Gottfried Mader

Josephus & the Politics of Historiography

Apologetic & Impression Management in the Bellum Judaicum

BRILL

JOSEPHUS AND THE POLITICS OF HISTORIOGRAPHY

MNEMOSYNE

BIBLIOTHECA CLASSICA BATAVA

COLLEGERUNT

H. PINKSTER • H. W. PLEKET

C. J. RUIJGH • D. M. SCHENKEVELD • P. H. SCHRIJVERS

BIBLIOTHECAE FASCICULOS EDENDOS CURAVIT

C. J. RUIJGH, KLASSIEK SEMINARIUM, OUDE TURFMARKT 129, AMSTERDAM

SUPPLEMENTUM DUCENTESIMUM QUINTUM

GOTTFRIED MADER

JOSEPHUS AND THE POLITICS OF HISTORIOGRAPHY

JOSEPHUS AND THE POLITICS OF HISTORIOGRAPHY

APOLOGETIC AND IMPRESSION MANAGEMENT IN THE *BELLUM JUDAICUM*

BY

GOTTFRIED MADER

BRILL
LEIDEN · BOSTON · KÖLN
2000

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Mader, Gottfried.
Josephus and the politics of historiography : apologetic and impression management in the Bellum Judaicum / by Gottfried Mader.
p. cm. — (Mnemosyne, bibliotheca classica Batava. Supplementum, ISSN 0169-8958; 205)
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 9004114467 (cloth : alk. paper)
1. Josephus, Flavius. De bello Judaico. 2. Jews—History—Rebellion, 66-73—Historiography. I. Title. II. Series.
DS122.8.J83 M33 2000
933'.007'202—dc21 00–022449
CIP

Die Deutsche Bibliothek - CIP-Einheitsaufnahme

[Mnemosyne / Supplementum]
Mnemosyne : bibliotheca classica Batava. Supplementum. – Leiden ; Boston ; Köln : Brill
Früher Schriftenreihe
Teilw. u.d.T.: Mnemosyne / Supplements
Reihe Supplementum zu: Mnemosyne
205. Mader, Gottfried: Josephus and the politics of historiography – 2000

Mader, Gottfried:
Josephus and the politics of historiography : apologetic and impression management in the Bellum Judaicum / by Gottfried Mader. – Leiden ; Boston ; Köln : Brill, 2000
(Mnemosyne : Supplementum ; 205)
ISBN 90–04–11446–7

ISSN 0169-8958
ISBN 90 04 11446 7

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is a pleasant duty to record various debts of gratitude incurred during the writing of this essay. Professor Mireille Hadas-Lebel (Paris) responded to queries and kindly sent me materials to which I would not otherwise have had access. For hospitality, encouragement and valuable suggestions on repeated occasions I wish to thank Professors Klaus Rosen and Otto Zwierlein (Bonn), Franz Römer (Vienna) and Gerhard Petersmann (Salzburg); a substantial part of my work on Josephus was done at their institutes, which provided a congenial environment for reflection and writing. The usual disclaimers apply. Several visits to these centres were made possible by generous research funding from the University of South Africa, for which I express my sincere thanks. The Centre for Science Development (HSRC, South Africa) also contributed in part towards my travel costs on my last visit in 1998.

Pretoria GOTTFRIED MADER
August 1999

This page intentionally left blank

PREFACE

Commentators on Josephus widely agree that the present form of *Bellum Judaicum* presupposes a substantial Greco-Roman influence, but such claims often rest on little more than broad generalizations or inventories of lexical and thematic parallels. And from here it is just a short step to the dubious conclusion that the classical features in *BJ* are simply a matter of style or superficial *ornatus*. One reason, no doubt, for this lack of critical interest in Josephus' use of his classical predecessors and his adaptation of generic conventions is the traditional bias of Josephan research, which has tended to emphasize the theological, historical and political aspects over questions of composition, literary artistry and intellectual affiliation. But the works that have 'traditionally been a hunting-ground for theologians' (Rajak [1983] 79) are much more than that, and it has well been remarked that 'the time has come to realize that Josephus' works contain more than what theologians sought therein: secular history prevails over sacred history' (Hadas-Lebel [1994] 106). And secular history is related to the question of secular historiography. It is time to reconceptualize the question of Josephus' intellectual affiliation to his classical predecessors and to the νόμοι τῆς ἱστορίας, to consider the work's classical and generic features in other than just formal-stylistic terms, and to pay closer attention to the neglected literary, artistic and structural aspects of *BJ*.

The main thesis of this essay is that there is a demonstrable correlation between Josephus' use of classical themes and generic conventions on the one hand, and his tendentious interpretation of the Jewish revolt on the other—between his historiographical method, that is, and his political agenda. Both areas have indeed long been recognized as significant issues in their own right, but have traditionally been treated apart from each other. I argue instead that they are not only closely interconnected, but that each can be better understood when they are analysed in tandem and as a conscious reciprocity. At the intersection of these two lines, it is proposed, we can get a clearer picture of the historian who stands intellectually between Jerusalem and Rome.

In an attempt to do justice to a question of this complexity, each chapter consciously takes a different perspective and approach. The first surveys recent opinion on Josephus' relationship to classical historiography, reviews his treatment of the Jewish insurgents, and then suggests how these

two areas might be connected. The next three chapters explore in some detail various aspects of this interrelationship: the unifying theme here is that the classical elements and generic conventions in *BJ* are not incidental or formal by-products of Josephus' decision to produce a historical work in Greek, but were consciously included to convey a particular interpretation of the war to an audience familiar with the νόμοι τῆς ἱστορίας programmatically invoked in the work's preface; formal and presentational aspects, that is, persuasively reinforce the partisan view urged by Josephus. In chapter 2, a (non-sequential) selection of representative passages is analysed to demonstrate how Josephus in a typical style of argumentation incorporates motifs of Greco-Roman provenance for their polemical-apologetic effect, exploiting this affiliation to give his hostile treatment of the Jewish insurgents the veneer of 'scientific' analysis in the manner of his predecessors. Chapter 3 continues this line in a different way: here I offer a running commentary on *BJ* 4.121-282 (the outbreak of *stasis* in Jerusalem, and perhaps the most consistently polemical section in the whole work), paying attention to the Thucydidean strands and how they are woven into the intellectual design of the Jerusalem narrative. Josephus' reception and adaptation of Thucydidean impulses, it is argued, is both more extensive and far more subtle than commentators have generally recognized; most notably his penetrating analysis of conceptual confusion and political semanticide, one of the most effective instruments of polemic in *BJ*, is demonstrably inspired (and legitimated) by the celebrated Corcyrean excursus of Thucydides. Chapter 4 again takes a different perspective, looking now at the generic background and contextual function of three thematic complexes (the *aristeiai*, sacrilege and cannibalism). The final chapter draws together the strands of the argument by considering briefly Josephus' strategy of genre-mediated persuasion in relation to the expectations and assumptions of his ancient readers.

Unless otherwise indicated, the Greek text used is that of MICHEL-BAUERNFEIND (see bibliography). References to this edition are in two forms: either 'MICHEL-BAUERNFEIND 6 n. 34' (= their note 34 to *BJ* 6); or, when the reference is not to a particular note, by volume and page number. English translations of Josephus are adapted from the Loeb and Penguin editions (see bibliography).

For reasons of space, secondary literature in the footnotes is referred to only by author's name and date, with full citations appearing in the bibliography.

CHAPTER ONE

MEANS AND ENDS

> Πολλά... ἐστὶν ἃ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἐνίους ἀναγκάζει τὰ ψευδῆ λέγειν εἰς τὸ χρήσιμον ἀποβλέποντας.
>
> LUCIAN, *Philopseudes* 1.

> Give me the facts, Ashley, and I will twist them the way I want to suit my argument.
>
> M. ASHLEY, *Churchill as Historian* (1968) 18.

> From one who boasted so proudly of his own achievements in the art of deception we should hardly expect a high standard of objectivity.
>
> G.A. WILLIAMSON (trans.), Josephus, *The Jewish War* (1959) introduction.

1. *Premise*

Bluff, ambivalence and expediency (with cognates) are notions likely to appear frequently in any account of the enigmatic Flavius Josephus. Even a cursory reading of *Bellum Judaicum* will give a fair impression of Ἰώσηπος πολύμητις: clever ruses and a good knowledge of human nature saved his skin in Galilee (2.595-613, 635-646), where he proved more than a match for his slippery rival John of Gischala (2.620-628); bluff was used to good psychological effect during the siege of Jotapata (3.186-189); when the town fell to the Romans, Josephus duly managed to evade the death-pact he himself had proposed (3.387-391); and after his capture by the Romans, the famous prediction about Vespasian (3.399-402) proved no less useful to himself than to the future emperor. The self-serving and self-preserving political opportunism of this Janus-like figure does not call for further recital here. His credibility as historian has suffered accordingly, with sentiments like those of WILLIAMSON in the quotation above not uncommon in the secondary literature. The dictum on style and the man comes easily to mind at this point: *talis hominibus fuit oratio qualis vita.* The author of a distinguished study on Josephus, rejecting the extreme view of *BJ* as 'a tissue of lies', suggests that 'it is probably only the fact that Josephus was seen as a traitor which has made it at all possible to envisage

him as the author of so great a lie'.[1] But granted that the reciprocity traitor/liar can no doubt be pushed too far, it should not be rejected out of hand: with reference to the work's apologetic and polemical tendencies, I shall argue, Josephus is not beyond reproach, and here indeed *BJ* is a continuation of his politics in a different medium.

The literary dimension of his polemical and apologetic strategy comes out clearly in his reception, or better in his *use*, of the classical historians, which is a far more subtle, eclectic and calculating matter than is usually supposed. Attempts to situate him in the tradition of Greek historiography begin typically with the formal programmatic elements in his preface, and turn for additional criteria to the ancient treatises on historical writing[2]—yet in relation to his observable historiographic practice, Josephus' proemial declarations not only give a misleading picture of what he is really up to, but also a rather distorted impression of his relationship to his Greek predecessors. The theoretical and programmatic statements in *BJ* arguably raise many more issues than they ostensibly clarify.

In the preface to *BJ*, as again at 5.19-20, Josephus acknowledges the conventions of Greek historiography (τὸν τῆς ἱστορίας νόμον, 1.11 ≈ τῷ νόμῳ τῆς γραφῆς, 5.20) with its rigorous insistence on truthful reporting (τιμάσθω δὴ παρ' ἡμῖν τὸ τῆς ἱστορίας ἀληθές, 1.16 ≈ περὶ τῆς ἀληθείας δὲ οὐκ ἂν ὀκνήσαιμι θαρρῶν λέγειν, ὅτι μόνης ταύτης παρὰ πᾶσαν τὴν ἀναγραφὴν ἐστοχασάμην, 7.455);[3] but equally he draws explicit attention to the lamentation which is a characteristic motif in *BJ* (ἐπολοφύρεσθαι, 1.9 and ὀλοφύρσεις, 1.12 ≈ ὀλοφυρμῶν οἰκείων, 5.20). The two strands—as he himself acknowledges—coexist in uneasy tension (1.12 ≈ 5.20). The dissonance is especially perceptible (and problematical) when Josephus' ὀλοφύρσεις, formally related to the literary tradition of Jeremianic lamentation,[4] blend into polemical strictures against the τύραννοι: 'Seine Klage [wird] zur Anklage (κατηγορικῶς λέγειν, 1.11) seiner politischen

---

[1] Rajak (1983) 106 (with her n. 3 for some of the extremer interpretations she rejects).

[2] Thus (e.g.) Collomp (1947); Herkommer (1968) *passim* (see his index *s.v.* 'Iosephus Flavius'); Attridge (1976) 44-51; Van Unnik (1978) 26-40; Bomstad (1979) 58-74; Thérond (1979) 203-215; Villalba I Varneda (1986) 203-214, 242-279; Bilde (1988) 200-206; Sterling (1992) 240-245.

[3] Programmatic insistence in the preface on ἀλήθεια, ἀκρίβεια, autopsy, and disavowal of partiality align Josephus with the principles whose classic expressions include Thuc. 1.22.2-3, Polyb. 2.56.10-12, Dion. Hal. *Thuc.* 8 and Lucian *Hist. conscr.* 7, 9, 39, 41, 47, 50. Cf. further Van Unnik (1978) 37-40; Fornara (1983) 99-104. The strictures on Greek indifference to truth at *BJ* 1.16 and *Ap.* 1.46 are directed specifically at inaccurate Greek accounts of the Jewish War (and not against the Greek historians generally).

[4] See Lindner (1972) 132-141.

Gegner'.[5] Whether we regard strict factual accuracy and partisan lamentation as mutually antagonistic or just as contrastive foils, there remains a clear disjunction that cannot easily be brushed aside. But Josephus, in the words of the Yiddish proverb, is trying to dance at two weddings, speciously severing fact and lamentation into discrete entities:

> **9** ...I shall accurately report [μετ' ἀκριβείας... διέξειμι] the actions of both sides; but in my reflexions on the events I cannot conceal my private sentiments, nor refuse to give my personal sympathies scope to bewail my country's tragedy [τοὺς δ' ἐπὶ τοῖς πράγμασι λόγους ἀνατίθημι τῇ διαθέσει, καὶ τοῖς ἐμαυτοῦ πάθεσι διδοὺς ἐπολοφύρεσθαι ταῖς τῆς πατρίδος συμφοραῖς]... **11** But if anyone should criticize me for my strictures against the tyrants or their gangs of bandits, or for my laments over my country's misfortunes, he must pardon an emotion which falls outside the rules of historical writing... **12** ...However, should any critic be too austere for pity, let him credit the history with the facts, and the historian with the lamentations [εἰ δέ τις ὅσα πρὸς τοὺς τυράννους ἢ τὸ λῃστρικὸν αὐτῶν κατηγορικῶς λέγοιμεν ἢ τοῖς δυστυχήμασι τῆς πατρίδος ἐπιστένοντες συκοφαντοίη, διδότω παρὰ τὸν τῆς ἱστορίας νόμον συγγνώμην τῷ πάθει... εἰ δέ τις οἴκτου σκλήροτερος εἴη δικαστής, τὰ μὲν πράγματα τῇ ἱστορίᾳ προσκρινέτω, τὰς δ' ὀλοφύρσεις τῷ γράφοντι].
>
> (1.9-12)

This is however special pleading that will not bear scrutiny: the qualified and highly artificial disclaimer of bias, in which polemical κατηγορικῶς λέγειν is euphemistically subsumed as ὀλοφύρσεις, accentuates rather than resolves the discrepancy, and we recognize that Josephus' credibility as historian in the Greek tradition is severely strained by his partisan treatment of the Jewish war-movement in particular.[6] This is acknowledged, to

---

[5] LINDNER (1972) 140. Similarly WEBER (1921) 24: 'Sein ganzes Werk wird zu einer einzigen Anklage gegen diese Männer...; mit leidenschaftlichem Ingrimm zeichnet er sie als die verworfensten Verbrecher in immer neuen Bildern des Entsetzens'. RAJAK (1983) 79-80 concedes that Josephus is 'a highly emotive writer', but does not see this as a significant historiographical problem; she goes only so far as to say 'when it comes to his enemies, his presentation must be deemed somewhat deficient' (141). See also next note.

[6] LINDNER (1972) 134: 'Nun wird man unschwer erkennen, daß diese säuberliche Bereichetrennung nur Theorie ist... Die hellenistische Theorie verlangt die Objektivität des Historikers... Das Klagen des Josephus gerät nun, wenn man es an dieser Theorie mißt, ebenfalls unter die Kategorie des Subjektiven, das die ἀλήθεια beeinträchtigt'. Similarly WEBER (1921) 9-10: 'Also ist auch seine ἀλήθεια nicht wertfrei, sondern subjektiv... Josephus ist also weder frei von dem Verdacht, mit der Wahrheit es nicht ganz so streng wie sein Vorbild Thukydides genommen, sondern subjektiv gestaltet zu haben, noch von dem schwereren Vorwurf..., selbst aus persönlichen Gründen am Scheideweg mehr der Gratia als der Veritas gefolgt zu sein. Auch über die Rhetoren, die er so schalt, ist er nicht in jeder Hinsicht erhaben'; THÉROND (1979) 69: 'Il est banal de dire, aujourd'hui, que Josèphe... n'a pas respecté l'impartialité historique à laquelle il aurait dû être tenu'; BILDE (1988) 205: 'As far as impartiality and objectivity go, undeniably Josephus has a hard time... In this respect, he cannot live up to his own ideals and those of

varying degrees, by most commentators. Consequently it becomes a pressing question to ask how this tension between allegedly accurate ἀφήγησις πραγμάτων and ideologically tinged ὀλοφύρσεις, between Greek theory and Jewish practice, is resolved in the narrative: how does Josephus 'sell' his own tendentious version, how does he accommodate it to the intellectual assumptions and expectations of a Greco-Roman readership familiar with the conventions of classical historiography? How, in a word, does one indulge in polemic and propaganda (as Josephus plainly does) while sustaining, at least to some plausible degree, the illusion of impartial reporting (as required by the theory he claims to follow)? This historiographical balancing-act is the subject of the present essay.

I shall argue for a consistent methodology of impression management based on intertextual strategies: Josephus systematically shores up the credibility of his own interpretation through selective inclusion of typical patterns of explanation from his predecessors in the genre, which together create the impression of rational or 'scientific' historical analysis. By a curious paradox some of the best evidence for Josephus' intellectual affiliation to the Greco-Roman tradition comes not from his vocal programmatic statements, but precisely from the arguments, tucked away in the narrative, which aid and abet his own cause and thus actually go *against* the proemial claims; and conversely the borrowed motifs which subserve Josephus' anti-Zealot polemic create the impression of a rationalist and analytical Greek orientation. I shall argue that Josephus consciously appropriates these 'scientific' principles with an eye to their *function*—namely as frames of deception to pass off subjective polemic as rational analysis. That historical distortion and reader-manipulation can evince literary artistry of a high order, worth studying in its own right, is well known from works like Caesar's *Commentarii* or the *Annales* of Tacitus. Josephus' anti-Zealot polemic in *BJ*, I propose, is a phenomenon of the same order. If, then, we take a more sceptical view of the whole question, redirecting attention from form to function, from historical theory to historical practice, we get a somewhat revised picture of Josephus' relationship to the ancient historiographical tradition—less orthodox and less etherial, to be sure, but arguably altogether more realistic.

Classical motifs as instruments of persuasion appear typically in the context of Josephus' polemic against the Jewish war parties, especially when he discusses their *motives*, and it is within this characteristic ambit that

---

his school'. Villalba I Varneda (1986) 208, noting Josephus' criticisms of bias in other historians, comments: 'Even so, even [*sic*] Flavius Josephus himself will not be able to avoid it completely'—an understatement if ever there was one.

they will be analysed. For while it is generally recognized that Josephus' use of classical material on the one hand, and on the other his treatment of the Jewish insurgents are both central issues in their own right, they are almost invariably treated apart from each other. Against this 'separatist' view it is proposed that the two areas might usefully be brought together and studied as an interdependent and interacting complex. The principles underlying this reciprocity will emerge from a brief review of the separate issues.

2. *Josephus and Classical Historiography*

Josephus' reception and assimilation of the classical literary-historiographical tradition remain a central issue in the literature on *BJ*. Where earlier theories had tended to explain (away) the Greek elements in Josephus as uncritical plagiarisms or the work of literary συνεργοί,[7] a growing body of opinion now regards Josephus himself as personally responsible for both the contents and the literary form of his works[8]—which in turn raises the question of his intentions in drawing on his Greek predecessors, and of the principles guiding his selection. Certainly it would be hard to overemphasize the importance of this aspect in an author who, on typical recent estimates, 'stands squarely in the Greek tradition';[9] who 'from the point of view of language, style and form... belongs to Greek and Hellenistic literature, and as a writer... belongs to Greco-Roman historiography';[10] whose *BJ* is 'a historical work of Graeco-Roman type, in which traditional Jewish themes were not unimportant, but were viewed through a Hellenizing glass'.[11] But if there is agreement on the broad contours, many of the specifics still have to be filled in.

---

[7] These positions are represented respectively by Hölscher (1916) coll. 1963-1967, and Thackeray (1929) 100-124. For surveys of the main issues and trends in Josephan criticism, see Attridge (1986) 324-329; Bilde (1988) 123-171.

