

Josephus: Craft and Environment

Dov Gera

J. Edmondson, S. Mason, and J. Rives (eds.), *Flavius Josephus and Flavian Rome*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005. XVI + 400 pp. ISBN-13: 978-0-19-926212-0.

J. Sievers and G. Lembi (eds.), *Josephus and Jewish History in Flavian Rome and Beyond* (Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism, 104), Leiden: Brill, 2005. XIII + 454 pp. ISBN-13: 978-9-04-4179-7

Since the early 1990's Josephus' writings enjoy a renaissance of sorts. The Brill Josephus Project, with S. Mason as its General Editor, set out to offer a new English translation of and commentary on all of Josephus' writings. This effort is well underway, which gives hope that publication of the latter half of the *Jewish Antiquities* and the entire *Jewish War* will not be long in coming.¹ A similarly well advanced project is the French initiative which reproduces the Greek text of the *Jewish Antiquities*, accompanied by a new French translation and annotations.² In addition, there is a new edition of Book 1 of *Against Apion*, as well as a Hebrew translation and commentary for the whole work.³ One may also add two books concerned with the study of the *contra Apionem*.⁴ The *Vita* has also received its share of scholarly attention, and there is now a new edition of it, as well as a new Hebrew translation.⁵ In connection with the *Bellum* one may cite

¹ *Flavius Josephus: Translation and Commentary*, S. Mason (ed.) (vol. 3. *Judean Antiquities 1-4*, L.H. Feldman [ed.], Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2000; vol. 4. *Judean Antiquities Books 5-7*, Chr. T. Begg [ed.], 2005; vol. 5. *Judean Antiquities Books 8-10*, Chr. T. Begg and P. Spilsbury [eds.], 2005; vol. 9. *Life of Josephus*, S. Mason [ed.], 2001; vol. 10. *Against Apion*, J.M.G. Barclay [ed.], 2007).

² *Flavius Josèphe: Les Antiquités Juives* (vol. IA. *Livres I à III*. Introduction et texte, Et. Nodet [ed.], Paris: Les éditions du Cerf, 1990; vol. IB. Traduction et notes [vol. I. *Livres I à III*², 1992]; vol. II. *Livres IV et V*, 1995; vol. III. *Livres VI et VII*, 2001; vol. IV, *Livres VIII et IX*, 2005).

³ *Flavius Josephus, Contra Apionem, Buch 1: Einleitung, Text, Textkritischer Apparat, Übersetzung und Kommentar*, D. Labow (ed.), Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament, N.F. 7 (167), Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 2005; *Josephus Flavius, Against Apion: A New Hebrew Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, 2 vols., A. Kasher (ed.), Jerusalem: The Zalman Shazar Center for Jewish History, 1996.

⁴ L.H. Feldman and J.R. Levison (eds.), *Josephus' Contra Apionem: Studies in its Character and Context with a Latin Concordance to the Portion Missing in Greek*, Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums, 34, Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1996; Chr. Gerber, *Ein Bild des Judentums für Nichtjuden von Flavius Josephus: Untersuchungen zu seiner Schrift Contra Apionem*, Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums, 40, Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1997.

⁵ *Flavius Josephus, Aus meinem Leben (Vita): Kritische Ausgabe, Übersetzung und Kommentar*, F. Siegert et alii (eds.), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001; *Flavius Josephus, Vita:*

the monograph of G. Mader.⁶ It may also be reported here that a new Hebrew translation of the *Bellum* has been prepared by Lisa Ullmann, which is being annotated by Jonathan J. Price and Israel Shatzman. Hopefully, this work will be published in the course of 2008.⁷ This sample of recently published translations and commentaries, monographs and collected studies attests to the intense scholarly activity surrounding Josephus and his works. The same may be said of the two volumes reviewed here, each of them being the *acta* of a separate conference. Not only do they reflect this activity, they are also its product.

The tome edited by Edmondson, Mason and Rives (henceforth referred to as EMR), contains fourteen studies, while the similarly titled collection, edited by Sievers and Lembi (henceforth SL), has no less than twenty two papers. These numbers alone exclude the possibility of a review of each of these articles, and hopefully the reviewer will be excused for focusing on the studies of his choice.

We may begin with Anthony J. Forte, who is involved in the preparation of a new English translation of the *Jewish War*. In his paper ('Translating Book 1 of Josephus' *Bellum Judaicum*: Some Critical Observations', in: SL, 383-403), F. deals with H. St. J. Thackeray's translation of book 1 of the *Bellum*. He is of the opinion that Thackeray's translation, brilliant at times, owes much to the French translation of Theodore Reinach and his collaborators. Despite this criticism of Thackeray, F. has a high regard for this 'highly competent Greek scholar' whose work makes 'a very good read'. He calls however, for a 'more literal translation' of Josephus' Greek, which will be 'more faithful' (403) to the original, suggesting that his translation, when published, will be seen to follow these guidelines.

Unlike F.'s publication, which discusses English translations of the twentieth and the twenty first centuries of Josephus' works, Gaia Lembi focuses on a medieval rendering of the *Jewish Antiquities* ('The Latin Translation of Josephus' *Antiquitates*', in: SL, 371-81). In her learned paper, she laments the present day neglect of the Latin translations of Josephus' works. L. offers a few test cases in which the Latin rendering contributes towards the establishment of the Greek text of the *Jewish Antiquities*. She also points out the importance of these translations for our understanding of the way the history of the Jews was perceived in the late Middle Ages.

Moving away from translations of the *Jewish Antiquities* to a literary analysis of a segment within this work, we may first turn to Josephus' reworking of the biblical figure of King Saul. The author, Detlev Dormeyer, wishes to deal with this adapted biblical narrative within the framework of hellenistic writings ('The Hellenistic Biographical History of King Saul: Josephus, *A. J.* 6.45-378 and 1 Samuel 9:1-31:13', in: SL, 147-57). Unfortunately, D.'s discussion is imprecise. One glaring example may be found in relation to the prophet Samuel's words to Saul in which he revokes the earlier divine promise of eternal rule, because of the king's sin (1 Sam 13.13). D. claims that Josephus

Introduction, Hebrew Translation, and Commentary, D.R. Schwartz (ed.), Between Bible and Mishnah: The David and Jemima Jeselsohn Library, Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi Press, 2007.

⁶ *Josephus and the Politics of Historiography: Apologetic and Impression Management in the Bellum Judaicum* (Mnemosyne Supplementum 205), Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2000.

⁷ I am indebted to Israel Shatzman for details regarding this project.

belittles the deity's earlier promise, and that it was meant to ensure Saul only an 'exceedingly long (πλεῖστον ἂν βασιλευσαι χρόνον)' reign. If this was God's original promise, so claims D., then 'the punishment of Saul is minimised' (149). However, this passage of Josephus should be quoted in full. What God had originally promised Saul according to the prophet amounts to an eternal rule: σοὶ τ' αὐτῷ πλεῖστον ἂν βασιλευσαι χρόνον ἐξεγένετο καὶ τοῖς σοῖς ἐγγόνους (*Ant.* 6.104). Later D. seems to claim that Josephus has made Saul into a model for the Hasmonean dynasty (154), and for Josephus himself as well (157). I find little evidence for these analogies.

