogen bekront. Die Gruppe besteht aus zwei Quadrigen, zwischen denen ein Reiter auf seinem Pferd und neben ihm eine Frau zu Fuß abgebildet ist. Da die Konstellation der zwei Quadrigen mit Reiter nur aus dem Triumphzug der Flavier bekannt ist,<sup>47</sup> gehen die meisten Forscher zu Recht davon aus, dass hier in anachronistischer Weise die kaiserlichen Familien beim Triumphzug dargestellt ist.<sup>48</sup> Der Reiter kann dann mit Domitian identifiziert werden. Da es unwahrscheinlich ist, dass sich beim Triumphzug eine Frau an zentraler Stelle zwischen den Triumphatoren bewegte, muss die weibliche Figur neben Domitian als Göttin interpretiert werden.

<sup>45</sup> Gerhard Kleiner („Der Triumph des Titus,“ in: Ahrens, Dieter (Hg.), *Festschrift Max Wegner zum sechzigsten Geburtstag*, Münster: Aschendorff, 1962, 43) postuliert, der stark beschädigte *togatus* links neben dem Schaubrottisch, stelle Kaiser Vespasian dar. Dies ist jedoch unwahrscheinlich da Vespasian als Triumphant auf der Quadriga stand und nicht bei den Beutestücken mitlief (so auch Pfanner, *Titusbogen*, 75). Kleiners These, es handle sich bei der dargestellten Szene um den bei Josephus berichteten Beginn des Triumphzugs bei der *porta triumphalis*, ist deshalb abzulehnen, da der im „Beuterelief“ abgebildeten Bogen eben nicht mit dem Triumphbogen identifiziert werden kann; s. dazu u. Zudem bestand auch keine Notwendigkeit, Vespasian auf dem Bogen besonders herauszuheben, da der Bogen eindeutig den vergöttlichten Titus ehrt und nicht Vespasian (gegen Kleiner, „Triumph,“ 43).

<sup>46</sup> Vgl. dazu Jane M. Cody, „Conquerors and Conquered on Flavian Coins,“ in: *Flavian Rome. Culture, Image, Text*, (hg. von A. J. Boyle und W. J. Dominik), Leiden: Brill, 2003, 103–123, insbes. 107–8.

<sup>47</sup> Vgl. Josephus, *B.J.* 7.152; Sueton, *Dom.*, 2; Cassius Dio 65,12.

<sup>48</sup> 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.<sup>49</sup> 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 *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“<sup>50</sup>, 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<sup>51</sup> 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.<sup>52</sup> 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

<sup>49</sup> Während Kleiner, „Triumph“, 42, und Eltester, „Leuchter“, 70 A.16, an Virtus denken, favorisiert Pfanner, *Titusbogen*, 72, Minerva.

<sup>50</sup> Roehmer, *Bogen*, 221. Vgl. Künzl, *Triumph*, 22: „Es handelt sich um die für den Titusbogen bezeichnende Mischung von Realität und Ideologie, die man auch am Triumphwagenrelief... ablesen kann“.

<sup>51</sup> Zur Bedeutung der Menora im Judentum zur Zeit des Josephus vgl. Erwin R. Goodenough, *Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period, Volume 4: The Problem of Method. Symbols from Jewish Cult*, Bollingen Series 37, New York: Pantheon Books, 1954, 82–88; Hachlili, *Menorah*, 204–9.

<sup>52</sup> Vgl. Roehmer, *Bogen*, 255.

Sieg auf dem fiktiven Bogen im „Beuterelief“ und in den Archivolzwickeln des realen Bogens, die unbekannte Göttin auf der Attikakrone begleitet in untergeordneter Stellung – zu Fuß neben dem reitenden Domitian – den späteren Kaiser.

Der ganze Bogen dient somit der Verherrlichung des Titus, der nach seinem Tod unter die Götter aufgenommen wurde und – so können die Betrachter aus dem Reliefsprogramm folgern – nicht einer ihrer Geringsten ist. Durch die Bogeninschrift und den fiktiven Bogen im „Beuterelief“ wird allerdings deutlich, dass Titus nicht eine singuläre Erscheinung ist. Er ist Teil der flavischen Familie, von der der verstorbene Vespasian ebenfalls schon zu den Göttern gehört und der noch lebende Domitian wie Titus von Göttern begleitet wird.

#### 4. DIE SCHILDERUNG DES TRIUMPHZUGES IN *B.J.* 7.123–162

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 *B.J.* 7.123–162

Der Abschnitt über den flavischen Triumphzug in *B.J.* 7.123–162 ist im wesentlichen ein historischer Bericht, der jedoch – wie in der antiken Geschichtsschreibung üblich – einerseits vorgegebene Schemata aufnimmt und andererseits ein Interesse verfolgt, das den Verfasser während des ganzen Werks leitet. Die Auswahl, Anordnung und Ausformulierung der historischen Details lässt bei genauerer Betrachtung die Intention der Darstellung erkennen. Ein Blick auf den Aufbau von *B.J.* 7.123–162 zeigt, dass sich der Text folgendermaßen gliedern lässt:

- 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, Götterbilder, 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 |

Dieser Überblick zeigt bereits einige Eigenheiten der Darstellung des Josephus. Die Beschreibung des Triumphzugs wird durch dessen Vor- und Nachbereitung gerahmt. Dabei fällt unter anderem der Anhang über den Bau des Friedenstempels und die Aufbewahrung der Beutestücke (158–162) auf. In die eigentliche Triumphzugsschilderung ist durch die Beschreibung der auf den Schaugerüsten gezeigten Kriegsdarstellungen ein kurzer Rückblick auf wesentliche Ereignisse des jüdischen Krieges integriert (143–146). Es fehlt jedoch die Erwähnung der dritten Abteilung des Triumphzugs, nämlich der den Triumphantoren folgenden Soldaten.<sup>53</sup> Bevor diese Eigenheiten im Bericht des Josephus interpretiert werden, sollen zunächst in einem Durchgang durch den Text die theologisch relevanten Passagen untersucht werden.

#### *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

---

<sup>53</sup> 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 Tempelvorhangs 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).

Das erste Heiligtum, das in *B.J.* 7.123–162 erwähnt wird, ist der Isistempel (123), in dessen Nähe die Feldherren die Nacht vor dem Triumphzug verbracht hatten.<sup>54</sup> Mit der Nennung des Tempels ist jedoch keine religiöse Handlung verbunden. Wie seine Gegenüberstellung zum oberen Palast zeigt (*οὐ τῶν ἄνω βασιλείων ἀλλὰ πλησίον τοῦ τῆς Ἰσιδος ἱεροῦ*) dient das Isisheiligtum als reine Ortsangabe zur Lokalisierung des historischen Ausgangspunkts des Geschehens.

Die Gebete des Vespasian und des Titus in den Hallen der Octavia sind die ersten Handlungen, die im Bericht des Josephus explizit kultischen Charakter tragen (128). Die beiden Triumphantoren, die die „herkömmlichen Purpurgewänder“ (*πορφυρᾶς . . . πατρίους*) tragen (124), verrichten in traditioneller Weise mit verhülltem Haupt die „vorgeschriebenen Gebete“ (*εὐχὰς . . . τὰς νεομισμένας*). Josephus betont somit bereits bei der ersten religiösen Aktivität der beiden Flavier im Zusammenhang mit dem Triumphzug, dass sie in Übereinstimmung mit der religiösen Tradition der Römer steht. Ebenso geschieht das dem Gebet folgende Frühstück der anwesenden Heeresteile traditionsgemäß in „herkömmlicher“ Weise (*τὸ νεομισνέον ὅριστον*) (129).

Beim Triumphtor, durch das – wie Josephus betont – „schon immer“ (*αἰεὶ*) die Triumphzüge geleitet wurden (130), begehen Vespasian und Titus die nächste kultische Handlung: sie opfern „den Göttern, deren

---

<sup>54</sup> 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 letztnannte Möglichkeit (so z.B. Michel und Bauernfeind sowie Thackeray); vgl. auch Beard, „Triumph,“ 557 A.34.

Standbilder neben dem Tor errichtet waren“ (*τοῖς τε παριδρυμένοις τῇ πύλῃ θύσαντες θεοῖς*). Dabei erwähnt Josephus nicht die Namen dieser Gottheiten. Wichtig für ihre Verehrung ist nicht ihre konkrete Identität, sondern vielmehr der Standort ihrer Statuen. Dass die Opfer im Bericht des Josephus keine besondere Beachtung erfahren, wird auch durch deren nur sehr knappe Erwähnung deutlich. Sie werden nicht ausführlich beschrieben, sondern sind vielmehr Teil eines komplexen Rituals, das ebenso das Anlegen der Triumphalgewänder und den Aufbruchsbefehl umfasst. Die Opfer der Flavier erscheinen somit als Teil der römischen Triumphtradition und nicht als eigenständige religiöse Handlungen.

In den folgenden Paragraphen beschreibt Josephus zunächst ausführlich die Pracht der beim Triumphzug zur Schau gestellten Schätze (132–138). In 139–147 wendet er sich den mehrstöckigen, Bilder tragenden Schaugerüsten zu, die den Zuschauern beim Triumphzug die vergangenen Kriegshandlungen ebenso vor Augen führten wie den Lesern des Josephus bei der Lektüre der Paragraphen 142–147. Religiöse Handlungen finden sich in diesen Abschnitten ebenso wenig wie Bezüge auf die römische Tradition.

Allerdings werden an zwei Stellen Kultobjekte erwähnt. In 136 berichtet Josephus von Götterstatuen (*θεῶν ἀγάλματο*), die beim Triumphzug gezeigt werden. Seine Beschreibung der Kultbilder macht deutlich, wie er sie einordnet. Sie sind „von erstaunlicher Größe, künstlerisch hervorragend gearbeitet und alle ohne Ausnahme aus kostbarem Material“ (*μεγέθεοι θαυμαστὰ καὶ κατὰ τὴν τέχνην οὐ παρέργως πεποιημένα, καὶ τούτων οὐδὲν, ὅ τι μὴ τῆς ὕλης τῆς πολυτελοῦνς*). Die Götterstatuen sind somit in der Darstellung des Josephus wertvolle Kunstgegenstände, jedoch nicht mehr. Eine theologische Wertung erübrigkt sich daher für Josephus.<sup>55</sup>

Des Weiteren sind in 144 Abbildungen von im Krieg abgebrannten Heiligtümern (*πῦρ . . . ἐνιέμενον ιεροῖς*) erwähnt. Es ist unsicher, ob sie mit konkreten galiläischen bzw. judäischen Synagogen identifiziert werden können,<sup>56</sup> 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

<sup>55</sup> Ähnlich Michel und Bauernfeind, *Flavius Josephus*, 244 A.70.

<sup>56</sup> 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.

Anders verhält es sich mit dem nächsten im Text erwähnten Heiligtum, dem Tempel in Jerusalem (τῷ ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ἱερῷ) (148). Die darin erbeuteten Gegenstände übertreffen nach Josephus alle anderen Beutestücke (διέπρεπε δὲ πάντων). Im einzelnen handelt es sich dabei um einen goldenen Tisch, einen goldenen Leuchter (148), sowie „das Gesetz der Juden“ (ὁ . . . νόμος ὁ τῶν Ἰουδαίων) (150). Josephus erläutert vor allem das Aussehen des Leuchters mit Sockel, Schaft, Armen und Lampen und weist – zwar in moderaten Worten, aber dennoch unverkennbar – auf die religiöse Bedeutung der Menora hin: ihre sieben Arme symbolisieren die Ehre, die die Siebenzahl bei den Juden genoss (ἐπτὰ δ' ἡσαν οὗτοι τῆς παρὰ τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις ἔβδομάδος τὴν τιμὴν ἐμφανίζοντες) (149). Die Anspielung auf den Sabbat ist hier unverkennbar und dürfte nicht nur von jüdischen Lesern, sondern auch von einem gebildeten paganen Publikum verstanden worden sein.<sup>57</sup> Wegen der expliziten Erklärung seiner Symbolik ist der siebenarmige Leuchter in der Beschreibung des Josephus aus der Menge aller anderen beim Triumphzug gezeigten Gegenstände herausgehoben. Die aufmerksamen Leser können an dieser Stelle erkennen, dass hinter den Gegenständen aus der jüdischen Tradition eine tiefere Bedeutung steckt.

Mit den Ritualgegenständen aus dem Jerusalemer Tempel ist der Höhepunkt der Triumphzugserzählung bei Josephus erreicht.<sup>58</sup> Die danach exponierten Standbilder der Siegesgöttin Victoria – bei Josephus griechisch Nike genannt – sind im Gegensatz dazu ähnlich wie die in 136 erwähnten Götterbilder lediglich kostbare, aus Gold und Elfenbein gefertigte Statuen (151), jedoch ohne jegliche religiöse Bedeutung.

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 (ἡν γὰρ παλαιὸν πάτριον), dass der Zug dort anhielt

<sup>57</sup> 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 Sciences and Humanities, 1974–1984, pass.

<sup>58</sup> So auch Künzl, *Triumph*, 26–27.

und auf die Meldung von der vollstreckten Exekution des feindlichen Feldherrn wartete, der nach römischem Recht (*νόμος δ' ἐστὶ Ρωμαίοις*) auf dem Platz oberhalb des Forums hingerichtet wurde (154). Nach dem Erhalt der Nachricht und dem Jubel der Massen begehen die Triumphatoren das Abschlussritual, das aus Opfern und „vorgeschriftenen“ (*νομιζομέναις*) Gebeten besteht (155). Anschließend löst sich die Festgesellschaft in verschiedene Tafelrunden auf (156).

Betrachtet man diesen Abschnitt vom Höhepunkt der Triumphzugsfeierlichkeiten auf dem Capitol, so fällt die nüchterne Berichterstattung des Josephus auf. Der Jupitertempel dient analog dem Isistempel zu Beginn der Erzählung (123) lediglich als Ortsangabe: dort angelangt, hielt man an (*ἐφ’ ὅν ελθόντες ἔστησαν*). Erst einige Zeilen später, nach der Erklärung der Hinrichtung Simon bar Gioras als einer durch das römische Gesetz vorgeschrivenen Handlung, referiert Josephus die dort stattfindenden Opfer und Gebete; auch sie sind durch die römische Tradition vorgegeben, wie bereits die Gebete vor dem Triumphzug (128). Ähnlich wie in 130 wird der göttliche Adressat der Opfer nicht genannt. Indem Josephus die rituellen Handlungen nicht explizit auf den Jupitertempel – und erst recht nicht auf Jupiter selbst – bezieht, erscheinen sie als notwendige Bestandteile eines komplexen römischen Rituals, das wegen seiner alten Tradition unbestritten seine Berechtigung hat. Die selbständige Bedeutung von Opfer und Gebeten als religiösen Handlungen, die den Kontakt mit einer bestimmten Gottheit – in diesem Fall Jupiter – bedeuten, wird jedoch durch die Erzählweise des Josephus völlig zurückgedrängt. Vespasian und Titus werden als Menschen beschrieben, deren Frömmigkeit in der peniblen Befolgung der römischen Triumphzugstradition einschließlich der geforderten kultischen Handlungen liegt. Eine Beziehung zu bestimmten römischen Göttern wird nicht ausgesagt, im Gegenteil: sie wird bewusst vermieden. Auch wenn auf den ersten Blick vom Text her völlig klar zu sein scheint, dass die Opfer und Gebete der Flavier an Jupiter Capitolinus gerichtet waren, und es sich sicher historisch auch so verhielt, so ist an dieser Stelle doch das „beredte Schweigen“ des Josephus zu vermerken. Durch die Nichterwähnung des Jupiter ermöglicht er seinem Lesepublikum, die Religionsausübung der Flavier nicht lokalspezifisch als Jupiterkult, sondern als universale Frömmigkeit zu interpretieren.

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,

könnte der Bericht des Josephus eigentlich enden. Es folgt jedoch ein Anhang, in dem Josephus seine Leser und Leserinnen über Vorgänge informiert, die in seinen Augen zu dem Geschehen dazugehören.

Dazu gehört als erstes der Bau des Tempelbezirks für die Friedensgöttin Pax (bei Josephus griechisch Eirene) (158–159), der historisch immerhin erst vier Jahre nach dem Triumphzug im Jahr 75 fertiggestellt wurde. Josephus betont dabei besonders die Ausstattung des Baukomplexes. Kunstobjekte aus allen Zeiten (159) und aus allen Orten (160) werden dort wie in einem großen Museum gesammelt. Der Friedenstempel ist damit für Josephus Symbol für die einende Macht des römischen Imperiums, unter dessen Hegemonie die verschiedenen Völker mit ihren je eigenen Traditionen leben können.<sup>59</sup> Wie das jüdische Volk nach Josephus' Ansicht seinen Platz im römischen Weltreich einnimmt, so finden auch die goldenen Geräte aus dem Jerusalemer Tempel ihren Platz im Friedenstempel in Rom (161).

Zwei Gegenstände finden allerdings besondere Aufmerksamkeit: das jüdische Gesetz und der Jerusalemer Tempelvorhang. Über ihren Verbleib erzählt Josephus in 162: Ihr Gesetz aber und die purpurnen Vorhänge des Heiligtums befahl er, in den Palastgebäuden aufzuheben und zu bewahren (*τὸν δὲ νόμον αὐτῶν καὶ τὰ πορφυρᾶ τοῦ σηκοῦ καταπετάσματα προσέτοξεν ἐν τοῖς βασιλείοις ἀποθεμένους φυλάττειν*). Dieser Satz, mit dem Josephus den Triumphzugsbericht schließt, berichtet somit von der besonderen Ehre, die Vespasian dem Tempelvorhang und der Tora zukommen lässt. Sie werden im kaiserlichen Palast, das heißt im Privatbereich des Kaisers, aufgehoben und damit bewahrt.

Die Beschreibung des Josephus endet mit dem griechischen Verb φυλάττειν. Es verdient Beachtung, dass dessen hebräisches Äquivalent שָׁמַר (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 (הָעֵד וְשִׁמְעָן יִשְׂרָאֵל). Die Septuaginta übersetzt: καὶ ἀκουσον Ισραὴλ καὶ φύλαξαι. 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

<sup>59</sup> Zur Intention des Josephus in *B.J.*, die Weltherrschaft der Flavier als gottgewollte Ordnung darzustellen, vgl. Michel und Bauernfeind, *Flavius Josephus*, 240–41. A.66 (Exkurs XX); Steve Mason, *Flavius Josephus und das Neue Testament*, Tübingen: UTB, 2000, 92–93.

garantiert bei Josephus der nicht-jüdische römische Kaiser Vespasian. Er sorgt sich persönlich um den Fortbestand des jüdischen Gesetzes und der Tempelvorhänge und ermöglicht damit die Zukunft der jüdischen Religionstradition.

#### 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.

1. In die Darstellung des Triumphzuges ist in *B.J.* 7.143–145 eine Zusammenfassung über die Ereignisse des Jüdischen Krieges integriert. Ihre Funktion ist die gleiche wie die der Bilder auf den Schaugerüsten, über die Josephus erzählt, nämlich dem Publikum die Kriegsergebnisse in gebündelter Form noch einmal vor Augen zu führen. Dabei liegt die Betonung bei Josephus eindeutig auf den Leiden, die die Kämpfe um das jüdische Land mit sich brachten: Verwüstete Landschaften, Tod, brennende Heiligtümer – diese Schreckensbilder des vergangenen Krieges bilden einen eindrucks- vollen Kontrast zum prächtigen und wohlgeordneten Triumphzug zu Beginn der flavischen Friedenszeit (157).
2. Eine weitere Besonderheit der Triumphzugsdarstellung des Josephus ist die bereits von verschiedenen Forschern konstatierte auffällige Hervorhebung der Traditionstreue der Flavier.<sup>60</sup> 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-

---

<sup>60</sup> Vgl. Michel und Bauernfeind, *Flavius Josephus*, 241 A.66 (Exkurs XX); Beard, „Triumph“, 554.

bericht<sup>61</sup> und zugleich Höhepunkt des *Bellum Judaicum*<sup>62</sup> 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.<sup>63</sup> 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 paganen 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 und pagane Römer teilen.<sup>64</sup> 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<sup>65</sup> 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.

3. In *B.J.* 7.123–162 fällt weiterhin auf, dass jüdische Ritualien sowohl in der Schilderung des Triumphzuges selbst (148–150), als auch in der Rahmenhandlung (161–162) den Höhepunkt der Darstellung bilden. Um die exponierte Rolle der beim Triumphzug mitgeführten Gegenstände aus dem Jerusalemer Tempel – den Schaubrottisch,

<sup>61</sup> So Beard, “Triumph,” 556–58.

<sup>62</sup> So Michel und Bauernfeind, *Flavius Josephus*, 240 A.66 (Exkurs XX).

<sup>63</sup> Dies zeigt sich auch an Münzen aus der frühen flavischen Zeit. Auf einer Sesterzprägung des Jahres 71/72 hatte sich Vespasian beispielsweise als Opfernden darstellen lassen. Neben ihm war die Siegesgöttin Victoria abgebildet, die den Siegeskranz über den Kaiser hielt, und im Hintergrund war ein Bogen zu sehen. Durch das Opfer bewies Vespasian seine Frömmigkeit und damit die nach den Bürgerkriegen wiedergekehrte Ordnung und Stabilität des Römischen Reiches. Vgl. dazu Roehmer, *Bogen*, 221–22, mit Tafel 9,2.

<sup>64</sup> Vgl. Bernd Schröder, *Die väterlichen Gesetze? Flavius Josephus als Vermittler von Halachah an Griechen und Römer*, TSAJ 53, Tübingen: Mohr, 1996, pass.

<sup>65</sup> Die Frage nach den Adressaten des *Bellum Judaicum* ist komplex und kann an dieser Stelle nicht eigens thematisiert werden. Auch wenn „Josephus‘ erstes Publikum in Rom“ eher Nicht-Juden waren (so Mason, *Flavius Josephus*, 101), dürfte der Schriftsteller gleichwohl darum bemüht gewesen sein, seine Ausführungen auch dem Denken gebildeter Juden gerecht werden zu lassen.

die Menora und die Tora – zu unterstreichen, hält Josephus die Beschreibung der Triumphatoren sehr knapp und verzichtet ganz auf die Erwähnung der dritten Zugteiles: den der kaiserlichen Familie folgenden Behördenvertretern und Soldaten.<sup>66</sup> Auch die den Bericht abschließende Notiz von der Aufbewahrung des Gesetzes und der Tempelvorhänge im kaiserlichen Palast ist von Josephus mit Bedacht gewählt. Vespasian, der von Gott eingesetzte Herrscher über Rom und die ganze Welt, hat mit Tora und Tempelvorhang die Symbolgegenstände der jüdischen Religion in ihrer pharisäischen und ihrer priesterlichen Dimension unter seinen persönlichen Schutz gestellt. Unter dem Dach des römischen Kaisers kann das Judentum wohlbewahrt überleben.

### 5. SCHLUSS

Die Untersuchung hat Ähnlichkeiten und Unterschiede der verschiedenen Dokumente über den Triumphzug des Titus gezeigt. Sowohl die Reliefs auf dem Titusbogen als auch die Ausführungen bei Josephus stabilisieren durch ihre Darstellungen die flavische Dynastie und sind insofern „Herrschaftsinstrumente“. Beide Zeugnisse betonen die Wichtigkeit und den Symbolcharakter der jüdischen Ritualgegenstände. Während es den Reliefbildern dabei allerdings mehr um das Materielle und Spektakuläre der Beutestücke geht, das den Ruhm der Flavier steigert, hebt Josephus die Bedeutung und die Zukunft der symbolträchtigen jüdischen Ritualien hervor. In theologischer Hinsicht wurde deutlich, dass dem Titusbogen und dem Bericht bei Josephus völlig verschiedene Grundkonzeptionen zugrunde liegen. Das römische Monument zeigt die Götter als Diener der Flavier und allen voran des Titus, der selbst vergöttlicht wird. Bei Josephus dagegen sind die Flavier Diener der göttlichen Macht. Durch Opfer und Gebete tun sie ihre religiöse Pflicht innerhalb der Grenzen ihrer eigenen Religion. Darüber hinaus stellt Vespasian das Judentum unter seinen Schutz und dient somit dem einen Gott.

---

<sup>66</sup> Dies beobachtet auch Künzl, *Triumph*, 14.



## JOSEPHUS ON TITUS: THE VANQUISHED WRITING ABOUT THE VICTOR

JAMES S. McLAREN  
AUSTRALIAN CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY

“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.<sup>1</sup> 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.<sup>2</sup> 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.<sup>3</sup> Although the nature of Josephus' motiva-

<sup>1</sup> For example, see G. Mader, *Josephus and the Politics of Historiography* (Leiden: Brill, 2000) 152–57; G. M. Paul, “The Presentation of Titus in the *Jewish War* of Josephus: Two Aspects,” *Phoenix* 47.1 (1993): 56–66; Y. Yavetz, “Reflections on Titus and Josephus,” *GRBS* 16 (1975): 411–32; T. Leoni, “Tito e l’incendio del Tempio di Gerusalemme: repressione o clemenza disubbidita?,” *Ostraka* 9.2 (2000): 455–70; cf. K.-S. Krieger, *Geschichtsschreibung als Apologetik bei Flavius Josephus* (Tübingen: Francke, 1994), 298–304.

<sup>2</sup> For example, R. Laqueur, *Der jüdische Historiker Flavius Josephus: ein biographischer Versuch auf neuer quellenkritischer Grundlage* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1970 [= Giessen: Münchow, 1920]).

<sup>3</sup> See T. Rajak, *Josephus: the Historian and his Society* (London: Duckworth, 1983), 203–17.

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.<sup>4</sup> 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).<sup>5</sup> 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.

<sup>4</sup> See J. Andrew Overman, "The First Revolt and Flavian Politics," in *The First Jewish Revolt* (ed. A. Berlin and J. Andrew Overman; London: Routledge, 2001), esp. 214–18.

<sup>5</sup> 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.<sup>6</sup> 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.<sup>7</sup> 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.<sup>8</sup> 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).<sup>9</sup> 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

<sup>6</sup> For the following discussion see also J. B. Campbell, “Teach Yourself How to be a General,” *JRS* 77 (1987): 13–29; idem, *The Roman Army 31 BC–AD 337* (London: Routledge, 1994) and A. K. Goldsworthy, *The Roman Army at War 100 BC–AD 200* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1997).

<sup>7</sup> See Campbell, “Teach Yourself,” 18–20.

<sup>8</sup> Note also that Onasander was a near contemporary to Josephus and that in *B.J.* 3 the latter behaved very much in the mould of the commander as outlined by Onasander. See C. J. Smith, “Onasander on How to be a General,” in *Modus Operandi. Essays in Honour of Geoffrey Rickman* (ed. M. Austin, M. J. Harries and C. Smith; London: ICS, 1998), 151–66 and D. Ambaglio, “Il trattato ‘Sul Comandante’ di Onasandro,” *Athenaeum* 59 (1981): 353–77 regarding Onasander’s possible motivation for writing his manual.

<sup>9</sup> 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 (23) 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).<sup>10</sup> 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 wearied, 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

<sup>10</sup> 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.<sup>11</sup> 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.<sup>12</sup>

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.<sup>13</sup> 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.

<sup>11</sup> 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.

<sup>12</sup> 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.

<sup>13</sup> 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).<sup>14</sup> 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

<sup>14</sup> 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 subsequently punished (*B.J.* 6.256, 260–262).

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.<sup>15</sup>

Drawing on the context of Roman attitudes on being a good commander provides an important corrective to any enthusiasm for a simple positive reading of Josephus' portrait of Titus' military activity. This point is no more obvious than in the most often cited feature 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

<sup>15</sup> 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).<sup>16</sup> 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*).<sup>17</sup> 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-

<sup>16</sup> It is possible that the contrast outlined by Suetonius has been exaggerated in order to heighten the extent of Titus' success.

<sup>17</sup> 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.<sup>18</sup>

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 (*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" (*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.<sup>19</sup>

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 *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.<sup>20</sup> The building

<sup>18</sup> An important consequence of this connection is the need to reconsider the dating of the *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.

<sup>19</sup> Note that Suetonius makes only a brief reference to the capture of Jerusalem (*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.

<sup>20</sup> See L. H. Feldman, "Financing the Colosseum," *BAR* 27.4 (2001): 20–31, 60–61.

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.<sup>21</sup>

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).<sup>22</sup> Titus is clearly not the first to capture Jerusalem, let alone subdue the Jews. In case anyone had missed this point,

<sup>21</sup> This line of argument is in direct contrast to the approach advocated by Overman, "First Revolt."

<sup>22</sup> 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.<sup>23</sup> 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.

<sup>23</sup> 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.<sup>24</sup> 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.<sup>25</sup>

These reminders meant the war was not simply a matter of some

<sup>24</sup> 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.

<sup>25</sup> 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.<sup>26</sup> 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."<sup>27</sup> 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.<sup>28</sup>

<sup>26</sup> See Barclay, "The Empire" as well as his essay in this volume.

<sup>27</sup> 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.

<sup>28</sup> 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.<sup>29</sup>

## 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 *Antiquities* incorporates a critique of Rome amidst the reality of current circumstances.<sup>30</sup> These insights help provide a framework

<sup>29</sup> The naming of Tiberius Alexander as Titus' advisor lessens the claim of sole command (*B.J.* 5.44–46).

<sup>30</sup> P. Spilsbury, "Flavius Josephus on the Rise and Fall of the Roman Empire," *JTS* 54.1 (2003): 1–24. Note also his contribution to this volume.

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.<sup>31</sup>

---

<sup>31</sup> 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.<sup>1</sup> This is about to change. The focus on Josephus' Roman context has been one of the most significant traits of recent research on Josephus.<sup>2</sup> 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.<sup>3</sup>

## 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

<sup>1</sup> On the latter point, see e.g. M. Hadas-Lebel, "Flavius Josephus, Historian of Rome," in *Josephus and the History of the Greco-Roman Period: Essays in Memory of Morton Smith* (ed. F. Parente and J. Sievers; StPB 41; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 99–106, and M. Beard, "The Triumph of Flavius Josephus," in *Flavian Rome: Culture, Image, Text* (ed. A. J. Boyle and W. J. Dominik; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 543–58.

<sup>2</sup> 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]).

<sup>3</sup> 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,<sup>4</sup> 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.<sup>5</sup> 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.<sup>6</sup>

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:<sup>7</sup>

It is recorded that when Rusticus Arulenus<sup>8</sup> extolled Thrasea Paetus, when Herennius Senecio extolled Helvidius Priscus,<sup>9</sup> 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)

<sup>4</sup> See e.g. J. A. Fitzmyer, *Romans: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (New York: Doubleday, 1993), 86–87.

<sup>5</sup> Ancient sources are quoted from the translations of the Loeb Classical Library, unless otherwise indicated.

<sup>6</sup> See e.g. the discussion in S. Mason, *Life of Josephus: Translation and Commentary* (BJP 9; Leiden: Brill, 2001), xv–xvi note 1.

<sup>7</sup> 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.

<sup>8</sup> The names of Junius Arulenus Rusticus appear in several combinations in the different sources.

<sup>9</sup> 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.<sup>10</sup> 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,<sup>11</sup> Juvenal and Suetonius in the early second century C.E. has been retained until today.<sup>12</sup>

During the past few decades scholars have attempted to draw a more nuanced and balanced picture of Domitian.<sup>13</sup> It is first of all easy to see that the image of an insane despot served to legitimize 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.<sup>14</sup> 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

<sup>10</sup> See e.g. R. Syme, “Domitian: The Last Years,” *Chiron* 13 (1983): 121–46, 123, or the discussion in P. Southern, *Domitian: Tragic Tyrant* (London: Routledge, 1997), 153 note 12.

<sup>11</sup> As only the younger Pliny, the younger Seneca, and the younger Cato figure in this article, I use only their given names below.

<sup>12</sup> In other words: Even more than Josephus, Domitian has suffered from a serious image problem!

<sup>13</sup> See e.g. B. W. Jones, *Domitian and the Senatorial Order. A Prosopographical Study of Domitian’s Relationship with the Senate, A.D. 81–96* (Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society 132; Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society, 1979); Syme, “Domitian”; B. W. Jones, *The Emperor Domitian* (London: Routledge, 1992), and Southern, *Domitian*.

<sup>14</sup> 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.<sup>15</sup> 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.<sup>16</sup>

### 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

<sup>15</sup> 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.

<sup>16</sup> See e.g. Syme, “Domitian,” 121–28; M. Goodman, *The Roman World 44 BC–AD 180* (London: Routledge, 1997), 64–65, and Southern, *Domitian*, 110 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.<sup>17</sup>

The Roman upper class approached philosophy pragmatically and eclectically, with Stoicism as the main component.<sup>18</sup> 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.”<sup>19</sup> 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.”<sup>20</sup> For a Roman senator, such withdrawal could easily be interpreted as

<sup>17</sup> See e.g. Tacitus, *Agr.* 4.

<sup>18</sup> See e.g. R. MacMullen, *Enemies of the Roman Order. Treason, Unrest and Alienation in the Empire* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1966), 49–50, and P. A. Brunt, “Stoicism and the Principate,” *Papers of the British School at Rome* 30 (1975): 7–35, 7.

<sup>19</sup> 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.

<sup>20</sup> Lucan, *Pharsalia* 8.490, quoted from MacMullen, *Enemies of the Roman Order*, 25. Seneca's nephew Lucan is not representative of Stoic thought in all matters.

treason—"for what one avoids, one condemns."<sup>21</sup> 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.<sup>22</sup>

### 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.<sup>23</sup>

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.<sup>24</sup>

<sup>21</sup> Seneca, *Ep.* 14.8.