[8] E.g. Shutt (1961) 59-75; Thérond (1979) 27-30, 41-43; Schäublin (1982) 321 n. 41; Rajak (1983) 62-64, 233-236; Bilde (1988) 132-134, 142.

[9] Cohen (1979) 31.

[10] Bilde (1988) 202.

[11] Rajak (1983) 103; *ibid.* 78-79: 'Josephus' theory is Hellenized in its presentation, but is essentially Jewish... centred on a scheme of sin and punishment... For what is striking and even bold in Josephus is the very fact that he had introduced a distinctive Jewish interpretation into a political history which is fully Greek in form, juxtaposing the two approaches'. This essentially restates the earlier view of Weber (1921) 66: 'Er schreibt als griechischer Historiker und als jüdischer Prophet. Das ist sein Doppelgesicht'; cf. *ibid.* 77, 'Josephus hüllt sich auch als Historiker in prophetisches Gewand'.

Josephus' formal bows to the Greco-Roman tradition—evidenced for easy instance in his use of proemial *topoi*, set speeches, dramatic and rhetorical writing[12]—give little indication of how deep this influence runs, or to what extent these strands are woven into the intellectual design of *BJ*. The Thucydidean elements in particular are a clear case in point. Inventories of lexical parallels prove beyond doubt that Josephus knew and drew extensively on Thucydides, as do the many other echoes and thematic allusions noted by commentators[13]—but it remains to ask whether this is anything more than just a matter of formal literary *ornatus*. The question becomes more pressing in light of the observation that *BJ* has a conscious Thucydidean-Polybian orientation, in contrast to the Isocratean-Dionysian slant of *AJ*.[14] Yet criticism remains sharply divided on the issue. On the one hand it has been claimed that Josephus' Hellenization (which includes also his use of Thucydides) 'is of a rather formal and superficial nature',[15] and his Thucydidean allusions have been dismissed as stereotypical.[16] Others insist that the affiliation is less tenuous: Josephus has been called 'the Jewish Thucydides';[17] 'indem er der ἀλήθεια und ἀκρίβεια huldigt, bindet er sich an die großen Geschichtschreiber, an deren Spitze, unerreicht, Thukydides steht. So ist Josephus, der Orientale, bewußt Klassizist';[18] 'les textes de cet historien relèvent d'une rhétorique historique qui commence avec Hérodote et Thucydide, et c'est, du reste, Thucydide qui est imité dès les premières lignes de son livre';[19] or again, 'le modèle de Josèphe, à n'en pas douter, c'est Thucydide'.[20] Remarks like these imply a

---

[12] On all these matters, see in particular Villalba I Varneda (1986) *passim*, and n. 2 above.

[13] Numerous lexical parallels and echoes are assembled by Drüner (1896) 1-34; Brüne (1913) 161-164; Stein (1937) 58-68; Plümacher (1972) 62. Some interesting Thucydidean reminiscences in *Ap.* are noted by Schäublin (1982) 324, 326, 330, 333. The most significant Thucydidean allusions in *BJ* are collected by Luschnat (1971) coll. 1303-1305; Thackeray (Loeb edition) II xvii; Michel-Bauernfeind I xxiv; Thérond (1979) 20-21; Ladouceur (1981) 28-30; Eckstein (1990) 178, 204; Schwartz (1990) 224; Kottek (1994) 156-160. The following are among the best known parallels: *BJ* 1.1 ≈ Thuc. 1.1 and 1.22; *BJ* 1.373-379 ≈ Thuc. 2.60-63; *BJ* 3.423 ≈ Thuc. 8.1; *BJ* 4.131-134 ≈ Thuc. 3.82-83; *BJ* 4.319-321 ≈ Thuc. 2.65; *BJ* 5.367 ≈ Thuc. 1.76.2 and 5.105.2; *BJ* 6.136-140 ≈ Thuc. 7.44.

[14] Attridge (1976) 44-50.

[15] Bilde (1988) 204-205 (the quotation from 205). In this sense also Michel-Bauernfeind I xxiv: 'Vielleicht wurden jedoch solche klassischen Vorbilder im Schulbetrieb dieser Zeit so eindrücklich vermittelt, daß man sie bei ähnlichen Situationen fast unwillkürlich gebrauchte...'.

[16] So Horsley (1986 *a*) 163, 166; Krieger (1994) 284-285, 308.

[17] Shutt (1961) 125, endorsed by Zeitlin (1968/1969) 178.

[18] Weber (1921) 6.

[19] Vidal-Naquet (1978) 15.

[20] Hadas-Lebel (1989) 245.

relationship that is both more complex and more substantive. And where opinions diverge so widely, the case may legitimately be reopened, with particular emphasis on the central but largely neglected question of the possible *collective and contextual function* of these classical elements. The remarks that follow are concerned with this intersection of the Jewish and Greco-Roman axes in *BJ*.

A single commentator, to my knowledge, has taken a broader 'unitarian' view of the Thucydidean and other Greek borrowings in Josephus, and attempted to co-ordinate them within an overarching design. Yitzhak Baer argues that since Josephus himself was not present in Jerusalem during the siege, the details he supplies must derive from earlier Greek historical accounts, and that the situation in the Holy City is assimilated to the framework of classical Athens: thus the high priests represent the democracy, the Zealots are the tyrants, John of Gischala is stylized along the lines of the Thucydidean and Aristophanic Cleon; economic and social measures by the insurgents replicate the typical contours of Greek political crises (destruction of the archives, abolition of debt, liberation of slaves, measures against the wealthy). The resulting picture, concludes Baer, is a grandiose distortion, the *stasis* described by Josephus exists only in the intertext and not on the ground: 'Josephus' tales about hatred, sins, cruelty and massive self-destruction in Jerusalem have to be discounted by and large as so many tendentious inventions. *The people fought united for the holiness of their way of life and city*'.[21] On this view Josephus' system of classical allusion, by assimilating Jerusalem to the classical Athenian frame, has the specific function of obscuring the ideological cohesion among the Jews.

This hypothesis has drawn well-founded criticism. Thérond in particular points out that Baer's interpretation reveals more of the modern commentator's nationalist bias than of Josephus' historiographical method:

> Il est donc facile de comprendre les raisons politiques de ce jugement. Y. Baer, doyen des historiens israéliens, est un fervent adepte du nationalisme intégral. Il ne peut donc que récuser Josèphe lorsque celui-ci décrit les violents conflits internes qui secouent la société juive pendant la période 66-70: pour lui, la guerre civile n'a pas eu lieu; elle n'est qu'un mythe rhétorique et romain. Les habitants de Jérusalem 'ont été unis pour la sainteté de leur mode de vie et de leur cité'.[22]

Louis Feldman, equally critical, urges that 'it is an error to confuse the influence of Greek historians on Josephus' style, notably in speeches, with

---

[21] Thus Baer (1971) 1, in the English summary of his paper (emphasis mine).
[22] Thérond (1979) 20 n. 5.

the influence on his content';[23] and that 'in any case, even if such influence [of Thucydides or Polybius] could be shown, this would indicate merely that Josephus had turned to classical writers as a model for style and would not prove that the facts themselves had been tampered with...'[24] Baer's interpretation, together with the response of Feldman, could usefully be taken as setting the broad paramaters of the present investigation: on the one hand a *functionalist* interpretation, with Baer's Josephus consciously using the classical frames to support a partisan viewpoint, on the other hand the *formalist* or 'aesthetic' view that the Greek influences are a matter of style rather than content.

Both positions require some qualification. Feldman's oposition style/content is too undifferentiated to be of much use: we need to test individual instances within their contexts before deciding whether the Greek elements have a specific function or are just features of style. And while it is hard to accept Baer's blatantly nationalist interpretation, we should not for that reason dismiss his working assumption of a conscious correlation between the Greek elements in *BJ* and the work's ideological design (however that is understood). Here again we should be guided by context rather than preconceived ideas. The classical frames in *BJ*, I shall argue, are not just formal by-products of the author's decision to write a historical work in Greek; they are indeed functional and directly related to the work's ideological slant—engaging the reader and subtly adjusting his perspective—only that my understanding of *BJ*'s ideological tendency differs sharply from Baer's nationalist reading.

The kind of correlation between intertextual allusion and interpretative perspective here posited is a frequent and flexible phenomenon. A number of diverse and apparently unrelated observations in the recent literature on *BJ* when taken together suggest the possibility of a conscious strategy in Josephus' incorporation of Greco-Roman elements. Josephus brings to bear the classical categories, the 'Hellenizing glass' as it were, on his Jewish narrative apparently with an eye to informed readers (Greeks, Romans, Hellenized Jews) and in a manner that activates prior knowledge and associations, and so steers (or at least potentially affects) reader-response through allusion to common frames of reference: when, for example, Josephus as Galilean commander stylizes himself as the ideal general, consciously appropriating the *virtutes imperatoris* as codified in the literary-historical tradition to legitimate and exalt his own role;[25] when his analysis

---

[23] Feldman (1984) 348-349.
[24] Feldman (1989) 389.
[25] Details in Cohen (1979) 91-100. For the literary tradition, see Plöger (1975).

of *stasis* in Jerusalem conflates the biblical-prophetic categories of sin and punishment with classical Thucydidean elements;[26] when, in a related vein, the crimes ascribed by Josephus to the Jewish insurgents have a Jeremianic complexion on the one hand, while on the other his sustained polemical emphasis on temple desecration might also, according to a recent commentator, owe something to Polybius;[27] or when Josephus at 4.559-563 indicts the rebels in terms redolent of traditional Roman political invective.[28] The list could easily be extended. Intertextual allusion of this kind is not just a matter of formal *ornatus*, but implies also an interpretative intent: Josephus by evoking recognizable frames and models suggests analogies and parallels in a manner which would engage his Greco-Roman readers in their own cultural terms, and which thus adds subtle nuance to his narrative. From this perspective the 'Hellenizing glass' serves as a medium for implied authorial comment, predisposing the reader to a particular interpretation of the historical data.

In a work as tendentious as the *BJ* there is clearly ample scope for subtle reader-manipulation of this kind, and the phenomenon might best be studied in relation to the various apologetic currents that give the history its distinctive character. Of these tendencies it has well been remarked, 'On ne saurait proposer de plus utiles prolégomènes à un lecteur du *De Bello Judaico* qu'en essayant de démêler et de décrire les différents courants apologétiques qui s'y entrecroisent'.[29] Against this background the intertextual allusions often acquire a very precise polemical function which is less obvious when they are treated apart from their immediate context. In what follows I shall argue for a demonstrable correlation between Josephus' anti-revolutionary polemic on the one hand, and his deployment

---

[26] Noted, among others, by Rajak (1983) 92-98; Goodman (1987) 19-20; Feldman (1994) 50: '...appealing to his politically-minded audience so familiar with Thucydides' description (3.82-84) of the disastrous effects of the revolution at Corcyra'. The *polemical* function of this *color Thucydideus* is noted in passing by Goodman (1987) 199: 'The best abuse is culled from Greek, and specifically Thucydidean, political vocabulary rather than Josephus' own imagination: the *stasis* was caused by revolutionary tyrants whose brutality to their compatriots and self-imposition on an unwilling population are constantly stressed'.

[27] See Cohen (1982) esp. 377-380.

[28] See Nadel (1966), Paul (1993 *a*). Major themes in Roman political invective are analysed by Opelt (1965) 125-165. It would be worthwhile to trace the reception and adaptation of such motifs in Josephus: a quick glance at the thematic index in Koster (1980) 365-368 suggests that the influence might be quite considerable. So for example Josephus' description of the debauched Zealots who wear perfume and paint their eyelashes (4.560-562), taken literally by Rajak (1983) 136, seems more likely to be a topical construct: cf. Paul (1993 *a*) 147-148.

[29] Nikiprowetzky (1971) 461.

of Greco-Roman themes on the other: the 'Hellenizing glass', it is proposed, is consciously applied to legitimate the historian's hostile interpretation of the revolt and to give it the appearance of detached historical analysis in the tradition of his 'scientific' Greek predecessors.

3. *Josephus and the Jewish Insurgents*

We begin with the paradox that 'our best source for the origins of the revolt of 66 C.E., is not to be trusted on this subject'.[30] The Jewish insurgents, as is well known, get an extraordinarily hostile press in *BJ*, for our principal informant has many axes to grind: a concentrated example of this vitriol is his final reckoning with the rebels at 7.253-274 where Josephus in strident succession excoriates Sicarii, John of Gischala, Simon ben Giora, Idumaeans and Zealots. The disjunction between τὸ τῆς ἱστορίας ἀληθές of Greek theory and Josephus' own practice of κατηγορικῶς λέγειν could hardly be wider; lamentation and polemic all but vitiate the historical value of the excursus.[31] The virulent anti-revolutionary polemic is demonstrably related to the various partisan and apologetic tendencies in *BJ*, which include self-justification of Josephus, absolving the Jews as nation (especially the nobility and priestly aristocracy) by blaming the revolt and destruction of Jerusalem on a disreputable and unrepresentative minority, absolving the Roman leadership, painting a flattering portrait of Titus, explaining the Jews to the Romans and the Romans to the Jews, and taking issue with the theological assumptions of the revolutionaries.[32] The last of these aspects is our immediate concern.

One significant function of Josephus' polemic against the Jewish insurgents is to counteract and downplay the religious substratum which gave the revolt its broad ideological cohesion. Explicit references to this

---

[30] Goodman (1990) 39.

[31] On the historical value of this passage, see the analysis of Krieger (1994) 305-313. He concludes: '[Josephus] bedient sich stereotyp einiger weniger Motive und Gedanken. Unterschiede zwischen den Gruppen werden nicht recht deutlich: im Grunde hat keine ein eigenes Profil' (312). 'Es ist das Bild einer gemeinsamen Schuld, hinter der die Besonderheiten der jeweiligen Gruppe zurücktreten... Der Exkurs ist daher für historische Rückschlüsse auf Eigenart und tatsächliche Motivation und Ideologie der Aufstandsgruppen ungeeignet' (313). Cf. Rajak (1983) 81.

[32] Useful overviews of the partisan-apologetic tendencies in *BJ* in Attridge (1984) 195-206; Bilde (1979) 180-182, (1988) 75-78. Fuller analysis in Nikiprowetzky (1971); Cohen (1979) 97-100, 154, 240-241, (1982) *passim*; Thérond (1981); Stemberger (1983) 33-37; Stern (1987); Saulnier (1989) 545-562; Paul (1993 *b*); and, most comprehensively, Krieger (1994) *passim*, with concise summary at 326-338.

underlying religious dimension are indeed scanty, restricted to a few isolated remarks by the rebel leaders, casually reported in a manner that ridicules or dismisses—but we can fill in the picture by reconciling these remarks with the counter-tendency of Josephus' own polemic, always vocal and consistently emphasizing a few recurrent themes. Such purposeful salvos would be hard to explain without assuming an equally specific target: the tendentious polemic reflects, in contrapuntal symmetry, the ideological nexus it aims to refute, and on this premise provides the basis for an *a contrario* extrapolation of the principal motifs which gave the revolt its ideological contours. As Mireille Hadas-Lebel has put it, '[Josèphe] révèle ainsi les arguments de ses adversaires en les retournant contre eux-mêmes'.[33] And when Josephus disparages the insurgents as madmen without method, we do well to recall the principle 'Wer die Musik nicht hört, hält die Tanzenden fur wahnsinnig': conversely through close observation of the choreography we may reconstruct the missing sound-track, and so co-ordinate the two.[34] Thus the context in which polemical clusters appear is often a guide to the implicit claims that are being refuted. The broad outlines of this question are well known, but it will be useful to summarize the main points which bear directly on our study.

Modern scholarship on the causes of the Jewish revolt emphasizes a complex interplay of political, social and economic issues: the problem of debt, social banditry, class tensions, lack of credibility of the new Jewish ruling class among their own people and hence their inability to perform the political role expected of them by the Romans.[35] In addition, there are the all-pervasive religious susceptibilities and expectations of the Jews, implied throughout Josephus' narrative. Although these religious strands,

---

[33] Hadas-Lebel (1990) 418. This is the procedure which Hengel (1976) 190 terms 'polemische Umkehrung': 'Wir haben hier [4.262] eine Form schärfster Polemik vor uns, die man als "polemische Umkehrung" bezeichnen könnte: Das ursprüngliche Bestreben des Gegners wird völlig umgedreht und ihm all das unterschoben, was er am entscheidensten von sich weisen mußte'. Similarly Rhoads (1976) 166-173, who remarks (166): 'The reverse polemic is the main technique which Josephus uses to deal with honorific reasons for which the war was fought, reasons which Josephus might have feared his readers would support. When we encounter this polemic in Josephus' writings, it is often a signal to us that Josephus is dealing with what must have been an important issue of the war'. Cf. Nikiprowetzky (1971) 473; Rajak (1983) 134; Goodman (1987) 218.

[34] I borrow the felicitious expression from the fragmentary novel *Katzenmusik* by Gerhard Fritsch (edited posthumously by Alois Brandstetter, Salzburg 1974), where it stands as motto.

[35] Smallwood (1981) 256-292; Rajak (1983) chaps. 5 and 6; Horsley (1979 *a*, 1979 *b*, 1981, 1988, 1995); Horsley-Hanson (1985) 48-87; Goodman (1982, 1987, 1990) *passim*; Applebaum (1989); Kreissig (1989). On Josephus' own interpretation of the causes of the war, see Bilde (1979); Rajak (1983) 65-77.

and Josephus' treatment of them, will be a central theme in my argument, this emphasis should not be taken to imply their relative priority over the other causal factors, still less an autonomous existence: men do not live by faith alone, 'no religious movements match the force of political movements',[36] and it is essential always to keep in mind the wider socio-political universe. But in terms of *mentality*, it is the presence of this religious dimension which gives the Jewish war its distinctive contours and which sets it apart from other revolts in the ancient world.[37]

Josephus' polemic in *BJ* systematically downplays the religious and ideological aspects and so distorts the picture beyond all probability. This distinctive emphasis is explicable in terms of the work's political-apologetic slant. The religious ideology which inspired the rebels against Rome has affinities with the theology of zealousness from the Maccabean period and beyond, and is firmly rooted in the ancient traditions of Jewish piety.[38] Josephus, expert in such matters, certainly knew all this,[39] yet he spares neither effort nor ingenuity to obscure any suggestion of intellectual continuity—for by blaming the anti-Roman rebellion on a minority of misguided individuals, vocally dissociated from both the mainstream of Jewish religious tradition and from 'majority' opinion,[40] he implicitly

---

[36] Dyson (1971) 273.

[37] On the theological aspects of the revolt, Hengel (1974, 1976) remains fundamental. From the extensive literature on the subject, the following deserve mention: Weber (1921) 27-36; Farmer (1956); Baumbach (1965, 1968, 1973, 1985); Brandon (1965); Bruce (1969) 93-100; Nikiprowetzky (1971) 463-464, 473, (1989); De Jonge (1974); Rhoads (1976) 82-87; Stern (1977); Horsley (1981) 424-426; Schäfer (1983) 124-127; Bohrmann (1989) 96-123; Hadas-Lebel (1989) 193-202, (1990) 407-421; Schwier (1989) 55-201. The religio-political symbiosis is widely recognized, e.g. Roth (1959); Harter (1982) 5-27, 209-217; Rajak (1983) 139-141; Gafni (1984) 24-27; Baumbach (as above); Applebaum (1971) 158-163, (1989); Mendels (1992) 355-383.

[38] The case is fully argued by Farmer (1956); further Applebaum (1971) 159-160; Nikiprowetzky (1989). On the biblical-historical tradition of zealousness, see esp. Hengel (1976) 151-188; Bohrmann (1989) 124-145. The latter aptly remarks that 'tout Juif de la tradition est un Zélote en puissance' (124). The strongly traditionalist orientation of the insurgents comes out clearly in Agrippa's speech at 2.393: σπουδὴ γὰρ ὑμῖν μία τὸ μὴ τῶν πατρίων τι καταλῦσαι.

[39] Cf. Wirth (1993) 595: 'Es ist daher wohl nicht nur Unvermögen, wenn Josephus der Zelotenbewegung so wenig gerecht zu werden... scheint. Daß er mehr gewußt haben muß, als er sagt, wird seinem eigenen Lebenslauf zufolge anzunehmen sein'.