Another literary analysis, this time of a speech embedded within the non-biblical part of the *Jewish Antiquities*, is the subject of Jan Willem van Henten's paper ('Commonplaces in Herod's Commander Speech in Josephus' *A.J.* 15.127-146', in: *SL*, 183-206). H. focuses on the oration which is put into the mouth of King Herod, as he and his troops are about to attack the Arabs, ca. 31 BCE. H. identifies the speech as a deliberative piece of rhetoric, designed to raise the morale of the troops. He then turns to the works of four historians who preceded Josephus: Herodotus, Thucydides, Polybius and Dionysius of Halicarnassus. All four had included commander exhortation speeches in their writings, and all may have been a source of influence for the Jewish historian. H. surveys the contents of these orations, and then meticulously analyzes and identifies various Greek motifs in Herod's speech. These motifs are found in commander speeches written by one, or more, of the four earlier authors. Among the motifs discussed by H. is that of the *bellum iustum*, which is linked in Herod's speech with accusations of improper conduct by the enemy. Another motif discussed by H. is that of divine intervention in warfare, which he distinguishes from the role played by fortune (τύχη). Here, the commander speeches of Thucydides and Polybius supply meagre results,⁸ while those of Herodotus and Dionysius none at all. Yet in his summary, H. concludes that Herod's oration rests on 'conventional Greek arguments and not on biblical traditions, although what he says hardly counters Jewish religious views' (206). H. is of course aware of the role of God in the wars of the Bible, which 'frequently presents wars as authorized by God' (204). Yet, I find H.'s language here far too mild, for to the best of my recollection, there is only one battle in the whole Hebrew Bible whose outcome is *not* said to have been decided by God, or by one of his messengers.⁹ In view of this, it may be claimed that Josephus, when putting the argument of divine intervention in the mouth of Herod, was mainly influenced by the biblical tradition. The presence of the same motif in some of the commander speeches of Thucydides and Polybius was probably a subsidiary source of influence.

One of the subjects common to the *Jewish Antiquities* and *Against Apion* is its author's continued effort to convince his readers of the antiquity of his people, as compared to the relative late appearance of the Greeks. John M.G. Barclay contributes two studies which focus on *contra Apionem*. He supplies a detailed commentary on a short section from this work (*c. Ap.* 2.125-134 ['The Empire Writes Back: Josephan Rhetoric in Flavian Rome', in: *EMR*, 315-32]) while his other piece turns to a longer section from

⁸ Thuc. 4.92.7; 7.77.3; Polyb. 3.111.10, quoted by H. on 204-5.

⁹ The exception being Gen. 14.1-11. Even there, after Abraham gets involved in the fighting, the responsibility for his victory is attributed to God, although retroactively. See vss. 14-16, 20.

Book 1 (6-59). Here B. offers more sweeping observations intended to help our understanding of Josephus' responses to the double challenge to his discussion of the antiquity of the Jewish people: that of ignorance by Greek writers and hostility by Egyptian sources ('Judean Historiography in Rome: Josephus and History in *Contra Apionem* Book 1', in: SL, 29-43). In both articles B. looks at *Against Apion* through the eyes of post-colonial theory (EMR, 316-19; SL, 35-36, 43). His interest is not so much in the effect that reigning Graeco-Roman historiography had on the writing of Josephus, but rather on the way Josephus' picture of the history and culture of his vanquished people may have challenged, perhaps subtly, the claims for superiority of the representatives of the dominant culture. Thus, in his detailed discussion of *c. Ap.* 2.125-134, B. turns to Josephus' attempt to defend his people from the accusation of Apion that the Jews have unjust laws, an accusation based on the fact that they had been governed by many nations and their city had suffered various calamities (*c. Ap.* 2.125). Josephus does not mention what these calamities were, but some of the better known catastrophes which befell Jerusalem up to Apion's time would have included the destruction of the First Temple, the despoilation of the Second by Antiochus Epiphanes, and the later capture of the shrine by Pompeius Magnus. Josephus does refer, however, to the destruction of Egyptian holy places, the burning of the Acropolis and the dire fate of thousands of temples, including those of Delphi and Ephesus. In all these events, says Josephus, 'no one has blamed these things on the victims, but on the perpetrators' (*c. Ap.* 2.129, 131; B.'s transl., on 323). Could Josephus, while mentioning these temples, have avoided thinking of the Jerusalem shrine? If he did have the Temple in mind, then the implication would be that Titus, Vespasian and the Romans were responsible for the destruction of the Temple, an accusation which Josephus was at pains to discredit in his earlier work, the *Jewish War*. However, an admission to Jewish sins followed by divine punishment, motifs which do appear in the *Bellum*, would have played into the hands of those in support of Apion's accusations. Thus, Josephus may have deliberately omitted any reference to the Jewish Temple in this passage. B.'s subversive but cautiously framed suggestion that in *Against Apion* Josephus had accused the Romans of being responsible for the destruction of the Temple is a distinct possibility. B.'s notable achievement here is to show how post-colonial theory, combined with careful and sensitive reading, can lead to a multifaceted understanding of Josephus' text in which alongside 'a melody ... composed of complicity and cultural subservience' other 'soft notes of self-assertion and resistance' can also be heard (331-32).

Honora Howell Chapman is the second of three scholars who have made a contribution to both volumes under review here. Her two papers deal with Josephus' *Jewish War* from a literary point of view. In one ('"By the Waters of Babylon": Josephus and Greek Poetry', in: SL, 121-46), C. aims at showing how Josephus 'used specific words and themes from Greek poetry' and weaved them into his text (123). C. is aware of Josephus' acknowledgement of the use he has made of some 'assistants for the ... Greek' (*c. Ap.* 1.50; transl. Thackeray), who helped him along. These anonymous helpers of the Jewish historian became a focus of interest for H.St.J. Thackeray, who devoted to them one of the lectures found in his seminal study on Josephus.¹⁰ To Thackeray, working in an age

¹⁰ *Josephus: The Man and the Historian*, The Hilda Stich Stroock Lectures at The Jewish Institute of Religion, New York, NY: Jewish Institute of Religion Press, 1929, Fifth Lecture —

when *Quellenforschung* was very much in vogue, these assistants seemed at times to be a replacement for Josephus himself.¹¹ C.'s approach is much more sensible in that the credit for the interlacing of literary and poetic themes into the *Jewish War* is given only to Josephus. Thus, her Josephus is a man who has spent time and energy in acquiring a Greek literary education, as he himself attests,¹² in order to impress his readers, and to color his work with the refinement of Greek literary style. In this paper C. collects the poetic allusions to earlier Greek works used by Josephus, and assesses Josephus' aims in utilizing these allusions. She is also concerned with the question of how these allusions may have been understood by the historian's readers. C. concentrates on the works of Homer, Pindar, Sophocles and Euripides — all mentioned by Josephus' early contemporary Petronius (*Sat.* 2), and all apparently alluded to in the *Bellum*. A fine example of C.'s literary analysis can be seen in her discussion of Josephus' narrative on the death of Niger, one of the prominent commanders of the Jewish revolt in its early stages (*BJ* 4.359-361). C. notes the similarity between Niger's death scene in which he is dragged alive to his death outside the walls of Jerusalem, and the pulling of Hector's body by Achilles' chariot, outside the walls of Troy (*Il.* 22.396-405). In Josephus' narrative Niger is made to plead in vain for burial, in much the same way as Hector's entreaties for an honourable entombment are met with a deaf ear (*Il.* 22.338-339, and 345). Before dying, Niger invokes the Romans who will punish his killers, reminding us of Hector's warning to Achilles that he shall be destroyed by Paris and Phoebus Apollo (*Il.* 22.355-360). Josephus' evocative treatment of this episode, as ably demonstrated by C. (130-132), must have caused his readers to reflect not only on the common ending of Hector and Niger, but also of the imminent destiny that awaited Jerusalem, similar to that of Hector's Troy. It may also be noted that the similarity between the death scenes of Hector and Niger would have suggested to Josephus' readers that the fate of the Jews, as predicted by the dying Niger, would be effected through divine intervention, just as Achilles' death in the *Iliad* is a foregone conclusion, because of the involvement of Paris and Apollo. However, Josephus does not have the sense to let matters rest there, and he seals the story of Niger with the statement that God had ratified all of Niger's curses (*BJ* 4.362). This statement of the obvious by Josephus, would not have endeared him to people of literary refinement, such as Theophrastus and his followers.¹³ In this fine paper C. attempts to convince us, as she does in her other paper ('Spectacle in Josephus' *Jewish War*, in: *EMR*, 289-313), that Josephus was capable of adding depth, sensitivity and literary refinement to his narrative, and to a certain extent she succeeds. Yet, no matter how much erudition, skill and effort were invested by the Jewish historian, it is debatable whether he is to be noted for exceptional literary achievements.