<sup>22</sup> See e.g. MacMullen, *Enemies of the Roman Order*, *passim*. On Thrasea Paetus, see Tacitus, *Ann.* 16.21–22. On the elder Helvidius Priscus, see Epictetus, *Diatr.* 1.2.19–22. On Herennius Senecio, see Dio Cassius 67.13 (quoted below).

<sup>23</sup> See e.g. Suetonius, *Vesp.* 15.

<sup>24</sup> 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.<sup>25</sup>

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)<sup>26</sup>

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 (ὅτι ἐφιλόσοφει)<sup>27</sup> 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

<sup>25</sup> 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).

<sup>26</sup> Suetonius—apparently by mistake—attributes both eulogies to Junius Arulenus Rusticus. The death of Herennius Senecio is not mentioned.

<sup>27</sup> My translation. Cary (LCL) translates “because he was a philosopher.”

correct that Domitian considered the very act of doing philosophy a crime.<sup>28</sup> 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,”<sup>29</sup> 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.”<sup>30</sup> When the bid for *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 *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.”<sup>31</sup>

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.<sup>32</sup> 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.<sup>33</sup> This might explain why philosophizing or “stoicizing” could become almost equivalent to treason.<sup>34</sup>

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.<sup>35</sup>

<sup>28</sup> See e.g. J. L. Penwill, “Expelling the Mind: Politics and Philosophy in Flavian Rome,” in *Flavian Rome: Culture, Image, Text* (ed. A. J. Boyle and W. J. Dominik; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 345–68, esp. 359 ff.

<sup>29</sup> Syme, “Domitian,” 124.

<sup>30</sup> Tacitus, *Agr.* 2.4.

<sup>31</sup> Brunt, “Stoicism and the Principate,” 27.

<sup>32</sup> 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.

<sup>33</sup> See e.g. Tacitus, *Ann.* 14.57, and Seneca, *Ep.* 73.1.

<sup>34</sup> See e.g. MacMullen, *Enemies of the Roman Order*, 46 and 56 ff.

<sup>35</sup> See e.g. MacMullen, *Enemies of the Roman Order*, *passim*; Brunt, “Stoicism and the Principate”; Jones, *Domitian and the Senatorial Order*, 41 ff.; Jones, *Emperor Domitian*, 119 ff. and 180 ff.; Southern, *Domitian*, 110 ff., and Penwill, “Expelling the Mind.”

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.<sup>36</sup> “Freedom to prosecute was one of the last vestiges of Republican *libertas*.<sup>37</sup>

Other factors, missing from the brief accounts of Tacitus, Pliny, Suetonius and Dio Cassius, may also be conjectured.<sup>38</sup> 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.<sup>39</sup> 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

<sup>36</sup> See e.g. Pliny, *Ep.* 7.33.

<sup>37</sup> Syme, “Domitian,” 124.

<sup>38</sup> See e.g. Penwill, “Expelling the Mind,” 358 ff.

<sup>39</sup> Tacitus, *Ann.* 16.34–35; Dio Cassius 62.15. In fact, Junius Arulenus Rusticus might well have been Tacitus’ source. See Brunt, “Stoicism and the Principate,” 12 note 22.

body" with Demetrius the Cynic.<sup>40</sup> 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.<sup>41</sup> Philostratus points to Socrates a few times in his *Vita Apollonii*,<sup>42</sup> 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.<sup>43</sup> 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."<sup>44</sup>

#### 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.<sup>45</sup>

Philosophers, among them Euphrates and Dio Chrysostom, returned to Rome, and at one point Trajan's wife apparently claimed to be an Epicurean.<sup>46</sup> Philostratus even relates that Dio Chrysostom accompanied Trajan in a triumph.<sup>47</sup> 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.

<sup>40</sup> Tacitus, *Ann.* 16.34.

<sup>41</sup> 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.

<sup>42</sup> See e.g. *Vit. Apoll.* 8.2.

<sup>43</sup> C. G. Starr, "Epictetus and the Tyrant," *CQ* 44 (1949): 20–29, 28.

<sup>44</sup> Tacitus, *Ann.* 15.64.

<sup>45</sup> See e.g. *Ep.* 9.13.

<sup>46</sup> See Syme, *Tacitus*, 538.

<sup>47</sup> *Vit. soph.* 1.488.

### JOSEPHUS AND THE CRUSHING OF THE “STOIC OPPOSITION”

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*.<sup>48</sup>

Domitian's brutal rule has for a long time served as an important interpretative context for the book of Revelation.<sup>49</sup> 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)<sup>50</sup> 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.<sup>51</sup> 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:

<sup>48</sup> 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.

<sup>49</sup> 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.

<sup>50</sup> 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.

<sup>51</sup> S. Mason, “Greco-Roman, Jewish, and Christian Philosophies,” in *Approaches to Ancient Judaism, New Series, Volume Four: Religious and Theological Studies* (ed. J. Neusner; South Florida Studies in the History of Judaism 81; Atlanta: Scholars, 1993), 1–28, and S. Mason, “*Philosophiae*: Graeco-Roman, Judean and Christian,” in *Voluntary Associations in the Graeco-Roman World* (ed. J. S. Kloppenborg and S. G. Wilson; London: Routledge, 1996), 31–58.

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.”<sup>52</sup>

In his recent essays on the *Antiquitates*, Mason returns to the events in 93–94 C.E.<sup>53</sup> 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.”<sup>54</sup> 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.<sup>55</sup>

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.

<sup>52</sup> Mason, “Philosophies,” 17–18.

<sup>53</sup> S. Mason, “Introduction to the *Judean Antiquities*,” in *Judean Antiquities 1–4: Translation and Commentary* (ed. S. Mason; trans. and comm. L. H. Feldman; BJP 3; Leiden: Brill, 2000), xiii–xxxvi, xxxiv–xxxv, and S. Mason, “Flavius Josephus in Flavian Rome: Reading On and Between the Lines,” in *Flavian Rome: Culture, Image, Text* (ed. A. J. Boyle and J. D. William; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 559–90, 560.

<sup>54</sup> Mason, “Flavius Josephus in Flavian Rome,” 589.

<sup>55</sup> Mason, “Introduction,” xxxiv–xxxv. However, in his earlier article on *Contra Apionem*, he dates that treatise to the reign of Nerva: S. Mason, “The *Contra Apionem* in Social and Literary Context: An Invitation to Judean Philosophy,” in *Josephus’ Contra Apionem: Studies in its Character and Context with a Latin Concordance to the Portion Missing in Greek* (ed. L. H. Feldman and J. R. Levison; AGAJU 34; Leiden: Brill, 1996), 187–228, 223. On the deaths of Flavia Domitilla, Flavius Clemens and Nero’s freedman Epaphroditus, see e.g. Suetonius, *Dom.* 14–15 and Dio Cassius 67.14. On the identity of Josephus’ patron Epaphroditus, see e.g. Gerber, *Ein Bild des Judentums*, 65–66, and Mason, “Introduction,” xviii–xix.

*CONTRA APIONEM—A PRESENTATION OF JEWISH PHILOSOPHY?*

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.<sup>56</sup> *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.<sup>57</sup> 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”<sup>58</sup> and a part of Josephus’ “sustained effort . . . to portray Judaism for his Roman readers as a national ‘philosophy’ with its own philosophical schools.”<sup>59</sup> 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.”<sup>60</sup> Similarly, Pieter W. van der

<sup>56</sup> On Josephus' use of Alexandrian sources for his *Contra Apionem*, see e.g. G. P. Carras, “Dependence and Common Tradition in Philo *Hypothetica* VIII 6.10–7.20 and Josephus *Contra Apionem* 2.190–219,” *Studia Philonica Annual* 5 (1993): 22–47. For the view that *Contra Apionem* should be understood primarily within an Alexandrian context, see e.g. S. J. D. Cohen, “Respect for Judaism by Gentiles According to Josephus,” *HTR* 80 (1987): 409–30, 425, and S. Schwartz, *Josephus and Judaean Politics* (Columbia Studies in the Classical Tradition 18; Leiden: Brill, 1990), 21–23. For criticism of this approach, see e.g. M. Goodman, “Josephus’ Treatise Against *Apion*,” in *Apologetics in the Roman Empire: Pagans, Jews, and Christians* (ed. M. Edwards, M. Goodman and S. Price; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 45–58.

<sup>57</sup> See e.g. M. Goodman, “Josephus as Roman Citizen,” in *Josephus and the History of the Greco-Roman Period: Essays in Memory of Morton Smith* (ed. F. Parente and J. Sievers; StPB 41; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 99–106; R. G. Hall, “Josephus’ *Contra Apionem* and Historical Inquiry in the Roman Rhetorical School,” in *Josephus’ Contra Apionem: Studies in its Character and Context*, 229–49; M. Goodman, “Josephus’ Treatise Against *Apion*,” and J. M. G. Barclay, “Judaism in Roman Dress: Josephus’ Tactics in the *Contra Apionem*,” in *Internationales Josephus-Kolloquium Aarhus 1999* (ed. J. U. Kalms; Münsteraner Judaistische Studien 6; Münster: Lit, 2000), 231–45.

<sup>58</sup> Mason, “*Contra Apionem*,” *passim*.

<sup>59</sup> Mason, “Philosophies,” 1.

<sup>60</sup> P. Bilde, *Flavius Josephus between Jerusalem and Rome: His Life, His Works, and Their Importance* (JSPSup 2; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988), 120.

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,’<sup>61</sup> and Aryeh Kasher maintains that Josephus ‘made efforts to present it as a clear and true philosophy, admired by the greatest of Greek thinkers.’<sup>62</sup>

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*.<sup>63</sup> 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*.<sup>64</sup>

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.<sup>65</sup> In the *Bellum* and the *Antiquitates* Josephus

<sup>61</sup> P. W. van der Horst, ‘The Distinctive Vocabulary of *Contra Apionem*,’ in *Josephus’ Contra Apionem: Studies in its Character and Context*, 83–95, 85.

<sup>62</sup> A. Kasher, ‘Polemical and Apologetic Methods of Writing in *Contra Apionem*,’ in *Josephus’ Contra Apionem: Studies in its Character and Context*, 143–86, 154. Cf. also J. W. van Henten, *The Maccabean Martyrs as Saviours of the Jewish People: A Study of 2 and 4 Maccabees* (JSJSup 57; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 288: Josephus ‘depicts them as a people of philosophers,’ and S. D. Breslauer, ‘Philosophy in Judaism: Two Stances,’ in *The Blackwell Companion to Judaism* (ed. J. Neusner and A. J. Avery-Peck; Blackwell Companions to Religion; Malden: Blackwell, 2000), 162–80, 162: Josephus ‘suggests that Judaism has a ‘natural philosophy’ inherent in itself, that has instructed even the most advanced of Greek thinkers. This point of view identifies Judaism and philosophy. True Judaism demonstrates its authenticity through its philosophical rigor.’

<sup>63</sup> See e.g. *C. Ap.* 1.161 ff; 2.168, 257, 281. The expression ‘dependency theme’ is adopted from D. Ridings, *The Attic Moses: The Dependency Theme in some Early Christian Writers* (Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensis 59; Göteborg: Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis, 1995).

<sup>64</sup> 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.

<sup>65</sup> See Haaland, ‘Jewish Laws for a Roman Audience,’ 288–95.

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.* 13.171–173<sup>66</sup> and 18.11–25). In *Contra Apionem* the picture is different. With very few exceptions,<sup>67</sup> “philosophy language” has disappeared from the descriptions of the Jews and their way of life.<sup>68</sup> 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*.<sup>69</sup> Furthermore, the treatise never presents the Jewish way of life as a way to ἐνδαιμονία (“happiness”),<sup>70</sup> and the question of divine providence is only touched upon.<sup>71</sup> These latter topics are both prominent in the *Antiquitates*.<sup>72</sup>

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

<sup>66</sup> In *A.J.* 13.171 the word αἱρεσίς (“school,” “sect”) is used, but not “philosophical” or “philosophy.” The same applies to *Vita* 9–10.

<sup>67</sup> 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.

<sup>68</sup> A similar development can be traced for words like σοφία (“wisdom”) and φρόνησις (“prudence,” “wisdom”). See Haaland, “Jewish Laws for a Roman Audience,” 295.

<sup>69</sup> The word αἱρεσίς does not occur at all in *Contra Apionem*.

<sup>70</sup> 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.

<sup>71</sup> *C. Ap.* 2.180. On the sparse use of πρόνοια (“providence”) and “fate language” in *Contra Apionem*, see Haaland, “Jewish Laws for a Roman Audience,” 294.

<sup>72</sup> 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*.<sup>73</sup> 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 ἐλευθερία (“freedom,” “liberty”)<sup>74</sup> or παρρησία (“freedom of speech”).<sup>75</sup> 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.<sup>76</sup> 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.”

<sup>73</sup> See e.g. S. J. D. Cohen, “History and Historiography in the *Against Apion* of Josephus,” in *Essays in Jewish Historiography* (ed. A. Rapoport-Albert: South Florida; Middletown: Wesleyan Univ., 1988; repr. Studies in the History of Judaism 15; Atlanta: Scholars, 1991), 1–11, and P. Pilhofer, *Presbyteron kretitton: der Altersbeweis der jüdischen und christlichen Apologeten und seine Vorgeschichte* (WUNT 2.39; Tübingen: Mohr, 1990), 193 ff.

<sup>74</sup> 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 ἐλεύθερος is used with reference to the Hasmonean era (*C. Ap.* 2.134).

<sup>75</sup> This word is never used in *Contra Apionem*, while it is frequent in the *Bellum* and the *Antiquitates*.

<sup>76</sup> See e.g. *C. Ap.* 2.151 ff.

SOCRATES AND MARTYRDOM IN *Contra Apionem*

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 *τοὺς ρῆμα μόνον παρὰ τοὺς ἐκείνων νόμους φθεγξαμένους περὶ θεῶν* (“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.<sup>77</sup>

The treatment of Jewish martyrdom in *Contra Apionem* is totally consistent with the lack of compassion on behalf of Socrates.<sup>78</sup> 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: *ρῆμα φθέγξασθαι παρὰ τὸν νόμον* (“to utter a single word contrary to their Law,” *C. Ap.* 2.219).<sup>79</sup>

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).

<sup>77</sup> On the subtlety of this passage, see Gerber, *Ein Bild des Judentums*, 212.

<sup>78</sup> See *C. Ap.* 1.43, 190 ff., 212; 2.219, 232 ff., 272.

<sup>79</sup> Very similar wording also appears elsewhere in similar contexts: The Jews endure torture and death rather than *ρῆμα προέσθαι παρὰ τοὺς νόμους* (“utter a single word against the laws,” *C. Ap.* 1.43). To them the only evil is *ἡ πρᾶξαι τι παρὰ τοὺς ἔσωτῶν νόμους ἡ λόγον εἰπεῖν* (“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,<sup>80</sup> 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,<sup>81</sup> 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.<sup>82</sup> 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

<sup>80</sup> On the similarities between Socrates and Eleazar, the trial scene of the Jewish martyrs as the frequent use of the φιλοσοφ-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.

<sup>81</sup> Cf. the quotation above from Mason, “Flavius Josephus in Flavian Rome,” 589.

<sup>82</sup> 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.<sup>83</sup>

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.<sup>84</sup> 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.<sup>85</sup> My reading indicates that the treatise

<sup>83</sup> See e.g. *C. Ap.* 2.179 ff.

<sup>84</sup> 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."

<sup>85</sup> *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!

# ALEXANDRIEN ALS DREHSCHEIBE ZWISCHEN JERUSALEM UND ROM: DIE BEDEUTUNG DER STADT IM WERK DES JOSEPHUS

GOTTFRIED SCHIMANOWSKI  
SAARBRÜCKEN

In den Werken des Josephus erscheint das ägyptische Alexandrien gegenüber anderen Städten mit 94 (+24) Vorkommen<sup>1</sup> nicht übermäßig häufig (als Vergleich dazu z.B. Jerusalem 578 mal [+119];<sup>2</sup> Rom 244 mal [+895]<sup>3</sup> – dann schon mit Abstand Caesarea am Meer 84 mal [+13];<sup>4</sup> Samaria 80 mal [+67];<sup>5</sup> Akko [Ptolemaës] 69 mal [+11];<sup>6</sup> Tiberias 65 mal [+61];<sup>7</sup> Antiochien 64 mal [+32];<sup>8</sup> Jericho 50 mal [+4],<sup>9</sup> Damaskus 47 mal [+26]),<sup>10</sup> 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*

<sup>1</sup> Zuerst wird das Vorkommen des Städtenamens angegeben, danach in Klammern die Nennung der Einwohner: *B.J.* 31 mal (+3); *A.J.* 43 mal (+13); *C. Ap.* 18 mal (+8); *Vita* 2 mal. Die Erwähnung der Stadt ist damit etwa gleichmäßig auf alle Schriften verteilt, dem jeweiligen Umfang entsprechend, mit einem etwas größeren Schwerpunkt auf dem *B.J.* Die Anzahl richtet sich nach: K. H. Rengstorf (ed.), *A Complete Concordance to Flavius Josephus*, Suppl. I., von A. Schalit, Leiden 1968. Die *Vita* wird durchweg als „Auszgabe Münster“ zitiert nach F. Siegert u.a. (Hg.), *Flavius Josephus. Aus meinem Leben (Vita)*. Kritische Ausgabe, Übersetzung und Kommentar, Tübingen 2001.

<sup>2</sup> Ausgenommen *Contra Apionem*, etwa gleichmäßig auf den Umfang der Schriften verteilt (*B.J.* 151 mal (+2); *A.J.* 371 mal (+91); *Vita* 30 mal (+23)[nach der Ausgabe *Münster* 46 mal]; *C. Ap.* 26 mal (+3)).

<sup>3</sup> Mit einer ähnlichen Verteilung (*B.J.* 103 mal (+616); *A.J.* 134 mal (+202); *Vita* 6 mal (+61) [nach der Ausgabe *Münster* 60 mal]; *C. Ap.* 1 mal [+16]).

<sup>4</sup> Dazu noch 19 Erwähnungen unter anderem Namen (*B.J.* 52 mal; *A.J.* 24 mal; *Vita* 8 mal [Auszgabe *Münster* nur 1 mal]).

<sup>5</sup> In varierender Bezeichnung (*B.J.* 23 mal; *A.J.* 56 mal; *C. Ap.* 1 mal).

<sup>6</sup> Nach dem älteren Namen Akko (zweimal *Ant.*); *B.J.* 25 mal; *A.J.* 35 mal; *Vita* 7 mal [Auszgabe *Münster* 7 mal].

<sup>7</sup> Nach der *Vita* für Josephus vor allem biographisch interessant (*B.J.* 26 mal; *A.J.* 9 mal; *Vita* 33 mal (+56) [nach der Ausgabe *Münster* 82 mal]).

<sup>8</sup> *B.J.* 24 mal; *A.J.* 37 mal; *C. Ap.* 3 mal.

<sup>9</sup> *B.J.* 33 mal; *A.J.* 17 mal.

<sup>10</sup> *B.J.* 10 mal; *A.J.* 36 mal; *Vita* 1 mal.

und seine unmittelbare Umgebung geographisch die größte Bedeutung – neben Rom.<sup>11</sup> Trotzdem weiß er aber um die besondere Bedeutung Alexandriens als zweitgrößter Stadt des Mittelmeerraumes nach Rom. Er kennt ihre Größe und ihr weltpolitisches Gewicht. Das zeigt sich z.B. in den strategischen Überlegungen und ersten politischen Handlungen beim Regierungsantritt Vespasians, wie sie Josephus darstellt; diese werden durch die Darstellung des Tacitus u.a. weitgehend bestätigt.<sup>12</sup>

Es ist interessant, mit welchen Worten Josephus die Überlegungen Vespasians, mit 128 namentlichen Nennungen eine der prominentesten Personen des *Bellum Judaicum*,<sup>13</sup> zur Funktion Alexandriens beschreibt. Auf die besondere Bedeutung des damaligen ägyptischen Präfekten, Tiberius Julius Alexander, des Juden, kommen wir später noch zu sprechen.<sup>14</sup> Bei den Überlegungen des frisch gekürten Imperators spielt eine entscheidende Rolle, dass der Hafen Alexandriens als Umschlagsplatz der Getreidelieferungen aus ganz Ägypten größte strategische Bedeutung besitzt. So bemerkt Josephus, *B.J.* 4.605:

Vespasian wollte zuerst Alexandrien in seine Hand bekommen,<sup>15</sup> da er wusste, dass die Getreideversorgung aus Ägypten<sup>16</sup> von größter

<sup>11</sup> Vor allem im *B.J.*

<sup>12</sup> Vgl. Tacitus, *Hist.* 2.82.3: Titus bekommt die Befehlsgewalt der Truppen in Palästina und Vespasian sichert die Schlüsselpositionen Ägyptens (*Vespasianum 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*).“

<sup>13</sup> 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!*

<sup>14</sup> Er reagierte besonders rasch und vertrauensvoll auf einen Brief Vespasians und wurde so – wie ja später auch Josephus selbst – zu einem Mitarbeiter und Helfer (συνεργὸν . . . καὶ βοητὸν) des Imperators (*B.J.* 4.616; s.u.). Zu Josephus selbst vgl. die Bemerkungen bei S. Mason, *Flavius Josephus und das Neue Testament* (UTB 2130), München u.a. 2000, S. 64–75 und die Anmerkungen in der *Vita*, Ausgabe Münster s.v. *Vespasian(us)*.

<sup>15</sup> „Die Situation in Bezug auf Alexandrien in seine Hand bekommen“ (Imperf. von ἔχω + mit Gen pl. πράγματα mit ἐπί). *B.J.* 2.385–386 spricht vom Bevölkerungsreichthum Ägyptens, seinem Reichtum und seiner Größe, aber auch von der Möglichkeit des Aufstandes (ἀπόστασις, eine in der römische Literatur verbreitete Befürchtung; zum Begriff selbst vgl. u. Anm. 52). Kurz darauf – nach dem Exkurs über die Stadt – *B.J.* 4.616 sichert Josephus die Überlegung noch einmal ab: „So war es nur allzu verständlich, dass Vespasian zur Festigung des ganzen Reiches (εἰς βεβαίωσιν τῆς ὅλης ἡγεμονίας) danach strebte, diese Verhältnisse in seine Hand zu bekommen (έφιετο . . . τῶν ταύτῃ πραγμάτων).“

<sup>16</sup> Michel etwas frei: „die Kornkammer Ägypten“ (τὴν τοῦ σίτου χορηγίαν); vgl. 2.386.

Bedeutung für das Reich war.<sup>17</sup> Er hoffte, als Herrscher über dies Land,<sup>18</sup> falls der Krieg sich länger hinzöge, den Vitellus gewaltsam stürzen zu können, da die Bevölkerung Roms den Hunger auf die Dauer nicht werde ertragen können.<sup>19</sup> Außerdem wollte Vespasian die beiden in Alexandrien stehenden Legionen (δύο . . . τάγματα)<sup>20</sup> auf seine Seite ziehen (προσποιήσασθαι); schließlich hatte er im Sinn, dies Land als ein Bollwerk (πρόβλημα) gegenüber den Überraschungen des Schicksals (ἀπὸ τῆς τύχης ἀδήλων) zu benutzen.

Josephus benutzt diese Gegebenheit, um recht ausführlich die besondere geographische und strategisch bedeutende Position Alexandriens mit ihren Häfen und dem berühmten Leuchtturm,<sup>21</sup> 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.<sup>22</sup> 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<sup>23</sup> dass jeder, der (die Hauptstadt) einer Provinz besitzt, damit

<sup>17</sup> O. Michel etwas blasser: „ein besonders wichtiger Teil des Reiches“ (πλεῖστον τῆς ἡγεμονίας μέρος). Die Redewendung erscheint in ähnlicher Formulierung öfter bei Josephus (*B.J.* 6.379; *A.J.* 19.233; vgl. *B.J.* 4.599). Auf diese Weise hatte Vespasian gegenüber seinem Gegner Vitellus die elementare Versorgung Roms in seiner Hand und damit die Masse der Bevölkerung der Hauptstadt. Ähnlich auch Cassius Dio, *Hist.* 65.9.2.

<sup>18</sup> Die Formulierung ἃς κρατήσας εἰ παρέλκοι ist nicht zu übersetzen. Die Kordanz setzt an dieser Stelle für die Übersetzung ein Fragezeichen (aufschieben?, beiseite bringen?).

<sup>19</sup> Josephus lässt Agrippa II. in seiner ausführlichen Rede *B.J.* 2.386 darauf anspielen, dass Ägypten so viel Getreide ausführt, dass Rom davon vier Monate im Jahr leben kann (mit einer längeren Hinweis auf den Reichtum des Landes; weiter s.u. Anm. 62).

<sup>20</sup> Vgl. *B.J.* 5.44, 287, die Truppe des Tiberius Julius Alexander bei der Belagerung Jerusalems. Ihr Befehlshaber war Fronto Heterius nach *B.J.* 6.238 (allerdings werden wohl kaum – wie dort vorausgesetzt – beide Legionen komplett anwesend gewesen sein). Zum Begriff τάγμα, für lat. *legio*, vgl. H. J. Mason, *Greek Terms for Roman Institutions*, Toronto 1974, S. 162.

<sup>21</sup> Vgl. *B.J.* 5.169 (bei der Beschreibung der Herodesburg in Jerusalem), die Beschreibung des Hafens folgt 4.612–613; weiter zum Turm und zu den antiken Überlieferungen der Bedeutung der Stadt s. A. Bernard, „Testimonia selecta de portu magno et palatiis Alexandriae ad Aegyptum e scriporibus antiquis excerpta“, in: F. Goddio (ed.), *Alexandria. The Submerged Royal Quarter*, London 1998, S. 59–133.

<sup>22</sup> Die ersten Glückwünsche und Unterstützungen für seinen Regierungsanspruch erhielt Vespasian schon in Caesarea am Meer, reiste dann aber zunächst nach Antiochien (*B.J.* 4.630). Allerdings ist die Historizität dieser Reise umstritten; vgl. A. Henrick, „Vespasian's Visit to Alexandria“, *ZPE* 3 (1968) 51–80.

<sup>23</sup> Vgl. M. A. Levi, „L'esclusione dei senatori Romani dell'Egitto Augusteo“, *Aegyptus* 5 (1924) 213–235.

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.<sup>24</sup>

Solche Überlegungen bestimmen natürlich genauso Vespasian. Das massive Interesse für die Sicherheit und Zukunft seiner Herrschaft lässt er sich von keinem anderen abnehmen, darum tritt er eigenständig die Reise an. Aber es stellt sich bald heraus, dass seine Befürchtungen unbegründet sind. Ja, hier in Alexandrien erreichen ihn schon bald die positiven Signale aus Rom mit dem Tod des Vitellius und vor allem die volle Anerkennung seiner Person als Kaiser des ganzen Weltreiches. Das bringt Josephus wieder dazu, eine bewundernde Bemerkung zur Stadt einzuflechten mit den Worten: „Obwohl es nach Rom die größte Stadt ist (*μεγίστη τε οὖσα μετὰ τὴν Ῥώμην ἡ πόλις*), erwies sich Alexandrien angesichts dieser (gratulierenden) Menschenmassen als zu eng“ (*B.J.* 4.656).

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.<sup>25</sup> 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.

<sup>24</sup> Vgl. Tacitus, *Ann.* 2.59: *Augustus . . . seposuit Aegyptum ne fame urgeret Italiam quisquis eam provinciam claustraque terrae ac maris quamvis levi praesidio adversum ingentis exercitus insedisset.* Deswegen handelte sich Germanicus eine scharfe Rüge durch Tiberius ein, als er 19 n.Chr. ohne diese amtliche Genehmigung Alexandrien besuchte. Den Zusammenhang mit der kaiserlichen Bestimmung und die Gefahr einer Aushungerung erwähnt auch Cassius Dio, *Hist.* 51.17.1. Das macht die Anschuldigung gegenüber angesehenen Juden in Alexandrien und Rom, *B.J.* 7.447–448, besondersbrisant. Jedenfalls schließt sich Josephus selbst mit der jüdischen Oberschicht in Alexandrien zusammen (oder entlastet er sich nur dadurch, dass auch andere verleumdet wurden?), vgl. die Korrespondenz – und spätere Veröffentlichung zweier seiner Briefe – mit Agrippa II. (*Vita* 364; vgl. *C. Ap.* 1.50).

<sup>25</sup> *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 νέον αὐτοῖς ἐγκεχειρισμένην 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.).

In Alexandrien laufen die wichtigsten Handelswege zusammen. Hier befindet sich – wenn man so will seit dem Sieg des Augustus über Antonius – die Drehscheibe politischer und wirtschaftlicher Macht zwischen Ost und West. Den Glanz und die Brisanz der Lokalität weiß sich auch Vespasian zu Nutze zu machen. Die besondere Bedeutung der Stadt für das Leben einzelner Persönlichkeiten galt nun nicht nur für die politischen Größen der Zeit, sondern in gewisser Weise – nämlich biographisch – auch für Josephus selbst. Denn mit Sicherheit war er selbst schon bei all diesen Stationen Vespasiens in der unmittelbaren Nähe. Immerhin ist Josephus der Überzeugung, dass Vespasian die Regierungsgewalt von keinem geringeren als Gott selbst in die Hände gelegt und anvertraut wurde (ἐγκεχειρισμένην ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ).<sup>26</sup>

### 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).<sup>27</sup> In dramatischer Weise, in unterschiedlichen Perspektiven hat Josephus seine eigene Biographie dort in Szene gesetzt.<sup>28</sup> Allein die dreiseitige, kurze Zusammenfassung durch Steve Mason<sup>29</sup> 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“.<sup>30</sup>

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.<sup>31</sup> Danach bleibt er als hochgestellte Persönlichkeit immer – zunächst

<sup>26</sup> *B.J.* 5.2 beim Aufenthalt des Titus in Alexandrien.

<sup>27</sup> In der *Vita* wird auf die geschilderten Ereignisse nur kurz hingewiesen (*Vita* 412; vgl. die längere Anmerkung 33 in der Ausgabe Münster, S. 181).

<sup>28</sup> S. Mason verweist zu Recht auf die literarischen Vorbilder bei Odysseus (*Odyssee* 13.250–301) und Judith (s. nächste Anmerkung).

<sup>29</sup> S. Mason, *Flavius Josephus und das Neue Testament* (UTB 2130), Tübingen u.a. 2000, S. 64–67.

<sup>30</sup> Zu Josephus als Kriegsgefangener des Vespasian vgl. Sueton, *Vesp.* 5.6. Ähnlich auch Cassius Dio, *Hist.* 65.1.4; 65.9.1.

<sup>31</sup> Die Episode der Freilassung schildert ausführlich und wiederum mit dramatischer Choreographie *B.J.* 4.622–629.

als Gefangener, dann als Freier – im Umkreis des Imperators.<sup>32</sup> Unabhängig von Josephus erwähnt auch Sueton die Prophetie des Josephus, eines vornehmen Gefangenens (*unus ex nobilibus captiuis*), die diesem die Kaiserwürde voraussagte.<sup>33</sup> Das Schicksal des jüdischen Autors hat sich so mit dem des römischen Kaisers verflochten.

Auf jeden Fall befindet sich Josephus selbst nach *Vita* 215 bald mit Vespasian bei den Vorfeiern zur Ernennung zum Kaiser in Alexandrien.<sup>34</sup> Er heiratet – offensichtlich mit kaiserlicher Genehmigung – ein drittes Mal,<sup>35</sup> wird von den Römern damit nicht als Sklave und ehemaliger Kriegsgefangener behandelt.<sup>36</sup> Später in Rom ließ er sich aber auch von dieser Frau, mit der er drei Kinder hatte, von denen aber nur eines überlebte, wieder scheiden<sup>37</sup> und heiratete schließlich eine vornehme Jüdin aus Kreta.

Von Alexandrien brach Josephus wieder zusammen mit Titus auf, um nach Palästina zurückzukehren, diesmal zur Belagerung Jerusalems. Zusammen mit Titus scheint er dann ein weiteres Mal in Alexandrien gewesen zu sein (s.u.). Es ist offensichtlich, wie eng das Schicksal des Josephus vor allem in den ersten Jahren seiner Freilassung mit dem des Imperators verknüpft gewesen ist.

## 2. TIBERIUS JULIUS ALEXANDER<sup>38</sup>

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

<sup>32</sup> 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 (αεὶ προσεδρεύειν αὐτοῖς ἡγάκαστν).

<sup>33</sup> 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.

<sup>34</sup> *C. Ap.* 1.48.

<sup>35</sup> Zur – kurzen – Ehe mit einer Kriegsgefangenen (Josephus' zweite Ehe) s. die Anm. 34 und 35 in der Ausgabe Münster, S. 182–83 (vgl. u. Anm. 54).

<sup>36</sup> So D. Daube, „Three Legal Notes on Notes on Josephus after his Surrender“, *The Law Quarterly Review* 93 (1977) 192.

<sup>37</sup> Möglicherweise spielen auch halachische Bestimmungen bei der Scheidung eine Rolle; das legt zumindest *Vita* 426 mit Bezug auf die (jüdischen) ζην nahe; vgl. P. Tomson, „Les systèmes de halakha du *Contre Apion* et des *Antiquités*“, F. Siegert u.a. (Hg.), *Internationales Josephus-Kolloquium Paris 2001* (MJSt 12), Münster 2002, S. 189–220 (203).

<sup>38</sup> Siebzehnmal nennt Josephus ihn (13 mal im *B.J.*; 4 mal in *A.J.*).

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.