[40] The tendency to discredit the warmongers by stylizing them as a subversive and *unrepresentative* minority group runs like a refrain through the work, e.g. 2.345-346, 399; 3.448, 454-455; 5.53. On Josephus' schematic division of Jews into revolutionary minority and peace-loving majority, see Krieger (1994) 283-285. But this is plainly a tendentious oversimplification: Cohen (1979) 154-160, 236-237; Goodman (1987) 167-175, 199-201; Krieger (1994) 273-277. Analogous marginalization through denial of representativeness appears elsewhere in *BJ*, again with apologetic or polemical tendency. Judas the Galilean is cast as innovator and maverick operating outside the Jewish tradition (ἦν δ' οὗτος

exonerates the Jews as nation and deflects onto the rebels the anti-Semitism which was inevitably exacerbated by the war (cf. 2.398-399).[41]

Josephus' regular charges of impiety and strident denials that the rebels were acting from honourable religious or idealistic motives help delineate, *a contrario*, the ideological nexus he attempts to refute, and to that extent the religious dimension indirectly shimmers through his polemic often enough. Thus the argument that God has sided with the *Romans* is heard so regularly precisely because it is intended to counter the parallel claim by the rebels that their *own* cause was supported by the divine symmachy.[42] This latter idea finds expression in their belief of the inviolability of Jerusalem, and gives the revolt the character of a holy war with distinct apocalyptic overtones—whence John of Gischala's confident boast, ὡς οὐκ ἄν ποτε δείσειεν ἄλωσιν· θεοῦ γὰρ ὑπάρχειν τὴν πόλιν (6.98; cf. 5.342, 459; Dio Cass. 65.5.4).[43] The divine alliance is maintained through strict observance of the πάτριος νόμος, particularly with reference to the Temple and its cult (2.391, 394): hence Josephus' refrain-like strictures that the rebels are θεομάχοι guilty of every imaginable pollution and impiety which have driven God from the Temple.[44] Widespread messianic expectations

---

σοφιστὴς ἰδίας αἱρέσεως οὐδὲν τοῖς ἄλλοις προσεοικώς, 2.118), an exaggeration partially corrected at *AJ* 18.23. At the later appointment of Phanni (*BJ* 4.153-154) innovation is again stressed to obscure continuity (cf. below, chap. 3, section 3). Compare also Agrippa's apologetic at 2.352-353, where miscreant Roman governors are treated as aberrations who cannot be taken as fairly reflecting the will of Rome.

[41] Thus Applebaum (1971) 157: 'The *War*, written to laud the victors and to play down the responsibility of the Jews as a whole for the revolt, sought to present the Zealots as the main, if not the sole, agents of the rising and of the destruction of the Temple. In proportion as the role of the people as a whole was minimized, that of the Zealots had to be emphasized and isolated, and the colour of their villany became blacker'. Bilde (1988) 77 aptly remarks: '...Josephus' intention was to mend the relationship between the Jews and Rome and to restore the Roman policy of tolerance towards the Jewish people. Therefore... Josephus places all of the responsibility on the part of the Jews onto the marginal groups—the 'bandits' and the 'tyrants'—whereas he attempts to exonerate the Jewish people as a whole for responsibility and guilt with regard to the War.' Similarly Thackeray (1929) 29; Farmer (1956) 16-19; Zeitlin (1968/1969) 180, 182; Stern (1977) 266; Cohen (1979) 234; Daniel (1981) 170-196; Dihle (1989) 181; Lendle (1992) 248; Krieger (1994) 327, 330. On Roman anti-Jewish feeling after the war, see Goodman (1987) 237-239.

[42] Divine support claimed by the rebels: *AJ* 18.4-5; *BJ* 2.394; 5.306, 459; 6.98-99. God on the Roman side: *BJ* 2.390; 3.354, 484; 4.370; 5.367-368, 376-378, 412; 6.38-41, 371, 411; 7.319. Further Lindner (1972) 42-48; Rhoads (1976) 168.

[43] See Nikiprowetzky (1971) 464 n. 3; Hengel (1976) 289-292; De Jonge (1974) 212-214; Rhoads (1976) 170-173; Betz (1987) 25-38; Schwier (1989) 156-170.

[44] E.g. *BJ* 2.424, 455-456; 4.150, 159, 163, 171, 182-183, 210, 215, 241-242, 263, 317, 323, 382, 563; 5.10, 18-20, 380, 402-403, 413-414; 6.95, 99-102, 110, 121-128; 7.329. Cf. Jaubert (1963) 341-344; Thoma (1969) 41-48; Lindner (1972) 142-144; Hengel (1976) 188-195; Rhoads (1976) 169-170.

were fuelled by the famous χρησμὸς ἀμφίβολος reported at 6.312,[45] and hopes of apocalyptic deliverance sustain the besieged Jews in their desperate plight. In this eschatologically charged climate, oracles and prophecy arouse intense interest; and even if Josephus dismisses the prophets as impostors or disguised activists, the flurry of vatic activity before and during the war suggests that the popular mood was extremely receptive to the σωτηρία they proclaimed.[46] If hopes of divine intervention centred on the Temple and made it an ideological rallying point (6.239), its firing by the Romans will explain, symmetrically, the devastating psychological impact of this action on the Jews (6.233-234, 253).[47] Yet not even this catastrophe extinguishes hopes of messianic deliverance: now, for the first time, the rebel leaders negotiate with Titus and seek permission to abandon the city with their wives and children, and to retire to the desert (6.351)—typically the locality for signs of apocalyptic deliverance (cf. 2.259).[48] Finally, both Titus and Josephus feign amazement at the sheer irrationality of the insurgents (note τίνι πεποιθότες... at 4.93, 5.369 and 6.330);[49] and Titus and Eleazar give impressive parallel surveys of the *material* resources that might have encouraged rebellion (6.330-332, 7.369-371). The one item that does not appear here is divine assistance, σωτηρία or the like, a selective omission of the first importance. The polemical effect of this silence is further enhanced by a suggestive juxtaposition at 5.368-369: here Josephus, exhorting the rebels to surrender, first declares that God is on the *Roman* side (368), then pointedly taunts his besieged countrymen, αὐτοὺς δὲ τίνι καὶ πεποιθότας ἀντέχειν...; (369). The insurgents' loss has become the Romans' gain. All these elements are

---

[45] Cf. Tac. *Hist.* 5.13; Suet. *Vesp.* 4. Contrary to annalistic practice, Josephus reports the oracle not in its chronological place among the events leading up to the revolt, but only much later in the prodigy list (6.288-315) between the firing of the Temple and the final destruction of Jerusalem. This strategic postponement plays down its significance as αἴτιον, and suggests also a causal link between Jewish ἄνοια and the destruction of Jerusalem (6.315). Cf. Weber (1921) 40-42; Lindner (1972) 129-132; Michel-Bauernfeind 6 n. 150 ('ein retardierendes Moment'). On the messianic background see (e.g.) Rhoads (1976) 170-173; Klausner (1977); Bohrmann (1989) 54-64; Nikiprowetzy (1989) 225-228; Vidal-Naquet (1992) 83-90; Michel-Bauernfeind II,2 190-192 (Exkurs XV).

[46] E.g. *BJ* 2.258-263, 650; 6.285-315; 7.438; with disussion in Macmullen (1966) 146-149; Barnett (1981); Krieger (1994) 145-149.

[47] Cf. Dio Cass. 66.6; Farmer (1956) 111-114; Hengel (1976) 226-229.

[48] On the wilderness motif, see Michel-Bauernfeind 2 n. 147; Farmer (1956) 116-122; Thoma (1969) 50-51; Hengel (1976) 259-261; Barnett (1981). Weber (1921) 216 misses this important point when he takes 6.351 as 'Zeichen barbarischer Größe'.

[49] The same expression is used also by Agrippa at 2.361 in an analogous context, ποίᾳ στρατιᾷ, ποίοις πεποιθότες ὅπλοις; For the ironic nuance, compare Archidamus' argument to the Spartans at Thuc. 1.80.3, πῶς χρῆ πρὸς τούτους ῥᾳδίως πόλεμον ἄρασθαι καὶ τίνι πιστεύσαντας ἀπαρασκεύους ἐπειχθῆναι;

logically co-ordinated within a religious-apocalyptic matrix, where they yield coherent sense. Without this framework of reference, needless to say, they are apt to appear scrambled and disjointed: *Wer die Musik nicht hört...*

Again, passing remarks hint clearly at the underlying mentality that inspired and sustained resistance. At *BJ* 6.13 Josephus has a brief but revealing comment on the extraordinary inner fortitude of the Jews: 'But worst of all was the discovery that the Jews had an inner courage [τὸ παράστημα τῆς ψυχῆς] that rose superior to faction, famine, war and disasters beyond number. The Romans began to think the onslaughts of these men irresistible, and their equanimity amidst disasters unshakable'.[50] So too when Titus acknowledges 'the endurance of these Jews and their fortitude in distress' [ἡ Ἰουδαίων μακροθυμία καὶ τὸ καρτερικὸν ἐν οἷς κακοπαθοῦσιν] (6.37). A similar attitude is evinced also by the Essenes (2.152-153) and by the Sicarii who were captured and martyred in Egypt (7.417-419). '...Such madness or strength of soul cannot be explained in terms of political or national fanaticism. It lies embedded in the deepest layers of man's being, by which we mean in religious mentality. Contemporary history provides us with similar examples'.[51] This interpretation is fully consonant with the broader picture. The *religious* roots of this mentality, which Josephus prefers to ignore in relation to the rebels, come out clearly earlier in *BJ* in contexts where it is not aggressively anti-Roman. In the affairs with Pilate (2.169-174) and Petronius (2.192-203) the massed Jews, heroically displaying τῆς δεισιδαιμονίας ἄκρατον (2.174), prefer death to violating their law; such Torah-centric zeal is essentially no different from that of the revolutionaries, but because it is here non-violent, Josephus reports it sympathetically and with admiration (2.174, 198).[52] In terms of mentality, there is no disjunction between these two

---

[50] Cf. Tac. *Hist.* 5.13.3; Dio Cass. 65.5.4.

[51] Nikiprowetzky (1989) 219. Similarly Weber (1921) 76 (on *BJ* 5.458f.): 'Dieser selbstzerstörende Fanatismus ist aus der Hoffnung auf Heil, die tief religiöse Brunst ist, geboren und die gewaltige Hoffnung auf Gottes Hilfe in größter Not wird durch den Willen zum Endkampf überstrahlt'. Hengel (1974) 179 (on 6.351, 366, 378ff.): 'Eine derartige selbstmörderische Beharrlichkeit konnte im Grunde—nach allem, was wir über die jüdische Geschichte seit dem Makkabäeraufstand wissen—letztlich *nur religiös motiviert* sein; dies wird uns auch von so unbefangenen Zeugen wie Tacitus, Sueton und Dio Cassius bestätigt'. Hadas-Lebel (1990) 421: 'Seule une telle certitude explique leur acharnement et certains comportements objectivement irrationels présentés par Josèphe comme folie sanguinaire et suicidaire'. For modern parallels, see Lanternari (1963).

[52] Good discussion of these episodes in Krieger (1994) 32-34 and 65-73. On the Pilate affair he aptly remarks (33): 'Josephus zeichnet die "Demonstranten" positiv... Ihre Aktionen, die sämtlich gewaltlos sind, gipfeln darin, daß sie als Konsequenz ihres Gesetzesgehorsams zum Martyrium bereit sind. Darin liegt der Grund, warum Josephus sie positiv herausstellt. Diese Juden sind *ein* Gegenbild gegen die, die mit den Mitteln der

incidents on the one hand and the zeal of the insurgents on the other—religion is the common denominator and cohesive principle[53]—although Josephus would have us believe otherwise. Individual rebel leaders are described as motivated by base personal factors, while collective displays of Jewish bellicosity are regularly dismisssed as impulsiveness, fanaticism or downright insanity.[54] The emphasis is clear, consistent and revealing: the underlying religious and ideological factors are deliberately obscured by a screen of secular and psychological explanation. And all this works to the detriment of the insurgents, for as one comementator has put it, the collective evidence points overwhelmingly to the conclusion that 'Jewish nationalism in the Roman period was rooted, not in secularized self-interest, as Josephus suggests, but rather in pious devotion to the God of the Torah who was also the God of the national sanctuary'.[55] The result is a perceptible tension between the rarely stated but clearly felt religious motivation on the one hand, on the other Josephus' dismissive 'rationalist' or psychological explanations.

This characteristic dissonance is central to my enquiry. Mireille Hadas-Lebel, commenting on the antagonism between Josephus and John of Gischala, notes that 'l'opposition entre Josèphe et Jean... paraît correspondre... à un affrontement entre *politique* d'une part et *mystique eschatologique* de l'autre'.[56] The polarity, in fact, might be extended to cover the whole range of Josephus' anti-revolutionary polemic: against the religious and ideological motives of the insurgents he deploys the political and psychological categories of Hellenistic rationalism, superimposing an internally coherent scheme of explanation which in effect permits the historian to sidestep the thorny religious and ideological issues. In this way the war parties are 'marginalized beyond all historical probability',[57] their motives grotesquely distorted.

But if there is broad agreement that Josephus consistently misrepresents the rebels' motives, and if an explanation for these distortions is to be

---

Gewalt gegen Rom kämpfen'. Later at 5.376ff. (Josephus' speech) the ideal of non-violence (with concomitant divine symmachy) appears explicitly as a counterfoil to indict the rebels' bellicosity: cf. Lindner (1972) 25-33; Michel (1984) 954, 959-961; Bilde (1988) 181, 186-187.

53 This aspect is well brought out, in the context of the Cumanus affair, by the image of the magnet: Ἰουδαῖοι δὲ... καθάπερ ὀργάνῳ τινὶ τῇ δεισιδαιμονίᾳ συνελκόμενοι (2.230).

54 Personal motives of individual leaders at (e.g.) *BJ* 2.585-590; 4.508, 576; 5.5-6; 7.253-274; *AJ* 18.7. For Josephus' picture of John, see Krieger (1994) 258-263. On Josephus' idea of collective Jewish 'madness', see Hadas-Lebel (1987); Eckstein (1990) 191.

55 Farmer (1956) 122.

56 Hadas-Lebel (1990) 419 (emphasis mine).

57 Bilde (1988) 74.

sought in the work's polemical and apologetical tendencies, the *process* of defamation itself deserves closer scrutiny. For if the polemic is to carry conviction, and thus effectively subserve the work's partisan thrust, it must be presented in an intrinsically plausible manner; the more coherent the substituted explanations, the less obvious their polemical intent will be. Further, both polemic and propaganda rely for their effect, to some considerable extent, on the principle *si latet ars, prodest.* 'Selbstverständlich hat die Propaganda eine Absicht, aber die Absicht muß so klug und so virtuos kaschiert sein, daß der, der von dieser Absicht erfüllt werden soll, das überhaupt nicht bemerkt'. Thus an exponent well qualified to pronounce on such matters[58]—to which it need only be added that for 'propaganda' we could also read 'polemic'. The question of how Josephus 'sells' a patently slanted account is all the more pressing in light of his professed allegiance to Greek theory (τὸν τῆς ἱστορίας νόμον, τὸ τῆς ἱστορίας ἀληθές): this is the historiographical balancing-act once again. With this in mind we need to examine the process of misrepresentation itself, paying attention to its various forms and intrinsic logic, looking for recurrent patterns and identifying possible sources. Certainly the lines of distortion identified above would justify such an enquiry.

4. *Method*

An appropriate *modus procedendi* is suggested by the nature of the problem itself. Broadly speaking, Josephus' classical imitations and his treatment of the insurgents intersect in the kind of arguments he deploys against the 'mystique eschatologique' of his political opponents. If Josephus' polemical counterthrusts often reflect in contrapuntal symmetry the thrust of the original argument he attemps to rebut, as Mireille Hadas-Lebel and others have well remarked, and if a number of classically tinged categories, especially those relating to error analysis and human nature, seem on even a cursory reading to work consistently *against* the insurgents, we must allow the theoretical possibility that each appearance of such a classical motif potentially signals a polemical tension in which an alternative explanation is being deliberately obscured by Josephus. In this configuration, the classical elements would (or at least could) be directly subserving the work's polemical intent. We need to be constantly alert to the telling 'seams' or fault lines between the classical and Jewish strata; for as one commentator

[58] Josef Goebbels on 25. March 1933, as quoted by Schneider (1978) 120.

has remarked, 'Der Umstand, daß sich Josephus an der griechischen Tradition der rationalistisch verfahrenden Geschichtsschreibung orientiert, impliziert, daß er Darstellungs- und Erklärungskriterien akzeptiert, die mit den jüdischen geschichtstheologischen Auffassungen nur schwer zu vermitteln sind'.[59] Or again, '[es] ringen westliche Motive, wie das vom größten Krieg, mit alttestamentlichen, wie dem vom Zorn Gottes...'[60] The dissonance will obviously become an issue when there is polemic at work; any perceptible oscillation between the two levels needs to be examined and explained. And although I cannot accept the hypothesis of Y. Baer mentioned earlier, one aspect of his method nevertheless needs to be emphasized again as pertinent to my own enquiry: whenever Josephus' Jewish narrative takes on a consciously classical complexion (usually with emphasis on the typical and the generic) this process becomes a potential prism to filter out, refract and marginalize some of the specifics that do not fit his own interpretation. To that extent Josephus' Hellenizing might itself become a means of manipulating and adjusting the reader's perspective. The precise contextual function of individual 'borrowings' is clearly of the greatest importance: where such motifs appear, we need to determine their exact argumentative intent, i.e. to identify the competing claims and counterclaims, to see to what extent specific classical motifs are being deployed as polemical responses in particular situations. After analysing some typical examples, we can speculate on the collective effect of this intertextual strategy on *BJ*'s ancient readership.

[59] Eichler (1994) 18.
[60] Weber (1921) 16.

CHAPTER TWO

MANUFACTURED MOTIVES: A 'RATIONALIST' MODEL OF CAUSE AND EFFECT

> Sein... spielen... kennen Sie den Unterschied so genau, Chevalier?...
> —Ich nicht. Und was ich hier so eigentümlich finde, ist, daß alle scheinbaren Unterschiede sozusagen aufgehoben sind. Wirklichkeit geht in Spiel über—Spiel in Wirklichkeit...
> —Ich schwöre, daß das keine Komödie ist.
> —Freilich nicht, überall blitzt etwas wirkliches durch. Das ist ja das Entzückende.
>
> Arthur SCHNITZLER, *Der grüne Kakadu* (1898).

> Wirklichkeit verschwindet im Nebel der Deutung. Der Wille und wie wir ihn sehen sollen, wird Realität.
>
> Thomas MEYER, *Die Inszenierung des Scheins* (1992) 11.

> Josèphe a si habilement dissimulé les motivations religieuses des Insurgés en n'éclairant que l'aspect politique de leur mouvement que nombreux sont, aujourd'hui encore, les historiens qui hésitent ou se refusent à en admettre la réalité.
>
> Valentin NIKIPROWETZKY, 'La mort d'Éleazar...' (1971) 473.

The correlation posited between Josephus' anti-revolutionary polemic and his use of motifs from Greek and Roman historical writing can be tested on a representative sample of typical instances. Since our principal concern here is with the style, structure and function of the arguments he uses, the sequence in which the individual examples are presented is of little consequence. For the sake of clarity the texts are arranged in roughly ascending order of complexity.