'Josephus and Hellenism: His Greek Assistants', 100-124.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 108: 'This long section, *compiled largely or wholly by others*, occupies some five books ... from the establishment ... of Herod ... to the confirmation of Agrippa I ...' [i.e. from *Ant.* 15.1 to 19.291]. Again he writes on 108: 'The peculiarities of this portion *cannot be referred to the author himself*' (the italics are mine: D.G.). Similarly, on 109 he assigns books 15-16 of the *Antiquities* to an assistant named by him α, while responsibility for the writing of books 17-19, is allotted to a different helper, code-named β.

¹² *Ant.* 20.263, discussed by C. on 122-23.

¹³ See Theophrastus' statement as quoted by Demetrius of Phaleron, *Eloc.* 222.

The involvement of Josephus' literary assistants in the writing of the *Jewish War*, somewhat marginalized by C., receives an altogether new interpretation by Steve Mason. In his treatment, these helpers become part of the author's social circle ('Of Audience and Meaning: Reading Josephus' *Bellum Judaicum* in the Context of a Flavian Audience', in: SL, 71-100). M. notes the unique Greek style used by Josephus when writing the *Jewish War*, which differs from that of his later works, and is also at variance with the Greek of earlier Jewish compositions, as well as the language employed in the New Testament writings of Josephus' days. M. finds in the *Bellum* affinities with the works of Dio Chrysostomus and Plutarch, both contemporaries of Josephus, and with later writers such as Aelius Aristides and Lucian. If we see Josephus, as does M., as standing in the forefront of a new fashion of Greek literature, the Second Sophistic, this raises the question of the kind of audience Josephus would have had in mind when writing the *Jewish War* (75-76). M. stresses, in a general introduction to the subject of Josephus' readership, how different the process of dissemination of new literary works was in the ancient world, when compared with the publication of books in modern times. In those days, insists M., the production of books was a local affair that depended largely on the social standing of the writer, or that of his patron, within a particular community. Partial drafts of a planned literary work were either distributed among the author's associates, or were read aloud to them. Ensuing comments and reactions would have then prompted the author to revise his text, and offer the new version to the scrutiny of a different, or wider, group of friends. Under those conditions it was common for both old and new revisions to be in circulation, side by side. Thus, 'there was no clear line between writing and publication' (80). Furthermore, the author's associates were also his designated audience, or at least, a microcosm of it. M. draws a very interesting model for the way literary works were disseminated in ancient Rome, and then goes on to apply it to the *Jewish War*.

A plausible analysis of two letters, written by Agrippa II and sent to Josephus (*Vit.* 365-366), leads M. to the conclusion that the Jewish historian, when writing the *Bellum*, sent his works to the Jewish king piecemeal. In all likelihood this was done while Agrippa II was staying in Rome, in close proximity to the historian. M. goes on to depict Josephus as writing within a defined social group in Rome, when mentioning the Jewish historian's need for some *συνεργοί* to help him with the Greek language (*c. Ap.* 1.50). For M., these helpers are the historian's 'literary friends'.¹⁴ Not surprisingly, the picture offered by M., fits the model previously outlined by him. However, in a section which immediately precedes the two epistles mentioned above, Josephus relates how he had presented copies of the *Jewish War* to Vespasian and Titus (*Vit.* 361; *c. Ap.* 1.50-51). The latter was so impressed with Josephus' writing that he ordered the books to be published (*Vit.* 363: τὰ βιβλία δημοσιῶσαι προσέταξεν). While it is very likely that Josephus did exaggerate at the impact his books had on Titus, the fact remains that Titus, had he wished to, could procure scribes who would copy the *Jewish War*. He could also

¹⁴ M.'s discussion on 85-86. He accepts the view of T. Rajak (*Josephus: The Historian and his Society*², London: Duckworth, 2002, 63) for the social standing of the *συνεργοί*. It may be noted that Thackeray (n. 10), 104-5, confesses that originally he thought these *συνεργοί* to be Josephus' 'literary friends in Rome', but after reconsideration identified them 'as his slaves'.

recommend the books to his friends, thus promoting the distribution of Josephus' work. M. suggests that this 'may have meant nothing more than deposit in one of the new imperial libraries' (88), clearly intending to dismiss any alternative to his model, and to distance the Flavian family from involvement with, or influence on, the *Bellum*. This separation is absolutely essential for M. in his second article ('Figured Speech and Irony in T. Flavius Josephus', in: EMR, 243-88), in which he seeks to convince us of Josephus' ability to offer veiled and ironic criticism of the Flavians.

Josephus' social circle in Rome consisted, according to M. (86-87), of Romans who had fought with Vespasian and Titus in Judea and Jews who were in possession of Greek learning (of the latter, three Herodian princes are specifically named). All were either given copies of the *Jewish War*, or else were convinced to buy it from the author. This inner circle on whom Josephus relied for feedback and advice, his support group if you will, would have been a heterogenous one, consisting of former military commanders in Judea, acquainted with the terrain of the country they had subdued, but with much inferior information on Jewish history and customs. However, the Jewish component of this group, including the three royals, would have been much better informed on these latter points. M.'s discussion on the way the *Bellum* reflects what his intended audience would and would not know, completely ignores the Jewish half of Josephus' social circle in Rome, focusing exclusively on its Roman members. Thus, M. tries to demonstrate that Josephus does not take for granted that his audience will have knowledge concerning Jewish things, but does assume that they will be familiar with facts which relate to Roman history. It may be said, however, that even if these points were to be proven to our satisfaction, the intended readership need not be placed in the city of Rome, but in all corners of the Roman Empire. In fact, Josephus specifically states in the preface to the *Jewish War* that in his work he will 'propose to provide the subjects of the Roman Empire with a narrative of the facts' (1.3; transl. Thackeray). This problem is anticipated by M., for not much escapes his keen eye. However, the solution he adopts, that this statement is rhetorically motivated and that any historian worth his salt would be writing for a more restricted and defined audience (90-91), again conforms to M.'s pre-conceived ideas about Josephus' intended audience.

Let us now look briefly at some of the evidence presented by M. to support his view that Josephus' *Bellum* was written with a Roman readership in mind. He correctly states that 'Josephus first mentions Marc Antony, Augustus, and Marcus Agrippa without introduction' (*BJ* 1.118; on 92). One doubts if the only group who would not need an explanation as to the identity of these three figures were the members of the social circle described above. Furthermore, these Roman personalities are mentioned by Josephus in connection with the decision of Queen Alexandra (Shlomzion) to imprison some members of her family in the Antonia. Josephus, in an aside, remarks that this citadel was named Antonia later on, when Antonius was in power, just as two cities were later to receive the names of Sebaste and Agrippias after Augustus and his lieutenant. Josephus digresses here from the topic he was discussing, the period of Queen Alexandra (76-67 BCE), to tell us about the names Herod subsequently gave to three of his building projects. But should we expect him to elaborate here on the identity of these figures, who were yet to make their mark on history, but at the time of Alexandra's death two of them were yet to be born, while the elder, M. Antonius, was a mere stripling? Other Romans, as well as events in the history of Rome, occasionally crop up in the *Bellum* without

elaboration or explanation for the reason of their appearance. Does this mean, as M. suggests, that Josephus assumed his audience would know of these matters? The mention of Pompey's flight from Rome enables Josephus to date Aristobulus II's release from prison by Julius Caesar. Cassius' death at Phillippi marks the appearance of a Jewish embassy before M. Antonius (one of the victors of that battle), whose aim was to effect the removal of Antipater's two sons from their positions of power. The subsequent mention of Messala is related to a second Jewish mission, similarly motivated, which presented its case before Antonius in Syria. Messala then intervened to refute the Jewish charges, and was vigorously supported by Hyrcanus. This led to a further promotion of Phasael and Herod by Antonius. Reference to the war at Actium surfaces in the *Bellum*, so that we could be told how Herod had every intention of offering military assistance to Antonius, in what was to become a world shaping event, but was hindered from doing so because it was Antonius himself, under Cleopatra's influence, who ordered him to wage war against the Arabs.¹⁵ In all these examples we see how Roman historical events, and activities of Roman notables, serve as a backdrop for the exposition of Jewish history and its chronology. In other words, Josephus' tendency, at times, to mention Roman events and personalities without elaboration on their significance, does not indicate that he relied on the presumed knowledge of his Roman audience. Rather, he saw these details as peripheral and subsidiary. Focusing on them would not serve the purpose of the *Jewish War*, but would lead its author astray.