Tiberius Julius Alexander fackelte nicht lange: Er las seinen Soldaten das Schreiben aus Palästina vor und erhielt sofort ihre volle Unterstützung. So wurden die Legionen Alexandriens zu den entscheidenden politischen Wegbereitern des Kaisers. Der Tag ihrer Zustimmung, und nicht jener der Vespasian selbst unterstellten Truppen in Palästina, wurde dann zum offiziellen Regierungsantritt, zum *dies imperii*.<sup>39</sup> Das ist erstaunlich; aber es gilt: je früher, desto besser und gewichtiger. Die Rolle des Alexanders in dieser geschichtsträchtigen Situation findet wohl darum bei den römischen Historikern volle Anerkennung.<sup>40</sup>

Dabei ist aber wenig wahrscheinlich, dass diese sich des Judes als Präfekten bewusst waren. Nie wird Tiberius Alexander bei ihnen als Jude bezeichnet. Tacitus kennzeichnet ihn allerdings zu Beginn seiner *Historien* als „Ägypter“,<sup>41</sup> 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.<sup>42</sup> Bei ihm fallen die Verachtung der Ägypter und die der Juden in eins; es handelt sich um eine bewusste Missachtung des Selbstbewusstseins Alexanders als Griechen 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.<sup>43</sup> Selbst bei einem der ersten brisanten und blutigen

<sup>39</sup> Sueton, *Vesp.* 6.3 zu diesem Tag: *qui principatus dies in posterum obseruatus est.*

<sup>40</sup> Sueton, *Vesp.* 6.4; Strabon, *Geogr.* 17.1.13.

<sup>41</sup> Tacitus, *Hist.* 1.11 zu Ägypten: *regebat tum Tiberius Alexander, eiusdem nationis.*

<sup>42</sup> Vgl. den berüchtigten Judenexkurs in *Hist.* 3.3.

<sup>43</sup> B.J. 2.220, 223 als Statthalter in Palästina durch Claudius, wobei die Ruhe des Landes (ἐν εἰρήνῃ) herausgestellt wird; 2.309 mit dem Besuch Agrippa II. zu seinem Amtsantritt. Der Abschnitt schließt an die Bemerkung an, dass Florus völlig ungerechtfertigt (namenlose) Juden im Ritterstand geißelte und kreuzigte, „die der Abstammung nach Juden waren und hohe römische Ämter bekleideten“ (ἐών ει καὶ τὸ γένος Ἰουδαίων ἀλλὰ γοῦν τὸ ἀξίωμα Ρωμαιικὸν ἦν). Als ein solch hochgestellter Jude im römischen Dienst wird also auch Tiberius Alexander völlig selbstverständlich anerkannt und gewürdigt.

Konflikte zwischen der jüdischen Gemeinde und der alexandrinischen Oberschicht zu Beginn seiner Amtszeit wird sein Verhalten als besonnen gegenüber allen Seiten geschildert (*B.J.* 2.287 ff.): All den Emotionen und Aggressionen gegenüber setzt er sich tatkräftig mit den römischen Soldaten durch und sorgt für Ruhe und Ordnung, nicht ohne einen Versuch, durch Verhandlungen mit der jüdischen Seite und der Sendung hoch angesehener Mitbürger (*τοὺς γνωρίμους*) noch in allerletzter Minute ein Blutvergießen zu verhindern.<sup>44</sup> Alexander stoppt schließlich das blindwütende Vorgehen seiner römischen Soldaten „aus Erbarmen“ (*κατοικτείρας*),<sup>45</sup> wobei man wohl zu ergänzen hat: „mit seinen Landsleuten“.<sup>46</sup> Tiberius Julius Alexander rückt bei dieser Beschreibung in die Nähe des Titus (s.u.).<sup>47</sup> Auf jeden Fall kommt bei Josephus in diesem Zusammenhangen des *Bellum Judaicum* Alexander ohne Einschränkung positiv weg. Seine Rolle und seine

<sup>44</sup> Die ganze Episode wird *B.J.* 2.487 als Beispiel angeführt, dass die Einwohner Alexandriens in ständigem Streit mit den Juden lebten (*ἄει μὲν ἣν στάσις πρὸς τὸ Ἰουδαικὸν τοῖς ἐπιχωρίοις*); dies ist auch die erste Erwähnung der Stadt und seiner Einwohner in seinen Werken überhaupt. Zu dieser Zeit scheint es schon anderswo (von außen bedingte?, oder verdeckt messianische Ansätze wie in Palästina?) zu Konflikten gekommen zu sein (Josephus bleibt etwas schwammig und allgemein). *B.J.* 2.490–498 schildert die bewaffneten Auseinandersetzungen; §499 rundet den Abschnitt ab mit der Bemerkung: „So trug das über die Juden Alexandria hereingebrochene Unglück zu (*τοιοῦτον μὲν τὸ κατὰ τὴν Ἀλεξανδρειαν πάθος συνηνέθη*).“ Josephus richtet danach wieder den Blick auf Palästina (den Fortgang und die Zuspitzung des jüdischen Krieges dort).

<sup>45</sup> Ein bei Josephus selten gebrauchtes Wort (nur hier im *B.J.*; vgl. aber 5.318); von Gottes Erbarmen spricht *A.J.* 8.327 (*κατοικτείραντος*, Auferweckung des Jungen durch Elia).

<sup>46</sup> Etwas wird das positive Bild getrübt durch die Bemerkung, dass das aggressive Vorgehen der Soldaten (als Reaktion auf das emotional geladene Vorgehen der Juden, was wiederum auf den offensichtlichen Antijudaismus in Alexandria antwortet) mit seiner Billigung geschieht (*B.J.* 2.494): „Er gestattete nicht nur den uneingeschränkten Waffengebrauch (*ἀναρπεῖν*, besser allgemein: das Töten), sondern auch die Plünderung des jüdischen Besitzes (*τὰς κτήσεις αὐτῶν διαρπάζειν*) und das in Schutt und Asche legen der Häuser (*τὰς οἰκίας καταφλέγειν*).“ Das letzte Verb *καταφλέγω* verbindet wie eine Kettenreaktion die verschiedenen beteiligten Gruppen (2.491 die Griechen; 2.492 die Juden; nun die römischen Soldaten). So zu Recht auch R. A. Kraft, “Tiberius Julius Alexander and the Crisis in Alexandria According to Josephus” (FS J. Strugnell), 1990: “Thus TJA is described as being in control, at least of the troops, of acting wisely in attempting to find a peaceful solution, and of showing compassion and thus saving some of the Jews who were being slaughtered by the tens of thousands. He does not seem to be seen as a villain in the whole episode!”

<sup>47</sup> Zum Verhältnis zwischen Alexander und Titus vgl. A. Barzanò, „Tito e Tiberio Giulio Alessandro“, in: *Atti del Congresso Internationale di studi Flaviani*, vol. II, Rieti 1983, S. 195–202,

Beziehung zu Vespasian sind freundschaftlich und zugleich herzlich und ohne Einschränkungen: er wird umworben und lässt sich umwerben als ein Mitarbeiter und Freund des Kaisers (*συνεργὸν αὐτὸν . . . καὶ βοητόν*).<sup>48</sup> 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 zuspitzen 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.<sup>49</sup> 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.<sup>50</sup>

Dem positiven Bild des Tiberius Julius Alexander scheint nur eine einzige Stelle aus den *Antiquitates* zu widersprechen (A.J. 20.100). Ohne ausführlicher auf diesen Text einzugehen,<sup>51</sup> sei zu dem vielfach wiederholten Gerücht einer „Apostasie“ Alexanders vom Judentum folgendes gesagt: Zum einen ist sprachlich der Begriff der Apostasie für die von Josephus verwendete Behauptung, Alexander „habe die Traditionen der Väter verlassen“ (*τοῖς γὰρ πατρίοις οὐκ ἐνέμεινεν ἔθεσιν*) unangemessen, wäre zumindest nicht seine Sprache; „Apostasie“ wird

<sup>48</sup> B.J. 4.616.

<sup>49</sup> 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 εὗνοιάν τε καὶ σύνεσιν) . . .“; ja gegenüber Titus wird er geschildert als „an Alter und Erfahrung voraus (ἡλικίᾳτε προύχων καὶ κατ’ ἐμπειρίαν), als ein Berater in allen Angelegenheiten des Krieges (σύμβουλός γε μήν τοῖς τοῦ πολέμου χρείσις).“

<sup>50</sup> Zur Tapferkeit der Truppen aus Alexandrien vgl. B.J. 5.287; 6.237–242 schildert die Überlegung und Beratungen des Titus In die gleiche positive Richtung weist der Erwähnung seines Vater mit der Spende von Gold- und Silberverzierungen an den Tempeltoren in Jerusalem, B.J. 5.205; 5.510 erwähnt noch die Übernahme einer Nachtwache bei der Belagerung, direkt nach Titus selbst.

<sup>51</sup> Vgl. meine ausführlichere Darstellung in G. Schimanowski, *Juden und Nichtjuden in Alexandrien. Koexistenz und Konflikte bis zum Pogrom unter Trajan (117 n.Chr.)*, MJSt 16, Münster 2005.

bei Josephus in erster Linie für politische Rädelsführer verwendet.<sup>52</sup> Zum anderen wäre eine Haltung im Unterschied zu den „väterlichen Gebräuchen“ für einen Mann in der Position Alexanders nichts Ungewöhnliches. Selbst für Josephus müsste man an verschiedenen Stellen ähnlich urteilen.<sup>53</sup> In der Oberschicht nicht nur Alexandriens, sondern auch Palästinas, haben sich nur selten Juden geweigert, mit Heiden an einem Tisch zu sitzen. Mehr als eine faire Politik und einen Ausgleich der Interessen wird in dieser Position von Alexander keiner erwartet haben.<sup>54</sup> Möglicherweise steht hinter einer solchen Behauptung des Josephus schlachtweg der Neid: Wo *er* nur reden konnte, konnte Alexander handeln.<sup>55</sup>

Bei der Darstellung des Alexander *junior* geht es um die Präsentierung einer jüdischen Gestalt aus Alexandrien, in der beides, der Osten wie der Westen, das römische Militär und seine Fähigkeit mit den besonderen Bedingungen orientalischer Hitzigkeit umzugehen, sich vereinigten. Zwar erwähnt Josephus das Judesein Alexanders nirgendwo im *Bellum Judaicum* direkt; es scheint aber immer wieder durch, wie bei dem umsichtigen Vorgehen durch die Vermittlung angesehener Alexandriner und auch in der vorbildhaften Präsentation seines Vaters, Alexander *senior*.

### 3. TITUS IN ALEXANDRIEN

Für mehr als einen Politiker der römischen Zeit war also Alexandrien eine wichtige Station.<sup>56</sup> Ähnliches wie bei Vespasian lässt sich auch

<sup>52</sup> 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.

<sup>53</sup> Vgl. *Vita* 214, 229 zur – verbotenen Ehe – Ehe mit einer Gefangenen; vgl. o. Anm. 35.

<sup>54</sup> Zur Deutungsmöglichkeit Alexanders als eines „neuen Joseph“ vgl. G. Schimanowski, aaO. Inhaltlich vgl. *B.J.* 2,81, wo sich eine ganze jüdische Delegation ganz selbstverständlich in ein Apollon-Heiligtum begibt, um politische Verhandlungen zu führen; Josephus bewertet ein solches Entgegenkommen in keiner Weise negativ.

<sup>55</sup> Zur Gesamtthematik vgl. S. Etienne, „Réflexion sur l’Apostasie de Tibérius Julius Alexander“, *SIPhA* 12 (2000) 122–142.

<sup>56</sup> Vgl. schon die Schilderung der Reise des Herodes nach Rom 40 v.Chr., *B.J.* 1,279 (*A.J.* 14,375). Auch er macht in Alexandrien Station, wird von Kleopatra mit allen Ehren empfangen und reist dann weiter nach Rom (also zu Beginn der langen Auseinandersetzungen zwischen Oktavian und Antonius). Zu den Reisewegen auf dem Meer vgl. die Angaben bei N. Kokkinos, *Herodian Dynasty*, Sheffield 1998, S. 287 (Anm. 81) 367–69.

bei seinem Sohn Titus nachzeichnen. Exemplarisch sei genannt dessen Rückkehr nach Rom nach der Eroberung Jerusalems 70 n.Chr.<sup>57</sup> 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 (*Titus* 5.3).<sup>58</sup> 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.<sup>59</sup>

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.<sup>60</sup> Er hatte die Reise ohne die ausdrückliche Genehmigung durch den Senat unternommen. Touristische Attraktionen allein waren selten ausschlaggebend. So werden bei Germanicus die Öffnung der staatlichen Getreidespeicher,<sup>61</sup> 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.<sup>62</sup> Später werden

<sup>57</sup> Vgl. vorher schon das Rekrutieren der Truppen in *B.J.* 3.8, 64 und 5.2.

<sup>58</sup> *quasi desciscere a patre Orientisque sibi regnum vindicare temptasset*. Der Verdacht wurde dadurch noch vermehrt, dass Titus eine Reise nach Memphis unternahm und dort der Beisetzung eines Apis-Stieres beiwohnte. Dabei trug er ein Diadem, „wie es der althergebrachte Brauch einer altehrwürdigen Religion verlangte (*de more quidem rituque priscae religionis*).“

<sup>59</sup> Immerhin lässt auch Tacitus die Macht des Titus in Alexandrien beginnen (s.o. zu *Hist.* 5.1.1 durch die Wahl seines Vaters, ihm die Truppen für die Belagerung Jerusalems anzuertrauen).

<sup>60</sup> Siehe *C. Ap.* 2.63.

<sup>61</sup> Zur enormen – sozialen und politischen – Bedeutung der ägyptischen Getreidelieferung s.o. Anm. 19 und vor allem G. E. Rickman, *The Corn Supply of Ancient Rom*, Oxford 1980, *passim*.

<sup>62</sup> Sueton, *Vesp.* 7.1 mit Besuch des Sarapistempels; ähnlich schon vorher ebd. 5.6 auf dem Karmel.

noch mehr Ereignisse mit seinem Ägyptenaufenthalt verbunden.<sup>63</sup> So gesehen, ist es kein Zufall, dass Vespasian zusammen mit Titus die Nacht vor dem großen Triumphzug in Rom im dortigen Isistempel verbringt.<sup>64</sup>

Daraus erklärt sich, dass seit den Tagen des Augustus für die römische Oberschicht immer ein Hauch an Verdacht beim Besuch der Stadt bestand. Neben anerkennenden Notizen illustrierten in der Regel auch abschätzige Bewertungen der Ägypter, wie sie unter den römischen Geschichtsschreibern gang und gäbe waren,<sup>65</sup> solche Berichte. Wir können dem hier nicht weiter nachgehen. Josephus selbst führt Vespasian und Titus als die höchsten Zeugen an für die Zuverlässigkeit seines *Bellum Judaicum*. Ihnen werden als erste seine Bücher vorgelegt und so jeder Vorwurf von Täuschung, Eigeninteresse und Apologie seines Lebens abgewehrt.<sup>66</sup>

#### 4. WELTPOLITISCHE PERSPEKTIVEN: DER KAMPF ZWISCHEN WEST UND OST

Ereignisse Alexandriens konnten, der geographischen Lage wegen, zu Weltereignissen stilisiert werden (vgl. Philo, *Flacc.* 45). Durch eine ganz andere Art von Text soll zum Abschluss noch auf diese Möglichkeit hingewiesen werden. Bei der dramatischen Schilderung der entscheidenden Schlacht bei Actium 31 v.Chr. im achten Buch von Vergils *Aeneis* werden die Protagonisten zu Schlüsselkörpern erhoben, die gleichzeitig auch geographische Implikationen repräsentieren.

Auf der einen Seite stehen Octavian und Agrippa, die die Werte der traditionellen römischen Gesellschaft widerspiegeln mit den

<sup>63</sup> Vgl. Philostratos, *Vita Apollonii* 5.27 ff. (vgl. Tacitus, *Hist.* 4.81; Sueton, *Vesp.* 7.2–3) zur Heilung von Blinden und Lahmen.

<sup>64</sup> *B.J.* 7.123. Vgl. auch die früheren Zusammenhänge mit dem Isistempel in Rom *A.J.* 18.65–84 und der damit verbunden Ausweisung von Juden aus Rom unter Tiberius. Zum gesamten Thema vgl. F. E. Brenk, “The Isis Campensis of Katja Lembke”, in: N. Blanc, A. Buisson (ed.), *Imago Antiquitatis. Religions et iconographie du monde Romain*. Mélanges offert à R. Turcan, Paris 1999, S. 133–144.

<sup>65</sup> Sie hatten etwas Exotisches an sich, waren gleichzeitig aber verpönt (vgl. schon Strabo; Tacitus und vor allem Seneca u.a.; anders bei Plutarch). Sie finden sich genauso bei Josephus, z.B. in *Contra Apionem*, und vor allem bei Philo. Zum Ganzen s. K. Berthelot, “The Use of Greek and Roman Stereotypes of the Egyptians by Hellenistic Jewish Apologists, with special reference to Josephus’ *Against Apion*”, in: J. U. Kalms (Hg.), *Internationales Josephus-Kolloquium Aarhus 1999*, MJSt 6, Münster 2000, S. 185–221. Vgl. u. Anm. 69.

<sup>66</sup> *Vita* 359–361; *C. Ap.* 1.50–51.

„Vätern, dem Volk, den Hausgöttern und der gesamten Götterwelt“ (V. 679), begünstigt durch die Natur (Wind) und die Götter (681). Auf der anderen Seite steht Antonius, einst der römische Feldherr κατ' ἑξοχήν, nun auf die Unterstützung einer fremden, barbarischen Armee angewiesen, gekennzeichnet durch unterschiedliche Rüstungen, verbunden mit seiner – in Vergils Augen – verabscheugswürdigen ägyptischen Gattin Kleopatra, deren Name nicht einmal Erwähnung findet (685–688). Auf seiner Seite kommen damit die „Kräfte des Morgenlandes und Ägyptens“ zu stehen (687). Auf dem Höhepunkt der Schlacht kämpfen nicht allein die Soldaten und ihre Befehlshaber, sondern das ganze römische und ägyptische Pantheon miteinander. Unter Einbindung von ägyptischen religiösen Elementen kommt es zur Entscheidungsschlacht zwischen Ost und West, Orient und Okzident (V. 698–700):<sup>67</sup>

Mitten befiehlt die Fürstin auf heimischer Rassel<sup>68</sup> 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.<sup>69</sup> 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 –

<sup>67</sup> Zum Ganzen vgl. Smelik/Hemelrijk, „Egyptian Animal Worship in Antiquity“, *ANRW* II, 17.4 (1984) Anfang S. 1854: *omnigenumque deum monstra et latrator Anubis / contra Neptunum et Venerem contraque Minervam / tela tenent ...*

<sup>68</sup> Der Text nennt das *sistrum* aus dem Isiskult – kein militärisches Schlachteinstrument wie eine Trompete!

<sup>69</sup> Z.B. bei den Erwähnungen der ägyptischen Götter Isis (s.o.; *A.J.* 18.65 ff., 4 mal; *C. Ap.* 1.289, 294, 298 zu Chaeremon) und Anubis (*A.J.* 18.72–77, 5 mal); ähnlich in der Auseinandersetzung mit Apion in *C. Ap.* 2.66 oder aber auch schon vorher bei den Angriffen auf Kleopatra in *C. Ap.* 2.56 ff. Vgl. o. Anm. 65.

vor allem rechtspolitischen – Fragen eine entscheidende Ausnahmestellung zubilligt.<sup>70</sup> Umgekehrt bestreitet er seinem literarischen Gegner Apion den Rang, Alexandriner zu sein; er ist ihm vielmehr ein barbarischer Ägypter.<sup>71</sup> Josephus verfolgt polemische und apologetische Interessen und passt seine Darstellung seinem Programm an.<sup>72</sup> Das gilt genauso für die Bedeutung und Stilisierung der Weltmetropolen selbst, ganz gewiss für Alexandrien in (oder richtiger: „bei“) Ägypten.<sup>73</sup>

---

<sup>70</sup> Vgl. den berühmten Claudiusbrief in der Fassung des Josephus, die sich erheblich von dem Reskript des Claudius selbst—*CPJ* 153—unterscheidet, am Ende der *Antiquitates* (19.278 ff.), der durch den zweiten Brief an die ganze „Oekumene“ Präzedenzwirkung zuerkannt wird (19.86 ff.). Ganz ähnlich verhält es sich in *C. Ap.* 2.32: wenn Apion die Alexandriner mit Schmähungen überhäuft, „trifft er damit auch alle übrigen Juden“ (vgl. *A.J.* 18.257). Die kurz darauf erwähnte Inschrift wird kaum mit Caesar, sondern erst mit Augustus zusammengebracht werden können (vgl. *A.J.* 14.188).

<sup>71</sup> Vgl. seine Kennzeichnung als „Ägypter“ *C. Ap.* 2.28–31; die Kritik an der Selbstbezeichnung Apions als „Alexandriner“ findet sich im Folgenden *C. Ap.* 2.41.

<sup>72</sup> Siehe S. Mason, *Flavius Josephus und das Neue Testament*, UTB 2130, München u.a. 2000, S. 48–49.

<sup>73</sup> 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 *ANTIQUITATES*

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.<sup>1</sup> 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.<sup>2</sup> 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?<sup>3</sup> 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

---

<sup>1</sup> The latest examples are, I believe, the excellent article by J. Carleton Paget, “Some Observations on Josephus and Christianity”, *JTS* 52 (2001): 539–624, the original study by S. Bardet, *Le Testimonium Flavianum. Examen historique, considérations historiographiques* (Paris: Cerf, 2002), and Alice Whealey, *Josephus on Jesus: The Testimonium Flavianum Controversy from Late Antiquity to Modern Times* (New York: Peter Lang, 2003).

<sup>2</sup> Among the scholars who tried to discover the intentions that lie behind the references (but in a very questionable way): E. Nodet, “Jésus et Jean-Baptiste selon Josèphe,” *RB* 92 (1985): 321–48; 497–524; A. Paul, “Flavius Josephus’ ‘Antiquities of the Jews’: an anti-Christian Manifesto,” *NTS* 31 (1985): 473–80; and Bardet, *Testimonium Flavianum*.

<sup>3</sup> 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 *Antiquitates* 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.<sup>4</sup> 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 Χριστὸς οὗτος ἦν), 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”),<sup>5</sup> 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

<sup>4</sup> T. Rajak, *Josephus: the Historian and his Society* (London: Duckworth, 1983), 131; 151, and K. A. Olson, “Eusebius and the Testimonium Flavianum,” *CBQ* 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”).

<sup>5</sup> 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,” *CBQ* 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.<sup>6</sup> 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.<sup>7</sup> 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

<sup>6</sup> 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.

<sup>7</sup> 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*,<sup>8</sup> or to see signs of change in

<sup>8</sup> See for example S. Mason, “‘Should Any Wish to Enquire Further’ (*Ant.* 1.25):

the global attitude of Josephus already in the revisions of Book 7 of the *Bellum*.<sup>9</sup> 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.<sup>10</sup>

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

---

The Aim and Audience of Josephus's *Judean Antiquities/Life*,” in *Understanding Josephus: Seven Perspectives* (ed. S. Mason; JSUP 32; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998) 64–103.

<sup>9</sup> S. Schwartz, “The Composition and Publication of Josephus’s *Bellum Iudaicum* Book 7,” *HTR* 79 (1986): 373–86.

<sup>10</sup> *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 ἀἵρεσις, 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.* 2.119. 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.<sup>11</sup> His political role does not appear brilliant

<sup>11</sup> *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 *Bellum*. 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 *Bellum*. 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.<sup>12</sup> 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.<sup>13</sup> 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, διῆλθον) 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,<sup>14</sup>

<sup>12</sup> They are therefore those citizens who, in the James episode, openly stand against Ananus (*A.J.* 20.201).

<sup>13</sup> 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.

<sup>14</sup> 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 ἀνήρ*), author of extraordinary deeds; he is teaching people who accept the truth gladly (*τῶν ήδονῆ τάληθη δεχομένων*); and he has been appreciated not only by the Jews, but also by the Greeks (*τὸ Ελληνικόν*). 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.<sup>15</sup> 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

<sup>15</sup> 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<sup>16</sup> 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,<sup>17</sup> 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<sup>18</sup> 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:<sup>19</sup> 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.

---

<sup>16</sup> 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 ὄμονοι and of the curt condemnation of στάσις.

<sup>17</sup> 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.

<sup>18</sup> 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.

<sup>19</sup> 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.

# THE DIVORCES OF THE HERODIAN PRINCESSES: JEWISH LAW, ROMAN LAW OR PALACE LAW?\*

BERNARD S. JACKSON

CENTRE FOR JEWISH STUDIES, UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER

## 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:<sup>1</sup>

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 (ἀπολυομένη τὸν γάμον), though this was not according to the Jewish laws (κατὰ τοὺς Ιουδαίων νόμους); for with us it is lawful for a husband to do so; but a wife, if she departs (διαχωρισθεῖσῃ) from her husband, cannot of herself be married to another, unless her former husband put her away (έφιέντος). However, Salome chose to follow not the law of her country, but the law of her authority (ἀλλὰ τὸν [νόμον] ἀπ' ἔξουσίας ἐλομένη), 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 . . .<sup>2</sup>

Josephus is clear here that it was Salome who sent a divorce document to Costobarus, and that this violated Jewish law.<sup>3</sup> Nevertheless, he is aware of a form of Jewish divorce initiated by the wife, in the

\* 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.

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> *A.J.* 15.259 (Marcus, LCL).

<sup>3</sup> D. Daube, *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism* (London: Athlone Press, 1956; repr., New York: Arno, 1973), 371–72, argues that Salome's choice of terminology,

sense that the wife may indeed “depart” (*διαχωρισθείση*) 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” (*έφιέντος*).<sup>4</sup>

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 ζῶντος*).<sup>5</sup>

Josephus’ disapproval, in this case, seems directed more at the subsequent marriage with Herod Antipas into which Herodias entered,<sup>6</sup> 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 *ἀποστήναι* (aorist 2 of *ἀποστάναι*), ‘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.

<sup>4</sup> D. Instone-Brewer, “1 Corinthians 7 in the light of the Jewish Greek and Aramaic Marriage and Divorce Papyri,” *Tyndale Bulletin* 52 (2001): 225–43, esp. 232 (on-line version, without full footnotes, at <http://www.instone-brewer.com/> and [http://www.tyndale.cam.ac.uk/Brewer/MarriagePapyri/1Cor\\_7a.htm](http://www.tyndale.cam.ac.uk/Brewer/MarriagePapyri/1Cor_7a.htm)) accepts that in theory only men could write a divorce certificate, while women had to demand a certificate through a rabbinic court, but suggests that in practice women may have taken the law into their own hands and asked a scribe or a male guardian to write it out (taking P.Hev. 13 as an example). Cf. J. D. M. Derrett, *Law in the New Testament* (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1970, 387 (*infra* n. 97).

<sup>5</sup> *A.J.* 18.136.

<sup>6</sup> 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.<sup>7</sup> 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 (*διαλύνονται οἱ 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.<sup>8</sup>

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.<sup>9</sup>

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 (*παραιτησαμένη*) 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.”<sup>10</sup>

<sup>7</sup> *A.J.* 18.130–132.

<sup>8</sup> *A.J.* 20.141–142.

<sup>9</sup> *A.J.* 20.145–146.

<sup>10</sup> *A.J.* 20.147. On the office of *alabarch*, and its tenure on occasion by Jews, see Schürer, *History* 3.1:136–37.

Some have viewed these divorces as reflecting the more liberal and egalitarian regime of the Roman or Hellenistic law of divorce.<sup>11</sup> 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 γραμματεῖον, and those of the other princesses, who deserted their husbands, apparently without any formal notification, whether oral or written.

## 2. THE CASE OF SALOME

The Jewish background has been well rehearsed in recent years. The one reference to divorce procedure in the legal sections of the Hebrew Bible, Deut 24:1, 3, presupposes the delivery of a כריהוח (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-

---

<sup>11</sup> 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 Flavus. Historian of Eretz-Israel in the Hellenistic-Roman Period* (in Hebrew; ed. U. Rappaport; Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 1982), 149–64, 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.

cedure 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.<sup>12</sup> 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.”<sup>13</sup>

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.<sup>14</sup>

However, by far the closest<sup>15</sup> parallel to the case of Salome is found in the much-discussed P. Hever 13,<sup>16</sup> which (following the view

<sup>12</sup> *m. Yebam.* 14:1. On the required formalities, taking account of the Masada bill of divorce, see Z. W. Falk, *Introduction to Jewish Law of the Second Commonwealth* (Leiden: Brill, 1978), 2:313–16.

<sup>13</sup> *m. Ketub.* 5:6, *m. Ned.* 11:12; cf. Falk, *Introduction to Jewish Law*, 2:310.

<sup>14</sup> The *formula contraria* is most clearly reflected in E. Kraeling, *The Brooklyn Museum Aramaic Papyri* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953), no. 7:24–25; see also A. E. Cowley, *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C.* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1923), no. 15, where the *formula positiva* is in line 4 and an oral declaration negating it in line 23. See further M. J. Geller, “The Elephantine Papyri and Hosea 2, 3,” *JJS* 8 (1977): 139–48; B. S. Jackson, “How Jewish is Jewish Family Law?,” *JJS* 55 (2004), 201–29.

<sup>15</sup> We do not need to take a position, for present purposes, on the controversy regarding the relevance to Jewish practice of *CPJ* 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 (*CPJud.* 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, *CPJ* 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.

<sup>16</sup> H. M. Cotton and E. Qimron, “XHev/Se ar 13 of 134 or 135 c.e.: A Wife’s Renunciation of Claims,” *JJS* 44 (1998): 108–18, esp. 115. This approves in substance the rendering of Yardeni in H. M. Cotton and A. Yardeni, *Aramaic, Hebrew and Greek Documentary Texts from Nahal Hever and Other Sites*, with an Appendix Containing

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 acknowledgement 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.<sup>17</sup>

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,<sup>18</sup> 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*.<sup>19</sup> if some such rule is read back here, the wife’s right to demand that the husband redeem the contract would entail her

---

*Alleged Qumran Texts* (DJD XXVII; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), 67 (quoted also by Cotton and Qimron, *op. cit.* 109) while resolving some ambiguities left open by Yardeni.

<sup>17</sup> See further B. S. Jackson, “Some Reflections on Family Law in the Papyri”, in *The Jerusalem 2002 Conference Volume* (ed. H. Gamoran; Binghamton: Global Academic Publishers, 2003), 141–77, esp. 155–57.

<sup>18</sup> See Lewis, Katzoff and Greenfield, “Papyrus Yadin 18” (*supra* n. 11). The legal commentary of Katzoff, in which he argued in some respects for an *interpretatio hebraica*, prompted a significant debate: see N. Lewis, “The World of Papyrus Yadin 18,” *BASP* 28 (1991): 35–41; A. Wasserstein, “A Marriage Contract from the Province of Arabia Nova: Notes on Papyrus Yadin 18,” *JQR* 80 (1989), 93–130; R. Katzoff, “Papyrus Yadin 18 again: A Rejoinder,” *JQR* 82 (1991), 171–76.

<sup>19</sup> 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.<sup>20</sup> 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 ρεπούδιον δοῦσα ἔχωρισθη*), and was separated from him.”<sup>21</sup> The terminology is interesting: he uses the verb *δοῦσα* rather than the terminology which had previously been standard in Roman sources, namely *mittere* or *remittere*.<sup>22</sup> Justin’s terminology is here closer to the Jewish tradition: in Deuteronomy, the husband is said to give (גַּזְבֵּן) the document הַדָּבָר; 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 *ρεπούδιον*, 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,

<sup>20</sup> Katzoff, “Papyrus Yadin 18” (*supra* n. 11) 243, has offered an alternative explanation: “I suggest that this particular phrasing was chosen to provide that the husband will not have to pay out the dowry when it becomes due, unless the document is surrendered, and, in other words, that he will not have to make do with a receipt. The practice recorded in Greek papyri was that receipts for payment of private debts were issued only in special circumstances, such as the death of the principal creditor or debtor, loss of the debt document, or partial or early payment. Otherwise the normal practice was to return and tear the document recording the obligation.” However, this clause of P. Yad. 18 speaks of redemption of the contract (*συγγραφήν*) as a whole, not simply the dowry, so that it is difficult for Katzoff to limit it, in the way he seeks, to the opinion of Rav Hai Gaon, *supra* n. 19.

<sup>21</sup> 2 *Apol.* 2.6, apparently written between 155 and 160 c.e.: see Jules Lebreton, “St. Justin Martyr,” *The Catholic Encyclopedia* (New York: Appleton, 1907–1912). Online: <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/08580c.htm>. The text was first discussed in the context of the relationship between Jewish and Roman law by B. Cohen, “Concerning Divorce in Jewish and Roman Law,” *PAAJR* 21 (1952): 3–34, reprinted in his *Jewish and Roman Law* (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1966), 1:384 (citing Levy, *infra* n. 27), but does not appear to have been taken up in the more recent discussion of the Jewish development, prompted by the Dead Sea papyri.

<sup>22</sup> As in *nuntium remittere*, discussed *infra*, text at nn. 30–32.

Cohen suggests, the terminology may reflect “the practice of the Roman provincial law of Palestine of their time.”<sup>23</sup>

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,<sup>24</sup> 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 *Apologies* was pagan rather than Jewish,<sup>25</sup> probably Roman.<sup>26</sup> 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 ρέπούδιον is indeed found earlier in Roman sources.<sup>27</sup>

<sup>23</sup> Cohen, *Jewish and Roman Law* (*supra* n. 21), 1:385; Derrett, *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](http://www.brepols.net)) overwhelmingly supports *libellum repudii* for Deut 24:1,3, with just two occurrences of *librum repudii*. In Matt 5:31, all the testimonies use either *libellum repudii* or simply *repudium*. Although it is argued below (text at nn. 45–47) that divorce by a wife performed by sending a *repudium* in the Roman juristic sources may reflect Jewish or Judaeo-Christian influence, the terminology of *repudium* itself is clearly Roman, as is indicated by the text of Justin Martyr discussed above.