1. Spes credula—*Apocalypse Now (6.283-288)*

Apocalyptic fervour among the besieged Jews intensifies as their situation becomes ever more desperate. The incident related below occurs after the

Romans have torched the Jerusalem Temple, causing a group of six thousand Jews to seek refuge in an adjoining colonnade (6.277). Their subsequent fate provides the historian with an opening for polemical comment:

> **283**The Romans then came to the last surviving colonnade of the outer court, where women and children and a mixed crowd of citizens had taken refuge, six thousand in all. **284**And before Titus had come to any decision about them or given any instructions to his officers, the soldiers, carried away by rage, set fire to the colonnade from below; as a result some plunged out of the flames to their death, others perished in the blaze, and of that vast number not one escaped. **285**They owed their destruction to a false prophet [ψευδοπροφήτης τις] who on that very day had proclaimed to the people in the city that God commanded them to go up to the Temple, and there receive signs of their deliverance [τὰ σημεῖα τῆς σωτηρίας]. **286**Numerous prophets, indeed, were at that time suborned by the party chiefs to deceive the people by exhorting them to await help from God [προσμένειν τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ βοήθειαν καταγγέλλοντες], in order to reduce the number of deserters and to buoy up with hope those who were above intimidation and [fear of] imprisonment. **287**In adversity man is easily persuaded; but when the deceiver actually pictures deliverance from prevailing miseries, the sufferer becomes the willing slave of hope. **288**So it was that the wretched people were deluded at that time by impostors and false messengers of God, while they neither heeded nor believed the unmistakable portents that predicted the coming desolation, but disregarded the plain warnings of God as if thunderstruck, blind and senseless.
>
> (6.283-288)

The argument unfolds in two distinct parts: first Josephus neutralizes apocalyptic prophecy by reducing it to political and psychological categories (283-287), then the famous prodigy list that follows reviews the individual σημεῖα to vindicate his own theological interpretation (288-315). The two sections are linked through the common motif of delusion. Josephus' indictment of the false prophets in the first part (quoted above) would have been more convincing if it were *not* followed immediately by the prodigy list, or if it is read apart from that list—for the juxtaposition produces a slight but telling tension. That Josephus' dismissive 'secularization' of the apocalyptic prophets belies a real concern with the underlying religious issues emerges plainly from his vigorous counterthrust in the catalogue of signs. Here the point of dispute is not the validity of the God-sent omens themselves (see esp. 310) but how they are to be understood, and in the prodigy list two competing interpretations meet head-on in what has well been described as 'une guerre d'oracles'.[1] Josephus' refutation of his

[1] The phrase is from NIKIPROWETZKY (1971) 474. Cf. MICHEL-BAUERNFEIND II,2 186-

opponents in the catalogue is insistent enough[2] to suggest that the preceeding σημεῖα τῆς σωτηρίας (285) are not indeed taken lightly. 'Misuse' by the insurgents of the term σωτηρία draws a pointed riposte from Josephus: 'Anyone who reflects on these things will find that God cares for mankind, and by all kinds of premonitory signs shows His people the means of salvation [τὰ σωτήρια], while they come to destruction through folly and evils of their own choosing' (310).[3] In other words, thrust and counterthrust in the prodigy list testify to the intensity of the fundamental *religious* controversy which Josephus first downplays by his cool rationalist dismissal of the prophets.

The credulous multitude, he says, is duped by a ψευδοπροφήτης, and the particular instance then widens into a general indictment (286-287) of what had become a common phenomenon in the years leading up to the war.[4] But these dismissive comments do not fit comfortably into the broader picture. Divine assistance (τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ βοήθειαν) is an ideological leitmotiv of the revolt (e.g. 6.98), with hopes of eschatological σωτηρία surviving even the destruction of the Temple itself (6.531); whenever the motif appears it is a revealing pointer to the underlying theology that sustained the insurgents. The prophets at 6.286 are a variation on this theme. Whether or not they were acting on instructions from the rebel chiefs, as alleged, is largely irrelevant: what is important is that their proclamations are consonant with the overarching apocalyptic pattern, while the size of their following (even after allowance is made for women and children) suggests that the prevailing mentality was extraordinarily receptive to their message. The slur that the prophets were suborned is apt to create the impression that the leaders themselves did not believe in the message proclaimed through their hirelings: but if this is what Josephus intended, it is refuted by various remarks which show quite

---

190 (Exkurs XIV); Rajak (1983) 90-91, who well remarks, 'Only prophets who are on the right side are acceptable... It is as though Josephus will not allow the enemy to occupy even an inch of ground—even when the ground is (for him) as slippery as this territory' (91).

[2] The polemical slant in Josephus may be gauged by comparison with the parallel Tacitean account. Tacitus includes a single critical generalization in relation to the messianic oracle: *sed volgus* ***more humanae cupidinis*** *sibi tantam fatorum magnitudinem interpretati ne adversis quidem ad vera mutabantur* (*Hist.* 5.13.2). Polemical interventions in Josephus' prodigy list are far more conspicuous, with two framing generalizations (288, 315) plus three pointed antitheses within the enumeration itself: τοῖς μὲν ἀπείροις–τοῖς δ' ἱερογραμματεῦσι (291), τοῖς μὲν ἰδιώταις—οἱ λόγιοι δὲ (295), and τὸν μὲν θεὸν ἀνθρώπων κηδόμενον—τοὺς δ' ὑπ' ἀνοίας καὶ κακῶν αὐθαιρέτων ἀπολλυμένους (310).

[3] The polemical responsion is noted by Michel-Bauernfeind II,2 187.

[4] See Barnett (1981) for the precursors to these traffickers in salvation.

clearly that the leadership did in fact share these same assumptions (4.122, 127, 6.98).[5]

Eschatological mystique is squarely countered with a psychological explanation. Josephus drains the central notions σωτηρία and τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ βοήθειαν of their *intended* sense and re-interprets them in psychological terms as instruments to serve the tyrants' political interests. The prophets, he asserts, were suborned to stem widespread desertion, ὡς ἧττον αὐτομολοῖεν καὶ τοὺς ἐπάνω δέους καὶ φυλακῆς γενομένους ἐλπὶς παρακροτοίη (6.286). When other means of coercion fail, Josephus would have us believe, the cynical party chiefs resort to ἐλπίς as an instrument of manipulation.[6] This is indeed consistent with the hostile characterization of John to whom an analogous ploy (πανοῦργον) was earlier attributed at 6.116-117;[7] but it does not accord with what we know about religious-ideological dimensions of the revolt.

The tendentious drift of the argument is indexed lexically by two appearances of the key term ἐλπίς: apocalyptic expectation (τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ βοήθειαν) is made to coalesce with a secularized species of hope which operates according to its own dynamic. The first occurrence of the word (ὡς... ἐλπὶς παρακρατοίη) prompts a gnome which analyses the psychology of hope in the manner of the Greek historians: πείθεται δὲ ταχέως ἄνθρωπος ἐν συμφοραῖς, ὅταν δὲ δὴ καὶ τῶν κατεχόντων δεινῶν ἀπαλλαγὴν ὁ ἐξαπατῶν ὑπογράφῃ, τόθ' ὁ πάσχων ὅλος γίνεται τῆς ἐλπίδος (287). The accentuation here points to Thucydides rather than Polybius, for while ἐλπίς in Polybius does appear with a negative tinge, it is not used as consistently with the same technical-affective nuance as in Thucydides.[8] In this connexion two further details might be noted. First, man is vulnerable to hope (and so also to persuasion) in proportion to his outward adversity

---

[5] On these passages, cf. MICHEL-BAUERNFEIND 4 n. 25; SCHWIER (1989) 148; and the following note.

[6] MICHEL-BAUERNFEIND 6 n. 134: 'Die Auffassung des Josephus macht aus den jüdischen Führern Verführer, die am Untergang der Verführten mit allen Mitteln arbeiten... Die jüdischen Führer standen selbst unter dem Einfluß der apokalyptischen Weissagung und waren im subjektiven Sinn nicht Verführer des Volkes, wie Josephus meint... Die politische Prophetie diente nach Josephus dazu, um das Überlaufen zu verhindern und eine Verzweiflung, die weder durch Drohung [δέος] noch Gefängnis [φυλακή] beeinflußbar war, durch neue Hoffnung zu überwinden...'

[7] Cf. THÉROND (1979) 59. One also recalls, *mutatis mutandis*, Polybius' comments (6.56) on the uses of religion as an instrument of social coercion.

[8] Negatively tinged ἐλπίς at (e.g.) Polyb. 4.62.4, πλήρεις ἐλπίδων κενῶν καὶ φρονήματος ἀλόγου πεποιηκὼς Αἰτωλούς; 29.8.3, πᾶσαν ἐλπίδα παρούτεινε καὶ πᾶν γένος δελέατος ὑπερρίπτει. On the other hand, ἐλπίσιν ἐπαίρεσθαι *vel sim.* (Polyb. 10.41.1, 11.28.1, 38.15.10) does not have the same loaded psychological nuance as equivalent expressions in Thucydides (e.g. 1.81.6, 3.45.1).

(πείθεται δὲ ταχέως ἄνθρωπος ἐν συμφοραῖς...). The same correlation between ἐλπίς and συμφοραί appears in Thucydides' Melian dialogue, where divination and oracles are cited as the final straws eagerly clutched at by desperate men:

> ἐλπὶς δέ, κινδύνῳ παραμύθιον οὖσα... μηδὲ ὁμοιωθῆναι τοῖς πολλοῖς... ἐπειδὰν πιεζομένους αὐτοὺς ἐπιλίπωσιν αἱ φανεραὶ ἐλπίδες, ἐπὶ τὰς ἀφανεῖς καθίστανται, μαντικήν τε καὶ χρησμοὺς καὶ ὅσα τοιαῦτα μετ' ἐλπίδων λυμαίνεται.
>
> Hope is indeed a comforter in danger... Do not make yourselves like the common people who... as soon as adversity comes and all visible grounds of hope fail them, turn to what is invisible, to prophecies and oracles and such things which by encouraging hope lead men to ruin.
>
> (Thuc. 5.103; cf. 2.62.5)

This is a psychological truism which will have had especial relevance in an atmosphere charged with apocalyptic expectation. For as one commentator has suggested, 'The eschatological expectations seemingly grew stronger whenever the actual condition of the Jewish nation was the opposite of the ideal national hopes expressed in the vision of the renewal of Israel's glory and the overthrow of foreign rule'.[9] Josephus by bringing out the reciprocity between συμφοραί and ἐλπίς in effect plays down the messianic-eschatological component of Jewish hope, which is reduced to a psychological syndrome. Next, the prophets who kindle hopes of divine intervention are dismissed as deceivers (ὅταν δὲ δὴ καὶ τῶν κατεχόντων δεινῶν ἀπαλλαγὴν ὁ ἐξαπατῶν ὑπογράφῃ..., 6.287), a stricture which obviously extends also to the leadership which orchestrates the deception. By linking ἐλπίς to the ἐξαπατᾶν motif Josephus again stresses the psychological at the expense of the eschatological. And this accentuation acquires added point in light of the typical Thucydidean syzygy hope/delusion. Ἐλπίς and ἐλπίζειν in the rigorous analysis of Thucydides regularly carry a negative affective nuance (≈ delusion, wishful thinking): they belong to the realm of τύχη, are without basis in objective reality, and as such are opposed to γνώμη and πρόνοια.[10] A related tinge informs our text, where tyrants and ψευδοπροφήται in unholy alliance, exploiting the desperate plight of the people, instrumentalize wishful thinking as a means

---

[9] Stern (1977) 265. We recall the proverbial *quod nimis miseri volunt,/ hoc facile credunt* (Sen. *HF* 313-314).

[10] Important passages include Thuc. 1.81.6, 1.84.4, 2.51.6, 3.45.1, 3.97.2, 4.108.4, 5.103.1, 5.111.2, 5.113, 6.78.2. On the psychology of ἐλπίς in Thucydides, see Cornford (1907) 167-168, 224-226; Landmann (1930) 59-61; Bender (1938) 40f. n. 109; Müri (1947) 253; Schrijen (1965) 99-119; Huart (1968) 141-149; Hunter (1973) 68, 111-112, 142.

of deception and political control.[11] Thus the tension hope/deception in Josephus serves the double purpose of debunking rebel claims of deliverance as cynical opportunism, and of presenting the credulous people as easy game to their tormentors.[12]

The gnomic form of Josephus' observation (πείθεται δὲ ταχέως ἄνθρωπος...) also suggests a Greek pedigree. Thucydides' anthropology, founded on the premise that human nature is constant and therefore largely predictable (1.22.4, 3.82.2), is distilled to a considerable degree in his characteristic gnomes; and among those dealing with ἀνθρωπεία φύσις, a good number concern ἐλπίς.[13] Formally *BJ* 6.287 bears comparison with a text like Thuc. 4.108.4: 'It is the habit of men to entrust to careless hope what they long for, and to use the full force of reason to reject what they find unpalatable' [εἰωθότες οἱ ἄνθρωποι οὗ μὲν ἐπιθυμοῦσιν ἐλπίδι ἀπερισκέπτῳ διδόναι, ὃ δὲ μὴ προσίενται λογισμῷ αὐτοκράτορι διωθεῖσθαι]. In either case the gnomic character of the statement is signalled by a generic introduction which anchors the utterance in human nature (εἰωθότες οἱ ἄνθρωποι ≈ πείθεται... ἄνθρωπος), while the gnomic present isolates the statement from the surrounding narrative past tense; the parallel content requires no comment. A direct Thucydidean influence seems quite likely here.

The thrust of our passage is plainly hostile: 'Hier redet der politische Gegner, der seine Feinde vernichtet. Wir haben Grund, vorsichtig zu sein'.[14] More precisely, Josephus' strategy has been described thus: 'Sur les personnages et sur les événements, il nous donne des interprétations personnelles et tendancieuses mais il s'efforce de les faire paraître universelles et impartiales en faisant croire à leur evidence. Aussi s'applique-t-il à les fondre, le mieux possible, dans le récit afin de masquer leur caractère subjectif... Josèphe trouve là [6.287] un moyen bien hypocrite pour insinuer l'idée fort tendancieuse qu'il n'y avait pas de véritables motivations religieuses dans le mouvement insurrectionnel qui ne comptait, dans ses rangs, que des faux-prophètes'.[15] We can now take this a step further:

---

[11] The motif of wishful thinking appears again at the end of the prodigy list (6.315), where the Jews either dismiss the signs or interpret them subjectively πρὸς ἡδονήν. Thucydides' comments on the subjective interpretation of the ancient oracle during the Athenian plague (2.54) offer an instructive analogy.

[12] The apologetic tendency to represent the people as victims is typical: cf. Krieger (1994) 283-285.

[13] Illuminating remarks on these 'réfléxions générales' in De Romilly (1990) 61-104. Gnomes specifically on hope: 2.43.5-6, 2.62.5, 3.45.5, 4.17.4, 7.66.3, 7.67.1, with Meister (1953) 78-81.

[14] Weber (1921) 37.

[15] Thérond (1979) 78 and 84 respectively.

Josephus first assimilates the specific eschatological expectation (τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ βοήθειαν) to a generalized and secularized ἐλπίς, then punctures the latter by descanting in the manner of Thucydides.[16] The argument is inherently plausible, while the Thucydidean complexion confers an aura of authority.

2. Καὶ ἔρως ἐνέπεσε τοῖς πᾶσιν... *(2.345-347)*

> **345** If I had found you all eager for war with the Romans, instead of seeing that the most honest and single-minded members of our community [τοῦ δήμου τὸ καθαρώτατον καὶ εἰλικρινέστατον] are determined to keep the peace, I should not have come forward to address you nor ventured to offer advice; for any speech in support of a wise policy is wasted when the audience unanimously favours a foolish one. **346** But seeing that the stimulus to war is for some of you a youthfulness which lacks experience of its horrors, for others an unreflecting hope of regaining independence, for others again perhaps avarice and the prospect of enriching themselves at the expense of the weak in the event of a general convulsion [ἐπεὶ δὲ τινὰς μὲν ἡλικία τῶν ἐν πολέμῳ κακῶν ἄπειρος, τινὰς δὲ ἐλπὶς ἀλόγιστος ἐλευθερίας, ἐνίους δὲ πλεονεξία τις παροξύνει καὶ τὸ παρὰ τῶν ἀσθενεστέρων, ἐὰν τὰ πράγματα συγχυθῇ, κέρδος], I, in order to bring these

---

[16] Related 'Thucydidean' analyses of hope appear elsewhere in *BJ* with analogous polemical intent, e.g. 5.66: 'The Jews, successful in their first attack, were elated with unreasoning hope [ἐπήγειρε τὰς διανοίας ἄσκεπτος ἐλπίς], and this fleeting turn of fortune [ἡ πρόσκαιρος ῥοπὴ] filled them with boundless confidence for the future'. On Agrippa's speech to the Jews (esp. 2.346), see below. Eleazar's second speech at Masada: 'Arms, ramparts, impregnable fortresses, and a spirit that in the cause of liberty no danger could shake—these encouraged all to rebel. Yet these things were effective for a very short time, and after bouying us up with hopes proved the beginning of worse misfortunes' [ἀλλὰ ταῦτα... ταῖς ἐλπίσιν ἡμᾶς ἐπάραντα μειζόνων ἀρχὴ κακῶν ἀνεφάνη] (7.370). The failure of the revolt is here described in terms that again recall Thucydidean psychology: ἐπαίρειν, ἐπαίρεσθαι and ἐκφέρεσθαι in Thucydides are used typically of irrational elation in response to unreasonable hope or passion (e.g. 1.81.6, 1.84.2, 1.120.3-4, 3.45.6, 3.84.1) and are usually danger signals; cf. Huart (1968) 390 n. 4. Eleazar's terminology suggests a *typical* process (false confidence inspired by illusory hopes) which plays down the specifics detailed in the preceding sentence. He continues: 'But since an honourable ambition deluded us [ἐπεὶ δὲ ἡμᾶς οὐκ ἀγεννὴς ἐλπὶς ἐβουκόλησεν] into thinking that we might perhaps succeed in avenging the city of her enemies, and now that hope has vanished and left us to our fate, let us hasten to die honourably' (7.380). The original hope, glossed as ὡς τάχα που δυνήσεσθαι τοὺς πολεμίους ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς ἀμύνασθαι, probably alludes to the inviolability of Jerusalem (≈ 6.98). Josephus by subsuming the eschatological motif into the psychological matrix debunks it as an evanescent illusion (ἐβουκόλησεν). Eleazar of course here serves as mouthpiece to articulate the hostile interpretation of Josephus himself; on the intrinsic improbability that the Sicarii chief used the arguments here ascribed to him, see Nikiprowetzky (1971) 466-467, 469-473. 'Il y a dans les paroles que Josèphe lui fait prononcer une insuffisance de cohérence psychologique et logique qui saute aux yeux' (*ibid.* 471). Cf. Rajak (1983) 83.

> people to reason and a change of mind, and to prevent virtuous citizens from reaping the consequences of the folly of a few [καὶ μὴ τῆς ἐνίων κακοβουλίας οἱ ἀγαθοὶ παραπολαύσωσιν], have felt obliged to call you all together and to tell you what I think is in your best interests. **347** Please do not interrupt me if my remarks are not to your liking. For those who are absolutely determined to revolt will still be free to feel the same after hearing my views; but my words will be lost even on those who want to hear, unless you all give me a quiet hearing.
>
> (2.345-347)

In one of the key speeches of *BJ*, Agrippa urges that war with Rome is not only unjustified but will drag the entire Jewish nation into certain destruction (2.345-401).[17] The significance of his oration is widely recognized: Agrippa's analysis, complemented by the later speeches of Josephus (5.362-419) and Eleazar (7.323-336, 341-388), gives the perspective of Josephus' own philosophy of history;[18] and in the manner of an overture just before the outbreak of hostilities, Agrippa's λόγος (subsequently vindicated by narrative ἔργα) offers the reader stable criteria to judge the unfolding drama. Surreptitiously Josephus also uses this eminently sensible rhetor to endorse his own tendentious interpretation of the war, and to that extent the speech fits into the work's wider polemical design.

Of particular interest in this regard is the proem, quoted above, whose standardized rhetorical form—expositional *captatio benevolentiae*, appeal by the speaker to συμφέρειν, the μὴ θορυβήσητε *topos*—is apt to belie its subversive intent. In the guise of a flattering appeal to his audience, Agrippa divides the Jews into a peace-loving majority and a minority of warmongers. The dichotomy echoes a polemical leitmotiv of *BJ* (cf. chap. 1, n. 40): if this were indeed an accurate reflexion of prevailing opinion, it would hardly have been necessary for Agrippa to argue his case at such length, nor would his speech then have elicited such a hostile reaction (cf. 2.402-403, 406-407): much rather the king serves as mouthpiece through

---

[17] It is instructive to compare the arguments, reported in the autobiography, by which Josephus himself tried to restrain the insurgents on the eve of the war. These read like a synopsis of Agrippa's more expansive treatment: 'I accordingly tried to repress these instigators of sedition and to bring them over to another frame of mind. I urged them to picture for themselves the nation on which they were about to make war, and to remember that they were inferior to the Romans, not only in military skill but in good fortune; and I warned them not recklessly and with such utter madness to expose their country, their families and themselves to the gravest perils. With such words I earnestly and insistently tried to dissuade them from their purpose, forseeing that the end of the war would be most disastrous for us. But my efforts had no effect; the madness of these desperate men was far too strong for me' (*Vita* 17-19).