Indeed, Josephus says as much when discussing the events surrounding Nero's death, and the ensuing struggle for supreme power in the Roman Empire. He briefly tells us the names of three of Nero's successors, and how each of them was removed from the seat of power. He then adds that he avoided going through all these events in detail, since it would be troublesome to all (ἐπειδὴ δι' ὄχλου πᾶσιν ἐστίν). Josephus then adds that descriptions of these events had been written by many Greek and Roman authors (*BJ* 4.491-496). Here Josephus does describe events which do not touch directly upon the Jews. Yet he does so quite unwillingly, and in a cursory fashion. In other words, Josephus is far from assuming previous knowledge of these events on the part of his readers.¹⁶ Another example again touches upon Nero, though this time at the moment of his accession. Josephus summarily presents the personal characteristics of the emperor: his madness and cruelty. He then says that since (a discussion of this) would be troublesome to all (ἐπειδὴ δι' ὄχλου πᾶσιν ἐστίν), he shall turn to the events relating to the Jews that happened under Nero (*BJ* 2.250-251: τρέψομαι δὲ ἐπὶ τὰ Ἰουδαίους ... γεγόμενα). Here Josephus specifically informs us that Roman history *per se* is of secondary importance to him, and that he has no wish to enter into its particularities. His main subject is the history of his people, and it is to this subject matter that he turns with gusto, leaving the burdensome details of Roman history to others.

Despite the reservations expressed here with regard to M.'s approach to the question

¹⁵ *BJ* 1.183 (Pompey's flight); 242 (Cassius' death); 243-244 (Messala's defense); 364-365 (Actium). For M.'s discussion of these, see 92-93.

¹⁶ Similarly, the plunder of the Jerusalem Temple by Crassus, meant to finance his Parthian campaign, leads Josephus to mention that Crassus and his army perished in that expedition. Josephus refuses to give further details concerning these operations, adding merely that περὶ ὧν οὐ νῦν καιρὸς λέγειν (*BJ* 1.179).

of Josephus' intended readership, the originality of his approach is commendable. He musters his acute literary sensitivity when offering a new and original reading of the very beginning of the prologue to the *Jewish War* (1.1-3). While earlier scholars understood this passage to be a reaction of Josephus to the works of his literary competitors, already completed, M. offers an engaging interpretation, based on the fact that this section is written in the present tense. According to him, Josephus was busy collecting, writing and editing the material for his *Bellum*, at the same time that his literary rivals were similarly occupied. Josephus, however, attacks and criticizes these competitors. But how would Josephus know of their activities, asks M., if their work was as yet unfinished. M.'s reply is simple. These writers would have given copies to friends, or had extracts of their works read, and this information filtered down to Josephus by way of mutual friends. M. seems also to read into further sections of the prologue an attack by Josephus on his rivals, which he interprets as his response to criticisms which had been aired by his literary competitors. This original notion is indeed compelling (88-90), and exemplifies M.'s strengths as well as his weaknesses. His originality is apparent, but we should also look for some solid ground, to plant our feet on.

M., as we have seen, regards those Romans (Vespasian and Titus excluded) and Jews who became the owners of a copy of the *Jewish War* through their personal contact with the author as Josephus' social circle. Hannah M. Cotton and Werner Eck ('Josephus' Roman Audience: Josephus and the Roman Elites', in: *EMR*, 37-52), do not accept at face value any statement of Josephus concerning his social contacts with the Flavian family and with other Roman dignitaries. Instead, they wish to ascertain in what way, if any, Josephus was a member of the social scene in Rome. Did the Jewish historian, so C. and E. ask, 'have contacts in Rome with members of the Roman elite?' (37). Had the authors come up with a positive answer, which would go hand in hand with Josephus' own claims to his close relations with the Flavians,¹⁷ then his standing in Rome would seem to be all the more central. However, C. and E. carefully go over the benefactions, which Josephus claims to have received from Vespasian. They convincingly maintain that these imperial acts of generosity merely represent the kind of *beneficia* a Roman emperor would bestow on his clients. Thus, the historian's claim to a special relationship with the Flavian family is denied (38-40). C. and E. then turn to the main theme of their paper, and examine whether there are any indications of personal relationships between Josephus and members of the elites in Rome, following the historian's enforced move to the city in 71 CE. After initially mapping out the social scene of the elites in Rome (37-38), C. and E. then examine members of the city's elites who either had a common background with Josephus through their participation in the Judean campaigns of Vespasian and Titus, or else were likely to contact the author of the *Jewish War* because of their interest in Judaism or Jewish history. Yet none of these persons, meticulously checked by the authors, is mentioned by Josephus as having any sort of personal relationship with him while he lived at Rome.¹⁸ The nature of the testimony, or rather 'the absence of any

¹⁷ See *inter alia* Jos. *BJ* 3.392-408; 4.623-629; 5.325; 7.448-450; *Vit.* 361, 363, 414-425, 428-429; *c. Ap.* 1.48-51.

¹⁸ Note C. and E.'s conclusions regarding the lack of any evidence after 71 CE, for any personal relationship between Josephus and Roman officers who had taken part in the Judaic campaign (41-44), and Mason's diametrically opposed views (in: *SL*, 87).

evidence of ... close ties with any personage who belonged to the Roman elite class' (52) leads the authors to the conclusion that in Rome Josephus found himself in utter isolation. The one person whom we know to have been in touch with him during this period was the literary patron for his later books, the elusive Epaphroditus. C. and E. discuss the two common identifications of this man, and after rejecting Nero's *a libellis*, they cautiously support the view that he is to be identified with the Epaphroditus mentioned in the *Suda*.¹⁹ However they reject, and with good reason, the claim of this source that Epaphroditus, before being released from slavery, had been in the service of one Modestus, a *praefectus Aegypti*. Thus, the patron of Josephus is denied social standing as a *libertus* of an important Roman *equus*, and with this Josephus too is shown to be without access to the Roman elites (49-52). While many of the details in this paper are not new, as can be seen from the authors' footnotes, the strength of the paper lies in the coherent and full picture it gives of Josephus' situation in Rome. However, C. and E.'s conclusions with regard to Josephus' solitary existence in Rome are perhaps less novel as they would have us believe (52). It may be noted that more than seven decades ago it was suggested that Josephus 'had lost or broken away from his old Roman friends. He was, ... on less friendly terms, if he had not actually broken with ... King Agrippa ... Bereft of his royal patrons, Josephus sought and found another in a certain Epaphroditus'.²⁰ To be sure, there are differences between the views of Thackeray and C. and E. Whereas the former divides Josephus' stay in Rome into two periods, in only the latter of which, during Domitian's time as emperor (81-96 CE), was the historian marginalized, C. and E. define Josephus' entire stay in Rome, from 71 CE till his death, as bleak and desparate. Yet, it was Thackeray, in his description of the friendless Josephus turning to Epaphroditus, who first gave us a glimpse into the private life of Josephus in Rome.