<sup>24</sup> Perhaps, given Justin’s description of the husband’s behaviour, following Matthew’s *porneia* exception. Justin indicates in the *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.

<sup>25</sup> The text occurs in the *Apology* (on which see the *Catholic Encyclopedia* article cited *supra* n. 21), not in the *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 (σοι), the Emperor, requesting that first she be permitted to arrange her affairs . . .”: 2 *Apol.* 2.8, in A. Roberts and J. Donaldson, eds., *Justin Martyr and Athanagoras* (Ante-Nicene Christian Library 2; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1870), 72.

<sup>26</sup> Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 4.18, says that it was addressed to Marcus Aurelius.

<sup>27</sup> On Juvenal and Suetonius, see *infra*, nn. 34, 39. Nevertheless, E. Levy, *Der Hergang der römischen Ehescheidung* (Weimar: Böhlau Nachfolger, 1925), 59, finds this written *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 ρέπούδιον in the papyri appears to be found only in the Byzantine period, and comes to be used also of bilateral divorce contracts. The earliest appears to be M. Chr. 127 (390 C.E.), on which see R. Taubenschlag, *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*”.<sup>28</sup> Its context appears to suggest knowledge of diversity of practice amongst different groups of Noahides (כְּנִינָה): 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 (וְגַנְגֵין שָׁאַן לְהַמְּנוֹרֶת). 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*.<sup>29</sup> We may attribute (a) to pagan Christians (no divorce), (b) to Hellenistic practice (divorce by mutual consent),<sup>29</sup> (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 divortium, 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*

Panstwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1955), 122 n. 73. P. Oxy 3581.15–16 (4th or 5th cent.) is a petition which mentions a ῥεπούδιον sent by a wife to her husband under Roman law: see further I. Arnaoutoglou, “Marital Disputes in Greco-Roman Egypt,” *JJP* 25 (1995): 11–28, esp. 22–23. See also P. Oxy 129 (6th cent.; see Taubenschlag, *ibid.*, 122); P. Cairo (Masp) 67154.r,2,13 (a divorce contract of the reign of Justinian); P. Lond. 1713.9, 22 (= P. Flor 93.5,14, a divorce contract of 569 C.E.); BGU 2203.4, 12 (571 C.E.); P. Cairo (Masp) 67121.subs, a divorce contract of 573 C.E.); BGU 2692.9 (6th cent.). See also H. I. Bell and B. R. Rees, “A Repudium from Hermopolis,” *Eos* 48 (1956): 175–79 (of 586 C.E.), where the term is used in the context of “reciprocal agreements for separation or divorce” (between Samaritans).

<sup>28</sup> Cohen, *Jewish and Roman Law* (*supra* n. 21), 1:384–85, plausibly supporting the emendation of the MS text from רְפֻרִין to רְפֻרִיִּן.

<sup>29</sup> Cf. *CPJ* 144, *supra* n. 15.

*uxori remittere or mittere* “to send one’s wife a letter of divorce,”<sup>30</sup> Robleda rightly takes Cicero’s use of the expression in *De or.* 1.40.183 as referring to communication of the fact that a formal, albeit indirect (oral) declaration had (here, not) been made.<sup>31</sup> The evidence would appear to support a development from messenger to message.<sup>32</sup> *Nuntius* is frequently found meaning a messenger, delivering a message (*nuntium*), whether oral or written.<sup>33</sup> Tacitus even speaks of an oral *repudium*.<sup>34</sup> And the use of a domestic *libertus* to deliver the message,<sup>35</sup> as also the requirement of seven witnesses under the *lex Julia*,<sup>36</sup> strongly suggest oral rather than written delivery.<sup>37</sup> In fact, no such

<sup>30</sup> Citing Cicero, *De or.* 1.40.183 (on which see further *infra*, at n. 90); 1.56.238; idem, *Att.* 1.13.3 (*uxori Caesarem nuntium remisisse*, “Caesar has divorced his wife”); idem, *Tōp.* 4.19 (of a woman who separates from her husband); *Dig.* 24.2.4; 24.3.22; also of the rejection of the marriage contract (*sponsalia*) by the parents and guardians in Plautus, *Truc.* 4.3.74.

<sup>31</sup> O. Robleda, “Il divorzio in Roma prima di Costantino,” *ANRW* 2:14 (1982): 347–90, esp. 374–75, relating this to a tradition of a fixed oral formula which Cicero, *Phil.* 2.28.69, attributes to the Twelve Tables. On this, see also J. F. Gardner, *Women in Roman Law and Society* (London: Routledge, 1990), 84–85; R. Yaron, “Minutiae on Roman Divorce,” *Tijdschrift voor Rechtsgeschiedenis* 28 (1960): 1–12, esp. 1–8 (though he interprets it as a substantive rather than a formal requirement).

<sup>32</sup> The classical *nuntium remittere* did ultimately come to be identified with the sending of a written *repudium*. By the third century C.E. the jurist Ulpian could use *repudium mittere* and *nuntium mittere* interchangeably: *Dig.* 24.2.4, Ulpianus 26 ad sab.: *Iulianus libro octavo decimo digestorum querit, 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 eius, patrem tamen eius nuntium mittere posse. quod non tractaret de repudio, nisi constaret retineri matrimonium: quae sententia mihi videtur vera.* See also *Dig.* 24.3.22.7, Ulpianus 33 ad ed. See further Levy, *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) *Apol.* 6.6 (written); *Mon* 11 (written); *Idol* 6 (oral); *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.

<sup>33</sup> C. T. Lewis and C. Short, *A Latin Dictionary* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1958), s.v. *nuntium*.

<sup>34</sup> *Ann.* 3.22, *dicere repudium*, cf. Levy, *Hergang* (*supra* n. 27), 59, citing also Juvenal, *Sat.* 6.146–148, who has the husband’s *libertus* deliver a rather unkind oral message: . . . *dicit libertus . . .* (without using the term *repudium*).

<sup>35</sup> Presupposed even in the divorce procedure required by the *lex Julia de adulteriis*: see further *infra*, at nn. 75, 76.

<sup>36</sup> On which see further *infra*, sec. 3.

<sup>37</sup> Some (e.g. Instone-Brewer, “1 Corinthians 7 [*supra* n. 4]” 105 n. 8; *Encyclopediæ Britannica*, 7th ed., 7:454, s.v. “Divorce”) have maintained that the *lex Julia* itself required (in the cases where it applied: see further *infra*, sec. 3) the sending of a *libellus repudii*. But the evidence for this consists in one highly problematic text (on whether remarriage in the wake of an invalid *repudium missum* constitutes adultery), *Dig.* 48.5.44(43), Gai. 3 ad legem XII Tab.: *Si ex lege repudium missum non sit et idcirco mulier adhuc nupta esse videatur, tamen si quis eam uxorem duxerit adulter non erit . . .*, discussed in detail by

written *repudia* have survived.<sup>38</sup> Tregiari 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

E. Volterra, "Intorno a D.48.5.44(43)," in *Studi in onore di Biondo Biondi* (Milan: Giuffrè, 1965), 2:123–40; C. Venturini, "Divorzio informale e 'crimen adulterii' (Per una riconSIDerazione di D. 48.5.44[43])," *IUR4* 41 (1990): 25–51.

Despite the fragment's inscription, it was placed by the compilers in their treatment of the *lex Julia de adulteriis*, 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 adulteriis 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 Configuración Jurídica hasta la Legislación 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 ρέπούδιον; 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. Tregiari, *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*.

<sup>38</sup> D. Instone-Brewer, "1 Corinthians 7 (*supra* n. 4)," 113: "Only four Latin marriage contracts have survived and no divorce deeds."

the wife.<sup>39</sup> In the latter case, unilateral divorce by wives, though possible, appears to have been rare,<sup>40</sup> and performed by oral declaration or behavioural messages,<sup>41</sup> 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 (ἵππι) it (the *sefer keritut*) in her hand" rather than simply "sends" it.<sup>42</sup> 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*.<sup>43</sup>

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,<sup>44</sup> that we first encounter

<sup>39</sup> 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.

<sup>40</sup> 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.

<sup>41</sup> 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 Alcumenia's declaration in the *Amphitruo* is a deliberate gender reversal, in which "she utters words which were properly spoken only by men".

<sup>42</sup> Though rabbinic law did early come to recognise delivery by an agent.

<sup>43</sup> *A.J.* 4.280; see further my *Studies in the Semiotics of Biblical Law* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 281; also "Lex Talionis: Revisiting Daube's Classic", § 12, online: [http://www.law2.byu.edu/Biblical\\_Law/papers/jackson\\_bs\\_lex\\_talionis.pdf](http://www.law2.byu.edu/Biblical_Law/papers/jackson_bs_lex_talionis.pdf).

<sup>44</sup> 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,<sup>45</sup> who is thought to have commenced his juristic career in Rome “but then carried on his work in the Eastern provinces”,<sup>46</sup> and to have written the *Institutes* probably in 161 C.E., towards the end of his career.<sup>47</sup> 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,<sup>48</sup> Ulpian<sup>49</sup> and Marcellus.<sup>50</sup> And in the late Empire, we encounter the terminology of *libellus repudii*,<sup>51</sup> perhaps reflecting versions of Deut 24,<sup>52</sup> and ultimately<sup>53</sup> the

<sup>45</sup> *Inst.* I.137a, *repudio misso*, of a wife in a *manus (coemptio)* marriage. He discusses how she may free herself from the *manus* after having dissolved the marriage.

<sup>46</sup> A. Borkowski, *Textbook on Roman Law* (London: Blackstone Press Ltd., 1994), 44.

<sup>47</sup> B. Nicholas, *An Introduction to Roman Law* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962), 36.

<sup>48</sup> *Dig.* 24.1.57.pr, Paulus 7 resp: . . . *quaero, an, si eadem titio marito suo repudium miserit.*

<sup>49</sup> *Dig.* 24.2.4, Ulpianus 26 ad sab.: *Iulianus libro octavo digestorum quaerit, an furiosa repudium mittere vel repudiari possit.*

<sup>50</sup> *Dig.* 24.3.38, Marcellus l.S. resp.: *Lucius titius cum esset filius familias, voluntate patris uxorem maeviā 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.*

<sup>51</sup> By contrast, we do find *libellus divorpii* earlier, in *Dig.* D.24.2.7 (Papian): “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.

<sup>52</sup> See text leading to n. 23, *supra*.

<sup>53</sup> 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.<sup>54</sup> This (along with other substantial restrictions on divorce in the late Empire) is generally understood to reflect Christian influence.<sup>55</sup>

### 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.<sup>56</sup> 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),<sup>57</sup> 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".<sup>58</sup> Moses had apparently (the narrative fails to tell us of it at the time) sent Zipporah back<sup>59</sup> to the house of her (Midianite) father, Jethro; when she and

See also Cohen, *Jewish and Roman Law* (*supra* n. 21), 1:385, apparently misunderstood by D. Instone-Brewer, *Divorce and Remarriage in the Bible. The Social and Literary Context* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 73 n. 48.

<sup>54</sup> 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 repudi* 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.

<sup>55</sup> Following Deut 24. Cf. Yaron, "Divortium inter absentes" (*supra* n. 51), 55; Cohen, *Jewish and Roman Law* (*supra* n. 51), 1:385, and earlier literature there cited.

<sup>56</sup> Y. Zakovitch, "The Woman's Rights in the Biblical Law of Divorce", *JLA* 4 (1981): 28–46, esp. 36–40.

<sup>57</sup> Zakovitch, "Woman's Rights," 34–35, views פָּנָא נִשְׁׁוֹן 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 verb נִשְׁׁוֹן) is first found at Elephantine. I think this text, not least with the intensification of the verb, פָּנָא נִשְׁׁוֹן, speaks against him. On the usage elsewhere (including the *ana ittišu* series), see further Jackson, "How Jewish" (*supra* n. 14), nn. 101–4.

<sup>58</sup> 1 Sam 25:44, on which see also A. Tosato, *Il Matrimonio Israelitico* (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1982), 196–97.

<sup>59</sup> 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.<sup>60</sup> 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.”<sup>61</sup> 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.<sup>62</sup> Similarly, the New Testament controversy

<sup>60</sup> 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.”

<sup>61</sup> 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 פָלִישׁ, 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.

<sup>62</sup> “Another commandment is that if a woman after parting (*ἀπαλλαχεῖσα*) 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 (*θεσμούς*) 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 ( $\alpha\piολύση$ ) his wife and marries another, commits adultery against her; and if she divorces her husband and marries another, she commits adultery.”<sup>63</sup> 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 ( $\chiωρίζεσθαι$ ) from her husband” (1 Cor 7:10–11), and this, he argues, is not implied to be constitutive of divorce, in accordance with the rabbinic position.<sup>64</sup> A similar view is taken by some

<sup>63</sup> Mark 10:11–12. Derrett, *Law in the New Testament* (*supra* n. 23), 392–93, interprets 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” consisting 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 creation, 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  $\alpha\piολύειν$ , ‘to dismiss’, with Josephus’ account of Salome’s divorce, though noting that the (middle,  $\alpha\piολύσθαι$ ) form of the verb— $\alpha\piολυμένη τὸν γάμον$ —is not quite so strong as the Markan “to dismiss the husband”. However, he tends towards the argument, supported by text-critical considerations, that  $\alpha\piολύειν$  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.

<sup>64</sup> Daube, *New Testament* (*supra* n. 3), 362–63: “... with reference to a marriage where both parts are believers, Paul uses the intransitive  $\chiωρίζεσθαι$  of the wife who ‘separates’, but the transitive  $\alpha\piιέναι$  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  $\alpha\piιέναι$  both of the dissolution of the marriage by the husband and of its dissolution by the wife. The latter application of  $\alpha\piιέναι$  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 gentile divorce.” In the Jewish context, he suggests,

of the old<sup>65</sup> strategy of including in the marriage contract a clause granting the wife a right of unilateral divorce, which is attested in Roman Palestine<sup>66</sup> and later in 10th and 11th century *ketubot* found in the Cairo Genizah.<sup>67</sup> Even if such clauses did give the wife an enforceable right to divorce,<sup>68</sup> the means of effecting it appear to have been through court action rather than mere desertion.<sup>69</sup> 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)<sup>70</sup> 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.<sup>71</sup> 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'." *Aliter*, Instone-Brewer, "1 Corinthians 7" (*supra* n. 4), 105–8, opposing the view of J. A. Fitzmyer, "The Matthaean Divorce Texts and Some New Palestinian Evidence", *TS* 37 (1976): 197–226, that χωρίζεθαι is not reflexive in v. 10, and arguing for a Greco-Roman interpretation of the whole passage. See also now Instone-Brewer, *Divorce and Remarriage* (*supra* n. 53), 197–203.

<sup>65</sup> Cf. the Elephantine contracts, *supra* n. 14.

<sup>66</sup> R. Jose in *y. Ket.* 5:9 (30b); see further Jackson, "How Jewish" (*supra* n. 14), § 5.

<sup>67</sup> 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.

<sup>68</sup> 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.

<sup>69</sup> 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."

<sup>70</sup> 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.

<sup>71</sup> 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 פָּלַש) while divorce by the wife was ἀπόλειψις.<sup>72</sup> Indeed, this latter terminology, which Taubenschlag sees as reflected in the ἀπαλλαγὴ,<sup>73</sup> is close to that employed by Josephus to describe the divorces of two of the younger Herodian princesses: καταλιπούσαν 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<sup>74</sup> 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<sup>75</sup> (not including the *libertus* of the divorcing party—this latter presumably being the *nuntius* who conveyed the message),<sup>76</sup> failing

<sup>72</sup> See S. C. Todd, *The Shape of Athenian Law* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), 214–15. However, there are suggestions that desertion by the wife, in Athens, had to be registered (probably not approved) by the *archon*. See A. R. W. Harrison, *The Law of Athens. The Family and Property* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968), 40–41; McDonnell, “Divorce Initiated by Women” (*supra* n. 40), 72 n. 22; V. J. Rosivach, “Aphairesis and Apoleipsis. A Study of the Sources,” *RIDA* 31 (1984): 193–230, esp. 198–99, 201. L. Cohn-Haft, “Divorce in Classical Athens,” *JHS* 115 (1995): 1–14, argues against the traditional view that divorce in Athens was frequent, even casual. Similarly, Rosivach, “Aphairesis,” 205–6, indicates that ἀπόλειψις was in practice dependent on the willingness of the wife’s male relatives to support her after the divorce.

<sup>73</sup> Taubenschlag, *Law of Graeco-Roman Egypt* (*supra* n. 27), 122. See, e.g., P. Tebt. 1.104 (of 92 B.C.E., a marriage contract which gives the wife the right to terminate if she “wishes of her own will to separate”), P. Ryl. 154 (of 66 C.E.), in Instone-Brewer, “1 Corinthians 7” (*supra* n. 4), 103–4, 198–99. Cf. the terminology of Philo, *supra* n. 62, and Josephus, *Vita* 415, *infra* nn. 101–2. On the demotic divorce documents, see H. S. Smith, “Marriage and the Family in Ancient Egypt. 1. Marriage and Family Law,” in *Legal Documents of the Hellenistic World* (H. Maehler, M. J. Geller and A. D. E. Lewis, eds.; London: Warburg Institute, University of London, 1995), 46–62, esp. 54–55, noting that either partner may say, “I repudiate you”, but the wife alone is spoken of as “going off on her own”.

<sup>74</sup> 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*.

<sup>75</sup> *Dig.* 24.2.9 (Paulus 2 de adult.): *Nullum divortium ratum est nisi septem civibus romaniis puberibus adhibitis praeter libertum eius qui divortium 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 divortium <inter absentes> ratum est nisi . . .* On the suggestion that the *lex Julia* required the sending of a *repudium*, see n. 37, *supra*.

<sup>76</sup> 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.<sup>77</sup> 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,<sup>78</sup> where Augustus made it mandatory for the husband to divorce his errant spouse,<sup>79</sup> and required him to have done so before instituting criminal proceedings against her.<sup>80</sup> 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).<sup>81</sup> It was therefore now important that divorce should be properly evidenced; otherwise, the husband was not allowed to remarry,<sup>82</sup> 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*.

<sup>77</sup> *Dig.* 38.11.1.1 (Ulpianus 47 ad ed.): *item iulia de adulteriis, nisi certo modo divor- tium factum sit, pro infecto habet.*

<sup>78</sup> 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 Tregiari, *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.

<sup>79</sup> There is a parallel here with Athenian legislation on adultery, at least where the husband catches his wife *in flagrante*. See D. Cohen, *Law, sexuality, and society. The enforcement of morals in classical Athens* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 110 n. 33 (citing Demosthenes [*Neaer.*] 59.85–8) and 124 n. 78 (citing Euripides, *El.* 920 ff.) though conceding that the latter must be taken with considerable caution. Though such a mandatory divorce is not evidenced in Jewish law before the rabbinic sources (*m. Sotah* 5:1, *b. Sotah* 18b, 27b, *b. Ket.* 9a), it has been plausibly argued to underlie the *porneia* exception in Matt 5:31–2, 19:9: see D. R. Mace, *Hebrew Marriage, A Sociological Study* (London: Epworth Press, 1953), 250; E. Lövestam, "Divorce and Remarriage in the New Testament," *JLA* 4 (1981): 47–65, esp. 59–60.

<sup>80</sup> On the relationship of the legislation to the earlier system of self-help, see Thomas, "Lex Julia" (*supra* n. 37); L. F. Raditsa, "Augustan Legislation Concerning Marriage, Procreation, Love Affairs and Adultery," *ANRW* 2.13: 278–339, esp. 312–13.

<sup>81</sup> Cf. Thomas, "Lex Julia" (*supra* n. 37), 637, citing C.9.9.1.

<sup>82</sup> Cf. Yaron, "*Divortium inter absentes*" (*supra* n. 51), 60.

actual pimping),<sup>83</sup> and bigamy if he remarried.<sup>84</sup> Indeed, Schulz maintains that absence of the seven witnesses rendered the husband liable to criminal penalties, but the divorce itself remained valid.<sup>85</sup>

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*,<sup>86</sup> 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.<sup>87</sup> It fits ill, however, with classical doctrine on the nature of marriage, and has been rebutted in detail by Yaron.<sup>88</sup> 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.<sup>89</sup>

<sup>83</sup> 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."

<sup>84</sup> See further Yaron, "Divortium inter absentes" (*supra* n. 51), 60; J. A. Crook, *Law and Life of Rome* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1967), 106; Treggiari, *Roman Marriage* (*supra* n. 37), 455; Borkowski, *Textbook* (*supra* n. 46), 118.

<sup>85</sup> F. Schulz, *Classical Roman Law* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951), 134–35, despite *Dig.* 38.11.1.1, *supra* n. 77.

<sup>86</sup> *Supra*, text at nn. 30–41.

<sup>87</sup> Levy, *Hergang* (*supra* n. 27), *passim*. The central passages are cited and discussed by Yaron, "Divortium inter absentes" (*supra* n. 51).

<sup>88</sup> Yaron, "Divortium inter absentes" (*supra* n. 51), 54–62. Cf. Corbett, *Roman Law* (*supra* n. 37), 230.

<sup>89</sup> 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.<sup>90</sup> 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.<sup>91</sup>

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,<sup>92</sup> or by virtue of Herod's own status as a *rex*

*Law of Persons* (*supra* n. 41), 53–54, describes this case as one where the man “contracted a second union without sending any kind of *repudium* to his wife in Spain”. In fact, the term *repudium* is not used, but rather: *neque nuntium priori remisisset*. Only later (see n. 32, *supra*) were *nuntium* and *repudium* equated.

<sup>90</sup> 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), 63 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”.

<sup>91</sup> *Etym.* 9.7.24: *repudium est quod sub testimonio testium vel praesenti vel absenti mittitur*.

<sup>92</sup> 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. Ciccù* (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

*socius*.<sup>93</sup> 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.<sup>94</sup>

#### 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.

<sup>93</sup> 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'EΘΝΟΣ ΤΩΝ ΙΟΥΔΑΙΩΝ dal 141 A.C. al 4 A.C.", *Bullettino 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).

<sup>94</sup> See B. S. Jackson, "On the Problem of Roman Influence on the Halakah and Normative Self-Definition in Judaism," in *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition* (ed. E. P. Sanders, London: SCM Press, 1981) 2:157–203 (text), 352–79 (notes), esp. 2:167–68, 362. On the meaning of *xenokritai* in the Babatha archive and elsewhere, see D. Nörr, "The *XENOKRITAI* in Babatha's Archive (Pap. Yadin 28–30)", *Israel Law Review* 29/1–2 (1995): 83–94, reviewing the earlier literature and arguing in favour of an identification with the *recuperatores* (who here may have been Romans or peregrines) of Roman procedure.

(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:<sup>95</sup> 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.<sup>96</sup> But that attempted justification (if indeed genuinely attributable to Salome) does not negate the probability that her own viewpoint was closer to “Palace Law.”<sup>97</sup>

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

<sup>95</sup> 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.

<sup>96</sup> *Supra*, n. 3.

<sup>97</sup> 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.<sup>98</sup>

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 *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 *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 *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 *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:<sup>99</sup>

<sup>98</sup> *Vita* 415, on which see further *infra*, nn. 101–2.

<sup>99</sup> Yaron, “*Divortium inter absentes*” (*supra* n. 51), 63. Cf., for classical Athens, Cohn-Haft, “Divorce in Classical Athens” (*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.<sup>100</sup>

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 (*ἀπαλλαγή*)".<sup>101</sup> 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."<sup>102</sup> I would suggest that this is optimistic.

---

tiated by the man). See also the remarks of Arnaoutoglou, "Marital Disputes" (*supra* n. 27), 18, on the divorce clauses in marriage contracts in Greco-Roman Egypt. These state forms of behaviour which entitle the other spouse to terminate, with consequences for the dowry. Arnaoutoglou writes: "Clearly they had a normative power in the sense that they were illustrating what was expected from the spouses and they were enforced by penalties. They cannot be regarded as grounds for divorce in a modern technical sense, but can be regarded, at least, as a kind of quasi-legal contractual norms, whose lack will render possible and justify abandonment or elopement and thus the eventual breaking of marriage."

<sup>100</sup> 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.

<sup>101</sup> *Vita* 415. See further Rabello, "Divorce in Josephus" (*supra* n. 11), 157–58.

<sup>102</sup> 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.”<sup>103</sup>

---

<sup>103</sup> *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 LATIN TRANSLATION OF JOSEPHUS' *ANTIQUITATES*\*

GAIA LEMBI  
SCUOLA NORMALE SUPERIORE, PISA

## 1. INTRODUCTION

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.<sup>1</sup> 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.<sup>2</sup> 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.*<sup>3</sup>

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.

<sup>1</sup> 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).

<sup>2</sup> A. P. Arlenius, ed., ΦΛΑΒΙΟΥ ΙΩΣΗΠΟΥ Ιουδαικῆς ἀρχαιολογίας λόγοι κ. Ιουδαικῆς ἀλώσεως λόγοι ζ. Περὶ ἀρχαιότητος Ιουδαίων κατὰ Απίστων λόγοι β. Εἰς τὸν Μακκαβαϊόν λόγος. ḥ περὶ αὐτοκράτορος λογισμοῦ (Basileae: Froben, 1544).

<sup>3</sup> Arlenius, ΦΛΑΒΙΟΥ ΙΩΣΗΠΟΥ, 2r.

translation improved only through the comparison of various Latin manuscripts:<sup>4</sup>

*Igitur Antiquitatum interpretationem ad vetera exemplaria latina duntaxat, ob Graecorum inopiam contulimus: coepimusque ut minus mendarum (fortassis ob argumentum vulgatus) quam in belli Iudaici historia: ita stylum interpres tanto inelegantiorem, ut haudquaquam credam ab eodem utrumque opus latinitate donatum: vel hac coniectura, quod in concionibus, quem Iosephus ubique sui similis sit, quoties in opere Antiquitatum incident, miram balbutiem videbis: contra in sequentis operis orationibus interpres, Rufinus opinor, proprius Iosephum adsequitur, eiusque declamatoriam quandam facultatem longe magis quam ille alter, quisquis est, exprimit.<sup>5</sup>*

## 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 work<sup>6</sup>—publication that, although criticized from various points of view,<sup>7</sup> 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.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>4</sup> S. Gelenius, ed., *FLAVII IOSEPHI ANTIQUITATUM IUDAICARUM libri XX, ad vetera exemplaria diligenter recogniti. DE BELLO IUDAICO libri VII, ex collatione Graecorum codicum castigatores 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 MACHABEIS liber unus à DES. ERASMO Roterodamo recognitus. Cum Indice copiosissimo* (Basileae: Froben, 1534).

<sup>5</sup> Gelenius, *FLAVII IOSEPHI*, 2r–2v.

<sup>6</sup> See F. Blatt, *The Latin Josephus I. Introduction and Text. The Antiquities: Books I–V* (København: Universitetsforlaget I Aarhus, 1958).

<sup>7</sup> 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.

<sup>8</sup> 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.<sup>9</sup>

As for Feldman's bibliography,<sup>10</sup> 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 Graesse<sup>11</sup> and Oberthür.<sup>12</sup>

### 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

<sup>9</sup> Josephus (Leiden: Brill, 1977), 26–43, esp. 27, n. 8. Schreckenberg's treatment of the Latin translation was criticized by Flusser: apparently Schreckenberg considered them to be nothing else than *Stieftöchter*. Cf. D. Flusser, "Der lateinische Josephus und der hebräische Josippon," in *Josephus-Studien. Untersuchungen zu Josephus, dem antiken Judentum und dem Neuen Testament. Otto Michel zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet* (ed. O. Betz, K. Haacker and M. Hengel; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974), 122–32; 122, n. 2.

<sup>10</sup> This manuscript was unknown to Blatt and—it seems—to everyone else, even after Schreckenberg's notice.

<sup>11</sup> Feldman, *Josephus and Modern Scholarship*, esp. 40–47 for the Latin and the Syriac versions.

<sup>12</sup> J. G. T. Graesse, *Trésor de livres rares et précieux ou Nouveau Dictionnaire Bibliographique* (Dresden: Rudolf Kuntze, 1862), 3:480–84.

<sup>12</sup> F. Oberthür, "De Flavio Iosepho," in *Bibliotheca Graeca sive Notitia scriptorum veterum graecorum quorumcumque monumenta integra aut fragmenta edita extant tum plerorumque e mss. ac deperditis* (ed. J. A. Fabricius; Hamburg: Bohn, 1796<sup>3</sup>), 5:1–64.

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.<sup>13</sup>

In this connection, special attention should be devoted to the importance of the Hebrew *Josippon* as an indirect witness to the Latin text of Josephus' *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 *Vulgata* (i.e. Jerome's Bible) and a manuscript of the Latin Josephus containing Books 1 to 16 of the *Antiquitates* and the *Hegesippus* (composed more or less around 370 C.E. by a converted Jew—at least according to the late D. Flusser).<sup>14</sup> It happens that we still have four manuscripts containing Books 1 to 16 of the *Antiquitates* and the *Hegesippus* together—all of them written in Italy,<sup>15</sup> “the homeland of *Josippon*.<sup>16</sup>

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 *Josippon*.<sup>17</sup> It may be interesting to note that the original *Josippon* was revised first as regards style—and this revision is the basis of the *editio princeps* (Mantua, 1480); it was, however, a second, enlarged and longer version (Constantinople, 1510; repr. Venice, 1540) that became the *vulgata*.<sup>18</sup> In this second version Josephus (re)appears as the real author of the

<sup>13</sup> See, for instance, É. Nodet, “Le texte des *Antiquités de Jésèphe*,” *RB* 94.3 (1987): 323–75, esp. 342–54.

<sup>14</sup> See Flusser, “Der lateinische Josephus,” 129: “Das Werk [...] wurde bekanntlich um das Jahr 370 verfaßt. Sein Autor war ein getaufter Jude. . . .” In Idem, “*Josippon*, a Medieval Hebrew Version of Josephus,” in *Josephus, Judaism and Christianity* (ed. L. H. Feldman and G. Hata; Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1987), 386–97: 392, the date is given as *circa* 375 C.E. (“He [i.e. the author of the *Hegesippus*] had written his book about A.D. 375.”)

<sup>15</sup> Cf. Flusser, “Der lateinische Josephus,” 126–27; Idem, “*Josippon*,” in Feldman and Hata, *Josephus, Judaism and Christianity*, 392. On the history of *Hegesippus'* textual tradition see V. Ussani, “Un ignoto codice cassinese del così detto Egesippo e i suoi affini,” in Idem, *Scritti di filologia & umanità* (Napoli: Ricciardi, 1942), 250–65; Idem, “Su Flavio Giuseppe e i suoi traduttori,” *ibid.*, 266–69; C. Mras, *Hegesippi qui dicitur historiae Libri V. Pars Posterior* (ed. V. Ussani; CSEL 66; Wien: Hoelder-Pichler-Tempsky, 1960), vii–l.

<sup>16</sup> So Flusser, “Der lateinische Josephus,” 128: “der Heimat des Josippon.”

<sup>17</sup> Cf. Flusser, “Der lateinische Josephus,” 129–30; Idem, “*Josippon*,” in Feldman and Hata, *Josephus, Judaism and Christianity*, 393–94.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. Flusser, “Der lateinische Josephus,” 123; Idem, “*Josippon*,” in Feldman and Hata, *Josephus, Judaism and Christianity*, 387–88.

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.<sup>19</sup>

#### 4. A FEW EXAMPLES OF THE USEFULNESS OF THE LATIN TRANSLATION FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE GREEK TEXT OF JOSEPHUS' *ANTIQUITATES*

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]).<sup>20</sup>

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 קפִירון<sup>21</sup>—, he wonders whether the original reading could not have been the Hebrew (כופר) or Aramaic (כפורה, pl. כפורה) name for the *cypress flower*,<sup>22</sup> this plant being nothing else than the henna (*Lawsonia inermis*), a tropical shrub mentioned not only by Dioscorides (1.95)<sup>23</sup> and the *Anthologia Palatina* (4.1.42),

<sup>19</sup> Cf. Flusser, “Der lateinische Josephus,” 124. For the text of *A.J.* 14.1–3 as given in the *Josippon* see D. Flusser, ed., *The Josippon [Josephus Gorionides]* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1978), 143–44 (= ch. 35 [ג'], ll. 1–8).

<sup>20</sup> *A.J.* 14.33: καὶ Σκαῦρος μὲν εἰς Δαμασκὸν πάλιν ἀνεχώρησεν Ἀριστόβουλος δὲ μετὰ πολλῆς δυνάμεως ἐπὶ τε Ἀρέταν καὶ Ὑρκανὸν ἐστράτευσεν καὶ συμβαλὼν αὐτοῖς περὶ τὸν καλούμενον Παπυρῶνα νικᾷ τῇ μάχῃ. . . .

<sup>21</sup> Cf. Flusser, *Josippon*, 151.

<sup>22</sup> Cf. M. Jastrow, *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature* (New York: Judaica Press, 1975), s.v.

<sup>23</sup> *Qifrus* in the Arabic version: cf. A. Dietrich, *Dioscurides Triumphans. Ein anonymer arabischer Kommentar . . . zur Materia medica* (Abhandl. der Akad. der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Philol.-hist. Klasse III/173; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1988), 148.