[18] On the interrelationship of these speeches, see Lindner (1972) 21-48; Gabba (1976/1977); Bomstad (1979) *passim*, esp. 175-186; Michel (1984).

whom Josephus articulates his own interpretation of the war. In this sense too the attributes assigned to the peace and war factions respectively balance each other in tendentious symmetry: τοῦ δήμου τὸ καθαρώτατον καὶ εἰλικρινέστατον, οἱ ἀγαθοί—τῆς ἐνίων κακοβουλίας. The polarity appears again when John of Gischala enters Jerusalem (4.128-135), and in either case Josephus masks its polemical slant by superimposing generalizations in the manner of his Greek models. Agrippa here does not simply *discredit* the warmongers, but purports to *explain* their mood (and so bring them back to their senses) by applying psychological categories redolent of Thucydides. Of particular interest is his review of the diverse impulses ('But seeing that the stimulus to war is for some..., for others..., for others again...'). Individually ἡλικία (= νεότης), ἐλπίς and πλεονεξία as causal factors all have negative connotations in Thucydides' error analysis; more particularly, Agrippa's configuration of affective elements appears to owe something to the subtle differentiation of Athenian motives on the eve of the Sicilian expedition:

> καὶ ἔρως ἐνέπεσε τοῖς πᾶσιν ὁμοίως ἐκπλεῦσαι· τοῖς μὲν γὰρ πρεσβυτέροις ὡς ἢ καταστρεψομένοις ἐφ' ἃ ἔπλεον ἢ οὐδὲν ἂν σφαλεῖσαν μεγάλην δύναμιν, τοῖς δ' ἐν τῇ ἡλικίᾳ τῆς τε ἀπούσης πόθῳ ὄψεως καὶ θεωρίας, καὶ εὐέλπιδες ὄντες σωθήσεσθαι· ὁ δὲ πολὺς ὅμιλος καὶ στρατιώτης ἔν τε τῷ παρόντι ἀργύριον οἴσειν καὶ προσκτήσεσθαι δύναμιν ὅθεν ἀίδιον μισθοφορὰν ὑπάρξειν.
>
> On all alike there fell a passion to set sail. The older men thought that they would either conquer the places they were sailing against, or at any rate that a great force could come to no harm. The younger men had a longing for distant sights and scenes, and were confident that they would return safely. The general masses and the average soldier hoped not only to get money for the present, but to acquire an additional empire that would be a permanent source of pay.
>
> (Thuc. 6.24.3-4)

Agrippa's role here is typologically akin to that of the 'wise warner' of classical historiography—that voice of reason and restraint, foil to misguided enterprises or individuals, heard typically *in cardine rerum*, unheeded, and duly vindicated.[19] On the eve of hostilities, Agrippa brings to bear the wisdom and practical insights of his literary antecedents. Both situation and argument recall two distinguished Thucydidean warners in particular: Archidamus at the start of the war (Thuc. 1.80-85) and Nicias in the Sicilian debate (6.9-14). In either case the antithesis maturity/youth

[19] For the main characteristics and relevant literature on this figure, cf. Mader (1993) 209-216.

(1.80.1; 6.12.2, 13.1) appears with the correlative polarity rationality/irrationality (1.81.6, 84.2-4, 85.1; 6.11.6-7). The seasoned commander Archidamus (πολέμων ἔμπειρός εἰμι) implies that youthful inexperience is a dangerous incentive to war: '...I see men among you who are as old as I am; no one of them, therefore, is eager for war through lack of experience, as would be the case with most men...' [ὥστε μήτε ἀπειρίᾳ ἐπιθυμῆσαί τινα τοῦ ἔργου, ὅπερ ἂν οἱ πολλοὶ πάθοιεν] (1.80.1; cf. 1.72.1; 2.8.1, 20.2, 21.2); so too Agrippa, τινὰς μὲν ἡλικία τῶν ἐν πολέμῳ κακῶν ἀπείρατος... παροξύνει (346). Archidamus, insisting that the Spartans are no match for Athens, enumerates the overwhelming resources of the Athenian empire (πλοῦτος, ἵπποι, ὅπλα, ὄχλος), and itemizes Spartan limitations in a series of pointed rhetorical questions:

> πῶς χρῆ πρὸς τούτους ῥᾳδίως πόλεμον ἄρασθαι καὶ τίνι πιστεύσαντας ἀπαρασκεύους ἐπειχθῆναι; πότερον ταῖς ναυσίν; ἀλλ' ἥσσους ἐσμέν... ἀλλὰ τοῖς χρήμασιν; ἀλλὰ πολλῷ πλέον ἔτι τούτῳ ἐλλείπομεν... τάχ' ἂν δέ τις θαρσοίη ὅτι τοῖς ὅπλοις αὐτῶν καὶ τῷ πλήθει ὑπερφέρομεν... τοῖς δὲ ἄλλη γῆ ἐστὶ πολλὴ ἧς ἄρχουσι, καὶ ἐκ θαλάσσης ὧν δέονται ἀπάξονται.
>
> **Why should we** irresponsibly start a war against such men, **and on what** do we rely if we attack them unprepared? **On our ships?** But there we are inferior... **Or on our wealth?** But in this respect we are at a still greater disadvantage... Perhaps someone might be emboldened by our superiority in arms and numbers... But the Athenians have plenty of other land in their empire, and will import all their needs by sea.
>
> (Thuc. 1.80.3-81.2)

Compare the shape and intent of Agrippa's argument: 'What are the troops, what are the weapons on which you rely? Where is the fleet that is to sweep the Roman seas? Where are the funds to pay for your expedition?' [ποίᾳ στρατιᾷ, ποίοις πεποιθότες ὅπλοις; ποῦ μὲν ὁ στόλος ὑμῖν διαληψόμενος τὰς Ῥωμαίων θαλάσσας; ποῦ δ' οἱ ταῖς ἐπιβολαῖς ἐξαρκέσοντες θησαυροί;] (2.361). This is not to suggest that Josephus consciously modelled his Agrippa on either Archidamus or Alcibiades—but the typological similarities imply a clear awareness of the literary tradition.

The point of this distinctive accentuation is precisely that it bypasses possible religious-eschatological motives, predisposing the reader to see the situation in exclusively secular terms. Specifics blend into gnomic-type remarks whose literary affiliation confers a nimbus of authority. A complex and multi-layered causation is simplified into a one-dimensional psychological explanation which in its new context conveniently subserves the historian's partisan account.[20]

---

[20] A parallel tendency to simplify through secularization is evident also when Agrippa

Interpreted thus, Agrippa's analysis at the start of *BJ* has its thematic counterpart in Titus' address to the 'tyrants' just before the drama's final act, and it is instructive to compare the respective arguments. In retrospect and not without irony, Titus reviews (again) the reasons which might have encouraged the Jews to revolt:

> **328** Well, gentlemen, are you now satisfied with your country's sufferings?—you who, utterly disregarding our strength or your own weakness, have through your reckless impetuosity and madness [ὁρμῇ δὲ ἀσκέπτῳ καὶ μανίᾳ] destroyed your people, your city, and your Temple, and richly deserve the destruction that is coming to yourselves; **329** you who from the moment Pompey reduced you by force never stopped rebelling, and have now ended by declaring open war on the Romans. **330** Did you rely on numbers? [ἆρά γε πλήθει πεποιθότες;] Why, a mere fraction of the Roman army was sufficient to deal with you. On the trustworthiness of your allies? Which nation beyond the limits of our empire would prefer Jews to Romans? **331** On physical strength, perhaps? Yet you know that the Germans are our slaves. On the strength of your walls? What wall could be a greater obstacle than the open sea? Yet the Britons, although girded by this, still do homage to Roman arms. **332** On your determination of spirit and the cunning of your generals? Yet you knew that even the Carthaginians were defeated. No, assuredly you were incited against the Romans by Roman kindness...
>
> (6.328-332)

Several motifs hark back to Agrippa's earlier speech and establish this as a point of reference: Pompey's conquest as historical caesura (6.329 ≈ 2.355-356); misplaced Jewish reliance on their numbers (6.330 ≈ 2.357) and support from their allies (6.330 ≈ 2.388-389); and the parallel apotreptic mention of Germans (6.331 ≈ 2.376-377), Britons (6.331 ≈ 2.378)[21] and

---

argues against the Jewish passion for liberty (2.348ff.). Refrain-like insistence on the terms ἐλευθερία and δουλεία throughout his speech implies that he is consciously taking issue with the ideological assumptions of his opponents: cf. LINDNER (1972) 23-24. But in relation to the rebels' programme, these concepts have both a secular-political *and* a theocratic-eschatological nuance; Agrippa's exclusively political treatment of the terms filters out any hint of these ideological motives. 'Josephus verdeckt weithin diese religiösen Motive seiner Gegner' (*ibid.*). (A similar emphasis also in the later speech of Ananus at 4.163-192). Agrippa's elaborate use of historical analogy, which assimilates the Jewish uprising to other politically driven movements, is another ploy to efface the distinctive ideological dimension.

[21] Here the correspondence is especially striking: 'On the strength of your walls? [ὀχυρότητι δὲ τειχῶν;] What wall could be a greater obstacle than the open sea? Yet the Britons, although girded by this, still do homage to Roman arms' [καὶ τί μεῖζον ὠκεανοῦ τεῖχος κώλυμα, ὃν περιβεβλημένοι Βρεττανοὶ τὰ Ῥωμαίων ὅπλα προσκυνοῦσιν;] (6.331) ≈ 'Again, consider the defences of the Britons, you who put your trust in the walls of Jerusalem [σκέψασθε δὲ καὶ τὸ Βρεττανῶν τεῖχος οἱ τοῖς Ἱεροσολύμων τείχεσιν πεποιθότες]: the ocean surrounds them, they inhabit an island as big as the land we inhabit; yet the Romans crossed the sea and enslaved them...' (2.378).

Carthaginians (6.332 ≈ 2.380-383). In terms of both form and intent, in fact, Titus' argument might be regarded as a much compresssed version of Agrippa's more extensive geographical catalogue. Of the individual arguments itemized by Titus under the rubric 'inconsiderate fury and madness', two in particular deserve attention here. The suspicion that ἆρά γε πλήθει πεποιθότες (6.330) could be a pointed counterthrust to the Maccabean 'numbers' motif, doubtless appropriated by the Zealots (cf. below, n. 40), is reinforced by a disparaging reference to the walls of Jerusalem (6.331), itself almost certainly an ironical riposte to the Zealots' belief in the inviolability of the Holy City (cf. 4.127; 5.458-459; 6.24, 98).[22] These two points in particular index the polemical tendency to re-interpret rebel ideas within a secular matrix. With the religious motives thus effectively dismissed, Titus concludes that the Jews must have been encouraged to revolt by the magnanimous treatment they received from the Romans (6.333-336). Thematically this is related to Agrippa's earlier image of the recalcitrant slave (αὐθάδης δοῦλος, 2.356) who turns against his master, and recalls also the kind of argument used by Livy's Scipio in a broadly analogous context (21.41.10-13); in either case the contrast between Roman φιλανθρωπία and barbarian ingratitude contains a perceptible element of self-justification and subtly evokes also the underlying concept of the *bellum iustum*. Thus at one stroke Titus vindicates Roman policy, deals his opponents a well-aimed blow, and endorses the validity of Agrippa's earlier analysis.

3. Animus turpis admissi memor *(6.2-4)*

The beleaguered Jerusalem rebels rush out against the Romans, callously trampling on their slain compatriots:

> **2**The innumerable corpses piled up throughout the city were not only a revolting sight and emitted a pestilential stench; they also obstructed the fighters in their sorties. For, like soldiers making their way with mass slaughter through a battle line, they were forced as they went to trample on

---

[22] For the pattern, compare also Titus' earlier address to his troops at 6.33ff. The motif of Jewish confidence in their walls (καίπερ γὰρ πολὺ τῷ τείχει πεποιθότες καὶ τῶν ὀργάνων καταφρονοῦντες, 6.24) is taken up by Titus and turned against them—for now these same ramparts cannot withstand the alliance of God and Romans: στάσις γὰρ καὶ λιμὸς καὶ πολιορκία καὶ δίχα μηχανημάτων πίπτοντα τείχη τί ἂν ἀλλ' ἢ θεοῦ μὲν εἴη μῆνις ἐκείνοις, βοήθεια δ' ἡμετέρα; (6.40). If trust in the walls by the Jewish rebels is a concrete expression of their underlying belief in the divine symmachy, Titus in one deft stroke dismisses the former and appropriates the latter for the Roman cause.

> the bodies [ἔδει τὰ σώματα πατεῖν]. **3**But they trod them underfoot without a shudder, without pity, without a thought of any evil omen to themselves from this insult to the dead [οἱ δ' ἐπιβαίνοντες οὔτ' ἠλέουν οὔτε κληδόνα κακὴν σφῶν αὐτῶν ὑπελάμβανον τὴν εἰς τοὺς κατοιχομένους ὕβριν]. **4**With hands drenched in the blood of their countrymen [πεφυρμένοι δ' ὁμοφύλῳ τὰς δεξιὰς] they rushed out to battle against foreigners [ἐπὶ τὸν πρὸς ἀλλοφύλους πόλεμον ἐξέθεον], reproaching the Almighty, it seems to me, for His slowness in punishing them [ὀνειδίζοντες ... τὸ θεῖον εἰς βραδυτῆτα τῆς ἐπ' αὐτῶν κολάσεως]; for it was not hope of victory which now emboldened them for the fight, but despair of escape [ἤδη δὲ ἀπογνώσει σωτηρίας ἐθρασύνετο].
>
> (6.2-4)

The extract is an extreme example of Josephus' technique of 'polemical reversal' to discredit honorific Zealot motives. Although the specific claims he targets are not named *expressis verbis*, they can be drawn out of his own tendentious account, and provide a context for his strident counterthrust.

Josephus first gives a lurid account of the Zealots' actions and then turns to the underlying motivation, with a corresponding shift in emphasis from the religious-philosophical to the psychological. The whole description of the Zealot atrocities turns on the polarity ὁμόφυλον/ἀλλόφυλον, i.e. slaughter of compatriots on the one hand, war against Romans on the other: this double aspect corresponds to Josephus' conception of the Jewish War as simultaneously external and civil war, with the latter infinitely more pernicious.[23] Here the fratricidal *stasis* is perceptibly stressed by the motif of the unburied corpses, by triple anaphoric censure of Zealot brutality (οὔτ' ἔφριττον οὔτ' ἠλέουν οὔτε... ὑπελάμβανον), by the suggestive verb πατεῖν, and by the lurid detail πεφυρμένοι δ' ὁμοφύλῳ τὰς δεξιὰς—all recurrent elements in Josephus' account of the civic strife.[24] The third member in the tricolon suggestively evokes the overarching scheme of sin and punishment by way of a κληδόνα κακὴν σφῶν αὐτῶν—alluding possibly to the παλαιὸς λόγος, twice reported in *BJ*, that the city would be taken when it fell victim to fratricidal strife and attendant sacrilege (4.386-388, 6.109-110).[25] At any rate, mention of the κληδών widens the

---

[23] See 1.10, 27; 3.297; 4.180-184, 375, 397, 412, 558; 5.28, 256-257, 362-363; 6.102, 122; 7.266.

[24] On the motif of the unburied corpse, see chap. 3, n. 7. Erosion of ἔλεος, here brought out by the anaphora, is a typical symptom of *stasis*: see chap. 3, section 1. Πατέω and compounds, both literally (νεκρούς, τὰ ἅγια καταπατεῖν) and figuratively (τοὺς νόμους πατεῖν), carry the suggestion of insolence and contempt (as Latin *calcare*) and are regularly used by Josephus to describe acts of sacrilege and *hybris*, e.g. 1.544, 2.170, 4.171, 4.258, 6.126. Cf. *ThWB* 5.942; Hengel (1976) 190 n. 3; Krieger (1994) 298. Bloodstained hands emblemize the theme of ὁμόφυλος φόνος also at 3.391, 4.183, 6.122.

[25] I take these two passages to the παλαιὸς λόγος as referring to the *same* prediction.

perspective and is a cue to read the passage in light of the work's metaphysical assumptions. We recall that Josephus' most vocal criticisms of the rebels typically 'have a religious tinge. It is the wickedness of shedding blood, and, above all, of polluting God's Temple, which is stressed...'; and that from this perspective '*stasis* is not just a sin, but the ultimate sin.'[26] All this gives point to the indictment in our passage.

The religiously tinged polemic works up to a paradoxical apex in the clause ὀνειδίζοντες, ἔμοιγε δοκεῖν, τὸ θεῖον εἰς βραδυτῆτα τῆς ἐπ᾽ αὐτῶν κολάσεως. A word is necessary, first, on the potentially ambiguous pronoun αὐτῶν. The only interpretation allowed by the context is αὐτῶν = αὑτῶν (i.e. referring to the Zealots themselves, and not to the Romans), for if αὐτῶν κόλασις were understood as τῶν Ῥωμαίων κόλασις, such (divine) punishment of the *Romans* would be equivalent to God's assistance to the *Zealots* (≈ ἡ ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ βοήθεια)—which is irreconcilable with the following remark that they have in fact already forfeited all hope of victory (οὐ γὰρ ἐλπίδι νίκης ὁ πόλεμος...). Thus I take the statement to mean that the Zealots by their actions (i.e. ὁμοφύλῳ φόνῳ, the ultimate sin) seem (to their critic Josephus) to be calling down divine retribution (κόλασις) upon their *own* heads. This is exactly correlative to an earlier remark, with reference to the παλαιὸς λόγος, where the Zealots were polemically said to be consciously fulfilling that dire prediction: 'The Zealots did not question this saying, but they made themselves the agents of its fulfilment' (4.388).

On this reading, the paradoxical sentence ὀνειδίζοντες... represents the *subjective* perspective (ἔμοιγε δοκεῖν) of Josephus who excoriates through exaggeration—but the very shrillness of his indictment suggests that it is directed against an equally specific set of opposing religious assumptions. It is tempting therefore to interpret the hyperbolical statement ὀνειδίζοντες... ἐπ᾽ αὐτῶν κολάσεως as a symmetrical reversal of the rebels' own claim that they were fighting as God's agents *and with divine assistance*, i.e. when the Zealots themselves used κόλασις in contexts like this, they would indeed have meant κόλασις Ῥωμαίων (referring to the divine symmachy). This assumption would also explain the rhetorical emphasis on *stasis*-related atrocities—for divine symmachy and ὁμόφυλος φόνος are mutually exclusive,[27] such φόνος can provoke only God's wrath (e.g. 7.331-332).

The exact prophecy Josephus has in mind is not altogether clear: cf. Michel-Bauernfeind 4 n. 101 and 6 n. 34; Rajak (1983) 95.

[26] Rajak (1983) 94 and 95 respectively.

[27] Josephus makes the point explicitly in his speech to the besieged insurgents (5.402-403): 'You have not eschewed the secret sins—theft, treachery, adultery—while in plundering and murder [ἁρπαγαῖς... καὶ φόνοις] you vie with each other in opening up new avenues of vice... And after all this do you expect Him, thus dishonoured, to be your

Josephus has polemically recast the insurgents as diabolical protagonists in an epic '*Heilsgeschichte* écrite à l'envers'.[28]

Having tendentiously excluded, through polemical inversion, any honorific motives on the part of the insurgents, Josephus now advances an alternative explanation for their undeniable θράσος in battle: οὐ γὰρ ἐλπίδι νίκης ὁ πόλεμος, ἤδη δὲ ἀπογνώσει σωτηρίας ἐθρασύνετο (6.4). In their hopeless situation they are motivated only by naked desperation (ἀπογνώσει σωτηρίας). Psychology and polemic coalesce in purposeful combination. It is a truism that sheer desperation may provide a potent psychological stimulus,[29] and collective Jewish ἀπόγνωσις σωτηρίας appears more than once as a counterpoise to the loftier Roman ideals (3.153, 3.209-210, 5.488, 6.42-44). But in relation specifically to the antecedent theme of fratricidal slaughter, ἀπόγνωσις σωτηρίας can here be narrowed down to a very precise and pointed nuance. Two passages in particular are helpful in analysing the structure of the insurgents' despair:

> **193** With these words Ananus roused the populace against the Zealots. He was fully aware how difficult it would be to suppress them now because of their numbers, their youthful vigour, and their intrepidity, but above all because they had such crimes on their conscience [συνειδήσει τῶν εἰργασμένων]; for they would never surrender, in the hope of receiving eventual pardon for all they had done [οὐ γὰρ ἐνδώσειν αὐτοὺς εἰς ἐσχάτην συγγνώμην ἐφ' οἷς ἔδρασαν ἐλπίσαντας].
>
> (4.193)

---

ally? [εἶτ' ἐπὶ τούτοις τὸν ἀσεβηθέντα σύμμαχον προσδοκᾶτε;] You are indeed righteous suppliants and it is with pure hands that you appeal to your protector!' The rebels by their crimes destroy the very basis of the divine symmachy, the polemical contradiction between outward action and underlying assumption is consciously used to implode their claims. A similar dissonance is used for polemical effect also by Agrippa (2.391-394): 'Consider... how you will be forced to transgress the very principles which provide your chief hope of making God your ally, and so will alienate Him... How will you be able to call the Deity to your aid, after deliberately denying Him the service which you owe Him?' The stylized congruence between Agrippa's early prediction and its later fulfilment by the rebels vindicates the original warning and provides a stable criterion for assessing the insurgents' behaviour.