Another attempt at the vexing problem of Josephus' intended audience for the *Jewish War* is the paper presented by Fausto Parente ('The Impotence of Titus, or Flavius Josephus' *Bellum Judaicum* as an Example of "Pathetic" Historiography', in: SL, 45-69). At the very start of his discussion, P. attempts, rather unnecessarily, to deny the *Jewish War* the title of being 'the official chronicle of the war fought by Vespasian and Titus' (46-47). While Josephus does claim, as had been mentioned above, that the first two Flavian emperors received copies of the *Bellum*, and that Titus ordered its publication, Josephus never maintains that members of the Flavian Imperial house gave preference to the version depicted in his work over the written reports of others. Similarly, the sense of competition between Josephus and other writers that one gets from reading the proemium to the *Jewish War* (*BJ* 1.1-16), suggests that there was no one work which was sanctioned by the Flavians as *the official chronicle of the war*. The whole notion may be a modern construct, which is not to say that Roman emperors, or other ancient world rulers, did not promote writers of their choosing. One may therefore proceed to P.'s discussion concerning Josephus' intended readership and the message he wished to convey to his readers.

Although P. recognizes that 'the *Bellum* took account of the Roman public', he suggests that this 'work was primarily intended for those Jews of the Diaspora who were

¹⁹ Suid. E 2004 (A. Adler [ed.], II, Stuttgart: B.G. Teubner, 1967, 334-35).

²⁰ Thackeray (n. 10), 53.

able to read Greek' (49). P. bases this statement on a passage where the Jewish historian, after dwelling at some length on the strength of the Roman army, informs his readers that his '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' (*BJ* 3.108). P. concludes that the '*Bellum* ... contains a message addressed to the Jews of the Diaspora' (49). However, the second part of Josephus' sentence does not necessarily address the Jews of the Diaspora, and may refer to all those living under Roman hegemony whom the author intended 'to provide ... with a narrative of the facts' (*BJ* 1.3). That Josephus did not have just one limited kind of readership in mind, but aimed at reaching several audiences, may be gleaned from the passage which directly follows the one discussed by P., where Josephus turns to 'any cultured readers who are unacquainted with the subject ... of the Roman army' (*BJ* 3.109). Nonetheless, such a multi-faceted audience need not rule out P.'s attempt to characterize the *Jewish War* as the author's explanation of the causes that led to the destruction of Jerusalem and its Temple.

P. reminds us that in the *Bellum* both 'God' and 'deity' side with Rome (50-51). He also raises the subject of the bandits (λησται) and reminds us that Josephus portrays them, (almost) consistently, as impious, cruel and sinful, despite the fact that they must have had some religious ideology to sustain them. P. then concludes that the accusations made against them by Josephus that they had polluted Jerusalem and the Temple, are not to be believed (51-59). It may be noted, however, that P.'s effort to clear the bandits of religious wrongdoings is somewhat militated by the fact that Josephus is not our only source to report on their sacrilegious acts. According to Tacitus, John of Gischala, using his men's offer of sacrifices as a mere pretext, gained access to the Temple mount which had been in the hands of Eleazar (son of Simon). John's men then became masters of the Temple, killing some of those present,²¹ presumably in the name of God.

P. then turns to very familiar ground, already covered by him, and studied long ago by Gedalyahu Alon, on the unreliability of Josephus' account of the burning of the Temple.²² Josephus, it will be remembered, claims repeatedly that throughout the war, Titus did his utmost to save the Temple from destruction, but was foiled by one of the Roman soldiers who set it on fire (*BJ* 6.252). P. meticulously surveys the evidence (60-66), and then goes on to ask why Josephus portrayed Titus as powerless in his efforts to save the Temple (66-67). Since P. is convinced that the *Jewish War* was written for a Jewish audience, he suggests that its author wanted to convey the message that even Titus could not prevent what has been ordained by God, namely the inevitable destruction of the Temple (67-69). P.'s solution may very well be true, but it need not be limited to Josephus' Jewish readers in the Diaspora. Josephus, when mentioning 'God' or the

²¹ *Hist.* 5.12.3-4. For the parallel report of these events, see *Jos. BJ* 5.98-105. Both sources agree that John's attack led to some killings, but whereas Tacitus implies that it was Eleazar and his men who died, Josephus states that the victims were innocent bystanders, and that Eleazar and his zealots found refuge in the Temple's underground passages.

²² G. Alon, 'The Burning of the Temple', in: *idem, Jews, Judaism and the Classical World: Studies in Jewish History in the Times of the Second Temple and Talmud*, transl. I Abrahams, Jerusalem: The Magnes Press, 1977, 252-68. This paper was originally published in Hebrew in 1939 and then reprinted posthumously in 1957, in Alon's collected papers. P. cites his own earlier article on 64, n. 42.

'deity', does not identify the divine being as Jewish. Rather, for him 'God' is left undefined, as was remarked by P. (50-51). P., however, identifies God as Jewish, because of his belief that Josephus' intended audience was almost exclusively Jewish. However, we have seen that the author of the *Bellum* had also other possible audiences in mind. They too could view the destruction of Jerusalem as originating from some divine power, not necessarily Jewish. This would go well with Josephus' own statement that the deity stood on the side of the Romans (*BJ* 5.412). Thus, the historian's non-Jewish readers were meant to be impressed with the invincibility of Rome. Furthermore, Titus' own attitude towards Jerusalem, as portrayed by Josephus, was designed to instill in them respect and sympathy for the author's compatriots.

Whereas Titus' inability to save the Temple induces P. to look for Josephus' motivation in describing Vespasian's heir in such a way, James S. McLaren focuses his gaze on all of Titus' military failures ('Josephus on Titus: The Vanquished Writing about the Victor', in: *SL*, 279-95). M. concedes that there is 'a positive dimension to the portrayal of Titus ... in Josephus' *Bellum Judaicum*' (279), but claims that the Jewish historian included negative elements intended to subvert Titus' image. M. first surveys scholarly views on Josephus, unanimous in viewing Josephus' characterization of Titus as extremely favourable. He then depicts Titus' *persona* in the *Jewish War* (280-281), and stresses the need to examine and evaluate Titus' record as a military leader, and 'to determine how Josephus' presentation of Titus as a commander interacts with existing Roman notions of good commanders' (282). M.'s subject has been relatively neglected by previous scholars, and he is to be commended for focusing on it. However, there is a fundamental flaw in his argumentation. For the chinks in Titus' armour, depicted by the author (282-87), are part and parcel of another of Josephus' aims when writing the *Bellum*. The Jewish historian sought to describe a war which was the 'greatest not only of ... our own time, but, ... well nigh of all that ever broke out between cities or nations' (*BJ* 1.1). Furthermore, Josephus criticizes some of his fellow historians for having no respect 'for the prestige of the generals, who, after such herculean labours under the walls of Jerusalem, are, ... of no repute in these writers' eyes, if their achievement is to be underestimated' (*BJ* 1.8). There can be little doubt that Josephus, when writing here of the generals around Jerusalem (τῶν στρατηγῶν, οἳ πολλὰ περὶ τοῖς Ἱεροσολύμοις ἰδρώσαντες) was referring foremost to Titus. Had Josephus portrayed the Roman campaign against the Jews in general, and Titus' siege of Jerusalem in particular, as a series of unabated Roman successes, he would have undermined his own intention of representing the war as a great one, and of giving Titus due credit for overcoming an awesome enemy. Roman setbacks and demonstration of Jewish bravery were an essential component of Josephus' description of the changing fortunes of war, so that the use of such setbacks as a clue to Josephus' attempt to subvert Roman favorable views concerning Titus seems unconvincing. Furthermore, M. was able to find only one instance where it can be said that the Jewish historian assigned direct responsibility for Roman failure to Titus (*BJ* 5.331-341). In this instance, Josephus' criticism of Titus' inability to secure the breach of the second wall of Jerusalem is diluted by the historian's stress on another important aspect of Titus' *persona*, his clemency. The emperor's son, we are told, sought to save the people of Jerusalem from harm to their persons, as well as to their possessions. His aim was to save the city for himself, and to save the Temple for the city. Typically, this scene of a Roman setback ends with Titus himself providing cover for his retreating

soldiers until they all reach safety. The picture is very much the same in other scenes where M. (but not Josephus) assigns temporary reversals of Roman fortunes to Titus' lack of organizational skills.²³ Each of these episodes ends with Titus saving the day.²⁴ Thus, the temporary failures during the construction of siege works are meant in fact to highlight Titus' tactical skills, his reckless daring, the calming effect of his authority on the troops and the devotion which they felt towards their supreme commander. Finally, M. points to the many references made by Josephus to the valour of Titus and to his tendency to place himself in the midst of the battle, without consideration for his own safety (281, 287). He sees this as underhand criticism of Titus, whose foremost duty was not to 'become directly involved in the actual fighting' (284). However, Titus' behaviour in the face of battle, his personal involvement in the fighting, and his disregard for his own safety seem part of his public image, as is evidenced not just by Josephus, but also by Roman sources.²⁵