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.<sup>24</sup>

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.”<sup>25</sup>

#### 4.2. Φαλλίων

In the same paragraph Josephus states that among the men who perished in the battle there was also *Phallion*, the brother of Antipater—καὶ Φαλλίων ὁ Ἀντιπάτρου ἀδελφός.<sup>26</sup>

As Marcus notices, this name is not mentioned elsewhere—except in *B.J.* 1.130 which reads τὸν ἀδελφὸν τὸν<sup>27</sup> Ἀντιπάτρου Φαλλίωνα—, 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 *apparatus criticus* are rather confused and confusing: in the text the reading is given as καὶ Φαλλίων, but the *lemma* in the apparatus is καὶ 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 *Bellum* we have *Phallion*.<sup>28</sup>

In fact, the reading Θαλλίων was to be adopted by Schalit:<sup>29</sup> the name, the equivalent of the Latin *Florus*, would have been the Hellenistic name of the brother of Antipater. Later on, however, Schalit changed his opinion: the reading καὶ Φαλλίων—the one cho-

<sup>24</sup> Cf. A. Schalit, *Namenwörterbuch zu Flavius Josephus* (Leiden: Brill, 1968), s.v. Καπνών: “Ort bei Jericho.” M. Stern, *Hasmonaeen Judaea in the Hellenistic World: Chapters in Political History* [(in Hebrew) ed. D. R. Schwartz; Jerusalem: Zalman Shazar Center, 1995], 206 n. 5, instead, suggested that *Papyron* appears to be an area south-east of Jericho that received its name from the presence of papyrus plants.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. A. Schalit, *Namenwörterbuch*, s.v. Καπνών; Idem, *König Herodes. Der Mann und sein Werk* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1969), 741–42.

<sup>26</sup> A.J. 14.33.

<sup>27</sup> In Haverkamp's footnote to the passage, it is stated that a manuscript has in fact the expected τὸν, but according to the same editor this (unusual) use of the definite article is typical of Josephus. Cf. S. Haverkamp, ed., *Flavii Josephi quae reperiri potuerunt opera omnia graece et latine, cum notis et nova versione Joannis Hudsoni . . .* (Amsterdam: Wetstein; Leiden: Luchtmans; Utrecht: Broedelet, 1726).

<sup>28</sup> There are no variant readings as regards the text of the *Bellum*.

<sup>29</sup> A. Schalit, *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 misreading, on the part of a Byzantine scribe, of an original ΚΕΦΑΛΛΙΩΝ as ΚΑΙΦΑΛΛΙΩΝ > ΚΑΙ ΦΑΛΛΙΩΝ.<sup>30</sup> The reading Κεφαλλίων of LA<sup>2</sup> would be, then, the hypocoristic form of the “authentic” form preserved only by the Latin, viz. *Cephalon*—Κεφάλων (cf. Pausanias, *Descr.* 1.3.1)—and, time and again, by the *Josippon*, which has כִּיפָּלְן.<sup>31</sup>

It must be added that this same reading—in the form *Caephalion*—was the one already preferred by Noldius<sup>32</sup> and Hudson—even if only in a footnote to the text.<sup>33</sup> Noldius pointed out also that the mistake seemed to be very ancient since it appeared already in the *Hegesippus*, not to mention the *Bellum*.<sup>34</sup>

One wonders, then, if the “mistake” shall not be ascribed to Josephus himself—leaving aside that the wording in the *Bellum* (τὸν ἀδελφὸν τὸν Ἀντιπάτρου Φαλλίωνα) excludes completely the possibility of the phenomenon we are used to call *itacism*, since here there is no καὶ before the name. Taking into account the meaning of Φαλλίων in Greek, *i.e.* φαλλοφόρος,<sup>35</sup> it is not to be excluded that the reading *kefal-* with all of its variants was dictated by the sensitivity of a very polite scribe. . . .

#### 4.3. Strabo on Pompeius and a Fine Gift (*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

<sup>30</sup> Schalit, *König Herodes*, 7: «Der byzantinische Kopist mißdeutete die vermutlich in einem Abstand von ΦΑΛΛΙΩΝ befindlichen Buchstaben KE als gleichbedeutend mit KAI—der Diphthong AI wurde E gesprochen—und schrieb καὶ Φαλλίων». Cf. Idem, *Namenwörterbuch*, s.v. Κεφαλλίων.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. Flusser, *Josippon*, 151.

<sup>32</sup> C. Noldius, “Historia Idumaeae seu De vita et gestis Herodum, diatribe Accesserunt hinc inde Notae in Josephum ut & pro eo vindicæ & responsiones contra Baronium, Serarium, Salianum, & Alios,” in Haverkamp, *Flavii Josephi quae reperiri potuerunt*, 1:333–401.

<sup>33</sup> Cf. Haverkamp, *Flavii Josephi quae reperiri potuerunt*, 1:686.

<sup>34</sup> Noldius, “Historia Idumaeae,” 339 (nr. 5): «Josepho etiam Bell. Jud. I c. 5 Φαλλίων appellatur. Pro quō Hegesippus Excid. I c. 14 scribit Fallion. Ad locum Papyronem (Heg. l. cit. male Paparionem) occubuit». In fact, in Ussani’s edition of the *Hegesippus* (22,10), we find: *Aristobulus autem uix dudum idoneus propulsando periculo manum collegit, hostem insequitur et ad Papyronem, id uocabulum loco, VI milia hostium simil et fratrem Antipatris Fallionem proelio fudit.*

<sup>35</sup> See 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].<sup>36</sup>

Leaving aside the many questions which this passage raises,<sup>37</sup> we should like to focus our attention on the term τερπωλή.

The nature of this δημιούργημα is far from clear. According to Josephus it was an ἄμπελον χρυσῆν; according to Strabo εἴτε ἄμπελος 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.<sup>38</sup>

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 יְהוָה נָתַן—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).<sup>39</sup>

Moreover, in the Septuagint ἄμπελος is the usual translation for יְהוָה; only once does it stand for יְהוָה (Lam 2:6) and three times for בָּדָשׁ. The idea of *delight* seems then to be excluded.<sup>40</sup>

In an attempt to clarify the question, K. Galling suggested that what we have here is an allusion to the so-called *Adonis gardens*, Ἀδώνιδος

<sup>36</sup> ἔπειμψε γὰρ αὐτῷ μέγα δῶρον Ἀριστόβουλος ἄμπελον χρυσῆν ἐκ πεντακοσίων ταλάντων. μέμνηται δὴ τοῦ δώρου καὶ Στράβων ὁ Καππάδοξ λέγων οὕτως· ἥλθεν δὲ καὶ εἰς Αἴγυπτον πρεσβεία καὶ στέφανος ἀπὸ χρυσῶν τετρακισχιλίων καὶ ἐκ τῆς Ιουδαίας εἴτε ἄμπελος εἴτε κῆπος· τερπωλὴν ὠνόμαζον τὸ δημιούργημα. τοῦτο μέντοι τὸ δῶρον ἱστορήκαμεν καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀνακείμενον ἐν ‘Ρώμῃ ἐν τῷ ἵερῷ τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ Καπετωλίου ἐπιγραφήν ἔχον Ἀλεξάνδρου τοῦ τῶν Ιουδαίων βασιλέως.

<sup>37</sup> See B. Chiesa, “Volute o voluttà? A proposito di *AJ XIV,34–36*” [2002] 1–13 (unpublished).

<sup>38</sup> Cf. Feldman, *Josephus and Modern Scholarship*, 254.

<sup>39</sup> See Chiesa, “Volute o voluttà?”, 5.

<sup>40</sup> Cf. W. Bauer, W. A. Arndt, F. W. Gingrich, ed., *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957), s.v.

κῆποι, the key being the very term κῆπος.<sup>41</sup> 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 טרפל (*terpol*—*tarpol*), with a final *-l* functioning as diminutive, the root being טר, 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 *terpnōn*) *id est delectabile*, the same reading of the *Josippon* חירפּוֹן or תְּרַפּוֹן, according to the ms Jerusalem, JNUL 8°41280, f. 34v).<sup>42</sup> As is apparent, the Latin translator did not understand the Greek term and *terpon* was nothing else than a faithful transcription of ΤΕΡΠΙΟΝ. 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 טרפּן, which appears in b. *Niddah* 20a, and means “foliage, leaves.”<sup>43</sup>

## 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.<sup>44</sup> 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

<sup>41</sup> K. Galling, “Die τερπωλή des Alexander Jannäus,” in *Von Ugarit nach Qumran. Festschrift O. Eissfeldt* (ed. J. Hempel and L. Rost; Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1958), 49–62.

<sup>42</sup> See D. Flusser, *Sēfer Yosippon: ha-nusakh ha-meqori, tzilum ktav-yad Yerushalayim 8° 41280 im hosafot* (Jerusalem: Zalman Shazar Center, 1978) [= *Josippon: The Original Version, MS Jerusalem 8° 41280 and Supplements*].

<sup>43</sup> Cf. Chiesa, “Volute o voluttà?,” 12–13.

<sup>44</sup> Cf. *De institutione divinarum litterarum* 1.17.

alongside Josephus<sup>45</sup>—just as, on the other hand, it is not so astonishing to find a work ascribed to Josephus as part of the Syriac Old Testament.<sup>46</sup> Thus, Josephus' works were utilized not only for apologetic 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 printing, the Latin text was edited several times before the publication of the Greek one by Arlenius.<sup>47</sup> Its fortune is testified to as well by the large number of manuscripts copied between the thirteenth and the fifteenth centuries.<sup>48</sup>

I was lucky enough to be able to peruse three of them, kept in the National and University Library in Turin.<sup>49</sup> 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 illuminated.<sup>50</sup> Curiously enough, one of them (D-II-8) shares with the largest one the shaping of the initial headings, for instance the shaping of the opening letter of Book 15 as a snake—the name in question is Sossius.

The fortune of both the Latin and vernacular translations of Josephus was even increased in the following two centuries, especially in Italy, due to the withdrawal of the Bible from the hand of the Christian communities.<sup>51</sup> Josephus became its natural *succedaneum*:

<sup>45</sup> See Flusser, "Der lateinische Josephus," 129–30.

<sup>46</sup> Cf. S. Castelli, "Riferimenti a Flavio Giuseppe nella letteratura siriaca," *Henoch* 23 (2001): 199–226, esp. 201–202.

<sup>47</sup> Cf. Graesse, *Trésor de livres rares*; Oberthür, "De Flavio Iosepho."

<sup>48</sup> Cf. Blatt, *Latin Josephus*, 25–100.

<sup>49</sup> I-I-10 (= Ta; cf. Blatt, *Latin Josephus*, 41; G. Pasini, *Codices manuscriptorum bibliothecae regiae taurinensis athenaei per linguas digesti, & binas in partes distributi, in quarum prima hebreai, & graeci, in altera latini, italicici, & gallici* [Torino: Stamperia Reale, 1749], 125); K-II-2 (= ta; cf. Blatt, *Latin Josephus*, 85–86; Pasini, *Codices manuscriptorum*, 126); D-II-8 (= tr; cf. Blatt, *Latin Josephus*, 39; Pasini, *Codices manuscriptorum*, 171).

<sup>50</sup> On the illuminated manuscripts of Josephus' works cf. H. Schreckenberg, "Josephus in Early Christian Literature and Medieval Christian Art," in H. Schreckenberg 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).

<sup>51</sup> Cf. S. Castelli, "Die Bibel und die italienischen Übersetzungen des Josephus in der Renaissance," in *An der Schwelle zur Moderne. Juden in der Renaissance* (ed. G. Veltri 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<sup>52</sup> 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.<sup>53</sup>

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*.<sup>54</sup> Even though the text was published in a generally available series—the *Corpus Christianorum (Series Graeca 30)*—, nobody seems to have taken notice of it, including the author of a recent monograph on the *Testimonium*.<sup>55</sup>

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.<sup>56</sup> 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.

<sup>52</sup> Cf. Castelli, “Die Bibel,” 93.

<sup>53</sup> Cf. B. Nogara, *Bibliothecae Apostolicae Vaticanae Codices Manu Scripti Recensiti* (Codices Vaticani Latini, Tomus III, Codices 1461–2059) (Roma: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1912), 396–97.

<sup>54</sup> J. H. Declerk, ed., *Anonymus Dialogus cum Iudeis saeculi ut videtur sexti* (Turnhout: Brepols, 1994). Cf. G. Lembi, “Il *Testimonium Flavianum*, Agrippa I e i fratelli Asineo e Anileo. Osservazioni sul libro XVIII delle *Antichità di Giuseppe*,” *Materia Giudaica* 6.1 (2001): 53–68, esp. 56–60.

<sup>55</sup> Cf. A. Whealey, *Josephus on Jesus: The Testimonium Flavianum Controversy from Late Antiquity to Modern Times* (New York: Peter Lang, 2003).

<sup>56</sup> 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” (γένει Ἐβραῖος) 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 μεταβαλόν) from the work which I previously composed in my native tongue (τῇ πατρίῳ συντάξας) for the barbarians in the interior (τοῖς ἄνω βαρβάροις).<sup>1</sup>

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.”<sup>2</sup> Gohei Hata has argued that Josephus used μεταβάλλω “to indicate some radical change, that is, rewriting, and not merely translation”.<sup>3</sup> 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.”<sup>4</sup> Historians have argued that Josephus did not simply

<sup>1</sup> Προυθέμην ἐγὼ τοῖς κατὰ τὴν Ῥωμαίων ἡγεμονίαν, Ἐλλάδι γλώσσῃ μεταβαλὸν ἀ τοῖς ἄνω βαρβάροις τῇ πατρίῳ συντάξας ἀνέπεμψα πρότερον (*B.J.* 1.3).

<sup>2</sup> Πάρθους μὲν καὶ Βαβυλωνίους Ἀράβων τε τοὺς πορρωτάτω καὶ τὸ ὑπέρ Εὐφράτην ὁμόφυλον ἡμῖν Ἀδιαβηνός.

<sup>3</sup> For a discussion of the meaning of the verb μεταβάλλω, see Gohei Hata, “Is the Greek Version of Josephus’ *Jewish War* a Translation or a Rewriting of the First Version?,” *JQR* 66 (1975): 89–108.

<sup>4</sup> γνῶναι διὰ τῆς ἐπιμελείας ἀκριβῶς, ὅθεν τε ἥρξατο καὶ δι’ ὅσων ἔχωρησεν παθῶν ὁ πόλεμος καὶ ὥπως 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.<sup>5</sup> 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*.<sup>6</sup> Josephus' first version was probably very different from the highly conventional Hellenistic 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.<sup>7</sup> 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 version in Josephus' native language.<sup>8</sup> 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 speakers. The Greek of the *Bellum* is quite elegant and sophisticated at times. It is certainly not a literal translation from a Semitic language.

<sup>5</sup> See Solomon Zeitlin, *The Rise and Fall of the Judaean State*, v. 2 (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1969), 315–17.

<sup>6</sup> For example, see *B.J.* 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."

<sup>7</sup> χρησάμενός τισι πρὸς τὴν Ἑλληνίδα φωνὴν συνεργοῖς οὕτως ἐποιησάμην τῶν πράξεων τὴν παράδοσιν (*C.Aph.* 1.50).

<sup>8</sup> οὗτος δὴ πᾶσαν τὴν Ἰουδαικὴν ἀρχαιολογίαν ἐν ὅλοις εἴκοσι κατατέθειται συγγράμμασιν, τὴν δ' ἱστορίαν τούτην κατ' αὐτὸν Ῥωμαϊκούν πολέμου ἐν ἐπτά, ἔτη καὶ οὐ μόνον τῇ Ἑλλήνων, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῇ πατρίᾳ φωνῇ παραδόνται αὐτὸς ἑαυτῷ 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 chiastic structures,<sup>9</sup> *figurae etymologicae*,<sup>10</sup> frequent word-plays,<sup>11</sup> alliteration<sup>12</sup> and assonance,<sup>13</sup> asyndeton,<sup>14</sup> etc. What is most striking to this translator is the abundance of *hapax legomena* which often appear in clusters.<sup>15</sup> 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<sup>16</sup> of Josephus as a “pioneering version.”<sup>17</sup> Despite other more recent English translations of Josephus,<sup>18</sup> 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

<sup>9</sup> *B.J.* 1.400: ὑπὸ μὲν Καίσαρος ἐφιλεῖτο μετ’ Ἀγρίππαν, ὑπ’ Ἀγρίππα δὲ μετὰ Καίσαρα.

<sup>10</sup> *B.J.* 1.511: δωρεῖται . . . δώροις.

<sup>11</sup> *B.J.* 1.377: λοιπούν . . . λιποῦν.

<sup>12</sup> *B.J.* 1.393: διάδημα δόγματι διεσήμαινεν τὴν δωρεάν.

<sup>13</sup> *B.J.* 1.557: τῷ πρεσβυτέρῳ τῶν ἀδελφῶν Ἀλεξάνδρου παίδων.

<sup>14</sup> Note the beginnings of *B.J.* 1.197, 199, 210.

<sup>15</sup> There are numerous hapaxes scattered throughout Book I which appear in clusters in three rather long sections, namely, *B.J.* 1.401–430, *B.J.* 1.467–497, and *B.J.* 1.513–533.

<sup>16</sup> William Whiston, *The Genuine Works of Flavius Josephus the Jewish Historian*, (London: W. Bowyer, 1737).

<sup>17</sup> See *Josephus*. Translated by H. St. J. Thackeray et al. 9 vols. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1926–1965, vol. 2, xxx.

<sup>18</sup> For a discussion of the English translations of Josephus, see Louis H. Feldman, *Josephus and Modern Scholarship (1937–1980)* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1984), 28–32.

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.<sup>19</sup>

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,<sup>20</sup> whose work Thackeray acknowledged with gratitude in his introduction to the *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.<sup>21</sup>

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 *Bellum*, yet a rapid perusal of Reinach's French translation of other parts of the *Bellum* will result in some very curious similarities with Thackeray's translation.<sup>22</sup>

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 *B.J.* 1.253.

(Niese)	(Reinach)	(Thackeray)
253 Ἐνστάσης δ' ἐορτῆς, ἡ πεντηκοστὴ καλεῖται, τὰ τε περὶ τὸ	Comme la fête de la Pentecôte approchait, tous les lieux voisins	When the feast called Pentecost came round, the whole neighbour-

<sup>19</sup> Steve Mason, *Flavius Josephus. Life of Josephus*, (BJP 9; Leiden: Brill, 2001), li.

<sup>20</sup> Théodore Reinach, *Oeuvres Complètes de Flavius Josèphe* (Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1912).

<sup>21</sup> Thackeray, *Josephus*, vol. 2, xxx–xxxii.

<sup>22</sup> This paper has served as the point of departure for a forthcoming article to be published in *SCI* entitled "Caveat Lector: Notes on Thackeray's Translation of the *Bellum Judaicum*" by Lisa Ullmann and Jonathan J. Price. The authors have applied my theory about Thackeray's translation to Book 2 of the *Bellum*.

(cont.)

(Niese)	(Reinach)	(Thackeray)
ιερὸν πάντα καὶ ἡ πόλις ὅλη πλήθους τῶν ἀπὸ <sup>τῆς</sup> χώρας ἀναπίμπλαται τὸ πλέον ὅτιτῶν.  καὶ Φασάηλος μὲν τὸ τεῖχος, Ἡρώδης δ' οὐ μετὰ πολλῶν ἐφρούρει τὰ βασιλεια·	du Temple et la ville entièrē se remplirent d'une foule de gens de de la campagne, armés pour la plupart. Phasaël défendait les murailles; Hérode, avec peu de soldats, le palais.	hood of the temple and the entire city were crowded with country-folk, for the most part in arms. Phasael defended the walls; Herod, with a small force, the palace.

Thackeray altered only one element of Reinach's version above by translating the word *καλεῖται*. Thackeray renders the genitive absolute *ἐνστάσης ἑορτῆς* in exactly the same way as Reinach and the prepositional phrase *περὶ τὸ ιερόν* 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 *δέ* is simply a copulative *δέ* that marks a transition as does the *καὶ* before *Φασάηλος*. Both particles are used as connectives. In the same way, the particles *μὲν* and *δέ* that accompany *Φασάηλος* and *Ἡρώδης* 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.

(Niese)	(Reinach)	(Thackeray)
φαμένου δὲ τοῦ βασιλέως δᾶρον ἔξειν παρ' αὐτοῦ τὸν ιύον, εἰ μὴ λύσειεν τὸν γάμον, ὄντων μὲν αὐτοῖς ἥδη καὶ τέκνων, στεργομένης δ' οὔτως ὑπὸ τοῦ μειρακίου τῆς γυναικός, ἣν παραμέ- νουσαν μὲν ἔσεσθαι δυσώπημα τῶν ἀμαρ- τημάτων, ἀπορραγεῖσαν δὲ αἰτίαν τῆς εἰς ἄπαντα ἀπογνώσεως· μαλακω-	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 beau- coup sa femme : si elle reste auprès de lui, elle lui inspirera le regret de ses fautes ; si on la lui arrache, on le plongera	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

(cont.)

(Niese)	(Reinach)	(Thackeray)
τέρας γὰρ γίνεσθαι τὰς τόλμας πάθεσιν οἰκείοις περισπωμένας·	dans un désespoir prêt à tous les excès, car un caractère bouillant trouve un dérivatif dans les affections domestiques.	him, her very presence would make him ashamed of his errors whereas, were she torn from him, he would be driven to utter desperation; for the domestic affections exercised a chastening and diverting influence on reckless characters.

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 εἴ 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 μέν . . . δέ construction is lost. What is most striking is Thackeray's rendering of πάθεσιν οἰκείοις as "domestic affections", a clear borrowing of Reinach's "affections domestiques". I suggest that the difficult last sentence, μαλακωτέρας γὰρ γίνεσθαι τὰς τόλμας πάθεσιν οἰκείοις περισπωμένας, 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.<sup>23</sup>

<sup>23</sup> 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' ἀποπειραθεὶς 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.

(Niese)	(Reinach)	(Thackeray)
λαμπρὰ δ' Ἡρώδῃ δῶρα προσενεγκών δέλεαρ ὡν ἔθηράτο καὶ παραχρῆμα πολλατλασίω λαβὸν σύνδεν ἡγεῖτο τὴν καθαρὰν δόσιν, εἰ μὴ δι’ αἵματος ἐμπορεύσεται τὴν βασιλείαν.	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 trahissait du royaume au prix du sang.	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.
<b>515</b> . . . φίλος ἐν τοῖς πρώτοις γίνεται· καὶ γὰρ ὁ βασιλεὺς διὰ τὴν πατρίδα καὶ πάντες οἱ περὶ αὐτὸν ἡδέως προετίμων τὸν Σπαρτιάτην.	<b>515</b> . . . et compta 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.	<b>515</b> . . . 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.
<b>516</b> Ο δ' ἐπεὶ τὰ σαθρὰ τῆς οἰκίας κατέμαθεν, τάς τε τῶν ἀδελφῶν διαφορὰς καὶ ὅπως διέκειτο πρὸς ἔκαστον ὁ πατήρ, . . . ἐταῖρον ἑαυτὸν εἶναι καὶ Ἀρχελάου πάλαι·	<b>516</b> 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, Euryclès . . . un ami éprouvé . . .	<b>516</b> 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 . . .
<b>517</b> πάντων δ' ἀποπειραθεὶς τῶν προσώπων ἄλλον ἄλλως ὑπῆι, γίνεται δὲ προηγουμένως μισθωτὸς Ἀντιπάτρου καὶ προδότης Ἀλεξάνδρου, τῷ μὲν ὄνειδίζων, εἰ πρεσβύτατος ὡν περιόψεται τοὺς ἐφεδρεύοντας αὐτὸν ταῖς ἐλπίσιν, Ἀλεξάνδρῳ δέ, εἰ γεγενημένος ἐκ βασιλίδος καὶ βασιλίδι	<b>517</b> 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'aîné, les intrigues de ceux qui complotaient contre ses espérances;	<b>517</b> 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

(cont.)

(Niese)	(Reinach)	(Thackeray)
συνοικῶν ἔάσει διαδέ- χεσθαι τὴν ἀρχὴν τὸν ἔξ ιδιώτιδος, καὶ ταῦτα μεγίστην ἀφορμὴν ἔχων Ἀρχέλαον.	à Alexandre, de laisser, lui fils et époux d'une princesse royale, suc- céder au trône un fils de bourgeoisie, alors surtout qu'il avait en Archélaüs un si solide appui.	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 Arche- laus such powerful sup- port 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,<sup>24</sup> 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:

(Niese)	(Reinach)	(Thackeray)
καὶ διανύσας ἐπὶ τὸν Λίβανον όκτακοσίους μὲν τῶν περὶ τὸ ὄρος προσλαμ- βάνει συμμάχους, Ῥωμαίων δὲ ἔν τάγμα ταύτῃ συνῆψεν. μεθ' ὧν οὐ περιμείνας ἡμέραν εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν ἐνέβαλεν κτλ. . . .	Marchant à étapes il arriva au Liban, où il s'adjoignit comme auxiliaires huit cents montagnards et rallia une légion romaine. Puis, sans attendre le jour, il envahit la Galilée et refoula les ennemis. . . .	By forced marches he pushed on to Lebanon, where he received a reinforcement of eight hundred of the moun- taineers and was joined by one of the Roman legions. With these allies, without waiting for daylight, he invaded Galilee. . . .

<sup>24</sup> See Reinach 104, footnote 1: "Peut-être à cause de la prétenue 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.<sup>25</sup>

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). . .<sup>26</sup>

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.

(Niese)	(Reinach)	(Thackeray)	(Forte)
κατεσκεύασεν δὲ καὶ περὶ τὰς ρίζας ὄλλα βασίλεια τὴν τε ἀποσκευὴν καὶ τοὺς φίλους δέξασθαι δυνάμενα.	Au pied du coteau, il bâtit un autre palais pouvant abriter un mobilier et recevoir ses amis.	Around the base he erected other palaces for the accommodation of his furniture and his friends.	At the foot of the hill, he also built other buildings, suitable for accommodating his household and his friends.

<sup>25</sup> See Reinach 67, footnote 1.

<sup>26</sup> Thackeray on Josephus, *B.J.* 1.329 (LCL), note *a*.

Reinach's incorrect rendering of ἀποσκευή in this passage as "mobilier" ("movable property") is in turn appropriated by Thackeray.<sup>27</sup> 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 ἀποσκευή in this passage in the *Complete Concordance* renders it as "court," yet I think that term is perhaps too restrictive.<sup>28</sup> LSJ offer several interpretations.<sup>29</sup> The entry includes a reference to the LXX and this gave me the impetus to seek another possible meaning elsewhere in the LXX. Indeed, ἀποσκευή 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); *impediments* (Jdt 7:2).<sup>30</sup> 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.

<sup>27</sup> It is true that Whiston's 1737 English translation also renders ἀποσκευή 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 ἀποσκευή: *bagages, mobilier, meubles*. Bailly's renderings fail to capture the meaning of ἀποσκευή in the context of *B.J.* 1.421.

<sup>28</sup> See K.H. Rengstorf, *A Complete Concordance to Flavius Josephus* (Leiden: Brill, 1973–1983). The entry for ἀποσκευή 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.]

<sup>29</sup> See LSJ, ἀποσκευή, 217: "*removal, riddance, i.e. assassination, J AJ 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."

<sup>30</sup> See J. Lust, E. Eynikel, K. Hauppie, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1996), 55.

The following passage, which includes three *hapax legomena* in the Josephan corpus,<sup>31</sup> 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.

<b>B.J. 1.405</b> <b>(Niese)</b>	<b>(Reinach)</b>	<b>(Thackeray)</b>	<b>(Forte)</b>
ἐνθα κορυφὴ μέν τις ὄρους εἰς ἀπειρον ῦψος ἀνατείνεται, παρὰ δὲ τὴν ὑπόρειον λαγόνα συνηρεφὲς ἄντρον ὑπανοίγει, δι' οὐ βαραθρώδης κρημνὸς εἰς ἀμέτρ- ητον ἀπορρώγα βαθύνεται πλήθει τε ὕδατος ἀσαλεύ- του καὶ τοῖς καθιμ- ῶσίν τι πρὸς ἔρευ- ναν γῆς οὐδὲν μῆκος ἔξαρκεῖ.	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 yawn- ing chasm, en- closing a volume of still water, the bottom of which no sounding-line has been found long enough to reach.	There, a moun- tain peak rises to an over- whelming height, and near the foot of the side of the mountain a dark cave opens from below, <sup>32</sup> through which a precipi- tous <sup>33</sup> chasm plunges down into an immense depth. No length of rope is suffi- cient to reach the great quantity of stagnant <sup>34</sup> water and measure the bottom.

The student of Josephus is aware that the *Antiquitates* 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 *Antiquitates* can provide a clue as to the possible

<sup>31</sup> This entire section, *B.J.* 1.401–430, contains 19 hapaxes: πρόσθεσις (404); ὑπανοίγω (405); βαραθρώδης (405); ἀσάλευτος (405); ὑπερεκχέω (407); προδομέω (412); ἐνομίζω (413); νάγμα (413); κολοσσός (2x : 413, 414); γῆλοφον (420); περίστυλον (422); λειμών (422); ἐπετήσιος (423); γυμνασιωρχία (423); φευκτός (425); ἐπεξκουφίζω (428; an absolute *hapax* in all of extant Greek literature); συστρόφος (429); ὄναγρος (429); προτέρημα (430).

<sup>32</sup> ὑπανοίγω is a *hapax* in Josephus.

<sup>33</sup> βαραθρώδης is a *hapax* in Josephus.

<sup>34</sup> ἀσάλευτος 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.

<b>B.J. 1.311 (Niese)</b>	<b>B.J. 1.311 (Forte)</b>	<b>A.J. 14.423 (Niese)</b>	<b>A.J. 14.423 (Forte)</b>
τοὺς γοῦν ἀλκί- μους καθιμῶν ἐν λάρναξιν ἐνίει τοῖς στομίοις.	He lowered his most valiant men in containers and thus gave them access to the entrances of the caves.	λάρνακας ἐπ' αὐτὸνς πηξάμενος καθίει ταῦτας σιδηραῖς ἀλύσεσιν μηχανῆς ἀπό <sup>35</sup> κορυφῆς τοῦ ὅρους.	He built containers and lowered them (the containers) on the men with iron chains as they were suspended by a machine from the top of the hill.

According to the *Complete Concordance*,<sup>35</sup> καθιμάω 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* 857<sup>b</sup>.<sup>36</sup> Thackeray, following Reinach’s “il fit descendre d’en haut à l’aide de cordes,”<sup>37</sup> 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 σιδηραῖς ἀλύσεσιν, “iron chains”, and therefore exclude the interpretation of καθιμάω 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 καθιμῶν 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.

\* \* \*

<sup>35</sup> Rengstorf, 402.

<sup>36</sup> H. G. Liddell – Robert Scott – H. Stuart Jones, *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Revised Supplement by P.G.W. Glare (Oxford: Clarendon, 1996). See also R. Renéhan, *Greek Lexicographical Notes, A Critical Supplement to the Greek-English Lexicon of Liddell-Scott-Jones*, in HYPOMNEMATA, *Untersuchungen zur Antike und zu ihrem Nachleben*, Heft 45 (1975) and Heft 74 (1982). For a review of the 1968 Supplement, cf. J. A. L. Lee, “A Note on Septuagint Material to Liddell and Scott,” *Glotta* 47 (1968): 234–242.

<sup>37</sup> 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.<sup>38</sup> 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: ἡ γὰρ κατὰ θεὸν λύπη μετάνοιαν εἰς σωτηρίαν ἀμεταμέλητον ἐργάζεται. ἡ δὲ τοῦ κόσμου λύπη θάνατον κατεργάζεται.<sup>39</sup> 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 ἔπαινον δόξης αὐτοῦ τοὺς προηλπικότας ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ.<sup>40</sup> The question here is whether the compound form προελπίζω has the same meaning as the simple form ἐλπίζω.<sup>41</sup> 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.<sup>42</sup>

<sup>38</sup> 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); καθίστησιν "appointed" (*B.J.* 1.203); καθίσταμενος "rendered" (*B.J.* 1.206).

<sup>39</sup> "For godly grief produces a repentance that leads to salvation and brings no regret, but worldly grief produces death." (RSV).

<sup>40</sup> "We who first hoped in Christ . . . to live for the praise of his glory." (RSV).

<sup>41</sup> 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: ὃ προεπηγγείλατο διὰ τῶν προφητῶν αὐτοῦ ἐν γραφαῖς ἁγίαις and Col 1:5: διὰ τὴν ἐλπίδα τὴν ἀποκειμένην ὑμῖν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, ἣν προηκούσατε ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τῆς ἀληθείας τοῦ εὐαγγελίου.

<sup>42</sup> 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 ἐγκέχηναν καὶ χάσκοντες τὸ στόμα θεωροῦσιν αὐτήν 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.

<i>B.J. 1 (Niese)</i>	<i>B.J. 1 (Forte)</i>
<b>292</b> . . . Ἡρώδης ἐκδραμών <sup>43</sup> μετ' ὀλίγου στίφους τρέπεται ταχέως καὶ Σίλωνα διασώζει <sup>44</sup>	<b>292</b> . . . Herod, with a small band of soldiers, <u>rushed out</u> at them, quickly drove them back, and rescued Silo, . . .
<b>295</b> Στρατοπεδευσαμένους δὲ κατὰ τὸ πρὸς δύσιν κλίμα τοῦ ἄστεος οἱ ταύτῃ φύλακες ἐτόξευνον τε καὶ ἔξηκόντιζον <sup>45</sup> αὐτούς,	<b>295</b> When the troops had pitched camp on the west side of the city, the guards stationed there <u>attacked</u> them <u>with</u> arrows and <u>javelins</u> ,
<b>297</b> . . . ἐπισκευασμένος γὰρ πολλοὺς τῶν στρατιωτῶν σπάνιν ἐπιτηδείων ἀναβοῶν <sup>46</sup> καὶ χρήματα εἰς τροφὰς ἀπαιτεῖν <sup>47</sup> ἀπάγειν τε σφῖς χειμεριοῦντας εἰς τοὺς ιδίους τόπους, ἐπειδὴ τὰ περὶ τὴν πόλιν ἦν ἔρημα πάντα τῶν περὶ Ἀντίγονον <u>προανεσκευασμένων</u> <sup>48</sup>	<b>297</b> . . . For he incited a large number of soldiers <u>to decry</u> the scarcity of supplies, <u>to demand</u> money for provisions, and to be marched to their own winter quarters, since Antigonus' men <u>had packed up and carried away</u> previously

<sup>43</sup> ἐκδραμών (< 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, ἐπεκδραμών (< ἐπεκτρέχω = “to rush out against, make a raid against, attack”).