[28] The felicitious expression is from Mosès (1986) 190.

[29] Compare the explanatory gnome at 3.149: 'Thus deprived of all hope of escape, the Jews were stimulated to deeds of daring; for in war there is nothing like necessity to rouse the fighting spirit' [τοῦτ' ἐν ἀπογνώσει σωτηρίας παρώξυνε τοὺς Ἰουδαίους πρὸς τόλμαν· οὐδὲν γὰρ ἀνάγκης ἐν πολέμῳ μαχιμώτερον]. Since this is said of the defenders of Jotapata, there are no polemical undertones. For the correlation, compare also 6.1, τῶν τε στασιαστῶν μᾶλλον παροξυνομένων ἐν ταῖς συμφοραῖς; 6.171, τοὺς γὰρ ἀπεγνωκότας τὴν σωτηρίαν... τὰς ὁρμὰς ἀταμιεύτους ἔχειν; Verg. *Aen.* 2.354, *una salus victis nullam sperare salutem*; Sen. *Med.* 163, *qui nil potest sperare, desperet nihil*; Tac. *Hist.* 3.82.3, *Vitelliani desperatione sola ruebant, et quamquam pulsi, rursus in urbe congregabantur*; *ibid.* 3.84.2.

> [The spectacle of the Roman troops receiving pay:] **353**Even the boldest were struck with utter consternation when they saw the entire army assembled, the splendour of their armour and the perfect discipline of the men. **354**I have no doubt that the partisans would have been converted by that sight, had not the enormity of their crimes against the people [≈ ἁρπαγαί, φόνοι, 5.402-403; ὁμόφυλος φόνος, 6.2-4] made them despair of obtaining pardon from the Romans [εἰ μὴ δι' ὑπερβολὴν ὧν τὸν δῆμον ἔδρασαν κακῶν συγγνώμην παρὰ Ῥωμαίοις ἀπήλπιζον]. **355**But since execution awaited them if they turned back now, they thought it far better to die in battle [ἀποκειμένου δὲ τοῦ μετὰ κολάσεως, εἰ παύσαιντο, πολὺ κρείττονα τὸν ἐν πολέμῳ θάνατον ἡγοῦντο].
>
> (5.353-355)

Both extracts are based on the same premise: conscious of their atrocities (i.e. ὁμόφυλος φόνος, plus the crimes catalogued at 5.402-403), the Zealots have forfeited all hope of pardon from the Romans (cf. 4.199, 220-223, 257; 5.354, 393, 494; 6.80; 7.324, 384)—which in turn perpetuates the spiral of τολμήματα. In this way atrocities and the resulting sense of guilt, interacting in vicious symbiosis, generate their own dynamic. As at 6.4, despair and intrepidity are linked in a relationship of cause and effect, and to predicate courage on despair and bad conscience necessarily disparages it. On the basis of these analogies, σωτηρίας ἀπόγνωσις at 6.4 could be interpreted specifically as συγγνώμης ἀπόγνωσις = ἀνάγκη κολάσεως ὑπὸ τῶν Ῥωμαίων. To explain the rebels' motivation, therefore, and at the same time to explain away any ideological or theological considerations, Josephus posits a coherent dynamic based entirely on psychological criteria.

This sense of guilt, coupled with fear of retribution, does not appear among the affective motifs regularly used by Thucydides, although the psychological structure of the argument fully justifies treating it alongside the other rationalist explanations assimilated by Josephus. Pangs of conscience do indeed appear occasionally in Polybius (e.g. 18.43.13, 23.10.2-3)[30]—but the best parallels for the causal relationship between guilt and action (even exceptional valour) are found in the *Roman* historians. A good example is Liv. 28.19.10, *non dux unus aut plures principes oppidanos, sed suus ipsorum ex conscientia culpae metus ad defendendam impigre urbem hortatur.*[31] A sense of guilt, no hope of pardon and fear of punishment as stimulants to action—the individual elements correspond so closely to the

---

[30] Cf. Schönlein (1965) 97-99; Eckstein (1995) 214.

[31] Cf. also Liv. 3.2.11, *Aequos conscientia contracti culpa periculi... ultima audere et experiri cogebat*; 45.26.6, [*principes civitatis*] *conscientia privatae noxae, quia ipsis nulla spes veniae erat, ...clauserunt portas*; Tac. *Ann.* 12.31.4, *atque illi conscientia rebellionis et obsaeptis effugiis multa et clara facinora fecere.* Further examples with discussion in Schönlein (1965) 17-30, 143-155.

scheme in Josephus that it is tempting to postulate a Roman influence here. And indeed, this idea of guilt and conscience as a mainspring of action appears to be Roman rather than Greek[32]—which would have made Josephus' interpretation easily accessible to his Roman readers.

Josephus' counterthrust, in sum, includes both a metaphysical and a secular aspect, with a perceptible 'seam' between the two. By evoking the scheme of sin and punishment, he brings to bear his own religiously tinged *Geschichtsphilosophie* while denying his opponents a corresponding religious motivation; and to account for their actions, he substitutes a typically Roman pattern of explanation. First polemical reversal is deployed to counter implicit religious claims, then a disparaging rationalist explanation is thrust into the foreground: the arguments form a complementary pair.

In addition to its psychologizing function, the guilt/conscience motif is also related in another way to the work's ideological design. Josephus tends to stylize the Jewish insurgents and their opponents (whether Jews or Romans), according to a symmetrical scheme of vice and virtue, and guilt/conscience too are accommodated in this pattern. Thus Zealot guilt has its thematic and ideological foil in several conspicuous appearances of the *repentance* motif. The work's preface states programmatically that Titus 'pitied the common people who were helpless against the revolutionaries, and often voluntarily delayed the capture of the city and prolonged the siege in order to give the ringleaders a chance to repent' [καὶ διδοὺς τῇ πολιορκίᾳ χρόνον εἰς μετάνοιαν τῶν αἰτίων] (1.10). Josephus, as mouthpiece of the Romans, makes similar appeals to the rebels (5.416-418, 6.103), and the motif appears again in a later speech of Titus to the besieged Jews (6.339). Thus where guilt and conscience slur the Zealots, calls for repentance symmetrically vindicate their opponents: in this way συνείδησις and μετάνοια together have a clear apologetic function.

Further, conscience in *BJ* typically indexes the moral status of its subject. The general principles are stated by the Galilean commander Josephus to his troops:

> **581** He said he wanted to test their military discipline, even before they went into action, by noting whether they refrained from their habitual sins of theft, banditry and looting, from defrauding their countrymen and from regarding as personal gain the misfortunes of their closest friends. **582** For the armies that were most successful in war were those in which every combatant had a clear conscience; but men whose private life was tainted would have to contend not only with their enemies but also with God

[32] The case is argued by SCHÖNLEIN (1965, 1969); and further THOME (1991) 366-377, (1992) 83-84.

> [διοικεῖσθαι γὰρ κάλλιστα τοὺς πολέμους παρ' οἷς ἂν ἀγαθὸν τὸ συνειδὸς ἔχωσιν πάντες οἱ στρατευόμενοι, τοὺς δὲ οἴκοθεν φαύλους οὐ μόνον τοῖς ἐπιοῦσιν ἐχθροῖς ἀλλὰ καὶ τῷ θεῷ χρῆσθαι πολεμίῳ].
>
> (2.581-582)

From this remark we can abstract two symmetrical models: on the one hand the causal nexus 'guilt → bad conscience → God as enemy → failure', on the other the opposite scheme 'just cause → clear conscience → divine assistance → success'. The first pattern is applied to the Zealots (and appears also in Eleazar's palinode at Masada), the second contours the portrait of Titus: in the moral geometry of *BJ*, therefore, Zealot crimes with the attendant sense of guilt are contrapuntally balanced by the *innocentia* of the Roman general.[33] Thus where the divine symmachy endorses the justice of the Roman cause, the conscience motif has the symmetrical function of condemning the Zealot cause as unjust. Both conceptual structure and function of the Josephan system are very close to the Roman notion of the *bellum iustum*, and this will hardly be a coincidence.[34] The logic of the just war posits a similar correlation between justice, divine assistance and eventual outcome, as in the classic statement at Liv. 21.10.9: *eventus belli velut aequus iudex, unde ius stabat, ei victoriam dedit.*[35] And awareness by the participants of their moral and legal status (in effect συνείδησις τῶν εἰργασμένων) is a powerful source of confidence. Thus also Octavian in his speech before the battle of Actium, as reported by Dio Cassius:

> Soldiers, there is one conclusion that I have reached, both from the experience of others and at first hand: it is a truth I have taken to heart above all else, and I urge you to keep it before you. This is that all victory comes to those whose thoughts and deeds follow the path of justice and of reverence for the gods [τοῖς τὰ τε δικαιότερα καὶ τὰ εὐσεβέστερα καὶ φρονοῦσι καὶ πράττουσι κατορθούμενα]. No matter how great the size and strength of our force might be—great enough perhaps to make the man who has chosen the less just cause of action expect to win with its help—

---

[33] The *innocentia* of Titus is expressed typically through the ἄκων motif (i.e. he was compelled by the insurgents to destroy Jerusalem against his own will): 1.10, 28; 5.334, 444; 6.130, 266, 345. Note also the grandiose apologetic gesture at 5.519: 'When Titus in the course of his rounds saw these valleys choked with dead and a putrid stream trickling from the decomposing bodies, he groaned, and raising his hands to heaven, called God to witness that this was not his doing'.

[34] Josephus' remarks on conscience (2.581-582) follow immediately upon the description (577-580) of how he organizes and trains his own army on the Roman model (one of the many texts which reveal his thorough acquaintance with Roman military methods). The juxtaposition perhaps suggests that the remarks on ἀγαθὸν τὸ συνειδός might also owe something to a Roman idea.

[35] See Mantovani (1990) *passim*.

> still I base my confidence far more upon the principles which are at stake in this war than upon the advantage of numbers.
>
> (Dio Cass. 50.24.1-2, trans. I. SCOTT-KILVERT, Penguin)

Absence of ἀγαθὸν τὸ συνειδός, conversely, translates into failure, as in Propertius' account of the same event: *frangit et attollit vires in milite causa;/ quae nisi iusta subest, excutit arma pudor* (4.6.51-52). That Josephus was familiar with the concept of the *bellum iustum* is clear from *AJ* 15.127-146, where Herod invokes the typical Roman categories to justify taking up arms against Nabatean aggression;[36] and the historian appears also to have recognized the polemical potential in applying this concept to his characterization of Jews and Romans. From the perspective of the *bellum iustum*, therefore, Zealot guilt set against the *innocentia* of Titus gives Josephus' indictment a distinctive Roman moral and legalistic complexion —a point which would not have been lost on his Roman audience.

4. *De-Mythologizing Beth Horon (2.517-518; 3.9-25)*

For the Romans, the campaign got off to an inauspicious start with the surprising defeat of Cestius Gallus in the Beth Horon defile; on the Jewish side, conversely, the initial victory will have had exactly the opposite effect. Josephus' account of events surrounding this opening action, for all its overt animus towards the insurgents, does not succeed entirely in obscuring the underlying religious and ideological issues, which in turn provide a context for analysing his own polemical response.

The hostile tendency comes out already in the prologue to the débâcle, when Cestius Gallus approaches Jerusalem and the Jews rush to its defence:

> **517**Seeing that the war was now approaching the Capital, the Jews abandoned the feast and rushed to arms [ἀφέμενοι τὴν ἑορτὴν ἐχώρουν ἐπὶ τὰ ὅπλα]; and, with complete confidence in their numbers [καὶ μέγα τῷ πλήθει θαρροῦντες] but without any organization, they sprang with loud cries into the fray, utterly disregarding the seventh day's rest, although this was the Sabbath, which they regarded with special reverence. **518**But the same passion which shook them out of their piety carried them to victory in the battle [ὁ δ' ἐκσείσας αὐτοὺς τῆς εὐσεβείας θυμὸς ἐποίησεν πλεονεκτῆσαι καὶ κατὰ τὴν μάχην]; for they fell upon the Romans with such fury that they broke and penetrated their ranks, inflicting heavy casualties.
>
> (2.517-518)

---

[36] See MANTOVANI (1990) 94-96.

Ignoring the defensive aspect of the Jewish action, Josephus presents it instead in a highly critical manner as a violation of their religious practices (thus ἀφέμενοι τὴν ἑορτήν, ἐκσείσας αὐτοὺς τῆς εὐσεβείας). The polemical accentuation patently vindicates Agrippa's earlier warning that Jewish military action on the Sabbath would violate their ancestral laws (2.392-393): prediction and outcome are brought into a studied congruence to slur Jewish resistance. But the correspondence involves a tendentious over-simplification, for the implicit premise that fighting on the Sabbath is sacrilege *tout court* ignores the evidence of two other passages which allow such pre-emptive military action as a legitimate exception (*AJ* 12.277, 14.63).[37] Josephus' vocal emphasis on impiety makes good sense as a counterthrust to the implied religious propaganda of the nationalists for whom the πάτριος νόμος was a significant ideological rallying point (cf. 2.393). On this assumption it is telling that he explains their motivation and success entirely in secular terms (μέγα τῷ πλήθει θαρροῦντες, θυμός). The religious and psychological explanations, in fact, are made mutually exclusive (ὁ δ' ἐκσείσας αὐτοὺς τῆς εὐσεβείας θυμός...): by severing the two Josephus tendentiously discounts the possibility that εὐσέβεια and θυμός might work in tandem as *religious* fervour.[38] Texts like 6.13 or 7.417-419 provide the necessary corrective (cf. chap. 1, section 3).

A major problem in interpreting the Beth Horon campaign is posed by the sudden withdrawal of Cestius Gallus when allegedly on the verge of taking Jerusalem. Josephus, concerned less with logistics than with literary and polemical effects, puts the paradoxical retreat down to an act of God: 'If only Cestius had persevered with the siege a little longer, he would have captured the city at once; but God, I suppose, because of those scoundrels, had already turned away even from His sanctuary and would not permit that day to witness the end of the war' (2.539). This curious emphasis is again best explained as a polemical reversal which turns against the rebels

---

[37] Full discussion in Farmer (1956) 72-81; Hengel (1976) 293-296; Krieger (1994) 239, 314-321. The latter's argument in essence (320-321): 'Wenn [Josephus]... den Widerstandskämpfern im Krieg gegen Rom Sabbatverletzung vorwirft, suggeriert er beständig, daß die Sabbatruhe jeden wie auch immer veranlaßten Waffengebrauch untersage. Er täuscht dem Leser vor, die extreme Haltung, die uns noch in *Jub.* 50,12f. entgegentritt, sei die damals allgemeingültige Auslegung des Sabbatgebotes gewesen. Josephus' übrige Werke verraten ebenso wie die anderen relevanten Quellen, daß Josephus diesen Eindruck in *BJ* nur deshalb erweckt, um die radikale Ablehnung des Notwehrrechts polemisch gegen die Aufstandsbewegung einsetzen zu können'.

[38] Farmer (1956) 79f. points out that 'the Jews who went out to fight in such a frenzy [2.517-518] had come to Jerusalem in the first place that they might participate in a religious festival': it seems reasonable therefore to posit a direct correlation between their belligerence and their religion.

their own theological interpretation of the event. The assumption is inherently plausible. Beth Horon, scene of earlier victories by Joshua over the Amorites (*Josh.* 10.6-14) and by Judas Maccabaeus over the Seleucid Seron (1 *Macc.* 3.13-26), had powerful religious and nationalist associations: in the eschatological imagination, history must have seemed to be repeating itself, and the Jerusalem rebels very likely saw their opening victory as divinely inspired.[39] If we assume, then, that propagandistic claims of this kind are the target of Josephus' polemic, a small detail in the preceding section acquires added point. In the highly tendentious overture to the Beth Horon episode discussed above, Josephus had attributed Jewish confidence to their numbers, καὶ μέγα τῷ πλήθει θαρροῦντες (2.517). The remark is a pointed counterthrust to a Maccabean motif, very likely appropriated by the Jerusalem rebels, which explicitly disavowed numerical superiority in favour of divine support.[40]

The Beth Horon episode very likely encouraged the rebels in their belief that they were fighting a holy war,[41] and indeed some indirect evidence for this interpretation is provided by Josephus' own studied attempt at demythologizing the event. In the autobiography, he puts Beth Horon into its wider context: 'This reverse of Cestius proved disastrous to our whole nation; for those who were bent on war *were thereby still more elated* and, having once defeated the Romans, hoped to continue victorious to the end' [ἐπήρθησαν γὰρ ἐπὶ τούτῳ μᾶλλον οἱ τὸν πόλεμον ἀγαπήσαντες καὶ νικήσαντες τοὺς Ῥωμαίους εἰς τέλος ἤλπισαν προσγενομένης καὶ ἑτέρας τινὸς τοιαύτης αἰτίας] (*Vita* 24). The tendentious accentuation, which replaces ideological continuity with psychological continuity, appears consistently also in *BJ*—though not without the telling dissonance.

---

[39] Thus Brandon (1951) 159-160, (1970) 43-44; Hengel (1976) 290; Krieger (1994) 252-253. On the logistic aspects of the Beth Horon encounter, see Gichon (1981); Smallwood (1976) 297. Beth Horon and environs as the site of many fateful actions for the Jewish nation: Gichon (1981) 51; Michel-Bauernfeind 2 n. 233.

[40] For the original Maccabean motif, cf. 1 *Macc.* 3.15-22, esp. 19: 'Victory does not depend on numbers; strength comes from Heaven alone'; *AJ* 12.290, 408-409. Against this background Titus' taunt at 6.330, just before the final Roman assault on Jerusalem, acquires added point: 'Well, gentlemen, are you now satisfied with your country's sufferings?... Did you rely on numbers? Why, a mere fraction of the Roman army was sufficient to deal with you'. Apart from the Maccabean association, the πλῆθος motif also acquires a polemical edge when it appears in pointed opposition to (Roman) ἐμπειρία (e.g. 3.475-476, 6.20).

[41] Hengel (1976) 290 conjectures, 'Sehr wahrscheinlich sahen die radikalen Gruppen darin den Auftakt zum eschatologischen Endkampf'. Cf. Horsley (1986 *b*) 52, 'The rout of Cestius and "liberation" of the city must have intensified the revolutionary spirit to fever pitch'.

Encouraged by their initial victory, the Jews proceed to attack Ascalon (3.9-28); in the event, the attempt ends in two separate repulses (3.9-21 and 22-28). Each subsection is prefaced by a clear backward reference to the earlier action: 'After the defeat of Cestius the Jews were so elated by their unexpected success [μετὰ τὴν Κεστίου πληγὴν ἐπηρμένοι ταῖς ἀδοκήτοις εὐπραγίαις] that they could not restrain their ardour...' (3.9); 'so far from being broken-hearted by such a disaster, the Jews were stimulated by defeat to still greater determination... They were lured by their earlier successes to a second disaster' [ἐδελεάζοντο τοῖς προτέροις κατορθώμασιν ἐπὶ πληγὴν δευτέραν] (3.22). The 'earlier successes' are the victorious actions against Cestius (≈ 2.517ff., 540ff.), and the eschatological mystique surrounding that episode extends also into the present narrative. So much is clear from a passing remark when the sudden reappearance of the commander Niger, believed to have perished shortly before, is taken by the Jews as a sign of divine providence: 'His reappearance filled every Jewish heart with undreamed-of joy; they thought that God's providence had preserved him to be their general in future actions' (3.28). Here we have the necessary link to demonstrate ideological continuity: if Beth Horon was both expression and confirmation of the rebels' belief in divine symmachy, 3.28 gives a glimpse of the efficacy of that prototype. The casual nature of the remark, tucked away at the end of the episode, belies its full significance; and while psychological and religious explanations need not of course *exclude* each other, Josephus' emphasis on the former is a conscious ploy to bypass and play down the latter.