Whether one accepts or rejects the suggestion of M. that Titus was subtly criticized by Josephus for his military failings, there can be no doubt that ultimately he, along with his father, emerged victorious from their confrontation with the Jews, and had to form and implement some new policies towards the vanquished. James Rives ('Flavian Religious Policy and the Destruction of the Jerusalem Temple', in: EMR, 145-66), seeks to ascertain whether Rome's attitude towards the Jews, as expressed by the leveling of the Jerusalem Temple and subsequent activities, reveals a coherent religious policy on the part of Vespasian towards the Jews. Naturally, the question of whether Titus deliberately destroyed the Temple, again comes to the foreground. R. offers a well-read and balanced survey of the problem, and suggests that while the fate of the Temple and the Jewish cult may not have been sealed in advance, the Romans must have seen that the suppression of the Jewish Revolt could lead to its destruction (146-51). While R. is reluctant to find in the levelling of the Temple in 70 CE an indication of a Flavian religious policy towards the Jews, he proposes that such a policy came into being by the following year when Vespasian imposed on the Jews a tax of two drachmas to be paid to Jupiter Capitolinus. This payment was to replace the contribution which the Jews had traditionally made to the Temple prior to its destruction.²⁶ That Vespasian's command had religious implications, and not just financial ones, cannot be denied. The Jews were forced, willy nilly, to recognize the chief Roman deity, even if they were not compelled to join his cult actively. Similarly, the presentation of the spoils from the Temple in the triumph of Vespasian and Titus and the subsequent placement of most of them in the *Templum Pacis* (BJ 7.148-150, 158-162), must have suggested finality. R. sees in the closing of the Temple of Onias in Egypt in 73 CE (BJ. 7.421, 433-435) a further sign of Vespasian's resolve to terminate the 'Jewish sacrificial cult' (152-54). He is well aware however, that no other measures against the Jewish religion had been initiated by

²³ See BJ 5.67-84, 275-287, 291-295, 479-485, referred to by M. on 286.

²⁴ See BJ 5.81-82, 84-97, 287-288, 295, 486-489. M. refers to many of these instances on 281.

²⁵ Suet. *Tit.* 4.3 (quoted by M. on 289), 5.2 (paraphrased by Eutropius, *Breviarium ab Urbe Condita* 7.21.2); Dio Cass. 66.5.1. Cf. V. Fl. 1.13-14.

²⁶ Dio Cass. 66.7.2. Josephus BJ 7.218, ignores the deity, saying only that the tax was paid to the Capitolium. Presumably, he sought to minimize the religious aspect of Vespasian's order.

Vespasian. Jews continued to observe their religious practices within the family circle as well as within their local communities. One cannot find here an attempt by the ruling Flavian family to wipe out Judaism as such. In fact, R. argues that a man of Vespasian's background would not have regarded Judaism as an entity but as 'several overlapping sets of terms' (157). The Temple cult was only one of these sets, along with Jewish customs and philosophical positions. R. uses these sets to explain why Flavian policy would have been directed against one aspect of Judaism and not another, but these sets simply stem from what we know of Greek and Roman attitudes towards Jews and Judaism. This is circular reasoning. R. then turns to the Temple cult in Jerusalem and equates it with the civic cult, since both took place in a public area, and were financed by public money. However, the Temple cult in Jerusalem was attended by Jews from Judea and the Diaspora alike. The civic cult of Jerusalem, as R. defines it, was anomalous because it united Jews from the inhabited world and beyond, thus forming a single 'shadow *civitas*'. This picture, admitted by R. to be 'rather speculative', would have been seen by Vespasian as posing an alternative for Rome, 'whose "citizens" ... were scattered throughout the empire' (163). Thus Vespasian's attack on the civic cult aspect of Judaism can be seen as a response to the threat posed to Rome by a Jewish *civitas* which knew no boundaries. One objection to R.'s highly original solution can rest on his own words. We do not know what Vespasian's picture of Judaism or Judaisms was, and whether he regarded the Temple cult in Jerusalem as civic. Another obstacle is Vespasian's treatment of the Jewish Temple in Leontopolis. This Temple was not a focus of religious beliefs, pilgrimage and monetary donations for the Jews of the Diaspora and Judea. It is quite doubtful that it even served such purposes for local Egyptian Jewry.²⁷ Vespasian's closing of that temple cannot be explained by R.'s theory, unless one assumes that the Roman emperor was willing to ascribe, contrary to reality, a centrality to that remote temple in Egypt, similar to the one that the Jerusalem Temple enjoyed until 70 CE.

Martin Goodman ('The *Fiscus Iudaicus* and Gentile Attitudes to Judaism in Flavian Rome', in: EMR, 167-77), like Rives, takes stock of the measures of Vespasian and Titus against the Jewish cult, starting with the destruction of the Jerusalem Temple. He comes to the rather sweeping conclusion that 'the Flavian State had brought Jewish worship to an end', and that this was how 'ordinary pagans' would have 'interpreted ... the end of worship of the Jewish God' (170). Such an assessment serves his attempt to overturn the accepted view that during the time of Domitian there was 'widespread adoption of Jewish customs by non-Jews in Flavian Rome' (169), most notably by members of the emperor's own family. However, claims G., if Judaism had reached such a low point after the razing of the Temple and the punitive measures which followed it,

²⁷ See V. Tcherikover, *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews*, Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1959, 277-80; J. Méléze Modrzejewski, *The Jews of Egypt*, Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 1995, 128. E.S. Gruen, 'The Origins and Objectives of Onias' Temple', *SCI* 16 (1997), 58-70, claims that this temple was designed 'to minister to the spiritual needs of all Egyptian Jews' (60). Even if that had been the original purpose of the temple's founder, there is not a shred of evidence that this goal was ever achieved. Gruen, whose main objective is to prove that Onias' Temple was not a schismatic establishment, states in this article, as well as in *Diaspora*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002, 250, that the Jews there recognized 'the ascendancy of Jerusalem'.

then the logic of adopting Jewish tenets and customs in part, or in full, becomes unacceptable. One cannot deny the rationale of G.'s argument, but it is questionable whether matters of faith have much to do with logic. Furthermore, in his discussion of the literary evidence pertaining to the question of non-Jews adopting Jewish ways in the Flavian era, G. neglects to mention an epigram of Martial, written in the midst of the Domitian years, in 88 CE. Martial names unpleasant odours which are preferable to the smell of the woman Bassa, including the smell of fasting Sabbatarian women (*ieiunia sabbatariarum*), i.e. women who keep the Sabbath (which was often perceived by non-Jewish authors to entail fasting). It may be argued that these Sabbath keeping fasting women are not Jewish, but sympathizers of Judaism.²⁸ Another piece of evidence probably pertaining to the time of Domitian, is that of Josephus Flavius, who claims that 'the masses have long since shown a keen desire to adopt our religious observances; and there is not one city, Greek or barbarian, nor a single nation, to which our custom of abstaining from work on the seventh day has not spread, and where the fasts and the lighting of lamps and many of our prohibitions in the matter of food are not observed' (*c. Ap.* 2.282). Josephus' observation indicates then, that 'ordinary pagans' were far from deducing 'the end of worship of the Jewish God' from the destruction of the Temple. He also stresses the ubiquitousness of the phenomenon, and while he may have exaggerated, he must have known the situation in Rome, his place of residence.²⁹ Tacitus, when writing his digression on the origins and the *mores* of the Jews, saw the *supremum diem* of Jerusalem (70 CE), as a boundary stone from which his description would go backward in time (*Hist.* 5.2.1). However, at least one noted scholar maintained that Tacitus, when writing on the Jewish proselytes (5.5.1-2), must have been influenced by the popularity of Judaism at that time,³⁰ close to the end of the first decade of the second century CE. But if proselytes were present in Rome during the reign of Trajan (98-117 CE), then the weaker form of attraction to Judaism by Judaizers, must have also existed. The rule of Trajan is seen by G. as a time when 'the Flavian view of the Jews as intrinsically anti-Roman was echoed ..., most strikingly ... by Tacitus himself [*Hist.* 5.1-10]' (177). Such feelings would only have intensified during the years of the *tumultus Iudaicus* (115-117 CE) when the Jews of the eastern Mediterranean rebelled against the Roman Empire, while those of Mesopotamia refused to accept its sovereignty. It was left to Hadrian,