<sup>44</sup> διασώζει κακῶς ἀμύνομενον (< διασώζω = “to save, spare”). The parallel passage at *A.J.* 14.397 uses the simple form of the verb, σώζει.

<sup>45</sup> ἔξηκόντιζον (< ἔξακοντίζω = “to throw spears (at someone)”). The compound verb is a hapax in Josephus. See *B.J.* 1.332, ὀκοντίζεται (“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, ἡκόντιζον.

<sup>46</sup> ἀναβοῶν (< ἀναβοῶ = “to shout, call out, clamour; to cry out against, complain loudly over”). The parallel in *A.J.* 14.406 has κατοβοῶν (“to cry out, inveigh [against someone], revile, abuse; to complain loudly; to demand [loudly]”).

<sup>47</sup> ἀπαιτεῖν (< ἀπαιτέω = “to demand back, reclaim; to require”). The parallel in *A.J.* 14.406 uses the simple αἰτεῖν.

<sup>48</sup> The double compound form προανεσκευασμένων (< προανεσκευάζομαι = “to pick up and carry away previously”) is used here, while the parallel in *A.J.* 14.406 has the compound ἀνεσκευάσθαι (< ἀνεσκευάζομαι = “to snatch up, carry off”).

<sup>49</sup> ὄρμήσας (< ὄρμάω = “to set out, depart for (in haste), start out, go”). The parallel in *A.J.* 14.408 uses the compound ἐξօρμήσας (< ἐξօρμάω = “to rush, start (rapidly), march out, move (out)”).

(cont.)

***B.J. 1 (Niese)******B.J. 1 (Forte)***

... **299** καὶ μετὰ τὴν δέησιν εὐθέως ὥρμήσας<sup>49</sup> αὐτὸς εἰς τὴν χώραν τοσαύτην αὐτοῖς ἐπιτηδείων ἀφθονίαν ἔκόμισεν, ὡς πάσας ἀποκόψαι τὰς Σίλωνος προφάσεις

... **300** ταῦτ' ἀκούσας Ἀντίγονος διέπεμψεν<sup>50</sup> περὶ τὴν χώραν εἴργειν καὶ λοχᾶν<sup>51</sup> τοὺς σιτηγοὺς κελεύων.

... διεκαθέζοντο<sup>52</sup> δὲ ἐπὶ τῶν ὄρων παραφυλάσσοντες τοὺς τὰ ἐπιτήδεια ἔκκομιζοντας.

**301** . . . ἐπὶ τὴν Ἱεριχοῦντα παραγίνεται, καὶ τὴν μὲν πόλιν καταλελειμμένην εύρισκει<sup>53</sup> . . .

... **299** 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.

... **300** 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.

**301** . . . 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 καὶ sometimes functions as an adverb and sometimes as a conjunction.

<sup>50</sup> 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 ἀπέπεμψεν ("to send out, dispatch, forward; to send back") and κατὰ τὴν χώραν.

<sup>51</sup> εἴργειν καὶ λοχᾶν ("to obstruct and lay an ambush"). The parallel passage in *A.J.* 14.409 uses two participles, εἴρξοντας καὶ λοχῆσοντας.

<sup>52</sup> διεκαθέζοντο (a *hapax* < διεκαθέζομαι = "to take up positions round about"). The parallel passage in *A.J.* 14.409 has καθεοθέντες (< καθέζομαι = "to sit down, settle, take a seat").

<sup>53</sup> καταλελειμμένην (< καταλείπω = "to leave behind; abandon") εύρισκει. The parallel in *A.J.* 14.410 has ἐκλελειμμένην (< ἐκλείπω = "to leave, abandon") καταλαβών (< 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' ἄρα τὸ χρεῶν αὐτοῦ ταῖς ἐλπίσιν. ὁ γοῦν Ἡρώδης προϊδόμενος αὐτοῦ τὴν ὄρμὴν τὸν τε Υρκανὸν κάκεινον ἐπὶ δείπνον ἐκάλει, παρεστῶτας ἔπειτα τῶν οἰκετῶν τινας πρὸς αὐτὸν εἰσέπεμψεν ως ἐπὶ τὴν τοῦ δείπνου παρασκευήν, τῷ δὲ ὅντι 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 ἄρα 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 γοῦν functions to give an explanation of the previous clause. Instead of using a καί . . . καί

construction to connect Ὑρκανόν and ἐκεῖνον, the more elegant combination of *τε* and *καὶ* unites the two elements. It seems that in this passage, ὅρα 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:

λέγοντες ώς Ἀντιπάτρῳ καὶ τοῖς νιοῖς αὐτοῦ παροχωρήσας τῶν πραγμάτων καθέζοιτο τούνομα μόνον βασιλέως ἔχων ἔρημον ἔξουσίας. καὶ μέχρι τοῦ πλανηθῆσεται καθ' ἑαυτοῦ βασιλεῖς ἐπιτρέφων; οὐδὲ γὰρ εἰρωνεύεσθαι τὴν ἐπιτροπὴν αὐτοὺς ἔτι, φανεροὺς δὲ εἶναι δεσπότας παρωσαμένους ἐκεῖνον, εἴ γε μήτε ἐντολὰς δόντος μήτε ἐπιστείλαντος αὐτοῦ τοσούτους παρὰ τὸν τῶν Ἰουδαίων νόμον ἀνήρηκεν Ἡρώδης· ὃν, εἰ μὴ βασιλεύς ἐστιν ἀλλ᾽ ἔτι ιδιώτης, δεῖν ἐπὶ δίκην ἥκειν ἀποδώσοντα λόγον αὐτῷ τε καὶ τοῖς πατρίοις νόμοις, οἵ τε κείνειν ἀκρίτους οὐκ ἐφιάσιν.

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 *καὶ* functions not only as a copulative conjunction ('Αντιπάτρῳ καὶ τοῖς νιοῖς 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 *γάρ* (οὐδὲ *γὰρ εἰρωνεύεσθαι*) is most likely explanatory, while *δέ*, marking a contrast with what precedes, is clearly adversative. In Josephus' elegant combination of *εἴ γε μήτε . . . μήτε*, the intensive particle *γε*, by its close proximity to *εἴ*, influences the entire clause with the double *μήτε*, and later picks up *εἴ μή* of the next sentence. Just as the *δέ* above functioned as an adversative, the *ἀλλά* of *ἀλλ᾽ ἔτι ιδιώτης* is an adversative conjunction, even stronger than *δέ*. Finally, the elegant combination of *τε καὶ*, as opposed to a simple *καὶ*, 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.<sup>54</sup>

κατέστησεν δὲ αὐτὸν καὶ Συρίας ὄλης ἐπίτροπον ἔτει δεκάτῳ πάλιν ἐλθὼν εἰς τὴν ἐπαρχίαν, ὡς μηδὲν ἔξειναι δίχα τῆς ἑκείνου συμβουλίας τοῖς ἐπιτρόποις 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<sup>55</sup> 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 πρεσβευτής.

προκαθίζουσίν τε οἱ ἡγεμόνες γραφὲν αὐτοῖς ὑπὸ Καίσαρος, Σατορνῖνός τε καὶ οἱ περὶ Πεδάνιον πρέσβεις, σὺν οὓς καὶ Οὐδολούμνιος 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. δωροδοκία, defined by Rengstorf's *Complete Concordance* as "bribe,

<sup>54</sup> For a discussion of this problem of Greek and Latin technical terms, see Hugh J. Mason, *Greek Terms for Roman Institutions, A Lexicon and Analysis* (Hakkert: Toronto, 1974). Mason discusses ἐπίτροπος on pages 142–43. See also the contributions of Dominic Rathbone and Gerhard Thür under ἐπίτροπος in *DNP* 3:1177–80.

<sup>55</sup> *C.A.P.* 1.98, ἐπίτροπον Αἰγύπτου.

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 ὑποδέξασθαι τοῦ στρατοῦ μοῖραν 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, ἔτυχεν δὲ καὶ Ἀντίγονος παρὰ Σίλωνος ἀντὶ τῆς δωροδοκίας ὥστε ὑποδέξασθαι τοῦ στρατοῦ μοῖραν 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.<sup>56</sup> Nicolaus is frequently mentioned in the *Antiquitates*

<sup>56</sup> There is a six volume modern edition of the *Excerpta Historica iussu Imp. Constantini Porphyrogeniti confecta*, published by U. Ph. Boisserain, and C. de Boor, Th. Büttner-Wobst (Berlin: Weidmann, 1903). See N. G. Wilson, *Scholars of Byzantium*, (London:

for having provided material for the *Bellum* (1.31–2.116).<sup>57</sup> 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.<sup>58</sup> 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.<sup>59</sup> This favorable bias is apparent in *B.J.* 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 *B.J.* 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. *B.J.* 1.413 describes the ψωλίδες that are situated within the wall that arose from the harbor.

---

Duckworth, 1983), 140–145 for a discussion of the merits of Constantine's work. The fragments of Nicolaus have been collected by Jacoby. See Felix Jacoby, *Die fragmenta der Griechischen Historiker*, II-A, (Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1926), 324–430.

<sup>57</sup> *A.J.* 14.9, 68, 104.

<sup>58</sup> M. Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism*, I (Jerusalem: 1974), 229.

<sup>59</sup> See G. Hölscher, "Josephus", *PWRE* 18 (1916), 1934–2000. The author views Josephus as a mere compiler, an untrustworthy narrator, who depended entirely on his sources.

***B.J. 1.413 (Niese)******B.J. 1.413 (Forte)***

Ψαλίδες τε πυκναὶ πρὸς καταγωγὴν  
τῶν ἐνορμιζομένων, καὶ τὸ πρὸ σύντων  
πάντα κύκλῳ νάγμα τοῖς ἀποβαίνουσιν  
πλατὺς περίπατος. ὁ δὲ εἰσπλους  
βόρειος, αἱθριώτατος γὰρ ἀνέμων τῷ  
τόπῳ βορέας.

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.<sup>60</sup>

\* \* \*

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.

<sup>60</sup> See A. Raban and J. P. Oleson (ed.), in *The Harbours of Caesarea Maritima: Results of the Caesarea Ancient Harbour Excavations Project, 1980–1985* (BAR International Series 491; Oxford: BAR, 1989).



# JOSEPHUS UND DAS ALPHABET DER RÖMER: ÜBERLEGUNGEN ZUR SCHREIBUNG GRIECHISCHER EIGENNAMEN IN LATEINISCHER SCHRIFT

FOLKER SIEGERT  
INSTITUTUM JUDAICUM DELITZSCHIANUM, MÜNSTER

## 1. DAS ANLIEGEN: VERMEIDUNG VON HYBRIDEN

Die Werke des Josephus sind voll von Namen griechischer und nicht-griechischer Herkunft. Eine griechisch-deutsche Ausgabe, wie sie in Münster betrieben wird, hat damit nicht nur textkritische Probleme – auf der griechischen Seite –, sondern auch orthographische – auf der deutschen – zu bewältigen.

Schon bei der Herausgabe der *Vita*<sup>1</sup> 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*.

Wir haben uns nun schon fast gewöhnt an die mehr oder weniger gedankenlose Hybridisierung eines semitischen Worts auf seinem Weg durch das griechische und das lateinische Alphabet bis hinein in eine moderne Landessprache. Jedoch, nach den Regeln welcher Sprache soll man das Endergebnis aussprechen? Für Philo-logen im vollen Sinne des Wortes sind Hybride immer unschön, und für Laien sind sie Anlass zu erneuten spontanen Verbildungen.

In Fällen wie den zitierten, die aus dem Hebräischen kommen, sind wir in unserer deutschen Wiedergabe stärker als bisher üblich auf die

---

<sup>1</sup> Flavius Josephus, *Aus meinem Leben (Vita). Kritische Ausgabe, Übersetzung und Kommentar* von F. Siegert, H. Schreckenberg, M. Vogel und dem Josephus-Arbeitskreis des Institutum Judaicum Delitzschianum, Münster (Tübingen 2001), 12–14.

Originalsprache zurückgegangen. Wir haben also „Jonatan“ transkribiert und, nach genaueren sprachgeschichtlichen Erkundungen, „Jotafat“.<sup>2</sup> Wie sich diese Namen auf Griechisch schreiben, kann man ja auf der jeweils gegenüberliegenden Seite nachsehen. Die für die Übersetzung gewählten Schreibungen jedoch erinnern durchaus an Gehörtes und werden wohl auch, analog zu bereits bekannten hebräischen Wörtern bzw. Namen, nicht allzu abwegig ausgesprochen werden.

Sollte unser Projekt eines Tages auch die *Antiquitates* noch bewältigen (wenngleich nur als Übersetzung), werden wir nun auch einen Ιούδας Μακκαβαῖος nicht latinisieren – als „Judas Makkabäus“, oder wie immer man dann halb lateinisch, halb deutsch schreibt, sondern wir werden ihn hebräisch-aramäisch lassen: Jehuda Makkabai.<sup>3</sup> Historisch gesehen, hat in diesem Namen Latein nichts zu suchen – außer dass wir uns des lateinischen Alphabets bedienen. Damit sind wir nun beim Thema.

## 2. PROBLEME GRIECHISCHER NAMEN IN LATEINISCHER SCHRIFT

Bis hierher war die Anwendung des lateinischen Alphabets unproblematisch. Sie wird es nun aber paradoxe Weise bei der Wiedergabe griechischer Namen. Hier tut sich nämlich, gerade wegen der Ähnlichkeit der Alphabet, 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

---

<sup>2</sup> So verteidigt auf dem Josephus-Kolloquium in Brüssel: F. Siegert, „Grundsätze zur Transkription semitischer Namen bei Josephus“, in: J. U. Kalms/F. Siegert (Hg.), *Internationales Josephus-Kolloquium Brüssel 1998* (Münsteraner Judaistische Studien 4; Münster 1999), 171–185. In unserer *Vita*-Ausgabe vgl. S. 12–14 und 213. – Es hat sich als nützlich erwiesen, die Grapheme ph und th für Griechisches zu reservieren. Zwischenvokalisches, nicht verstärktes p im Hebräischen ist für uns f, egal wie Josephus selbst es damals transkribierte, in seinem eigenen Namen etwa (s.u.). Hier nimmt er auf griechische Euphonieregeln Rücksicht, die in der deutschen Übersetzung nicht interessieren.

<sup>3</sup> Die heutige hebräische Vokalisierung ist „Makkabi“; die Quellen aber setzen noch die aramäische Form „Makkabai“ voraus. Gleiches gilt für den Frauennamen Σαλαμψιώ für eine Tochter des Herodes: In heutigem Hebräisch sagt man *Šalamšion*; die von Josephus transkribierte beruht jedoch auf einer alten aramäischen Vokalisierung: *Šalamšion*.

phonetischer Natur. Man schrieb ja Texte zum Vorlesen; so auch Josephus.<sup>4</sup> Selbst unsere moderne Übersetzung wird in der Arbeitsgruppe nicht nur auf ihre Genauigkeit und Richtigkeit, sondern auf ihren Klang geprüft. Wir möchten in jeder Hinsicht Josephus gerecht werden.

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 wenigen künstlichen Rekonstruktionen der Neuzeit.<sup>5</sup> Ein Beispiel: Für Φειδίας (Josephus nennt ihn in *A.J.* 19,8) fand man *Phidias*. Der dem Lateinischen fremde Laut φ (damals p+h)<sup>6</sup> 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 |e:|, nahe bei |i|.<sup>7</sup> Das Zeichen ist meist *i*, seltener *e*.<sup>8</sup> 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 *ov* 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*.

<sup>4</sup> Hinweis darauf sind in seinem Text die Prosarhythmen, wie in unserer *Vita*-Ausgabe S. 10f. bemerkt.

<sup>5</sup> Zu der des Erasmus siehe W. S. Allen, *Vox Graeca. the Pronunciation of Classical Greek* (1968, 3. Aufl., Cambridge 1987) 142–43, 150–51; für den Text des Erasmus selbst s. die zweisprachige Ausgabe von Kramer (*Desiderii Erasmi Roterodami de recta Latini Graecique sermonis pronuntiatione dialogus. Desiderius Erasmus von Rotterdam, Dialog über die richtige Aussprache der lateinischen und griechischen Sprache*, hg. u. übers. v. J. Kramer, [BKP 98; Meisenheim, Glan, 1978]). Ihm geht noch jedes Verständnis für Lautwandel ab. Als Ursache der Abflachung des Griechischen zum sog. Itazismus gibt er die *mulierculae* an, die mit halb geschlossenem Mund zu wispern pflegen (S. 117 [939 Ende]). – Solange der Begriff des „Phonems“ (des distinktiven Lautes) noch nicht gebildet war (den Allen natürlich zugrunde legt), wurde zumeist angenommen, das Alphabet einer Sprache sei identisch mit seinem Vorrat an Phonemen (anders aber Quintilian; s.u.).

<sup>6</sup> Historisches zur Aussprache des Griechischen s. Allen, *Vox Graeca*, dem ich in allem zu folgen vermag bis auf die (hier nicht relevanten) Vorschläge für englische Schulen.

<sup>7</sup> So auch in Allens Analysen, denen ich im Weiteren folge.

<sup>8</sup> 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),<sup>9</sup> geschah das in der unbelegten Annahme, ein Doppelgraphem sei stets auch ein Doppelphonem. Hier hätte bereits Quintilian (1.4,8 f.) sie eines Besseren belehren können. Einen Laut zwischen E und I bemerkte Quintilian in Wörtern wie *here*. Umgekehrt hatte das klassisch-griechische Alphabet ja auch einfache Grapheme für Doppellaute (ξ, ψ, positionsbildend), deren Überflüssigkeit von Quintilian (a.a.O.) gleichfalls bemerkt wird. Seine Einsichten in den (losen) Zusammenhang zwischen Alphabet und gesprochener Sprache gingen weiter als die der Philologen noch des 18. Jh.

Inzwischen muss man sagen: Die damals eingeführten „altgriechischen“ Neuerungen sind in vieler Hinsicht verfehlt gewesen und zumindest inkonsistent. Denn die Regel war offensichtlich, nur solche Laute zuzulassen, die auch das Deutsche kannte,<sup>10</sup> 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 entstanden 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.

---

<sup>9</sup> Abschn. 4. – Ältere Beispiele finden sich vereinzelt, v.a. im Einflussbereich des Calvinismus, der ja früh die erasmische Aussprache übernahm. Ich erinnere mich, in alten Calvin-Drucken derlei schon gesehen zu haben. Die Plutarch-Ausgabe des Heidelberger Grätzisten Xylander (Frankfurt 1599) bietet in ihrer lateinischen Kolumne Schreibungen wie Pheidias (sic). – Zu Luther vgl. unten Anm. 26f.

<sup>10</sup> Mir selbst wurde, als ich auf das humanistische Gymnasium ging, beigebracht, η für ein à anzusehen, οι für ai, οι für oi usw. Das war zwar einfach und hat im Schwabenland (wo ich lebte) sogar noch einen minimalen Unterschied zwischen ai und ei mit sich gebracht. Bei ευ aber, das unweigerlich gleichlautend wurde mit οι, habe ich einen Zwitter erlernt, der mir erst dann fraglich vorkam, als ich auf den Ruf der Bacchanten stieß, εὐοῖ: Der kann doch wohl kaum [ɔɪɔɪ] gelautet haben! Noch bei den deutschen Klassikern hingegen findet sich die von den Lateinern gelernte Transkription εοε.

- Griechisch wird seither vermischt mit Deutsch, wenn nun die meisten, die so ein Wort in Lateinschrift sehen, dabei aber deutsche Rechtschreibregeln anlegen, irgendetwas wie |faidias| lesen. Diesen Namen, kann man ehrlich sagen, hat es vor dem 19. Jh. nicht gegeben.

So ist man, unter Benützung ein und desselben lateinischen Alphabets, von der Wiedergabe des Klanges, dem antiken Prinzip, zu der des Schriftbildes übergewechselt, dem modernen – mit zweifelhaftem Nutzen. Denn gleichzeitig wirken landessprachliche Aussprachetraditionen jetzt irgendwie weiter, nur eben unterschwellig und ungeregelt.

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,<sup>11</sup> oder das griechische Schriftbild übertragen.

Da wir – die Münsteraner Arbeitsgruppe – in unserer Josephus-Ausgabe das griechische Schriftbild auf der gegenüberliegenden Seite jeweils *in extenso* präsentieren, haben wir uns für die erste Option entschieden. Sie hat zudem den Vorteil, die antike und von Josephus selbst befolgte zu sein. Auch brauchen wir zwischen der Wiedergabe des Semitischen und der des Griechischen nicht die Prinzipien zu wechseln. Das heißt, dass wir, das Alphabet der Römer benützend, uns auch an deren Gehör halten und nicht beanspruchen, es besser zu machen als sie.

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

---

<sup>11</sup> 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.

ist zu verfahren bei Πτολεμαῖος? Wir werden hier weder „Ptolemaios“ schreiben, wie heutzutage häufig zu lesen ist, noch „Ptolemaeus“ (zu schweigen von dem Mehrfachhybrid „Ptolemäus“), sondern: „Ptolemaeos“. Bei dieser, wie wir meinen, „sanften“ Lösung, die hier nicht zum ersten Mal vorgeschlagen wird,<sup>12</sup> bleibt es jedem überlassen, das ae auszusprechen nach seiner/ihrer Art von Latein.

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.

Wir werden, um dies nun auf einen bei Josephus vorkommenden Namen anzuwenden, dem Herodes keine Frau namens „Phaidra“, sondern eine „Phaedra“ zugesellen (*A.J.* 17.21). Ein anderes Beispiel ist der gleichfalls bei Josephus vorkommende Name Εἰρηναῖος (*B.J.* 2.21; *A.J.* 17.226): Hierfür wäre „Eirenaios“ ebenso anachronistisch wie unschön, und wir werden „Irenaeos“ schreiben. In den berüchtigten Itazismus werden wir deswegen nicht verfallen: Das η wird stets im Bereich dessen bleiben, was lateinisches e abdeckt.<sup>13</sup>

Ein i für griechisches ei ist ja schon alt, älter als die Übernahme des y in das lateinische Alphabet. Livius Andronicus, nach Varros Nachricht der älteste lateinische Dichter überhaupt, schrieb eine *Oduzia*. Der schon beobachtete Mangel, dass der sog. Diphthong ei bei solchem Gebrauch der Lateinschrift mal mit i, mal mit e wiedergegeben wird, wiegt nicht allzu schwer angesichts einer anderen, der Antike durchaus fremden Verwechslung, die erst infolge der Transliterierung bei Deutschen passiert, nämlich derjenigen von ei und αι.<sup>14</sup>

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 Αἴνεας, zunächst aus der *Ilias* bekannt (5.305 u.ö.), dann aber aus Vergil (in der Schreibweise *Aeneas*), kommt auch bei ihm vor

<sup>12</sup> Heinrich Wilhelm Stoll, Alphilologe und Religionshistoriker, schreibt z.B. in seiner *Anthologie griechischer Lyriker* (Hannover 1872) „Tytaeos“, „Aeschylos“ usw.

<sup>13</sup> Josephus selbst hätte für η ein helles (geschlossenes) e gesprochen. In der Josephus-Tradition lässt sich der Übergang des griech. η zu einem gesprochenen i erst in der lateinischen Übersetzung (6. Jh.) beobachten, u.z. in gewissen, noch keineswegs einheitlichen, Wiedergaben von Namen.

<sup>14</sup> Beispiele unten bei Anm. 30 und 31. Zu ευ/οι vgl. unten Abschn. 4 und 5.

(*B.J.* 5.326–327; *A.J.* 14.248, für verschiedene Personen). Wir werden „Aeneas“ schreiben und uns von einer Geschichte des Eindeutschens abkoppeln, die auch schon solche Undinge wie „Äneias“ hervorgebracht hat (dazu unten 5.).

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 könnten 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 graphischen. 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, veranschaulichen. Josephus selbst wäre nie auf den Gedanken gekommen, den Namen יונתן etwa mit *Juntn* wiederzugeben o.ä. (Transliteration), sondern er schreibt Ἰωνάθης (Transkription), wobei er, zur Einfügung in den griechischen Kontext, das Wortende praktischerweise flektierbar macht.<sup>15</sup> 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

---

<sup>15</sup> 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,<sup>16</sup> 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 ausschließlich zu beschäftigen pflegen); es gilt nicht minder für die hellenistische und die Kaiserzeit.<sup>17</sup> 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 Altphilologen gelten wollen.

Die, wie man meint, getreuere *Transliterierung* des Griechischen konserviert den alten Nachteil, dass, solange keine Sonderzeichen hinzutreten, Laute verwechselbar sind, die es im Griechischen nie waren, z.B. ε und η (das alte *ethos-ēthos*-Problem). Zusätzlich aber bringt sie infolge der andersartigen Ausspracheregeln *im Deutschen* eine Unzahl von Pseudo-Wörtern hervor, die kein Grieche zu keiner Zeit je verstanden hätte – wenn das ein Maßstab ist, und wir meinen, es ist einer. Der Name Ζεύς z.B. wird seit dem 19. Jh. in Deutschland so ausgesprochen, als habe er mit dt. *zeugen* etwas zu tun; viel eher verwandt ist er hingegen mit lat. *deus*, und außer dem ζ wird kein Laut richtig ausgesprochen. So zeigt sich: Was wir „Altgriechisch“ nennen, ist ein ebenso zufälliges wie willkürliches Gemisch aus Altgriechisch, Neugriechisch (in φ, χ und den Akzenten) und Deutsch – je nachdem, was gerade bequemer ist.

## 5. GESCHICHTLICHES

Wie kann das sein, fragt man sich, in Deutschland, dem Stammland der historischen Philologie? – Nun, die historische Philologie, deren

---

<sup>16</sup> 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.

<sup>17</sup> Details und Lit. hierzu bei F. Siegert, „Erfahrungen mit der Münsteraner Josephus-Ausgabe. Ein Werkstattbericht mit Seitenblicken auf griechische Bibelausgaben“, in: W. Weren und D.-A. Koch (Hg.), *New Developments in Textual Criticism: New Testament, Early-Christian and Jewish Literature* (Studies in Theology and Religion 8; Assen 2003), 167–187 (bes. 180f.) sowie in ders., *Zwischen Hebräischer Bibel und Altem Testament. Eine Einführung in die Septuaginta* (Münsteraner Judaistische Studien 9; Münster 2001) 144–45 und 197–202.

Leistungen hier keineswegs in Frage gestellt, sondern vorausgesetzt werden, ist leider um einige Jahrzehnte neuer als die Einführung der sog. „erasmischen“ Aussprache in deutschen Gymnasien. Jacob Grimm, der verdienstvolle Entdecker der Lautwandel und ihrer Gesetze – im Deutschen, aber nicht nur da –, hat noch die 1. Auflage seiner *Deutschen Grammatik* 1819 ohne Phonetik ausgehen lassen, und in seinen Texten aus der Frühzeit findet man „Buchstabe“ und „Laut“ auf Schritt und Tritt verwechselt.<sup>18</sup> Solange auch er die Lautgesetze – hier des Deutschen – noch nicht kannte, war es allemal leichter, von „Buchstaben“ zu sprechen. Kein Wunder, dass auch die zahlreichen Etymologien, mit denen Grimm die wechselseitigen Einflüsse der indoeuropäischen Sprachen darlegen wollte, nicht nur Verblüffung, sondern auch reichlich Widerspruch hervorriefen.<sup>19</sup> So wundert es dann auch nicht, wenn – um nun wieder ins Griechische zu wechseln – die *Griechische Schul-Grammatik* des verdienten Philipp Buttmann das Lautsystem des Griechischen unter der Überschrift „Eintheilung der Buchstaben“ bietet,<sup>20</sup> so wie viele Schulgrammatiken es noch heute tun. So treffend Buttmanns Beobachtungen am Quantitätssystem und an den Akzenten sind (S. 12–28), so fehlerhaft sind seine Angaben im Bereich der eigentlichen Lautlehre.

Als Geburtsstunde der historischen Philologie gilt überhaupt erst Jacob Grimms Erklärung des deutschen e-i-Ablauts (*ich gebe, du gibst*),<sup>21</sup> in deren Folge die 2. Auflage seiner *Deutschen Grammatik* (1822) dann endlich eine Phonetik vorgeschaltet bekam. Seither ist *Grimm's Law* ein Wort für Lautgesetze überhaupt geworden.

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

<sup>18</sup> Für Details aus dieser – bestens erforschten – Frühgeschichte der Germanistik und auch der Indogermanistik siehe G. Ginschel, *Der junge Jacob Grimm 1805–1819* (Deutsche Akad. d. Wiss. zu Berlin, Veröff. d. sprachwiss. Kommission 7; Berlin 1967), *passim*.

<sup>19</sup> 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.

<sup>20</sup> In der 7. Auflage (Berlin 1824) S. 9.

<sup>21</sup> 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.“

Zeit und in gegebener Region gültigen Phonetik die Texte korrekt ediert werden können: Erst dann lässt sich – nachdem der Regelkreis des Lernens aus den Handschriften und des Korrigierens der Handschriften hinreichend oft durchlaufen ist – unterscheiden zwischen akzeptablen, sinnhaltigen Formen und nicht akzeptablen, unsinnigen Verschreibungen.

All dies kam nun freilich zu spät, um die deutsche Schulaussprache vor den bereits eingeführten Barbarismen und Anachronismen zu bewahren. Verfestigend wirkte nun auch noch ein ideologisches Moment. Schon lange hatten Deutschlands Intellektuelle den direkten Zugang zur griechischen Kultur gesucht, ohne die lateinisch-romanische Vermittlung.<sup>22</sup> Als man nun gegen 1800 in Deutschlands Schulen die „erasmische“ Aussprache einführte, war zudem die große Zeit des deutschen Nationalismus gerade angebrochen. Die Griechenbegeisterung des Neuhumanismus erhielt zusätzlichen Aufwind durch die aufkommende Franzosenfeindschaft. Man fühlte sich nunmehr „reichsunmittelbar“ zu Griechenland hin; ja Bayern stellte sogar einen von dessen neuen Königen. Dieser nationale Elan ist mit zu bedenken, wenn man verstehen will, warum das Griechische so gnadenlos germanisiert wurde, dass ein Wort wie |tsɔɪs| zustande kam. – Literarisch blieb man übrigens im ganzen 19. Jh., was Namen betrifft, meist bei den lateinischen Schreibungen.<sup>23</sup>

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 |ɔɪ|, geschrieben äu). Mit Erasmus, d.h. mit dem Holländischen, kam dann auch |œɪ|, dt. |ɔɪ|, für ευ in Gebrauch; altgriechisch wäre |eu|, neugriechisch ist es |ev| bzw. |ef|. Das war eine willkommene Bequemlichkeit, wo wir landessprachlich ja auch |çiro:pa| sagen. Das altüberlieferte εω in Wörtern wie „Evangelium“ ist demgegenüber jedoch korrekter und lässt uns Josephus-Herausgeber überlegen, ob

<sup>22</sup> H. Hatfield, *Aesthetic Paganism in German Literature. From Winckelmann to the Death of Goethe* (Cambridge, Mass. 1964).

<sup>23</sup> Noch Eduard Zellers *Philosophie der Griechen* schreibt bis in ihre im 20. Jh. erschienenen Auflagen hinein „Posidonius“ usw., und die Patristik hat diesen Brauch weitgehend bis heute, verlässt ihn dann aber bei Namen, die neu ins Gespräch kommen.

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 |eɪ|-Diphthong, indem er mit ai zusammenfiel.<sup>24</sup> Nur selten aber wird darüber nachgedacht, was das Graphem *ei* in transkribierten griechischen Namen dann noch wert ist.

Ein weiterer, ganz banaler Faktor ist seither die Gewöhnung. Das Griechische hat anscheinend kein Recht mehr auf Fremdsein und eigene Phonetik. Inzwischen gibt es nicht wenige Leute, die glauben, ein griechischer Dichter habe |aɪʃylos| geheißen.<sup>25</sup> So weit geht man zwar im Griechischunterricht nicht; aber wer hat schon Griechischunterricht? Die Gewohnheit ist nunmehr, dass man so spricht, wie eine Transliterierung in Lateinbuchstaben *bei deutschen Ausspracheregeln* klingen würde. – Eben dies aber scheint uns für unseren Römer aus Jerusalem nicht wünschenswert.

Das gilt nun auch für die Diphthonge *eu* und *oi*. Um einen Unterschied zwischen diesen Diphthongen etwa in dem Namen Οίνεύς hörbar zu machen, wird die Namensschreibweise „Oeneus“ immerhin geeignet sein. Das heißt für unsere Josephus-Ausgabe, dass in A.J. 18.204 Στοιχεύς, ein Freigelassener Agrippas, im Deutschen „Stoecheus“ heißen wird.

Wenn Martin Luther einst in seinen Tischgesprächen<sup>26</sup> 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 ä und ö, die Umlaute also nach unserer Terminologie – wobei sein ä natürlich, nach der damals gültigen, byzantinischen Aussprache, das *oi* war und sein ö das *oi*.<sup>27</sup> Das ζ vergleicht er mit dt. stimmhaftem *s* (ganz wie Josephus und vor ihm schon die Septuaginta es für τ nehmen) und findet auch Laute wie χ (als Reibelaute) und den Vokal υ (Reuchlins Aussprache hatte hierfür durchaus noch ein ü) nur im Deutschen wieder, nicht im Latein.