To create the impression that the only continuity between Ascalon and the earlier Beth Horon action was at the *psychological* level, and at the same time to enhance the inherent plausibility of his own secularized interpretation, Josephus applies a typical Thucydidean-Polybian pattern of error analysis:

> **9**After the defeat of Cestius the Jews were so elated by their unexpected success that they could not restrain their ardour, and as if carried away by this stroke of luck [ἐπηρμένοι ταῖς ἀδοκήτοις εὐπραγίαις ἀκρατεῖς ἦσαν ὁρμῆς καὶ ὥσπερ ἐκριπιζόμενοι τῇ τύχῃ], they determined to carry the war further afield. Without a moment's delay their most warlike elements joined forces and marched on Ascalon... **13**The Jews in their fury marched at a most unusual pace [οἱ μὲν οὖν πολὺ ταῖς ὁρμαῖς συντονώτερον ὁδεύσαντες] and reached Ascalon as though they had just started from a neighbouring base. **14**But Antonius was ready for them... **15**It was a case of novices against veterans, infantry against cavalry, ragged order against serried ranks, men casually armed against fully equipped regulars, on the one side men whose actions were directed by passion rather than reason [θυμῷ τε πλέον ἢ βουλῇ], on the other disciplined troops [εὐπειθεῖς] who

> instantly responded to every signal... **18**In spite of their vast numbers, the Jews in their helpless state felt that they were terribly alone [καὶ τοῖς μὲν Ἰουδαίοις τὸ ἴδιον πλῆθος ἐρημία παρὰ τὰς ἀμηχανίας κατεφαίνετο]; while the Romans, few as they were, imagined in their unbroken success that they even outnumbered their enemies... **23**Without even waiting for their wounds to heal, the Jews reassembled all their forces and with greater fury than before, and much greater numbers, returned to the assault on Ascalon. **24**But with their inexperience and their military deficiencies, the same bad luck attended them as before. **25**Antonius had laid ambushes in the passes, and taking no precautions they fell into these traps [ἀδόκητοι ταῖς ἐνέδραις ἐμπεσόντες]...
>
> (3.9-25)

The whole analysis turns on the polarity θυμός/βουλή, explicitly articulated in the contrast betweeen Jews and Romans at 3.15, and this distinctive emphasis is transparently derived from the Greek tradition. The Polybian affiliation in particular has been stressed: Polybius typically predicates success and failure on the predominance of rationality and irrationality respectively (Polyb. 3.81 and 9.12 are emblematic in this regard), and analogous reflexions in Josephus have been linked to this model.[42] Certainly Josephus' reading of Polybius will have alerted him to the role of these psychological categories as causal factors. When, for example, Antonius in the above passage turns Jewish impetuosity to his own tactical advantage, this reads like a practical application of Polybius' reflexions at 3.81, where he says that a general should study the character of his opponents and exploit their mistakes. Another case in point is the use of the rare verb ἐδελεάζοντο at *BJ* 3.22. Δέλεαρ and δελεάζω, not attested in Thucydides, appear once each in Xenophon (*Mem.* 2.1.4), and then quite frequently in Polybius—and given the respective contexts, it seems quite likely that Josephus took his cue from the latter.[43]

But the θυμός/βουλή antithesis also takes us beyond Polybius. The Greeks, we recall, 'regarded the most important moral distinction as that which separates those who stop and think before they act from those who yield to impulse',[44] and among the Greek historians that distinction is axial also in Thucydides.[45] Θυμός and βουλή in the passage above are not

---

[42] On Polybius' scheme of psychological explanations, see PÉDECH (1964) 210-229; ECKSTEIN (1989) 6-9, (1995) 121-123, 142-145, 174-192. The Polybian model as source of Josephus' affective categories: ECKSTEIN (1990) 190-192, 195-198.

[43] For δέλεαρ with psychological-affective nuance, see esp. Polyb. 15.21.6-8, 29.8.3, 38.11.11.

[44] DOVER (1973) 36; cf. DE ROMILLY (1990) 108.

[45] Where it is expressed in such typical polarities as γνώμη—ὀργή (Thuc. 2.22.1, 2.59.3, 3.82.2), γνώμη—τύχη (1.144.4, 4.64.1, 4.86.6, 5.75.3), πρόνοια—ἐπιθυμία (6.13.1), λογισμός—θυμός (2.11.7), εὐβουλία—τάχος/ὀργή (3.42.1). On the reason/ passion

conceived as a static polarity, but Josephus probes the dynamics of irrationality (and so also of failure) in a manner that gives his analysis a distinctly Thucydidean complexion. His argument is not only replete with the kind of affective terminology used by Thucydides (ἐπηρμένοι, ὁρμή, τῇ τύχῃ, ταῖς ὁρμαῖς, θυμῷ, μεταβολῆς ἐλπίδι), but, more specifically, the discrete elements are *co-ordinated* in a manner that exactly replicates the Thucydidean affective spiral: success, especially when unexpected (ἀπροσδόκητος), causes man to be carried away (ἐπαίρεσθαι, ἐκφέρεσθαι) by the emotional side of his nature (ἔρως, ἐλπίς, ἐπιθυμία, πόθος *et sim.*), to become recklessly over-confident (ἐξυβρίζειν) and in defiance of reason to conceive unrealistic designs which usually end in failure; reason, conversely, takes cognizance of this proclivity and consciously resists succumbing to the dangerous syndrome.[46] A cognate process is indeed hinted at also by Polybius, typically in relation to military strategy,[47] but it is not as minutely analytical as the gnomic reflexions of Thucydides, who abstracts the phenomenon and articulates it as a coherent theory; in particular Josephus' explicit and calibrated *sequence* appears to condense the fuller Thucydidean pattern:

> Ἰουδαῖοι δὲ μετὰ τὴν Κεστίου πληγὴν ἐπηρμένοι ταῖς ἀδοκήτοις εὐπραγίαις ἀκρατεῖς ἦσαν ὁρμῆς καὶ ὥσπερ ἐκριπιζόμενοι τῇ τύχῃ προσωτέρω τὸν πόλεμον ἐξῆγον.
>
> After the defeat of Cestius the Jews were so elated by their unexpected success that they could not restrain their ardour, and as if carried away by this stroke of luck, they determined to carry the war further afield.
>
> (*BJ* 3.9)
>
> γενόμενοι δὲ πρὸς τὸ μέλλον θρασεῖς καὶ ἐλπίσαντες μακρότερα μὲν τῆς δυνάμεως, ἐλάσσω δὲ τῆς βουλήσεως, πόλεμον ἤραντο... εἴωθε δὲ τῶν πόλεων αἷς ἂν μάλιστα ἀπροσδόκητος καὶ δι' ἐλαχίστου εὐπραξία ἔλθῃ ἐς ὕβριν τρέπειν· τὰ δὲ πολλὰ κατὰ λόγον τοῖς ἀνθρώποις εὐτυχοῦντα ἀσφαλέστερα ἢ παρὰ δόξαν, καὶ κακοπραγίαν ὡς εἰπεῖν ῥᾷον ἀπωθοῦνται ἢ εὐδαιμονίαν διασῴζονται.

---

antithesis in Thucydides, see (e.g.) Zahn (1934) 74 n. 18; Huart (1973) 85-87. Eckstein (1990) 192 in urging the priority of Polybian influences on Josephus underestimates the possible impulses from Thucydides, and would even deny rationality and irrationality the status of 'a major Thucydidean theme'.

[46] For the details, see Cornford (1907) 167-173, 201-205, 213-220; De Romilly (1963) 322-329, (1990) 108-120; Huart (1968) *passim* (cf. his index).

[47] E.g. μετεωρισθεὶς καὶ περιχαρὴς γενόμενος ἐπὶ τῷ προτερήματι (3.70.1); ὑπὸ δὲ τῆς φιλοδοξίας ἐλαυνόμενος καὶ καταπιστεύων τοῖς πράγμασι παραλόγως ἔσπευδεν κρῖναι δι' αὐτοῦ τὰ ὅλα (3.70.7); ἐπαρθεὶς τοῖς εὐτυχήμασι (4.48.11); οἷς ἐπαρθέντες (5.73.8); and further 5.102.1, 10.14.1-3. Cf. Eckstein (1989) 10-11 and (1995) 183-192.

> Becoming confident in the future, and with hopes that extended beyond their means but fell short of their ambitions, they took up arms... Indeed those states to which great prosperity comes suddenly and unexpectedly, typically become arrogant; whereas men generally find success less precarious when it comes in accordance with reasonable calculations than when it surpasses expectation; and, I would say, it is easier for them to repel adversity than to maintain prosperity.
>
> (Thuc. 3.39.3-4)

> ὑμῖν γὰρ εὐτυχίαν τὴν παροῦσαν ἔξεστι καλῶς θέσθαι... καὶ μὴ παθεῖν ὅπερ οἱ ἀήθως τι ἀγαθὸν λαμβάνοντες τῶν ἀνθρώπων· αἰεὶ γὰρ τοῦ πλέονος ἐλπίδι ὀρέγονται διὰ τὸ καὶ τὰ παρόντα ἀδοκήτως εὐτυχῆσαι.
>
> For it is in your power to turn your present good fortune to good account... You would thus avoid the experience of those who achieve some unaccustomed success; for they are always led on by hope to grasp at more because of their unexpected good fortune in the present.
>
> (Thuc. 4.17.4).[48]

As in Thucydides' error analysis, the initial affective response (ἀκρατεῖς ἦσαν ὁρμῆς, ταῖς ὁρμαῖς) and its disastrous consequences are brought into a precise correlation. 'Ακρατεῖς... ὁρμῆς and ὥσπερ ἐκριπιζόμενοι τῇ τύχῃ imply a state akin to the Thucydidean ἐς ὕπριν τρέπειν, and this infatuation brings its own punishment: first the Jews are figuratively lured (ἐδελεάζοντο) by their earlier successes into a dangerous psychological spiral, then they quite literally stumble into Antonius' ambush (ἀδόκητοι ταῖς ἐνέδραις ἐμπεσόντες). This is the Thucydidean pattern of cause and effect, with infatuation destroying both wits and fortunes.

Josephus' analysis, in sum, appears to *combine* Thucydidean and Polybian elements (though needless to say a neat separation is not possible). How closely the two strands are interwoven is shown by his use of the verb ἐδελεάζοντο (cf. above): the word itself appears to derive from Polybius, while the mechanism it implies is expanded and described in typically Thucydidean terms. Our extract in turn fits into a wider system that spans the whole *BJ*: the rationalist error analysis of Greek historiography, assigning priority to psychological categories, is deployed as a cogent secular alternative to neutralize the eschatological motives of the Jewish rebels, the classical texts provide Josephus with ready arguments to support his own interpretation.

The key passage 3.9-25 quoted above also evidences Josephus' tendency to stylize the opposing sides according to a fixed bipolar scheme in which Roman virtues counterbalance Jewish defects in tendentious symmetry ('It

---

[48] Similarly Thuc. 1.84.2, 1.120.3-4, 3.45.5-6, 4.18.4, 4.65.4, 6.11.5-6.

was a case of novices against veterans...'), and in which the typical attributes are subsumed as normative, national characteristics. This system, which appears with refrain-like insistence, in effect predisposes the reader to expect an almost stereotypical pattern of behaviour from each side. Relating events from Roman perspective, Josephus compares the two nations on typically Roman criteria. The warring sides are characterized according to a binary opposition with γνώμη, ἐμπειρία, ἀνδρεία, ἀρετή, εὐπείθεια, πρόνοια on the Roman side, on the Jewish side θράσος, θυμός, ὁρμή, τόλμα and ἀπόνοια. Explicit *synkriseis* (3.15, 153, 209-210, 475-484; 4.42-48; 5.306, 315-316, 488; 6.20, 42-44, 79, 159-160; 7.7) are complemented by many individual psychograms of the two nations (e.g. Jews: 3.440-441; 5.78, 280, 285, 287, 485; 6.152, 328; Romans: 2.529, 580, 3.98-101; 4.373). Together these testimonia add up to a comprehensive and consistent pattern whose normative role in *BJ* is illustrated precisely by a few conspicuous exceptions to the general rule, those rare instances when the two sides act out of character. Thus Titus, reprimanding his troops for insubordination, in scathing irony reverses the typical attributes: 'The Jews, with desperation for their only leader, do everything with forethought and circumspection [μετὰ προνοίας... καὶ σκέψεως], planning stratagems and ambushes with every care... while the Romans, who because of their discipline and readiness to obey their leaders have always commanded success, are now humiliated through behaving in the opposite way out of a lack of self-control' [διὰ χειρῶν ἀκρασίαν] (5.121-122). Conversely a lacklustre performance by the Jews elicits the comment that they were not acting as one would expect of them: 'They dashed out in small parties, at intervals, with hesitation and fear—in short, unlike Jews; there was little sign of the national characteristics [τὰ γὰρ ἴδια τοῦ ἔθνους], daring, impetuosity, the massed charge and the refusal to admit defeat' (6.17). The assumptions are in both cases the same: Josephus operates with set characteristics and fixed patterns of behaviour, which in general vindicate the Romans and discredit the insurgents.[49]

Here as in examples discussed earlier the suasive force of the argument is predicated on form, presentational aspects and recognizable affiliations —for when the tendentious claims are shaped around the well-known

[49] The notable collective exception to the general scheme is when the Roman troops (against the orders of Titus, of course) fire the Jerusalem Temple (6.254-266). The section is replete with affective vocabularly, sharply critical of the Roman soldiers, e.g. οἱ μὲν τῷ πολεμεῖν, οἱ δ' ὀργῇ περισπώμενοι (256), ὁ θυμὸς ἁπάντων ἐστρατήγει (257), τὰς ὁρμὰς ἐνθουσιώντων τῶν στρατιωτῶν (260), οἱ θυμοὶ καὶ τὸ πρὸς Ἰουδαίους μῖσος καὶ πολεμική τις ὁρμὴ λαβροτέρα (263). See KRIEGER (1994) 295-304.

polarity 'self/other', with gnomic-type observations to support and generalize individual points, the reader is subtly encouraged to view the particular contrast from the wider perspective and to carry over also the *value judgements* implicit in those generic and argumentative frames. In that sense form *is* argument. Consider for example how Vespasian, encouraging his demoralized troops after a reversal, treats the particular incident *sub specie* ἀνθρωπείας φύσεως in a manner that simultaneously articulates the polemical duality and turns it to the Romans' advantage:

> **42**As it is the mark of vulgarity to be over-elated by success [ὥσπερ ἀπειροκάλων τὸ λίαν ἐπαίρεσθαι ταῖς εὐπραγίαις ≈ 5.120], so it is unmanly to be downcast in adversity; for the transition from one to the other is rapid, and the best soldier is the one who does not allow success to go to his head [ὁ κἀν τοῖς εὐτυχήμασιν νήφων], so that he may still remain cheerful when facing reverses. **43**As for recent events, they were due not to any slackness on our part nor to the valour of the Jews... **45**But recklessness in war and insane impetuosity [τὸ δ' ἀπερίσκεπτον ἐν πολέμῳ καὶ τῆς ὁρμῆς μανιῶδες] are alien to us Romans, who owe all our success to skill and discipline [οἳ πάντα ἐμπειρίᾳ καὶ τάξει κατορθοῦμεν]: they are a vice of foreigners [ἀλλὰ βαρβαρικόν] and the chief cause of Jewish defeats.
>
> (4.42-45)[50]

With the characteristic θυμός/βουλή polarity as point of reference, Vespasian extols his men—even after a reverse—at the expense of their opponents. The Romans, recognizing that success is founded on γνώμη, are exempt from the τύχη/ὁρμή spiral which is the chief cause of Jewish failure. In this matrix the occasional Jewish successes are disparagingly put down to chance, desperation or Roman negligence (e.g. 6.39, 42; 7.7), while their failure is ascribed to irrational impulsiveness. With the Romans it is just the other way round: success evinces their specific virtues, while even failure is no disgrace provided it has an intellectual component. Thus Josephus on their *ratio militaris*:

> **98**In battle nothing is done without plan or left to chance [οὐδὲν δὲ ἀπροβούλετον... οὐδὲ αὐτοσχέδιον]: consideration [γνώμη] always precedes action of any kind, and action conforms to the decision reached. **99**As a result the Romans meet with very few setbacks, and if anything does go wrong, the setbacks are easily remedied. **100**They regard successes due to luck as less desirable than a planned but unsuccessful stroke [ἡγοῦνται τε τῶν ἀπὸ τύχης ἐπιτευγμάτων ἀμείνους τὰς ἐπὶ τοῖς προβουλευθεῖσιν

---

[50] Vespasian's analysis is fully vindicated in the subsequent narrative when the Jews fall prey to the precise defects here identified: 'The people of Gamala were for the moment cheered by their success, so unexpected and so overwhelming [θαρρῆσαι τῷ κατορθώματι παρέστη παραλόγως τε συμβάντι καὶ μεγάλως]; but when they subsequently reflected [λογιζόμενοι δ' ὕστερον]... they became terribly despondent and their courage failed them' (4.49-50). Note the implied γνώμη—ὀργή/τύχη antithesis.

> διαμαρτίας], because accidental success tempts men to be improvident [ὡς τοῦ μὲν αὐτομάτου καλοῦ δελεάζοντος (≈ 3.22) εἰς ἀπρομήθειαν], whereas forethought, in spite of occasional failures, teaches the useful lesson how to avoid their recurrence. **101** They reflect further that the man who benefits from a stroke of luck can take no credit for it, while unfortunate accidents that upset calculations leave one at least the consolation that plans were properly laid.
>
> (3.98-101)[51]

This insistence on the absolute priority of reason, irrespective even of outcome, is again redolent of the Greek historians, recalling for easy instance the traditional wisdom embodied in the advice of Artabanus to Xerxes: 'I find that a well-conceived plan [τὸ γὰρ εὖ βουλεύεσθαι] is the greatest gain. Even if it meets some obstacle, the plan is just as good but is overcome by chance. But the man who has planned badly, if chance favours him, comes upon a windfall, but his plan is nonetheless bad' (Hdt. 7.10.δ; cf. Thuc. 2.40.2). Rational calculation and planning occupy a corresponding status in both Thucydides and Polybius,[52] while conversely it has been noted that a number of the negative traits ascribed to the Jews converge closely with Polybius' typology of Rome's enemies (impetuosity, undisciplined frenzy, insanity, youthful recklessness).[53] Beyond that Josephus' argumentation by reference to the national τρόποι recalls a rhetorical technique well known from Thucydides.[54] All these aspects give substance to the metaphor of the historian's 'Hellenizing glass'.

But Josephus' scheme of characterization also has a distinctive *Roman* complexion: he describes the Jews as a Roman typically describes barbarians,[55] and here we can detect the influence of the ancient ethnographic tradition. Greco-Roman ethnography, proceeding typically from a

---

[51] The quoted text stands near the end of Josephus' excursus on the Roman army (3.70-109), a passage which is generally accepted as heavily influenced by Polyb. 6.19-42, e.g. Michel-Bauernfeind 3 n. 32; Lindner (1972) 86 n. 2; Cohen (1982) 368; Eckstein (1990) 179. The Polybian excursus, it is interesting to note, contains no comparable *psychological* reflexions: Josephus superimposes Thucydidean-type observations on the Polybian material.

[52] Thucydides' history has been described as 'a study of man's attempt to master the world by the intellect' (Parry [1957] 181); of Polybius it has been said, 'l'histoire ainsi conçue devient une phénoménologie de la raison' (Pédech [1964] 247). On the status of γνώμη and cognate intellectual qualities in Thucydides, see (e.g.) 1.84.2-4, 2.40.2, 2.62.5, 2.64.6, 3.42.2, 4.18.4, 4.64; with Bender (1938) 6-14; Parry (1957) 150-175; Edmunds (1975 *a*) 7-75. For Polybius cf. above, nn. 42, 47.

[53] Cohen (1990) 189-194, (1995) 119-125.