²⁸ Mart. 4.4.7 (*GLAJJ*, I, No. 239). This is implied by the editor of *GLAJJ*, M. Stern, in his discussion of the epigram, I, 524, when speaking of 'the special attraction that the Jewish religion had for women'. The references supplied by him (*Jos. BJ* 2.560; *Act. Ap.* 13.50) reinforce this. However, D.R. Shackleton-Bailey in his translation ('the Sabbath fastings of Jewish women'), and D.S. Barrett, 'Martial, Jews and circumcision', *LCM* 9.3 (1984), 42-43, assume, without further ado, that the women are in fact Jewish.

²⁹ The dating of the *contra Apionem* to the years 94-96 BCE is probable, although it may be pushed to either the reign of Nerva, or that of Trajan; cf. Barclay (n. 1), xxvi-xxviii. But even if we adopt a later date, the difficulties to G.'s thesis remain, and see our discussion below.

³⁰ See in the unannotated English translation and adaptation of Yochanan (Hans) Lewy's paper, 'Tacitus on the Jews', in: *Binah: Studies in Jewish History* 1 (1989), 31-34. For the original Hebrew version, see H. Lewy, 'Tacitus on the Origin and Manners of the Jews', *Zion* 8.1 (1942), 32-34, reprinted in *idem, Studies in Jewish Hellenism*, Jerusalem 1960, 157-61.

Trajan's heir, to quash the Jewish rebellions. If one accepts G.'s argument that the Trajanic period was as anti-Jewish as the Flavian era, and therefore equally unlikely to host a movement of Romans towards Judaism, and if his logic is extended to Hadrian's reign, then we are left with a difficult problem. When did the proselytes referred to by Tacitus, and the god-fearers, whom Juvenal (writing under Trajan and Hadrian [117-138 CE]) mentions,³¹ come into being? To assume that they all resurfaced during the barely seventeen month period when the tolerant Nerva (96-98 CE) held power (175-76), would be unwise. It would seem therefore, that the grim results of the great Jewish revolt did not put an end to the phenomena of sympathizers to Judaism or proselytes.

Among the more direct results of the Roman victory over the Jews was the decision of Vespasian to celebrate a *triumphus*. Barbara Eberhardt offers a detailed theologically-oriented analysis of Josephus' description of this procession (*BJ* 7.123-157),³² which she compares with the reliefs of the (surviving) Arch of Titus ('Wer dient wem? Die Darstellung des Flavischen Triumphzuges auf dem Titusbogen und bei Josephus', in: *SL*, 257-77). In her discussion of the arch, E. identifies several deities in both the 'Triumphator' and the 'Spoils' reliefs,³³ whose roles she interprets as secondary. The main purpose of the gods and goddesses in the monument is to glorify the main figure, the deified Titus (262-68). Turning to Josephus' description of the triumph, E. notes that he mentions various gods and the performance of religious rites by Vespasian and Titus. E. favours the sensible view that Josephus aims at presenting the emperor and his son as being merely loyal to Roman 'ancestral laws', and does not betray any sympathy towards Roman religious practices. E. also attempts to attach contradictory meanings to the reliefs on the Arch of Titus and to Josephus' description of the triumph. On the arch, Titus is the dominant figure, while in Josephus' text, Vespasian is a tool in the hands of the Lord. Here E. throws all (academic) caution to the winds. She notes that once the *Templum Pacis* was consecrated (75 CE), the emperor ordered 'their Law and the purple hangings of the sanctuary ... to be deposited and kept (φυλάττειν) in the palace' (*BJ* 7.162). E. suggests that Josephus' use of the verb φυλάττειν is not accidental and draws attention to God's command to the people of Israel to hear him and to obey his words.³⁴ In the biblical text, the second verb has the meaning 'to obey', and although this verb is translated as φύλαξαι in the Septuagint, I can see no connection between the two texts. E.'s conclusion that Vespasian is assigned by Josephus the role of safekeeping the Torah and the hangings of the sanctuary, and consequently safeguarding Jewish religion for the future, seems fanciful (268-77).

Fergus Millar uses Josephus' description of the triumph as an opening to a discussion of the course of the *Sacra Via* and the building activity of the Flavians along that road ('Last Year in Jerusalem: Monuments of the Jewish War in Rome', in: *EMR*, 101-28).

³¹ Juv. 14.96-106 (*GLAJJ*, II, No. 301).

³² For another analysis of Josephus' text, see M. Beard, 'The Triumph of Flavius Josephus', in: *Flavian Rome: Culture, Image, Text* (A.J. Boyle and W.J. Dominik [eds.]), Leiden: Brill, 2003, 543-58.

³³ E.'s discussions would have profited from accompanying photographs or drawings of the two reliefs. These can be found in Boyle and Dominik (n. 32), Figures 25, 43-45.

³⁴ Deut 6.3: ושמעת ישראל ושמרת. The LXX offers the following: καὶ ἄκουσον, Ἰσραηλ, καὶ φύλαξαι

M. stresses that the Jewish revolt was ‘a major event in Roman military history’ (101), thereby indirectly supporting Josephus’ claim that ‘the war of the Jews against the Romans (was) the greatest not only of the wars of our own time...’ (*BJ* 1.1). From a Roman point of view, the importance of the war was enhanced because it served as a backdrop for the rise of a new imperial dynasty — the Flavians. They, and the founder of the dynasty in particular, had to contend with their relatively humble social origins which must have been measured against those of the Julio-Claudian family. Furthermore, the successive members of the earlier dynasty, and most prominently the last of them, Nero, had left their mark on Rome’s physical appearance. M. sets out to show us how Vespasian and his two sons, Titus and Domitian, celebrated the victory over the Jews through the construction of four major edifices, the Temple of Peace, the two Arches of Titus and the Colosseum, thus seeking to publicize their achievements and benefactions, and to denigrate those of Nero. But the building activity of the Flavian emperors, so M. argues, also left a lasting, and perhaps unintentional imprint on the physical appearance of ancient, and modern, Rome. For the two Arches of Titus (or rather, the arches dedicated to him) placed along the triumphal route, influenced later emperors to add their own architectural stamp along that very route. M.’s discussion of these constructions (of which two still stand today), should serve as a model in the use and analysis of variegated data: literary, epigraphic, pictorial as well as geographical and topographical. While the reader may, at times, find M.’s painstaking analysis somewhat taxing, the end result is of such brilliance, that but for the modest size of his study, it could have been termed as truly monumental.