<sup>24</sup> *Deutsches Wörterbuch*, Bd. 3, Sp. 73 unter EI.

<sup>25</sup> In der *Vita* hatten wir mit „Gischala“ ein analoges Problem; nach unseren Grundsätzen haben wir jedoch „Giš-Halab“ geschrieben.

<sup>26</sup> Nr. 3748 und 4018 in *Luthers Werke in Auswahl*, Bd. 8: *Tischreden* (hg. O. Clemen, Berlin 1930), Nummern wie in WA *Tischreden*.

<sup>27</sup> Für dieses Graphem hatte er offenbar die Aussprache |ø| erlernt. Hellenistisch und in Reuchlins Aussprache wäre es eher *y*: äquivalent langem *v*, mit welchem dieses Graphem in Manuskripten und auf Inschriften ja auch häufig verwechselt wird.

## 6. DAS VERMEIDEN VON WILDWUCHS

Machen wir noch die Gegenprobe von der negativen Seite her. Unser Motiv dafür, dass wir überhaupt Grundsätze aufstellen, ist – außer dem Bedürfnis der Konsistenz – der Wunsch, Wildwuchs und Zufallsergebnisse zu vermeiden. Auch diese haben eine bis ins 18. Jh. und weiter zurückreichende, kaum jemandem bewusste Geschichte. Johann Heinrich Voß' Übersetzung der homerischen Epen (1781–1793) – sie spätestens – hat damit angefangen, den Germanismus in den Schreibweisen literarisch zu machen. Voß' Bemühen um „altgriechische“ Schreibung<sup>28</sup> ist ein Unfall von Anfang an (was nichts sagt gegen seine poetischen Verdienste). Nachdem Voß anfangs die Gleichsetzung von η mit deutschem ä sogar in die Schreibung der Namen übernommen hatte – „Athän“ usf., was den Spott Lichtenbergs hervorrief,<sup>29</sup> hat er zwar anschließend manches gemildert, dabei aber die Konfusion zum Prinzip erhoben. Bei ihm liest man nun „Phöbos Apollon“, dann aber, auf derselben Seite: „Achaier“, dann wieder „Athenäa“, aber auch wieder „Peneios“. Das ist schon in sich unbefriedigend, weil regellos. Und es vermischt Transliteration mit Transkription.

Das Ergebnis sind neue Barbarismen, sei es in der Aussprache, sei es sogar in der Schreibung. Ein Wort wie „Museion“ werden die meisten Leute nunmehr wie „Musaion“ aussprechen – bis dahin, dass ein bekannter neuerer Autor über Antikes auch schon „Musaion“ schreibt.<sup>30</sup> Es finden öffentliche Lesungen aus Platons „Politaia“ statt,<sup>31</sup> usw. Diese Pannen haben gelehrte Leute zu Autoren! Umso mehr aber sollte „unser“ Josephus für jedermann lesbar sein und ohne Zusatzklärungen den Klang antiker Namen einigermaßen wiedergeben.

<sup>28</sup> Homer, *Ilias* und *Odyssee*, 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.“

<sup>29</sup> G. Ch. Lichtenberg, *Schriften und Briefe*, Bd. 3 (hg. W. Promies, München 1972), 296–308: „Über die Pronunciation der Schöpse . . .“. Lichtenberg meint, wer nunmehr „Athän“ schreibe usw., müsse sich fragen lassen, warum nicht auch „Jäsus“ [und in unserem Falle: „Josäphus“]. Über vieles amüsiert sich Lichtenberg, der kein Philologe ist, zu Unrecht, über anderes aber durchaus zu Recht, etwa darüber, dass Voß den engl. Ortsnamen „Portsmouth“ als „Portsmaut“ schreibt, offenbar in der Annahme, er laute so.

<sup>30</sup> B. Kytzler, *Frauen der Antike. Von Aspasia bis Zenobia* (Zürich 1994), 80.

<sup>31</sup> Ankündigung der Katholischen Akademie Franz-Hitze-Haus, Münster, für den 20.1.2003 (Prospekt wie Plakat).

Zweihundert Jahre ist es her, dass der Diphthong |ει| aus der deutschen Schriftsprache verschwunden ist; warum ihn dann noch schreiben für eine Buchstabengruppe des Griechischen, die ihrerseits in der Regel kein |ει| war, und schon gar kein |αι|?

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 „Schoenometresis Syriae“. Da hat man nun Fisch und Fleisch auf demselben Teller.<sup>32</sup> Das Gleiche, sogar noch inniger vermischt, begegnet in solchen pseudo-antiken Buchtiteln wie *Paraleipomena Jeremiou*:<sup>33</sup> Das zweite dieser Wörter ist in sich falsch, denn J ist weder als Buchstabe noch als Laut im Altgriechischen vorhanden.<sup>34</sup> Nicht besser wird es in der jüngsten deutschen Übersetzung desselben Textes, betitelt *Paralipomena Jeremiou*:<sup>35</sup> 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 (Ιώσηπος) schon „Josephos“ genannt worden ist?<sup>36</sup>

## 7. DAS VERMEIDEN NEUGRIECHISCHER BETONUNG

Ein Nebenmotiv für unser Verfahren einer gewissen, aber überlegten Anlehnung an die antike, uns lateinisch übermittelte Schreib- und Sprechtradition besteht darin, den Einfluss des neugriechischen Druckakzents (des *stress accent*, Zeichen: ' vor der betr. Silbe) fernzuhalten. Dieser würde beim Wechsel von der Transkription zur Transliteration das Ergebnis zusätzlich verfälschen. Dass der Druckakzent

<sup>32</sup> GLA77 1:xi. 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.

<sup>33</sup> R. Kraft und A.-E. Purintun (Hg.), *Paraleipomena Jeremiou* (SBLTT 1; Missoula, Mont. 1972).

<sup>34</sup> Das Neugriechische hat ihn, schreibt ihn aber nach Möglichkeit γι.

<sup>35</sup> B. Schaller (Übers. u. Komm.), *Paralipomena Jeremiou* (JSHRZ, 1, 8; Gütersloh 2002).

<sup>36</sup> G. Sterling, *Historiography and Self-Definition. Josephos, Luke-Acts and Apologetic Historiography* (NT.S, 64; Leiden 1992), im Untertitel. Schlatter hingegen meinte, „Josefus“ sei zu schreiben.

phonetisch durchaus nichts zu tun hat mit dem Akut oder dem Zirkumflex<sup>37</sup> 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 |hōmīlia| für ὄμηλια und hält das für Altgriechisch, ohne noch zu wissen oder wiederzugeben, welcher von diesen vier Vokalen kurz ist und welcher lang.<sup>38</sup> Dies trotz der durchaus korrekten Angabe des oben zitierten Buttmann:<sup>39</sup> „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'onnytos| – statt griechisch Διόνυτος (mit langem ο<sup>40</sup> und einem lediglich im Ton gehobenem ο) – zustande, und vieles dergleichen.<sup>41</sup> 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 lauter gesprochen wurde. Wir wissen nur, dass die

<sup>37</sup> Der Gravis, Abwesenheit eines Akuts oder, anders gesagt, Zeichen der unveränderten Stimmlage, braucht hier nicht erwähnt zu werden.

<sup>38</sup> Die Struktur ist ~~~-. Die Betonung in dt. „Homilie“ ist übrigens, wie so oft, französisch.

<sup>39</sup> *Griechische Schul-Grammatik* 13. Folgendes Zitat ebd. 19. – Wie sehr in der Antike Namen nach Quantitäten identifiziert und verstanden wurden, übrigens je nach Bildung, zeigt das von Erasmus (137 [945]) schon zitierte Beispiel aus Quintilian 12.10,57, wo ein italischer Bauer den Namen „Amphion“ (mit langem i) nicht versteht, bis man „Ampion“ |'ampion| sagt. Auch das ph schien er nicht zu kennen.

<sup>40</sup> Die Alternativform Διόνυσος bestätigt ja nur diese Quantitätenfolge.

<sup>41</sup> Im Italienischen werden die griech. Akzentsilben grundsätzlich gelängt, die von Natur langen aber nasalisiert. 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 |'so:krates|<sup>42</sup> bringt die Quantitätenstruktur dieses Namens durchaus besser zum Ausdruck als das gymnasiale |sɔ'krates| (ngr. |sɔ'kra:sis|) oder, was auch nicht besser ist, |sɔ:'krattes|. Wir sagen ja auch mit gutem Grund |hɔ'me:r|, 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 Hippocratis* diagnostizierte, mit einem betonten und langen a (offenbar wegen Ιπποκράτης). Oder ein ernsthafteres Beispiel: Der Komponist Carl Orff, stolz auf seine humanistische Bildung, hat eine seiner Kompositionen *Antigonae* benannt (was wir vermutlich |anti'gone:| aussprechen sollen), worin kein geringerer als Friedrich Hölderlin sein Vorgänger gewesen ist.<sup>43</sup> So ein Name ist, man verzeihe mir das Wort, ein Barbarismus, und komme er auch aus der besten Schule. Wiederum: So hat die Griechin Ἀντιγόνη 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.

<sup>42</sup> 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).

<sup>43</sup> F. Hölderlin, *Sämtliche Werke (Frankfurter Ausgabe)*, Bd. 16: *Sophocles* (hg. M. Franz, Frankfurt 1988), z.B. S. 56f. (mit Faksimile): „Antigona“. Hölderlin seinerseits folgt hierin J. G. Voß (vgl. oben bei Anm. 29f.). Die Verwirrung ist seither nicht mehr aufzuhalten und ging am weitesten in der Abgeschlossenheit der einstigen DDR. Die Übersetzung der *Griechischen Anthologie*, die im Aufbau-Verlag (Berlin/Weimar 1981; Übers.: D. Ebener) erschien, ist durchsetzt mit neugriechisch zu betonenden Namen: Wo die Tusculum-Ausgabe (München 1958; Übers.: H. Beckby) schreibt: „Asklepiades, trink!“ (12:50), heißt es jetzt: „Trinke doch, Asklepiádes!“ (sic). Das kann nur zu dem Barbarismus eines langen a an dieser Stelle führen. Der englische Sprachraum hat sich mit der „henninischen“ Aussprache (die nicht so ungeeignet ist, wie Allen sie darstellt) ein derartiges Durcheinander erspart.

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“ ('Αλεξάνδρεια), wobei aber – schon im alten Rom – nur Kenner des Griechischen |aleksandri:a| 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“, „Samaren“ 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.

Bleiben noch einige eher ungewöhnliche Schwierigkeiten anzusprechen, die sich aus den ganz oder teilweise orientalischen Namen bei Josephus ergeben. An Abschn. 1 anknüpfend, sei ein Name wie „Johannes Hyrkan“ (so die traditionelle Wiedergabe) nunmehr bedacht. Nachdem wir in der *Vita* angefangen haben, nicht mehr „Johannes“ zu schreiben, sondern „Johanan“, stellt sich uns nun die Frage, wie diese Form sich verbinden lässt mit Υρκανός. Nach unseren Vorgaben werden wir erhalten: Johanan Hyrkanos – und warum nicht? Der Träger dieses Namens benannte sich zweisprachig und tat dies auf den Vorder- und Rückseiten seiner Münzen jeweils getrennt. Jeder Name verbleibt also auch bei uns in seiner Herkunftssprache, wie es übrigens bei Transkriptionen im Talmud auch üblich ist.

Bei alledem sind wir aber flexibel genug, den Namen „Johannes“ für eine Person zu reservieren, die unter diesem Namen allbekannt ist, nämlich für Johannes den Täufer. Ebenso wird „Jesus“ nur für Jesus von Nazareth gesagt werden, nicht für die verschiedenen Ἰησοῦς genannten Personen von Josua an. Diese kleine Unterscheidungshilfe für ein heutiges Publikum wird man sicher nicht unwissenschaftlich finden.

Ein Kompromiss wird wohl nötig sein für den Namen „Hyksos“ (*C. Ap.* 1.82 ff.). Diese traditionelle Schreibweise, textkritisch bereits fraglich durch die Verwendung von -κσ- statt -ξ-, ist dem Codex Laurentianus und anderen späten und schlechten Zeugen geschuldet. Unser kritischer Text wird nunmehr Υκουστώς bringen, unterstützt von der in orientalischen Dingen durchaus ernstzunehmenden armenischen Überlieferung. Wir werden es aber wohl, der Einfachheit halber, in der deutschen Übersetzung bei „Hyksos“ belassen; man kennt diesen Volksstamm nicht anders. Ein zusätzliches Motiv für uns ist, dass Namen, die durch das Ägyptische gegangen sind, von nicht

reduzierbaren Varianten strotzen.<sup>44</sup> 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 unlösbareren Problemen orientalischer Philologien einerseits und an der Bekanntheit gewisser Namen und ihrer Verbindung mit überliefernten Schreibweisen anderseits. 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 Ἰώσηπος), 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.<sup>45</sup>

---

<sup>44</sup> Das Beispiel „Ram[*p*]ses/Rameses/Ramesses“, das sogar „Harmaïs“ einschließt, wird in der Einleitung unserer *Contra-Apionem*-Ausgabe zu diskutieren sein.

<sup>45</sup> Für Kritik und hilfreiche Hinweise danke ich Herrn Prof. Dr. Herwig Görögmanns, Heidelberg, und Herrn Dr. Dr. Eberhard Güting, Wallenhorst.

## ANHANG: DER STAND DES MÜNSTERANER JOSEPHUS-PROJEKTS

Durch den Tod eines noch jungen Mitarbeiters, Dr. Jürgen Kalms, der die Textdatei verwaltet hatte, ist das Unternehmen um fast ein Jahr zurückgeworfen worden. Die Veröffentlichung der griechisch-deutschen kommentierten Ausgabe der Apologie *Über das Alter des Judentums* – wie wir sie nunmehr nach Josephus' eigenem Willen nennen werden<sup>46</sup> – ist aber gesichert und ein Gang zum Druck noch im Jahre 2005 wahrscheinlich.

Was die Arbeit zusätzlich retardiert, ist ein eher glücklicher Umstand, nämlich die Wiederentdeckung einer Handschrift, die Niese nicht gefunden hatte: Es handelt sich um den Codex Elenis (aus Ely) in der Universitätsbibliothek Cambridge. Dessen Nachkollationierung nach Fotos und am Original hat Nieses These widerlegt, alle Handschriften der direkten griechischen *Contra-Apionem*-Überlieferung seien Abkömmlinge des Codex L(aurentianus). Codex E ist es eindeutig nicht, auch wenn er die große Lücke (*C. Ap.* 2.52–114) mit der gesamten griechischen Überlieferung teilt. Er wird nun eingearbeitet, wobei für die durch Wasserschäden unleserlichen Partien der ihm eng verwandte, von Niese gleichfalls verkannte Pariser Codex 1815, als Mikrofilm beschafft, eintreten wird.

Eine ähnliche Überraschung hatten wir mit den Codex Schleusinensis (in Schleusingen, Thüringen), der seit Deutschlands Einigung ja nun wieder problemlos zugänglich ist. Schon Niese hätte merken können, dass dieser die unmittelbare Druckvorlage der *editio princeps* war und also statt dieser zitiert werden müssen. Er ist *nicht* von Arlenius, deren Herausgeber, geschrieben, enthält auch nicht dessen Konjektur, und ist seinerseits in vielem von L unabhängig. – Insgesamt können wir durch das Nachkollationieren über 30 Konjekturen früherer Gelehrter jetzt als Handschriftenlesarten ausweisen.

Was die *Antiquitates* (künftig deutsch: die *Alte Geschichte*) des Josephus betrifft, so ist eine Übersetzung ins Deutsche am Institutum Judaicum 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

---

<sup>46</sup> Flavius Josephus, *Apologie (Contra Apionem)*. Kritische Ausgabe, Übersetzung und Kommentar von F. Siegert, H. Schreckenberg, M. Vogel und dem Josephus-Arbeitskreis des Institutum Judaicum Delitzschianum, Münster.

strittiger Lesarten und keine Einarbeitung der noch unerschlossenen Athos-Handschrift der *Epitome* und kein deutschsprachiger Kommentar, auch keine Einarbeitung der seit 500 Jahren ungelesenen Handschriften von Buch 6–20 in ihrer alten lateinische Übersetzung. Für solche Arbeiten wäre das Institutum Judaicum Delitzschianum auf öffentliche Gelder angewiesen, hatte sie auch nach all der geleisteten Vorarbeit<sup>47</sup> erhofft – eine Bitte, die trotz ausführlicher Begründung und trotz des Verweises auf die unentgeltliche Mitarbeit von Dr. Heinz Schreckenberg von den zuständigen Instanzen abgewiesen wurde. Welcher Sachverständ stand dabei waltete, lässt sich aus dem Ablehnungsbescheid der Deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft vom 11.12.2002 entnehmen, dessen Kernsatz lautet: „Entscheidend hierfür war, dass bei der intendierten Übersetzung keine neuen Handschriften herangezogen werden sollen.“

<sup>47</sup> Sie ist dokumentiert in: F. Siegert, „Josephus edieren – was alles dazugehört. Ein vorzeitiger Rückblick auf das Münsteraner Josephus-Projekt“, in J. Kalms/ F. Siegert (Hg.): *Internationales Josephus-Kolloquium Dortmund 2002* (Münsteraner Judaistische Studien 14; Münster 2003), 171–194; ders., „Bibliographie des Josephus-Projekts“, ebd., 195–201.



## CONCLUDING REMARKS

FOLKER SIEGERT  
INSTITUTUM JUDAICUM DELITZSCHIANUM, MÜNSTER

It may be risky to pronounce a conclusion on the basis of fresh impressions.<sup>1</sup> 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

---

<sup>1</sup> 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.<sup>2</sup>

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

---

<sup>2</sup> 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 Ἰουδαίων ἀρχαιότητος (*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.<sup>3</sup> 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,”<sup>4</sup> 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.

<sup>3</sup> *y. Sanh.* 7:19, 25d; cf. Folker Siegert, Heinz Schreckenberg, and Manuel Vogel, *Flavius Josephus: Aus meinem Leben* (Vita) (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001), 2.

<sup>4</sup> J. M. G. Barclay, “The Politics of Contempt: Judaeans and Egyptians in Josephus' Against Apion,” *SBLSP* 39 (2000), 327–58.

## V

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,<sup>5</sup> 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 γένεσις 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 πρόποντα. 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

<sup>5</sup> See K.-P. Pridik, "Josephus' Reden von Offenbarung. Eine Übersicht," in J. Kalms and F. Siegert, eds., *Internationales Josephus-Kolloquium Dortmund 2002*, (Münsteraner Judaistische Studien 14; Münster: Lit, 2003), 151–68.

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.

## LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

- Prof. JOHN M. G. BARCLAY, University of Durham  
Prof. HONORA HOWELL CHAPMAN, California State University, Fresno  
Prof. DETLEV DORMEYER, Universität Dortmund  
Dr. BARBARA EBERHARDT, Universität Erlangen  
Dr. NICLAS FÖRSTER, Georg-August-Universität, Göttingen  
Prof. ANTHONY J. FORTE, SJ, Pontifical Biblical Institute  
Dr. GUNNAR HAALAND, The Norwegian Lutheran School of Theology  
Prof. JAN WILLEM VAN HENTEN, University of Amsterdam  
Prof. BERNARD S. JACKSON, University of Manchester  
Drs. TESSEL JONQUIÈRE, Universiteit Utrecht  
Prof. GIORGIO JOSSA, Università di Napoli “Federico II”  
Dr. TAMAR LANDAU, Oxford and Tel Aviv  
Dr. GAIA LEMBI, Scuola Normale Superiore, Pisa  
Prof. JAMES S. McLAREN, Australian Catholic University  
Prof. STEVE MASON, York University, Toronto  
Prof. DORON MENDELS, Hebrew University of Jerusalem  
Prof. FAUSTO PARENTE, II Università di Roma, Tor Vergata  
Prof. JONATHAN J. PRICE, Tel Aviv University  
Dr. GOTTFRIED SCHIMANOWSKI, Saarbrücken  
Prof. FOLKER SIEGERT, Universität Münster  
Prof. JOSEPH SIEVERS, Pontifical Biblical Institute and Pontifical  
Gregorian University  
Prof. PAUL SPILSBURY, Alliance University College, Calgary  
Prof. LUCIO TROIANI, Università degli Studi di Pavia



# INDEX OF ANCIENT SOURCES

## GREEK AND LATIN AUTHORS

Aelius Theon	<i>Progymnasmata</i>		Aulus Gellius	<i>Noctes atticae</i>	
60		83	15.11.4		298 n. 7
70		83			
Aeschylus	<i>Supplices</i>		Caesar	<i>Bellum civile</i>	
686–687		236	3.88–94		285 n. 12
			<i>Bellum gallicum</i>		
			1.1		95 n. 62
<i>Anthologia Palatina</i>			2.25		285
4.1.42		375	5.33		285 n. 11
7.152.5–6		131 n. 37	7.22–28		284
			7.85		285
Appian	<i>Bella civilia</i>		7.86		285 n. 12
3.2.17		129 n. 30			
<i>Historia romana</i>			Cassiodorus	<i>De institutione divinarum litterarum</i>	
12.17.116–117		259 n. 13	1.17		379 n. 44
Aristophanes	<i>Lysistrata</i>		Cassius Dio	<i>Historia Romana</i>	
204		236	37.16.6–17.1		23 n. 9
<i>Ranae</i>			51.17.1		320 n. 24
465–466		142	51.21.2–22.3		259 n. 14
473–478		142	56.18–22		93 n. 60
<i>Vespae</i>			62.15		305 n. 39
379		394	65.1.4		321 n. 30
396		394	65.4.4		60 n. 37
			65.7.1		52 n. 17
Aristotle	<i>Mechanica</i>		65.9.1		321 n. 30
857b		394	65.9.2		319 n. 17
<i>Poetica</i>			65.12		266 n. 47
1452b34–1453a17		173 n. 40	66.1.4		109
1453a4–6		179 n. 58	66.6.2		64
1631b		45 n. 1	66.13		302 n. 24
<i>Rhetorica</i>			66.15.3–4		87 n. 46
1358b		186 n. 9	67.13		298 n. 7,
1359b–1360a		186 n. 13			302 n. 22,
1382a21–22		176 n. 49			303
1385b13–15		176 n. 49	67.14		308 n. 55
1414b		187 n. 15			
1417b		188 n. 19	Cicero	<i>Epistulae ad Atticum</i>	
1419b		189 n. 23	1.13.3		352 n. 30
Arrian	<i>Epicteti dissertationes</i>		<i>De divinatione</i>		
2.9.19		25 n. 14	1.36–37		38 n. 23
Augustine	<i>Epistulae</i>		<i>De officiis</i>		
102.89		23 n. 6	1.7.20–23		200 n. 57
			1.11.34–36		200 n. 57

1.23.80–81	200 n. 57	Dio Chrysostom <i>Orationes</i>	
2.8.26–27	200 n. 57	18.6–7	140 n. 67
<i>De oratore</i>			
1.40.183	352, 352 n. 30, 362 n. 83	Diodorus Siculus <i>Bibliotheca Historica</i>	
<i>Partitiones oratoriae</i>		1–5	9, 17
27	187 n. 15	1.3–6	38 n. 24
<i>Orationes philippicae</i>		2.31.9	38 n. 23
2.28.69	352 n. 31	2.59.2	249 n. 15
<i>De republica</i>		2.59.7	249 n. 16
2.17.31	200 n. 57	4–21	12
3.25.31	200 n. 57	11–20	17
<i>Topica</i>		18–20	13
4.19	351, 352 n. 30, 354 n. 40	31.7.9–12	259 n. 11
		40.2	28 n. 20
<i>Tusculanae disputationes</i>		Dionysius of Halicarnassus <i>Antiquitates</i>	
4.84	237 n. 34	<i>romanae</i>	
5.119–120	237 n. 34	1.6.5	192 n. 34
<i>Christus Patiens</i>		3.3.6	199
1470	144 n. 78	3.23.6–21	192
1668–1669	144 n. 75	4.26	186 n. 14
1678–1679	144 n. 75	4.70–85	175 n. 46
<i>Codex justinianus</i>		5.5.4	200
5.17.6	355 nn. 51–52	5.45.1	202 n. 70
5.17.8.pr	356 n. 54	6.6–9	192
5.17.9	356 n. 54	6.8.1	198
<i>Codex theodosianus</i>		6.8.1–3	192 n. 34
3.16.1	356 n. 54	7.66.3	192 n. 34
<i>Demetrius De elocutione</i>		8.2	200
222	78	8.2.5	199
287–298	78 n. 23	9.9	192, 202 n. 70
<i>Demosthenes [In Neaeram]</i>		10.6	188 n. 20
59.85–88	361 n. 79	11	16
<i>Contra Pantaenetus</i>		11.1–3	192 n. 34
12	188 n. 20	<i>De compositione verborum</i>	
<i>Digesta</i>		22	133 n. 47
24.1.57.pr	355 n. 48	<i>De Thucydide</i>	
24.2.4	352 n. 30,	5–7	38 n. 24
	352 n. 32,		
	355 n. 49		
24.2.9	353 n. 37,	<i>Dioscorides Pedanius De materia medica</i>	
	360 n. 75	1.95	375
24.3.22	352 n. 30	<i>Donatus Life of Virgil</i>	
24.3.22.7	352 n. 32	1861	25 n. 13
24.3.38	355 n. 50		
38.11.1.1	361 n. 77	<i>Epictetus Diatribai (Dissertationes)</i>	
48.5.30.3	362 n. 83	1.2.19–22	302 n. 22
48.5.44	355 n. 53	2.8.21	241 n. 55
48.5.44(43)	352 n. 37	<i>Euripides Alcestis</i>	
		791	236
		<i>Bacchae</i>	
		·	
		337–340	141
		735	142 n. 71
		739	142 n. 71

1104	142 n. 71	7.7	173
1127	142 n. 71	7.8–11	190 n. 24
1135	142 n. 71	7.9	197, 199,
1184	143		202 n. 69
1216–1220	141	7.10	197
1220	142 n. 71	7.101–105	197
1242	143	7.136.2	201 n. 66
1245–1246	143	7.171	132 n. 42
1329	143 n. 74	8.57–60	190 n. 24
<i>Electra</i>		8.68	190 n. 24
920	361 n. 79	8.83	190
		8.142.5	203 n. 77
<i>Eusebius Historia Ecclesiastica</i>			
1.8	126 n. 18	Hesiod <i>Opera et dies</i>	
3.9.1–2	88 n. 49	243	132 n. 42
3.9.2	108		
3.9.3	384 n. 8	<i>Historia Augusta</i>	
4.18	350 n. 26	27.10.3	6
<i>Praeparatio evangelica</i>			
7.21	237 n. 37	Homer <i>Iliad</i>	
8.14	237 n. 37	1.43	132 n. 44
13.12.3	240 n. 49	1.60	132 n. 44
		2.580	131 n. 35
		5.505	410
<i>Frontinus Strategemata</i>			
1.1–12	283 n. 9	17.201	129 n. 27
1.1.8	283 n. 9	22.338	131 n. 39
1.3.10	283 n. 9	22.338–343	131 n. 38
2.1–3	283 n. 9	22.339	132
2.3.23	283 n. 9	22.345	131 n. 39, 132
2.4–5	283 n. 9	22.358–360	131 n. 40
2.7–8	283 n. 9	24.18	130 n. 33
4.6.4	283 n. 9	24.163–165	130
		24.212–213	132 n. 42
		24.346	132
<i>Gaius Institutiones</i>			
1.93–94	364 n. 92	<i>Odyssey</i>	
1.137a	355 n. 45	13.250–301	321 n. 28
		20.351	129 n. 27
<i>Herodotus Historiae</i>			
1.71–214	149	Horace <i>Ars poetica</i>	
1.108–214	149	404–405	137
2.104	220 n. 27	<i>Carmina</i>	
3.41	129 n. 30	4.2	133 n. 48
3.48	171 n. 34	<i>Epistulae</i>	
3.50–53	171 n. 34	1.3.10	137
3.80–82	175 n. 46	<i>Satirae</i>	
5.18–21	201 n. 66	1.4.7	81
5.62	136 n. 60		
5.81.2	203	Isidore <i>Etymologicum magnum</i>	
6.9–12	190 n. 24	9.7.24	363 n. 91
6.62	129 n. 30		
6.109	190 n. 24	Jamblichus <i>Vita Pythagorae</i>	
7.5	199, 202 n. 69	256	247 n. 2

<i>Josephus Bellum Judaicum</i>				
1	384, 386, 403	1.146		91
1.1-2	90	1.160	x n. 3	
1.1-3	88, 100	1.170		91
1.1-12	89	1.179		92, 290
1.1-16	29	1.181		91
1.1-30	74 n. 12, 76	1.183		92
1.2-3	96	1.185		92
1.3	72, 90, 107, 121 n. 3, 383	1.194	363 n. 92	
1.4	75 n. 13, 97	1.197	385 n. 14	
1.5	26, 75 n. 13	1.199	385 n. 14	
1.6	72, 90, 383, 383 n. 4	1.202	395 n. 38	
1.6-9	100	1.203	171 n. 35,	
1.6-10	96	1.204	395 n. 38	
1.9	47, 110, 176 n. 48	1.204-228		
		1.204-430		170
		1.204-673		159
1.9-12	176 n. 48	1.205	92, 172	
1.10	48, 97, 280, 281	1.206	385 n. 14	
1.11	75 n. 13, 111	1.208	160, 172	
1.12	75 n. 13, 111, 176 n. 48	1.209	172, 399	
1.13	75, 75 n. 13, 169 n. 27	1.210	385 n. 14	
1.13-16	21 n. 1, 89, 90 n. 54	1.216-219		98
		1.229-353		170
		1.233		398
		1.242		92
1.15	75 n. 13	1.243	92, 93	
1.16	89, 107	1.253	386, 396 n. 43	
1.17-30	95	1.265-270		290
1.18	75 n. 13	1.269	202 n. 72,	
1.19	95, 97		203 n. 74	
1.19-20	95, 96	1.270		91
1.20	93, 95	1.284		93
1.21	95	1.292		396
1.21-28	96	1.295		396
1.22	90, 92	1.297		396, 401
1.23	95, 97	1.299		397
1.24	95	1.300		397
1.25	95, 280	1.301		397
1.27	294	1.302		401
1.27-28	280	1.311		394
1.28	95	1.329	390, 391 n. 26	
1.29	95	1.332	396 n. 45	
1.30	110	1.342-356		290
1.31	97	1.346		137
1.31-2.116	402	1.353		137
1.32	290	1.354-673		170
1.36-37	91	1.357		138
1.67	135	1.358-368		93
1.67-68	134	1.364		93
1.69-70	137.	1.366	183 n. 3	
1.118	92	1.373-379	183, 186,	
1.130	376		187 n. 16,	
1.138-152	290		196 n. 47	

1.375	202, 202 n. 71	2.1–117	96
1.377	132 n. 41, 385 n. 11	2.10–11	91
1.377–378	196 n. 46	2.24–38	98
1.378	201	2.25	93, 95
1.379	202 n. 68	2.30	202 n. 72,
1.380	184, 194		203 n. 74
1.388–392	180	2.42	91
1.393	385 n. 12	2.66–79	290
1.396–397	384 n. 6	2.88	59
1.398	93	2.90	142
1.399	400	2.90–110	98
1.400	93, 385 n. 9	2.92	97
1.401–430	171, 385 n. 15, 393 n. 31, 401, 402	2.118 2.119 2.119–166	334, 336 95 n. 62, 336 311
1.404	393 n. 31	2.184	94 n. 61
1.405	393, 393 n. 31	2.204–217	98
1.407	393 n. 31	2.220	323 n. 43
1.408–414	402	2.223	323 n. 43
1.412	393 n. 31	2.245–251	98
1.413	393 n. 31, 402, 403	2.247 2.250–251	94 94
1.414	393 n. 31	2.254	55
1.420	391, 393 n. 31	2.287	324
1.421	391	2.309	323 n. 43
1.422	92, 393 n. 31	2.313	91
1.423	393 n. 31	2.321	129 n. 29
1.425	393 n. 31	2.322	129, 140 n. 66
1.428	393 n. 31	2.336	237 n. 35
1.429	393 n. 31	2.345–401	114, 204 n. 81
1.429–430	170 n. 32	2.346	54
1.430	393 n. 31	2.347	129 n. 27
1.430–431	160, 170	2.356–357	290
1.431	170 n. 32	2.360	54, 116 n. 36
1.431–673	170, 174	2.385–386	318 n. 15
1.444	179	2.386	318 n. 16,
1.448–449	179 n. 59		319 n. 19
1.457–466	179	2.388–391	204 n. 81
1.467–497	385 n. 15	2.390	225
1.500	142	2.399	199 n. 54
1.509	386	2.411–417	333 n. 7
1.511	385 n. 10	2.487	324 n. 44
1.513–533	385 n. 15	2.490–498	324 n. 44
1.514–517	388	2.491	324 n. 46
1.514	389	2.492	324 n. 46
1.515	389, 390, 390 n. 24	2.494 2.499	324 n. 46 324 n. 44
1.516	389	2.517	56 n. 28
1.517	388, 388 n. 23, 389	2.582 2.601	199 n. 54 130
1.538	400	2.651	53 n. 19, 334
1.556–558	179	2.653	334
1.557	385 n. 13	2.81	326 n. 54
1.650	91	2.128	251 n. 23
1.665	160, 177 n. 52	3.1–8	98