Another article concerned with the effects of the Jewish War is that of T.D. Barnes (‘The Sack of the Temple in Josephus and Tacitus’, in: *EMR*, 129-44). B. deals with the way the story of Titus’ victory over the Jews and his treatment of their temple was disseminated by the court historians of the Flavian period. He dismisses, quite rightly, the possibility that Josephus’ version of the destruction of the Jewish Temple in 70 CE was accurate. Josephus claimed that Titus, after convening a council composed of his lieutenants, had imposed on them to spare the Temple at all costs (*BJ* 6.236-243). Sulpicius Severus also mentions a meeting attended by Titus and his chief officers, but his Titus specifically ordered the destruction of the Temple (*Chron.* 2.30.6-7, Halm). For B., as for Jacob Bernays, this passage reflects the substance of what Tacitus wrote in the lost portion of book 5 of his *Histories* concerning Titus’ policy towards the Jerusalem Temple.³⁵ B. is obviously in favour of ‘Tacitus’ version’ (as he terms it on 143), and stresses the contradiction between the two reports. He notes the similarity between Tacitus’ description of the events leading to the appropriation of supreme power by Vespasian and his arrival at Rome in the autumn of 70 CE and Josephus’ account, and suggests that both writers used the Elder Pliny’s lost *History* as their source, as did Plutarch for his *Galba* and *Otho* (136-38, 140-42). For B. then, ‘Tacitus’ version’ mirrors Pliny’s lost historical work, and since Pliny died two months to the day after Vespasian, his work would have reflected the history of Vespasian’s reign. Josephus, on the other, completed

³⁵ J. Bernays, *Ueber die Chronik des Sulpicius Severus*, Berlin: W. Hertz, 1861, 48-61 = *idem*, *Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, H. Usener (ed.), II, Berlin: W. Hertz, 1885, 159-81; repr. Hildesheim: G. Olms, II, 1971, 159-81; T.D. Barnes, ‘The Fragments of Tacitus’ *Histories*’, *CPh* 72 (1977) 225-28; and 133-35 of his article, here reviewed.

Books 1-6 of the *Jewish War* while Titus was emperor, and his report on Titus' efforts to save the Temple stems from that period (139-40, 143-44). B.'s article covers a series of variegated issues, all of which are dealt with authoritatively and with clarity of style. Yet there is a sense of rigidity there. He promotes the view that there were 'three successive "Flavian versions" of ... (what happened) in 69/70'. Each of these phases began when one of the three Flavian emperors became sole ruler (144). Such a theory not only ignores the possibility that important events within each reign may have affected Roman views on the destruction of the Jerusalem Temple, but it also overlooks the fact that Vespasian, as heads of dynasties are prone to do, assigned various roles to his two sons. Thus, both Titus and Domitian appear on Vespasian's coinage, and Domitian is not absent from the coins minted by his elder brother.³⁶ There is no reason to believe that the Roman writers active in the years 70-79 were unaware of the proximity of Titus, and to a lesser degree of Domitian, to the emperor, and the same applies to Domitian's relations with his brother for the years 79-81.³⁷ Therefore we need not follow B. when he claims that Books 1-6 of the *Jewish War* were written while Titus was emperor (139-40).³⁸ One of his reasons for doing so is that Titus, but not Vespasian, is mentioned in the preface to this work (1.10). But the father was not present in Jerusalem for the destruction of the Temple and the sacking of the city — the high point of the war in Roman eyes. Nor should we forget that Pliny dedicated his *Naturalis Historiae* to Titus, and not to the reigning emperor (*praef.* 3). Titus' combined powers under Vespasian were so extensive that a recent biographer of Vespasian has defined the son's standing as that of a co-regent.³⁹ One need not assume, as B. does, that Titus' order to publish Josephus' books (*Vit.* 363) could have happened only after the death of Vespasian. Similarly, the favourable depiction of Domitian by Josephus (*BJ* 7.85-88) may simply be the result of Josephus' sense of self preservation.⁴⁰ Titus, after all, had no sons who might continue

³⁶ See e.g. H. Mattingly, *Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum*, II. *Vespasian to Domitian*, London: The Trustees of the British Museum, 1966 (reprint), 1, No. 1; 22, No. 111; 23, No. 121; 237, No. 83.

³⁷ For such an approach to Titus, during Vespasian's reign, see Z. Yavetz, 'Reflections on Titus and Josephus', *GRBS* 16 (1975) 411-32.

³⁸ C.P. Jones, 'Towards a Chronology of Josephus', *SCI* 21 (2002) 113-14, 120, maintains that several books of the *Jewish War* were finished before Vespasian's death, but the whole work was completed only by 81. Jones' inclination to defer the completion of the *Bellum* to the reign of Titus rests, in part, on Josephus' pejorative remark concerning A. Caecina Alienus (*BJ* 4.644). This must have been occasioned by Caecina's removal, orchestrated by Titus (Suet. *Tit.* 6.2; Dio Cass. 66.16.3 [Xiphilinus]; *Epit. de Caes.* 10.4). Caecina's murder was thought to have happened in 79, but the date of 78 is now favoured by B. who realizes, despite his inclination to set a late date for the *Bellum*, that the earlier date for the assassination of Caecina allows the possibility that the *Jewish War* was completed in Vespasian's reign (137-39).

³⁹ B. Levick, *Vespasian*, London: Routledge, 1999, 184-88 (co-regent on 187). Note the excessive language used to describe Titus' standing in his father's lifetime: Suet. *Tit.* 6.1; Philostr. *Vita Apolonii* 6.30.1. Although these sources are late, Josephus' own exaggerations with regard to Titus are consistent with that picture. See *BJ* 5.88; 6.341, *contra* B.'s discussion (139-40).

⁴⁰ Levick (n. 39), 191.

the Flavian line. As mentioned above, B.'s belief in Bernays' characterization of the Sulpicius Severus passage as reflecting Tacitus' lost portion of Book 5 of the *Histories*, is absolute. While Bernays did demonstrate that Severus used Tacitus' *Annals* when discussing the reign of Nero,⁴¹ this does not necessarily prove that the *Histories* were also accessible to him. In 1977, B. suggested that *Chron.* 2.30.1-3a, which summarizes the short careers of Galba, Otho and Vitellius 'appears to be based on the first four books of the *Histories*'.⁴² The claim is not repeated in the present article, and may in fact be militated against by his present contention that 'Josephus' account of these events has ... similarities to Tacitus' *Histories*' (136). In other words, Severus' ultimate source for the events of 69-70 CE, may have been Josephus, not Tacitus.⁴³ This seems preferable in light of the fact that *Chron.* 2.30.3b-5 supplies us with a description of the Roman occupation of Jerusalem and with the number of those killed in the city (1,100,000), and those taken prisoner there (100,000; *Chron.* 2.30.5). These figures go back to Josephus, perhaps through Eusebius, and amount to twice the number for the entire besieged population in Jerusalem as supplied by Tacitus.⁴⁴ Since Severus' account of the debate on the fate of the Temple follows immediately upon this passage, it is like that his Temple discussion was influenced by Josephus as well, but re-worked for a Christian audience. Furthermore, proof that Severus made use of the *Histories* is still lacking, and there is no firm evidence for the use of a common source, the Elder Pliny, by Tacitus, Josephus and Plutarch. That Flavian source, like others of the same period (Antonius Julianus comes to mind) has disappeared, and some of the similarities between Tacitus and Josephus, stressed by B., may be explained by the fact that they narrate the same events. Other similarities may be a result of a shared Flavian tradition, for which there was more than one source. These reservations do not diminish my admiration for B.'s paper. In the end he may still be right.

It is perhaps impossible, and certainly unfair, to characterize the two volumes reviewed here. But it may be said with certainty that what has contributed to the success of both is the joint participation of scholars whose main focus of interest is Josephus and his writings, with others who are able to cast a new light on this subject precisely because they come from other fields.

Ben-Gurion University of the Negev

⁴¹ See Bernays (n. 35) 53-55 (of the original publication); recapitulated by Barnes (n. 35), 226.

⁴² Barnes (n. 35), 226.

⁴³ *BJ* 4.491-495, 545-549, 630-655; Eusebius, *Chron.* 186 (Helm); Tac. *Hist.* 1.4.2, 27.1-47.2, 56.2-57.2; 2.41.2-49.3, 79.1-80.1, 89.1-90.2; 3.82.2-85; 4.6.3.

⁴⁴ *BJ* 6.420; Eusebius, *Chron.* 187 (Helm); Tac. *Hist.* 5.13.3.