3.8	61, 327 n. 57	4.400	53
3.35–44	92	4.440	98
3.59–109	112	4.469	376
3.64	327 n. 57	4.491–502	98
3.65	61	4.496	94
3.70–71	ix	4.510	52
3.70–109	46, 49, 294	4.541	132 n. 46
3.76	294	4.545	98
3.103	294	4.545–549	98
3.105–106	294	4.550–551	58
3.108	49, 113	4.558–563	59
3.141–408	321	4.560–562	58
3.341	146 n. 84	4.586–587	98
3.344	146 n. 83	4.596	98
3.344–346	87	4.599	319 n. 17
3.346–351	281	4.605	318
3.347	146 n. 85	4.612–613	319 n. 21
3.354	116 n. 36	4.616	318 n. 14,
3.362–382	145 n. 82		318 n. 15,
3.362–419	114		325 n. 48
3.374	145 n. 82	4.622–629	321 n. 31
3.400–401	157	4.627–629	281
3.445	290	4.630	319 n. 22
3.472–484	204 n. 81, 281	4.630–655	98
3.484	61, 204 n. 81	4.656	320
3.485	290	4.656–663	98
3.495–496	281	5.1–3	98
3.503	290	5.1–26	294
3.522	290	5.2	320 n. 25,
3.530	138, 139		321 n. 26,
4.31	290		327 n. 57
4.39–48	186 n. 11	5.4	132 n. 46
4.70–82	290	5.5	53
4.72	46, 58	5.14	57
4.92–111	286	5.14–16	57 n. 29
4.112–116	286	5.18	57
4.137	132 n. 41	5.25–26	55 n. 24
4.161	53	5.27	142
4.162–192	186 n. 9	5.30–34	57
4.163–192	204 n. 81	5.44	319 n. 20
4.172	294	5.44–46	294 n. 29
4.190–191	204 n. 81	5.45–46	325 n. 49
4.208	53	5.56–59	281
4.233–333	96	5.67–84	286
4.317	91	5.71–97	96
4.318	334	5.75	281
4.319–320	334	5.81	281
4.332	140	5.81–84	61 n. 40
4.359	131 n. 35	5.86–87	281
4.359–360	131 n. 38	5.87–88	294
4.360	131 n. 39	5.88	61
4.361–362	131	5.97	281
4.383	138, 139	5.109–114	286
4.399–404	55	5.109–135	96

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 5.554	58 62
5.288	281	5.564	50 n. 9
5.289	286	6	46
5.290	62	6.2	132 n. 41
5.291–295	286	6.12–92	96
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

6.252	62, 64	7.144	270, 271
6.254	62	7.148	66, 265 n. 42, 272
6.256	63, 287	7.148–149	265 n. 43
6.258	63	7.148–150	270, 276
6.259	46 n. 3	7.149	272
6.260	65	7.149–150	265, 269
6.260–262	287	7.150	63, 272
6.261	63	7.151	269, 270, 272
6.262–265	63	7.152	266 n. 47,
6.265	64		269, 272
6.266	63	7.153	270, 272
6.267–270	291	7.153–156	269, 272
6.286–287	67 n. 47	7.154	270
6.299	68	7.155	231 n. 6,
6.299–300	68 n. 48		270, 273
6.300–309	67 n. 47	7.156	273
6.301	122	7.157	98, 269,
6.324	213 n. 14		273, 275
6.328–350	281	7.158	270
6.357	213 n. 14	7.158–162	98, 269
6.372	52 n. 14	7.158–159	269, 274
6.379	319 n. 17	7.159	274
6.387	65 n. 43	7.160	269, 274
6.388	65	7.161	274
6.389	65	7.161–162	65, 269,
6.399	ix		270, 276
6.406	46 n. 3	7.162	63, 270, 274
6.421	132 n. 41	7.256	55
6.435–442	291	7.262	334
7	46	7.270	55
7.33–53	186 n. 11	7.272	55
7.67	56	7.318–319	204 n. 81
7.73	231 n. 6	7.323	56
7.85–88	100	7.323–336	204 n. 81
7.117	320 n. 25	7.323–388	186 n. 9,
7.123	269, 270, 273,		201 n. 63
	328 n. 64	7.327–332	204 n. 81
7.123–131	268	7.341–388	204 n. 81
7.123–162	257, 268, 269,	7.344	314
	270, 275, 276	7.355	199 n. 54
7.124	270	7.358–359	204 n. 81
7.128	270, 273	7.389–397	55
7.128–129	231 n. 6	7.409	55
7.129	270	7.410	55
7.130	270, 273	7.417	56
7.132–133	268	7.418	56
7.132–138	271	7.437–453	22 n. 4
7.132–152	268	7.447–448	320 n. 24
7.134–138	268	7.455	75
7.136	269, 271, 272	<i>Antiquitates Judaicae</i>	
7.139–147	269, 271	1–12	3
7.142–147	. 271	1.1–17	30
7.143–145	275	1.5	30, 31, 91, 211
7.143–146	269	1.5–13	215

1.8	218	3.143	220 n. 25
1.8–12	30	3.144–146	265 n. 43
1.9	30	3.180	221 n. 29
1.10–13	211	3.205	220 n. 25
1.12	30	3.218	220 n. 25
1.13	30, 215	3.223	221 n. 32
1.14	335 n. 10	3.230	220 n. 25
1.14–15	31	3.257	220 n. 25
1.15	30	3.259	220 n. 25
1.17	31, 211	3.265–268	32 n. 5
1.20	335 n. 10	3.266	221 n. 30
1.22	30, 31	3.268	221 n. 30
1.25	220 n. 25, 315	3.287	221
1.77–103	234 n. 21	3.300	219
1.95	221 n. 29	3.313	218
1.97–98	234 n. 22	3.317	221 n. 30
1.155	240 n. 50	3.320	221
1.191–193	220	4.13	221 n. 29
1.192	220, 220 n. 25	4.105	231 n. 6
1.214	220, 220 n. 25	4.114	218
1.222–236	127 n. 19	4.115–116	226
1.240	221 n. 29	4.122	219
1.272	239 n. 46,	4.125	219, 226
	240 n. 51	4.127–128	219
1.272–273	235 n. 25	4.129	219
1.273	236 n. 27,	4.137	220
	236 n. 29	4.150	221 n. 29
1.279	326 n. 56	4.156	221 n. 29
2.6	221 n. 29	4.177–193	186 n. 9
2.18	221 n. 29	4.180	221
2.20	221 n. 29	4.183	57 n. 29
2.23	221 n. 29	4.184	227
2.24	221 n. 29	4.187	226
2.140–159	165 n. 16	4.188	226
2.177	32 n. 5	4.189	227
2.229	221	4.191	227
2.230	221	4.196	221
2.268–269	219	4.197	223
2.275	234 n. 19	4.198	220 n. 25
2.330	238 n. 43	4.204	23 n. 7
2.332	217	4.280	354 n. 43
2.334	232 n. 7	4.294	219
2.335–337	232 n. 8	4.302	220 n. 25
3.19	219	4.316	221 n. 32
3.33–38	232 n. 10	4.318	221 n. 32
3.34	232 n. 11	4.328	222
3.44–46	219	4.331	222
3.64	219	5.39–41	232 n. 12
3.78	234 n. 20	5.302	233 n. 14
3.84	222	6.45–46	148 n. 1
3.87–88	222	6.45–378	147
3.90	222	6.88–89	223
3.94	220 n. 25	6.90	224
3.139–143	265 n. 42	6.104	149

6.130	151 n. 9	13.171–173	311
6.137	151	13.288	134
6.138	151	13.289–298	134
6.150	151	13.299–300	134
6.259–261	151	14.1–3	375 n. 19
6.262–269	151	14.8–9	165 n. 17
6.327–342	149	14.9	402 n. 57
6.337	139 n. 64	14.24	239 n. 45
6.340–342	150	14.33	375, 376 n. 26
6.343–351	151, 152, 154	14.33–36	375, 377
6.368–377	149	14.63	199 n. 54
6.378	148	14.68	402 n. 57
7.46	153	14.82–83	x n. 3
7.119–120	201 n. 65	14.104	402 n. 57
7.267	153 n. 13	14.137	363 n. 92
7.294–296	153	14.158–17.199	159
7.373	227	14.158	363 n. 92
7.380	218, 239	14.188	330 n. 70
7.380–381	239	14.248	411
8.53	340	14.375	326 n. 56
8.107	242 n. 60	14.397	396 n. 44
8.116–117	217	14.401	396 n. 45
8.223	199 n. 54	14.406	396 n. 46,
8.262	220		396 n. 47,
8.280	198 n. 52		401
8.295	198 n. 52, 199 n. 54	14.408 14.409	396 n. 49 397 nn. 50–52
8.327	324 n. 45	14.410	397 n. 53
8.335–346	235 n. 23	14.412	401
8.343	235 n. 24	14.423	394
10.143	153	14.452	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

15.130–145	187, 195	17.329	341
15.131–134	201	18–20	332
15.132	188	18.4	336
15.133	188	18.6	336
15.133–134	188	18.6–9	336, 341
15.134	188, 189 n. 21	18.9	336
15.134–135	189	18.11–25	311
15.135	189 n. 21,	18.15	338
	198, 201	18.17	338
15.136	188, 189, 203	18.19	339
15.136–138	201	18.21	339
15.137	189 n. 21	18.23	336
15.138	187, 189,	18.23–25	56 n. 27
	189 n. 21,	18.59	341
	194, 196, 198	18.63–64	331
15.139	189, 195	18.65	329 n. 69
15.139–140	189, 202	18.65–84	328 n. 64
15.140	187, 188, 189,	18.70	341
	189 n. 21, 202	18.72–77	329 n. 69
15.140–142	188	18.116–119	339
15.140–144	195	18.127–128	156
15.141	189	18.129	156 n. 21
15.142	187, 196	18.130–132	345 n. 7
15.142–143	189, 196	18.136	344 n. 5
15.143	187	18.204	415
15.144	189 n. 21,	18.211	231 n. 6
	196, 204	18.236	341
15.144–145	189	18.257	330 n. 70
15.144–146	187 n. 16, 204	18.259	50 n. 11
15.145	189 n. 21,	18.333	341
	198, 204	19.8	407
15.146	187, 189 n. 21,	19.86	330 n. 70
	204	19.127	341
15.146–159	184	19.185	341
15.147	187	19.233	319 n. 17
15.147–160	187	19.278	330 n. 70
15.149	199	20.70	ix
15.155	201	20.100	50, 50 n. 11,
15.156	188		325
15.161	183	20.141–142	345 n. 8
15.174	185	20.145–146	345 n. 9
15.253–259	343 n. 1	20.147	345 n. 10
15.259	343 n. 2	20.180	337
15.371	220 n. 25,	20.181	337
	250 n. 22, 339	20.186	53 n. 19
16.183–186	165 n. 17	20.199–203	332
16.183–187	156 n. 19	20.200–203	336
17.21	410	20.200	331, 332
17.148	363 n. 92	20.201	338 n. 12
17.168	132 n. 43	20.206–207	337
17.202	364 n. 93	20.213	337
17.226	410	20.257–258	155
17.234	139 n. 64	20.259	122
17.317–323	364 n. 93	20.260	123

20.261	123	424–425	22 n. 4
20.263	89, 105, 118 n. 40, 122, 123	428–429 430	219 218
20.264	123	<i>Contra Apionem</i>	
20.266	123	1.1	31, 215
20.267	298	1.1–218	312
20.268	220 n. 25	1.2	39
<i>Vita</i>		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	
17–19	209	1.14	41
22	199 n. 54	1.15	41
40	21 n. 1, 48 n. 8, 89, 123 n. 6	1.16 1.20	40 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	
175–176	48	1.29	21 n. 1 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, 338 n. 13	1.37–38 1.37–41	215 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, 313 n. 79
281	412 n. 16		
343	46, 48	1.46–49	85
358	46, 49, 95 n. 62	1.46–56 1.47–56	84 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, 366 n. 98, 367 n. 101	1.56 1.60–68 1.69	95 n. 62 39 39
420	87	1.69–160	37
422–429	218	1.82	420
423	209	1.92	220 n. 25

1.98	400 n. 55	2.227	312 n. 74
1.161	310 n. 63	2.232	313 n. 78
1.161–218	40	2.233	313, 313 n. 79
1.162	40, 252 n. 28	2.239	133 n. 50
1.165	252 n. 27	2.244	133 n. 50
1.166	40	2.257	221 n. 29,
1.168–171	40		310 n. 63
1.171	220	2.262	313
1.175–182	42	2.263–264	313
1.177–179	311 n. 67	2.272	313 n. 78
1.181	42	2.281	310 n. 63,
1.190	313 n. 78		311
1.205–211	42 n. 30	2.286	221 n. 29
1.212	313 n. 78	2.296	218
1.219	31		
1.289	329 n. 69	<i>Justin Apologia ii</i>	
1.294	329 n. 69	2.6	349 n. 21
1.298	329 n. 69	2.8	350 n. 25
1.318	202 n. 72,	<i>Juvenal Satirae</i>	
	203 n. 74	6.146–148	352 n. 34
2.28–31	330 n. 71	7.98–104	103 n. 7
2.32	330 n. 70		
2.40	213 n. 14	<i>Livy Ab urbe condita</i>	
2.41	330 n. 71	<i>praefatio</i>	38 n. 24
2.47	311 n. 67	1.38.3	258 n. 4
2.56	329 n. 69	4.58.6	201 n. 67
2.63	327 n. 60	5.21.3–7	68 n. 48
2.66	329 n. 69, 428	5.23.5	258 n. 7
2.73	213 n. 14	8.6.7	201 n. 67
2.75	221 n. 29	10.12.2–3	201 n. 67
2.125–134	291 n. 23	21.10.9	204 n. 83
2.128	312 n. 74	34.52.2–12	259 n. 12,
2.134	312 n. 74		261 n. 25
2.135–136	32 n. 6		
2.141–142	220		
2.145	221 n. 29	<i>Lucan Pharsalia</i>	
2.145–296	310	8.490	301 n. 20
2.151	312 n. 76		
2.154	221 n. 29, 222 n. 33	<i>Lucian De historia conscribenda</i>	
2.156	221 n. 29	10–13	39 n. 25
2.158–159	315 n. 85	14	84
2.161	221 n. 29,	15	84, 110 n. 23
	222 n. 33	23	84
2.165	221 n. 29, 223		
2.168	310 n. 63	<i>Lysias De caede Eratosthenis</i>	
2.169	221 n. 29	4	362 n. 83
2.173	221 n. 29		
2.179	315 n. 83	<i>Marcus Aurelius Meditations</i>	
2.180	311 n. 71	11.27	247 n. 6
2.182–183	32 n. 6		
2.193	315 n. 85	<i>Minucius Felix Octavius</i>	
2.209	221 n. 29	33.2–4	26 n. 17, 47
2.219	313, 313 n. 78	47.22–48.2	47

Nicolaus of Damascus	<i>Vita Caesaris</i>	Pherecrates	<i>Fragmenta</i>
1–14	171 n. 33	121	130 n. 32
3,4–5	171 n. 35		
19,58–66	172 n. 38	Philo	<i>Legatio ad Gaium</i>
25a–b	171 n. 33	143–147	116 n. 34
		147	25 n. 14
Onasander	<i>Strategicus</i>	278	28 n. 20
1.1	284 n. 10	<i>De providentia</i>	
1,19–25	284 n. 10	2.66	25 n. 14
2	284 n. 10	<i>De specialibus legibus</i>	
3	284	1.69	23 n. 7
6–7	283	1.320–323	25 n. 15
10.1	283	2.62–63	25 n. 15
10.3	283	3.30	357 n. 62
10.4	283		
10.8	283	Philostratus	<i>Vita Apollonii</i>
10.9	284	2.38	247 n. 4
11.1	283	5.27	328 n. 63
11.2	283	7.10	247 n. 4
14.1	284	7.31	247 n. 4
15–22	283	8.2	306 n. 42
21.9	283	<i>Vitae sophistarum</i>	
22.2	283	1.488	306 n. 47
23	284		
24	283	Photius	<i>Bibliotheca</i>
25	284	33	123 n. 7
27–28	284	84	16
30	284		
31	283	Pindar	<i>Olympian Odes</i>
32	284	1.35–45	133 n. 51
33.6	284	<i>Pythian Odes</i>	
34	284	7.7–12	136
35	284	7.13–18	135
38.1	284		
40–41	283	Plato	<i>Leges</i>
42.3	283	941a	201 n. 66
42.8	284	<i>Politicus</i>	
		311b7–c6	236 n. 32
Origen	<i>Contra Celsum</i>	<i>Respublica</i>	
4.31	32 n. 6	5.470c	97 n. 65
4.36	32 n. 6	621c1–d3	236 n. 32
		8–9	175 n. 46
Orosius	<i>Historiarum adversus paganos</i>	<i>Sophista</i>	
libri VII		228a	97 n. 65
7.9.5–6	64	<i>Timaeus</i>	
		28a	241 n. 54
Pausanias	<i>Graeciae descriptio</i>	28c–29a	241 n. 53
1.3.1	377	31a	241 n. 54
10.15.5	11	40c	241 n. 54
Persius	<i>Satirae</i>	Plautus	<i>Amphitruo</i>
5.176–184	28 n. 21	925	354 n. 41
Petronius	<i>Satyricon</i>	<i>Miles gloriosus</i>	
2	127	1164	354 n. 41

<i>Truculentus</i>		1.44.1	192 n. 28
4.3.74	352 n. 30	1.45.3	191 n. 28
		1.60.5	191 n. 28
Pliny the Elder <i>Naturalis Historia</i>		2.64.1	191 n. 28
5.70	21 n. 3	2.67.1	192 n. 28
5.73	250 n. 20	3.19.4	192 n. 28
7.56	38 n. 23	3.43.11	192 n. 28
7.155	177 n. 50, 177 n. 53	3.54.2-4	194 n. 39
28.18	68 n. 48	3.63.1-14	192 n. 31
34.27	262 n. 28	3.63.4	194, 205 n. 84
37.14	379	3.64.2	194
Pliny the Younger <i>Epistulae</i>		3.71.8	191 n. 28
1.5	298 n. 7	3.108.3-109.13	196, 201
1.13	104 n. 10	3.108.3-9	196
3.11	298 n. 7	3.108.10-109.5	196
5.8	103 n. 7	3.109.7-8	202
5.12	81	3.109.9	202
7.17	81	3.111.1-10	205
7.17.3	83	3.111.1-11	194 n. 38
7.17.15	81, 91	3.111.10	205
7.33	305 n. 36	3.116.3	192 n. 28
9.11.2	88	4.80.15	191 n. 28
9.13	306 n. 45	5.4.6	192 n. 28
		5.44.2	202
Plutarch <i>Aemilius Paullus</i>		5.48.16	192 n. 28
32.2-34.8	259 n. 9,	5.53.6	191 n. 28
	261 n. 25	5.62.1	192 n. 28
<i>Caesar</i>		5.104.1-5	202 n. 69
55.1-4	259 n. 9	6.3.1-9.14	223
<i>De Herodoti malignitate</i>		6.19-42	49, 112
855d	30 n. 3	10.14.3	192 n. 28
<i>Lucullus</i>		10.49.7	192 n. 28
37.1-4	259 n. 9	11.11.2	191 n. 28
<i>Marcellus</i>		11.15.4	192 n. 28
22.1-4	259 n. 9	12.25i.3	186 n. 14
<i>Marius</i>		15.10.1-4	194
20	285 n. 11	15.10.1-7	194
<i>Pelopidas</i>		15.10.5	194, 205 n. 84
2.4	285	15.11.6-13	194
<i>Pompeus</i>		16.5.9	191 n. 28
19.35	285	23.2.9	186 n. 14
45	259 n. 9	28.4.2	186 n. 14
<i>Quaestiones romanae et graecae</i>		29.21	116
61	68 n. 48	36.1.1-7	191
<i>Romulus</i>	x n. 2	36.17	117
1.1	258 n. 5	Pseudo Hegesippus <i>De Excidio</i>	
16.5-6	259 n. 9	1.14	377 n. 34
16.5-8	258 n. 4	5.40.2	144 n. 77
16.8	354 n. 40	Quintilian <i>Institutio oratoria</i>	
22.3		1.1.13	105
Polybius <i>Historiae</i>		1.4.8	408
1.1-4	112		
1.32.8	191 n. 28		

1.4.8–9	408	Suetonius <i>Divus Iulius</i>	
1.4.9	408	37	259 n. 10
8.6.71	133 n. 47	49	259 n. 10
9.1.14	78 n. 23	51	259 n. 10
9.2.65	78 n. 23	<i>Divus Augustus</i>	
10.1	103 n. 7	1–7	171 n. 33
10.1.31	126 n. 14	8	171 n. 33
10.1.61	133 n. 47	<i>Tiberius</i>	
10.1.68–70	140 n. 67	11.4	354 n. 39
10.1.73–75	126 n. 14	17.20	259 n. 10
10.1.101–104	126 n. 14	32.2	25 n. 15
12.2	314 n. 82	36	150
		<i>Gaius</i>	
Sallust <i>Bellum Catilinae</i>		36.2	354 n. 39
5	95 n. 62	<i>Claudius</i>	
36.5	97 n. 65	28	94
<i>Historiae</i>		<i>Nero</i>	
2.77m	97 n. 65	22	129 n. 26
		25	259 n. 10
Seneca the Elder <i>Suasoriae</i>		57	94
3.7	137	<i>Vespasianus</i>	
		1.1	287
Seneca the Younger <i>Epistulae morales</i>		2.1	287
14.8	302 n. 21	4.5	287
73.1	304 n. 33	5.6	109, 321 n. 30, 322 n. 33, 327 n. 62
<i>De otio</i>		6.3	323 n. 39
5	301 n. 19	6.4	323 n. 40
Servius <i>In Vergili Aeneidos libros</i>		7.1	327 n. 62
2.351	68 n. 48	7.2	287
		7.2–3	328 n. 63
Sextus Empiricus <i>Adversus mathematicos</i>		8	257 n. 1
1.263–269	38 n. 24	15	302 n. 23
		<i>Titus</i>	
Sophocles <i>Antigone</i>		4	289
247	130 n. 34, 140 n. 65	4.1	61
256	130 n. 34	4.3	61, 289
407–440	138	5	289 n. 19
409	130 n. 34	5.2	61
409–412	138	5.3	327
410	138	6	257 n. 1
428	139	6–7	288
429	130 n. 34, 140 n. 65	7	93 n. 59
601	130 n. 32	7.1	318 n. 12
602	130 n. 34	7–8	288
<i>Elektra</i>		<i>Domitianus</i>	
637	242	2	100 n. 68, 257 n. 1,
<i>Trachiniae</i>			266 n. 47
205–210	242	10	298 n. 7, 303
Strabo <i>Geographica</i>		10.1	84
12.3.21	10	10.3–4	84
12.3.31	129 n. 30	13	300
17.1.13	323 n. 40	14–15	308 n. 55

Sulpicius Severus <i>Chronica</i>		5.5.1	23 n. 8
2.30.6	64	5.5.2	23 n. 8
		5.10.1	52
Tacitus <i>Agricola</i>		5.10.2	22 n. 4
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	Tertullianus <i>Apologeticus</i>	352 n. 32
45	298 n. 7,	6.6	
	299 n. 14	<i>De idolatria</i>	
<i>Annales</i>		6	352 n. 32
1.3	93 n. 60	<i>De monogamia</i>	
1.43	93 n. 60	10	352 n. 32
1.43.4	97 n. 65	11	352 n. 32
1.55	93 n. 60		
1.57–62	93 n. 60	Thucydides <i>Historiae</i>	38 n. 24
1.65	93 n. 60	1.1–22	
1.71	93 n. 60	1.20	39 n. 26
2.41	93 n. 60	1.21	10
2.45	93 n. 60	1.22.4	91
2.59	320 n. 24	1.73.2	188 n. 20
3.22	352 n. 34	1.86.2–3	201 n. 67
4.34	5	2.10.3	186 n. 14
11.18–20	284	2.11.1–4	191
11.26–27	363 n. 90	2.11.2	199
11.30	363 n. 90	2.11.7–9	191, 199, 201
12.53	94	2.39	140
13.35–39	284	2.48–59	97 n. 65
14.57	304 n. 33	2.54	132 n. 42
15.26	284	2.86.6	186 n. 14
15.28.3	50	2.87	193, 196
15.64	306 n. 44	2.87.1–2	196
16.21–22	302 n. 22	2.87.2–3	205 n. 84
16.34	306 n. 40	2.87.3–5	196
16.34–35	305 n. 39	2.87.6	198 n. 50
<i>Dialogus de oratoribus</i>		2.87.6–7	193
3	83, 84	2.87.7	195 n. 45
12.5	127 n. 22	2.89	197
<i>Germania</i>		2.89.2	191
37.5	93 n. 60	2.89.5	191
<i>Historiae</i>		2.89.7	197
1.4	94	2.89.9	191
1.11	323 n. 41	2.90.1	186 n. 14
1.26.1	97 n. 65	3.2	195
3.3	323 n. 42	3.82–84	97
2.82.3	318 n. 12	4.9.4	186 n. 14
4.73–74	116 n. 34	4.10	193 n. 37
4.75–85	100 n. 68	4.10.1	201
4.81	328 n. 63	4.10.3–5	193 n. 38
5.1.1	320 n. 25,	4.11.1	186 n. 14
5.2–3	327 n. 59	4.12	197
	31, 43	4.9.2	204
		4.92.1–2	191, 204

4.92.7	191, 204	7.77.3	205
4.95.3	191	7.77.5	201
4.98.7	201 n. 66		
4.126	195, 203	Valerius Flaccus <i>Argonautica</i>	
4.126.1	203	1.12–14	22 n. 3
4.126.2	198		
5.8.5	195	Velleius Paterculus <i>Historia romana</i>	
5.9.1	191	2.117–121	93 n. 60
5.9.3–6	193		
5.9.9	191	Virgil <i>Aeneid</i>	
6.68	198	8.679	329
6.68.3	193 n. 38	8.680	329
6.68.4	201	8.685–688	329
7.61–64	205	8.687	329
7.61.3	198 n. 50	8.698–700	329
7.62.4	201		
7.67.4	205, 205 n. 84	Xenophanes	
7.68.1	205 n. 84	21B11–21B18	243 n. 63
7.68.1–3	201		

## PAPYRI AND INSCRIPTIONS

<i>BGU</i>		P.Hever	
2203.4	351 n. 27	13	347, 349
2203.12	351 n. 27		
2692.9	351 n. 27	P.London (= P.Flor 93.5, 14)	
		713.9	351 n. 27
		1713.22	351 n. 27
<i>CIG</i>		P.Oxyrhynchus	
4957 (= <i>OGIS</i> 669)	50 n. 11	129	351 n. 27
		3581.15–16	351 n. 27
<i>CIL</i>		P.Rylands	
VI 944	262 n. 29, 288	4	360 n. 73
<i>SEG</i>		P.Tebtunis	
26.1123		1.104	360 n. 73
<i>CPJ</i>		P.Yadin	
144	347 n. 14, 351 n. 29	18	348, 349 n. 20
153.85–95	25 n. 16		
P.Cairo			
67121	351 n. 27		
67154.r, 2, 13	351 n. 27		

## BIBLICAL LITERATURE

*Hebrew Bible/Old Testament*

<b>Genesis</b>		<b>Judges</b>	
1:27	358 n. 63	15:2	356
2:21–24	358 n. 63	15:18	233 n. 14
2:24	351	19	357 n. 61
3:23	378	19:1–2	357 n. 61
6–8	234 n. 21		
14:14	213 n. 15	1 Samuel	
17	220	7:2	147 n. 1
27:28	236	9:1	147 n. 1
		9:1–15:35	147
<b>Exodus</b>		9:1–31:13	147, 148
3:13	234	13	149
10:24 [LXX]	392	13:13–14	149
12:37 [LXX]	392	15:9	151
14:10–12	232 n. 7	16:1–31:13	147
14:13–14	232 n. 8	17:47	204 n. 80
17:1–6	232 n. 10	18:17	204 n. 80
17:4	232 n. 11	25:44	356 n. 58
18:2	356 n. 59	31:1–13	149
19:3–9	221 n. 32		
20:3–6	150	1 Kings	
25:23–30	265 n. 42	18:20–46	235 n. 23
25:31–40	265 n. 43	18:39	235 n. 24
29:38–42	60 n. 38		
37:10–16	265 n. 42	1 Chronicles	
37:17–24	265 n. 43	27:31	241 n. 56
		29:6	241 n. 56
<b>Numbers</b>			
14:9 [LXX]	326 n. 52	2 Chronicles	
16:27 [LXX]	392	8:10	241 n. 56
28:3–8	60 n. 38	24:11	241 n. 56
<b>Deuteronomy</b>		<b>Ezra</b>	
5:7–10	150	9:6–15	233 n. 15
6:3	274		
18:11–14	150	<b>Esther</b>	
21:21	91	4:1	130 n. 31
24	352 n. 31, 356 n. 55	<b>Job</b>	
24:1	346, 350 n. 23,	1:20	130 n. 31
	354	2:12	130 n. 31
24:1–4	357		
24:3	346, 350 n. 23, 354	<b>Qohelet</b>	
		5:8	69 n. 50
<b>Joshua</b>		<b>Canticles</b>	
7:7–9	232 n. 12	1:14	376
22:22 [LXX]	326 n. 52	4:13	376

Isaiah		Daniel	
50:1	346	2	224
		2:33	225
		2:39	225
Jeremiah	357 n. 61	2:42–43	225
3:6–7	50		
25:9	50		
27:6	50		
34:2	45, 50, 50 n. 12	Hosea	
3:8	346	2:4	347
		5.15	68 n. 48
Lamentations		Zechariah	
2:6	378	1:13 [LXX]	186 n. 14
		11:1	68 n. 48
Ezekiel			
9:3	68 n. 48		

*New Testament*

Mark		7:14–16	350 n. 24
6:17–18	344 n. 6	10:1–4	24 n. 11
10:11–12	358 n. 63	16:19	25 n. 15
Matthew		2 Corinthians	
5:31	349, 350 n. 23	1:8	187 n. 17
5:31–32	361 n. 79	2:11	187 n. 17
19:9	361 n. 79	7:10	395
John		Ephesians	
7:35	26	1:12	395
		2:12	28
Acts		Colossians	
2:6–11	23 n. 7	1:5	395 n. 41
18:2	23 n. 10	1:21	28
18:24	23 n. 10	1 Thessalonians	
19:9	25 n. 15	4:13	187 n. 17
19:33–34	25 n. 14	Hebrews	
Romans		395 n. 41	
1:2	395 n. 41	24 n. 11	241 n. 52
4:1			
1 Corinthians			
7:10–11	358		

*Apocrypha*

Additions to Daniel		Additions to Esther	
6:19	237 n. 36	4:17 <sup>b–h</sup>	234 n. 16
		4:17 <sup>k–z</sup>	234 n. 17
1 Esdras			
2:12	241 n. 56	Judith	
4:19	395 n. 42	7:2	392
8:71–87	233 n. 15	9:11	198 n. 52

1 Maccabees		5:30	237 n. 36
2:41	56 n. 28	6:4	240 n. 48
3:19	198 n. 52	6:8	240 n. 48
12:21	390 n. 24		
2 Maccabees		4 Maccabees	
3:4	241 n. 56	7:9	240 n. 48
4:2	242 n. 58	9:24	237 n. 36
4:6	237 n. 36	13:19	237 n. 36
5:19	113 n. 31	17:22	237 n. 36
6:29	236 n. 28	Sirach	
12:31	236 n. 28	45:24	241 n. 56
13:26	236 n. 28		
14:35	243 n. 62	Wisdom of Solomon	
		2:16	240 n. 48
3 Maccabees		6:16	236 n. 28
2:9	243 n. 62	14:3	237 n. 36
4:21	237 n. 36	17:2	237 n. 36
5:7	240 n. 48		

*Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*

<i>Letter of Aristeas</i>		<i>Sibylline Oracles</i>	
90	46 n. 3	4.102-151	68 n. 49
211	243 n. 62	4.130-137	68 n. 49

## RABBINIC LITERATURE

*Mishnah, Talmud, and Related Literature*

<i>b. Berakot</i>		<i>b. Sanhedrin</i>	
40a	378	94a	52 n. 17
<i>t. 'Erubin</i>		<i>y. Sanhedrin</i>	
4:6	56 n. 28	25d	428 n. 3
<i>m. Gittin</i>		<i>b. Sabbath</i>	
4:1	355 n. 51	19a	56 n. 28
<i>b. Gittin</i>		33b	161 n. 4
33a	355 n. 51	<i>m. Sotah</i>	
56a	53 n. 19, 55 n. 24	5:1	361 n. 79
56b	66, 69 n. 50	<i>b. Sotah</i>	
<i>m. Ketubbot</i>		18b	361 n. 79
5:6	347 n. 13	27b	361 n. 79
<i>y. Ketubbot</i>		<i>m. Ta'anit</i>	
9a	361 n. 79	4:6	60 n. 38
30b	359 n. 66	<i>y. Ta'anit</i>	
<i>m. Nedarim</i>		69a	46 n. 4
11:12	347 n. 13,	<i>m. Yebamot</i>	
	368 n. 103	14:1	347 n. 12
<i>b. Niddah</i>		<i>b. Yoma</i>	
20a	379	39b	68 n. 48
<i>b. Roš Haššanah</i>			
31a	68 n. 48		

*Other Rabbinic Works**'Abot de Rabbi Nathan*

vers. A 6  
vers. B 6.1  
vers. B 7  
vers. B 20

53 n. 19  
55 n. 24  
53 n. 19  
69 n. 50

*Leviticus Rabbah*

22:2  
22:3  
*Deuteronomy Rabbah*  
1:17

69 n. 50  
69 n. 50  
68 n. 48

*Genesis Rabbah*

18:5  
19:5

351  
378