[54] National characteristics: e.g. Thuc. 1.70, with Rechenauer (1991) 140-143. Argumentation on this basis: e.g. Thuc. 6.9.3, 6.18.6-7, with Gommel (1966) 56-61.

[55] As (e.g.) Sen. *Ira* 1.11.3-4, 3.2.6. For the typology, see Dauge (1981) 424-440, 504-510; on Josephus, *ibid.* 246.

synkrisis/comparatio, constructs counterbalancing auto- and hetero-stereotypes in such a way that the stylized other is often a foil to the normative conception of self. With self and other pulled into this symmetrical relationship, the antithesis generally reveals more about assumptions and mentality of the describing subject than of the object described; and when the *synkrisis* is consciously applied as an instrument of *self*-definition, such ethnography slides easily into ideology.[56] Caesar's Gallic *ethnographica* are a classic case in point: 'Das Gegenstück zu römischer Rationalität, Ordnung und Disziplin sind die Barbaren... Barbaren sind unberechenbar. Ihre Entschlüsse sind plötzlich, schwankend (*mobilis*) und unvermutet. Gegenstück ist die römische *constantia*... Zwei Gesellschafts- und Menschenbilder werden hier gegeneinandergestellt. Die Gallier sind, was die Römer nicht sein wollen: unbeständig, wankelmütig, irrational, undiszipliniert, treulos.'[57] If the same typology and underlying intent reappear in Josephus' characterization of Jews and Romans, a conclusion about his sources seems inescapable. Ethnographic material analogous to that in Caesar will certainly have featured in the Flavian *commentarii*, very likely also with accompanying *Tendenz*; and since Josephus knew and used those memoirs,[58] it seems reasonable to conjecture that he took his cue from the Flavian *hypomnemata* and then elaborated the ethnographic data—duly nuanced with Thucydidean-type reflexions—into an ideological leitmotiv in his own work.

These formal and generic aspects bear directly on the question of Josephan polemic—and this takes us back to his treatment of the Beth Horon fighters. To filter out the underlying eschatological motives of the insurgents, Josephus substitutes a coherent scheme of secular, psychological explanation combining the categories of Greco-Roman historiography and ethnography. The recognizable patterns create the impression that external frames of reference are being applied: form and generic affiliation engage the Greco-Roman readers in their own terms and encourage acceptance of an interpretation situated within these familiar conceptual parameters. It seems fair to conclude that tactical-polemical considerations

---

[56] For the principles, see (e.g.) Müller (1972) 1-5; Lund (1990) esp. 28-35, 55-60. Trzaska-Richter (1993) has a useful discussion of the ideological applications, or what she aptly terms 'die Instrumentalisierung der Vorstellungen von Fremden'.

[57] Cancik (1987) 12-13; cf. *id*. (1986) 169-171. On the structure and *Tendenz* of Caesar's Gallic 'ethnography', see further Rambaud (1953) 324-328; Heubner (1973) 170-182; Müller (1980) 76-77: a number of the issue there discussed will also apply, *mutatis mutandis*, to *BJ*.

[58] Cf. *Vita* 341-342, 358; *Ap*. 56; with Broshi (1982) 381-383 and Rajak (1983) 215-216. The influence on *BJ* of the official Flavian records is argued most extensively by Weber (1921) *passim*.

played a significant role in Josephus' selection, inclusion and emphasis of classical elements. In this connexion too we should note already that all the main motifs noted above in Josephus' bipolar characterizations will appear again, dramatized and individualized, in a series of stylized *aristeiai* (chap. 4, section 1): here again the particular interpretation is conveyed through the standardized literary frames.

5. Auri sacra fames *(5.556-560)*

In the examples discussed so far, 'rationalist', secular and psychological arguments were deployed to counter and bleach away implicit religious-eschatological assumptions; Thucydidean-Polybian themes were introduced as substitutes to subserve the author's polemical interpretation, often with a perceptible tension between the two levels of explanation. These characteristic 'seams', indicators of Josephus' intellectual position between the Jewish and Greco-Roman traditions, are equally interesting as polemic and as a historiographical phenomenon. Both aspects come out again in our final example. With some qualification, this text could also be seen as a reversal of the pattern encountered so far. In our previous examples, the polemic had its locus in the *rationalist alternative*; here, in contrast, aberrational behaviour is first explained in psychological terms, with the polemical point then made by an added *religious-philosophical gloss.*

Jewish refugees, according to Josephus, were constantly trying to escape the reign of terror in Jerusalem. A cordon of guards made flight from the beleaguered city difficult (4.378, 5.29-30)—unless, says Josephus, the fugitive was wealthy enough to offer a bribe (4.379). Consequently some refugees hit on the idea of smuggling out gold coins by swallowing them. But the trick is discovered, and Arabs and Syrians in the Roman ranks proceed to rip open the escaping Jews (5.550-552). They are severely rebuked by Titus, but to little effect:

> **556**To the Arabs and Syrians Titus vented his wrath, first at the idea that in a war that did not concern their own nation, they should indulge their passions in an unrestrained manner, then that they should let the Romans take the blame for their own bloodthirsty butchery and hatred of the Jews; for some of his own troops shared in their infamy. **557**These foreigners he therefore threatened to punish with death if any man was found daring to repeat the crime; the legionary commanders he instructed to search out suspected offenders and to bring them before him. **558**But avarice, it seems, scorns every penalty and an extraordinary love of gain is rooted in human nature, nor is any other passion as powerful as greed. **559**In other

> circumstances these passions observe some bounds and are checked by fear; but here it was God who had condemned the whole nation and was turning every means of escape to their destruction. **560** Thus what Caesar had prohibited with threats men still ventured to do to the deserters in secret; advancing to meet the fugitives before the rest noticed them, the foreigners would murder them, and then, looking round in case any Roman saw them, they tore them open and pulled the filthy money from their bowels.
>
> (5.556-560)

Josephus tendentiously exonerates the Romans by attributing the practice primarily to anti-Semitic Arab and Syrian elements in the Roman camp (5.551, 556). Their persistence, despite threats of punishment, elicits a comment on human nature in the form of a triple gnome: καταφρονεῖ[59] δ', ὡς ἔοικε, φιλοχρηματία πάσης κολάσεως, καὶ δεινὸς ἐμπέφυκεν ἀνθρώποις τοῦ κερδαίνειν ἔρως, οὐδέν τε οὕτως πάθος πλεονεξία παραβάλλεται (5.558). Josephus' observations here seem to combine (perhaps unconsciously) two Thucydidean strands: in general terms, the conspicuous emphasis on greed (φιλοχρηματία—δεινὸς τοῦ κερδαίνειν ἔρως—πλεονεξία) recalls the status of πλεονεξία as causal factor in Thucydides;[60] and more particularly, the tension between greed and punishment (5.558, cf. 560) comes remarkably close to Diodotus' argument against the death penalty in the Mytilenean debate, where πλεονεξία appears within a configuration of constants which will always impel man to defy danger and risk punishment:

> ἢ τοίνυν δεινότερόν τι τούτου δέος εὑρετέον ἐστὶν ἢ τόδε γε οὐδὲν ἐπίσχει, ἀλλ' ἡ μὲν πενία ἀνάγκῃ τὴν τόλμαν παρέχουσα, ἡ δ' ἐξουσία ὕβρει τὴν πλεονεξίαν καὶ φρονήματι... ἐξάγουσιν ἐς τοὺς κινδύνους.
>
> Either, then, some terror more potent than this [sc. death] must be discovered, or we must admit that this deterrent is useless. But poverty inspiring boldness through necessity, and wealth inspiring ambition through insolence and pride... lead men on into dangers.
>
> (Thuc. 3.45.4)

In the manner of Thucydides, Josephus in an emphatic terminal *sententia* treats the particular aberration as symptom of a universal tendency rooted in human nature (δεινὸς ἐμπέφυκεν ἀνθρώποις τοῦ κερδαίνειν ἔρως): the

---

[59] The MS reading κατεφρόνει is accepted by Niese and Michel-Bauernfeind. But the gnomic character of the sentence seems to justify Destinon's emendation to the present tense καταφρονεῖ (thus Becker, Thackeray and Pelletier, with a number of modern translators). A gnomic present would also align καταφρονεῖ with παραβάλλεται and ἐμπέφυκεν (equivalent to a present).

[60] See Schmid-Stählin (1948) 109 n. 1, 117 n. 1; Weber (1967) 42-61; Huart (1968) 388-389.

analysis is apposite and self-contained, the gnome creates a sense of completion and finality.

But this is then abruptly ruptured, in a very *un*-Thucydidean manner, when Josephus brings to bear his own *Geschichtsphilosophie*: ἢ ταῦτα μὲν ἄλλως καὶ μέτρον ἔχει καὶ φόβοις ὑποτάσσεται, θεὸς δ' ἦν ὁ τοῦ λαοῦ παντὸς καταρίνας καὶ πᾶσαν αὐτοῖς σωτηρίας ὁδὸν εἰς ἀπώλειαν ἀποστρέφων (5.559). In the first half of the sentence we still have the psychological categories fear/punishment from the preceding gnome (φόβοις ≈ πάσης κολάσεως), but then Josephus redirects his polemic from the Arab and Syrian perpetrators to the *Jews*, i.e. the fate of individual fugitives is taken as an element in God's punishment of the whole nation (τοῦ λαοῦ παντὸς). The logic jolts from secular to theological, and then back to secular: first Arabs and Syrians are castigated for their vicious πλεονεξία (5.558), then these same culprits somewhat paradoxically become the agents through whom God works the destruction of the Jews (5.559), and finally Josephus returns to secular manifestations of πλεονεξία (5.560). The abrupt transitions in thought progression result from the conflation of two very different traditions.

In this connexion the pivotal sentence is of particular interest: 'In other circumstances [ἢ ταῦτα μὲν ἄλλως...] these passions observe some bounds and are checked by fear; but here it was God [θεὸς δ' ἦν...] who had condemned the whole nation and was turning every means of escape to their destruction' (5.559). The circumstances articulated in the μέν/δέ opposition are peace and war respectively (though the terms themselves do not appear), and in peace the passions like πλεονεξία are less likely to get out of hand. Both structure and idea recall an analogous comment in Thucydides, and even though similarities are very probably coincidental, a brief comparison will demonstrate the intellectually heterogeneous character of Josephan historiography. On the Corcyrean *stasis*, Thucydides had remarked

> ἐν μὲν γὰρ εἰρήνῃ καὶ ἀγαθοῖς πράγμασιν αἵ τε πόλεις καὶ οἱ ἰδιῶται ἀμείνους τὰς γνώμας ἔχουσι διὰ τὸ μὴ ἐς ἀκουσίους ἀνάγκας πίπτειν· ὁ δὲ πόλεμος... πρὸς τὰ παρόντα τὰς ὀργὰς τῶν πολλῶν ὁμοιοῖ.
>
> For in peace and prosperity both states and individuals have gentler feelings, because men are not then forced to face conditions of dire necessity; but war... creates in most people a disposition that matches their circumstances.
>
> (Thuc. 3.82.2)

Like Thucydides, Josephus begins by noting the positive reciprocity, in times of peace (ἐν μὲν γὰρ εἰρήνῃ—ἄλλως), between outward circumstances

and man's inner disposition; but where Thucydides in exact symmetry (ἐν μὲν γὰρ εἰρήνῃ—ὁ δὲ πόλεμος) applies the same criteria also to the wartime situation, Josephus in his δέ clause moves from empirical anthropology to metaphysical aetiology, introducing his concept of the inverted *Heilsgeschichte*. Secular and theological explanations are clamped together in an asymetrical contrast whose heterogeneous character is the more apparent beside the corresponding Thucydidean opposition.

Our example clearly illustrates Josephus' conception of two simultaneous and interacting planes of causation, the human and the divine;[61] but this alone is insufficient to account for the jarring alternation between the two levels of explanation—which results rather from the wish to make a polemical point. If Josephus tendentiously secularizes religious and eschatological motives, as we saw earlier, this last example suggests that the procedure is also in a sense reversible, for here a metaphysical interpretation is somewhat forcibly clamped onto a fully self-sufficient rationalist explanation—clearly for its polemical effect. The two levels of explanation in this text are neither competing nor mutually exclusive (as before), but the rationalist explanation is subsumed as part of the overarching divine plan: first the gnome explains an aberration by reference to a general psychological law, then the philosophical observation, as interpretative gloss, adds a damning value judgement (the aberration as an element of divine punishment).[62] In that sense the locus of polemic has here shifted from the secular to the theological plane. But whether we are dealing with secularization of religious motives or *vice versa*, the assimilated Greek motifs can always be used as a foil to detect a counter-current of religious elements, and the resulting dissonance is a sure pointer to the ulterior intentions of the historian.

---

[61] See Thoma (1966) 28-34, (1969) esp. 41-43; Lindner (1972) 142-150; Mosès (1986) 188-196; Villalba I Varneda (1986) 1-63.

[62] The same structure (psychological explanation + polemical-theological gloss) also at 5.342-343. The besieging Romans are thwarted in their advances, to the delight of the Jews: 'Thus the Romans after gaining the second wall were driven out again. The war-party in Jerusalem were elated, carried away by their success [τῶν δ' ἀνὰ τὸ ἄστυ μαχίμων ἐπήρθη τὰ φρονήματα, καὶ μετέωροι πρὸς τὴν εὐπραγίαν ἦσαν] and convinced either that the Romans would never venture to set foot in the City again, or if they did, that they themselves would prove invincible. For God was blinding their minds because of their transgressions, and they saw neither the strength of the remaining Roman forces—so much more numerous than those they had ejected—nor the famine that was creeping towards them'. First the reaction of the Jews is described in the affective categories of Thucydides, then this state of elation is itself accommodated to the overarching scheme of sin and punishment (ἐπεσκότει γὰρ αὐτῶν ταῖς γνώμαις διὰ τὰς παρανομίας ὁ θεός).

6. *Summary*

The secondary literature on *BJ* contains many scattered observations on Josephus' tendency to downplay the insurgents' ideological motives by thrusting psychological and political explanations into the foreground. On the theme of youthful impetuosity, for example, it has been noted that 'Polybius revealed to Josephus a good Hellenistic explanation of events, one that would obviously be acceptable to a Greek-speaking audience, and one that carried the additional advantage of exonerating much of the Jewish population from responsibility for the Revolt'.[63] This remark should be read beside the quotation from Nikiprowetzky at the head of this chapter: an explanation transparently related to the Greek tradition becomes in Josephus a subtle instrument of polemic and apologetic. This is a typical case; close scrutiny of Josephus' practice makes it possible to take the argument a step further and posit a consistent strategy.

As apologist for the Jewish nation and to mend relations with Rome, Josephus avoids explicit reference to the revolt's religious roots in order to conceal the link between anti-Roman nationalism and traditional Jewish piety. To this end too the peace-loving majority in Jerusalem are stylized, against all historical probability, as victims of a tyrannical minority of misguided warmongers whose actions flagrantly violate the πάτριος νόμος. Occasionally, however, hints of the underlying ideology shimmer through these sharply drawn contours, and such glimpses help put the polemicist's counterthrusts into perspective.

But a 'conspiracy of silence' alone would not suffice to neutralize the religious and ideological motives of his opponents: to demolish them effectively and plausibly (keeping in mind his Greco-Roman readership), Josephus has to substitute an alternative pattern of explanation based on a coherent and self-regulating aetiology. The needs of the apologist-polemicist are answered to a considerable extent by Greek historiography, with Thucydides and Polybius in particular supplying a ready-made system of explanation which meets Josephus' requirements in two significant respects. First, a Thucydidean- and Polybian-type error analysis, founded on empirical anthropology and psychology, provides an effective counter-thrust to the eschatological mystique of the revolt; and second, the recognizable generic affiliation would itself have conferred a measure of legitimacy on Josephus' own use of such a system.

---

[63] Eckstein (1990) 193.

Josephus' polemical use of explanations based on ἀνθρωπεία φύσις operates according to a simple but highly effective mechanism: religious-eschatological specifics slide into psychological generalizations (themselves implicit value judgements) and dissolve within this secular matrix. Josephus' rationalist explanations function as a refracting prism to subtly adjust the reader's perspective, magnifying one aspect while filtering out another. 'Die Wirklichkeit wird... fiktionalisiert, die Fiktion faktualisiert'.[64] The polemicist-apologist also factualizes fiction to the extent that judicious application of the 'Hellenizing glass' both implies a particular interpretation and creates the illusion of objective analysis based on external criteria.

But why should Josephus' construct convince? Its effectiveness and legitimacy, I would venture, derive not least from the Thucydidean-Polybian connexion itself, and here two points should be made, one on form and the other on logic. Josephus by appropriating recognizable elements of Thucydides' classic error analysis tacitly stresses his generic affiliation to the founder of 'scientific' historiography, and that link in turn gives his own interpretion credibility and an implicit stamp of authority. The Thucydidean-type pattern was sufficently diffused in antiquity (e.g. via Polybius, Sallust, Caesar, and Livy) to ensure easy recognition by Greco-Roman readers. The intertextual association facilitates acceptance and accessibility, and when Josephus assimilates his own tendentious explanations to the Greek model, he takes into account precisely this aspect. A man who says something profoundly new will often seize on an old frame or terminology to conceal the novelty of his own ideas: and readers who tacitly recognize (with approval) the classic model will be less likely to perceive that they are being influenced by it. Next, both more and less obviously, there is the intrinsic cogency and internal consistency of the Thucydidean pattern itself. When Josephus applies this model, it is always with a precise intention. For maximum effect, propaganda and polemic alike cannot be seen to be operating with tall stories, crass lies or flagrant untruths:[65] instead they will rely on various *forms* of truth—half truths,

---

[64] Kraus (1978) 17 (here specifically on media effects) in a discussion of political distortion and suggestion which could be applied to most propaganda analysis (esp. 13-24, 36-54).

[65] The topic is well analysed by Ellul (1965) esp. xv, 52-61. A number of his observations on the mechanics of propaganda apply equally to Josephus' polemic and the question of its credibility, as discussed above, e.g. 'For a long time propagandists have recognized that lying must be avoided. "In propaganda, truth pays off"—this formula has been increasingly accepted... It seems that in propaganda we must make a radical distinction between a fact on the one hand and intentions or interpretations on the other;

truth out of context, as well as selective ommission, tendentious accentuation, implicit or explicit commentary. The Thucydidean-Polybian pattern, inherently logical and commanding a high degree of plausibility, becomes in *BJ* such a *truth out of context* (for the fact that Josephus deploys it for a particular purpose does nothing to reduce its intrinsic validity). Together these formal and logical aspects give Josephus' own interpretation a veneer of authenticity, seeming naturalness and inevitability. The collective effect of the intertextual allusions is that the *probabile* and *verisimile* of the Thucydidean and Polybian systems (εἰωθότες οἱ ἄνθρωποι...) subtly assume the status of the *verum* in Josephus, a judgement of probability slides into a judgement of value. In this way a partisan and subjective interpretation is given the appearance of 'scientific' analysis in the distinguished tradition of classical historiography. The reader who succumbs to this illusion becomes the polemicist's unwitting accomplice.

---

in brief, between the material and the moral elements. The truth that pays off is in the realm of *facts*. The necessary falsehoods, which also pay off, are in the realm of *intentions* and *interpretations*. This is a fundamental rule for propaganda analysis' (53). And also, we might add, for the analysis of Josephus' polemic.

CHAPTER THREE

THE SEMANTICS OF *STASIS*: SOME THUCYDIDEAN STRANDS IN *BJ* 4.121-282

> Iam pridem equidem nos vera vocabula rerum amisimus.
> SALLUST, *Catilina* 52.11.

> Jede Revolution geht mit einer Umwertung der Wörter einher... Wörter deuten die Welt; wer seine Deutung durchzusetzen weiß, ist Herr über die Seelen.
> W. SCHNEIDER, *Wörter machen Leute* (1978), 146, 149.

> We lose our essence when we fall into propaganda–false naming... We may begin healing our diseased species by a small but radical reclaiming of language...
> S. KEEN, *Faces of the Enemy* (1986), 97.

> For sure, the world of politics makes no sense at all without the notion of relativism. It is a world of plural understandings and plural moralities and a marked scarcity of absolutes, rich in *asserted* absolutes but poor in *agreed* absolutes.
> F.G. BAILEY, *The Prevalence of Deceit* (1991), 119.

In the preceding chapters we noted a number of instances where Josephus' interpretation of motive and event clearly presupposes specific rebel claims, which are then countered and turned on their head by the strategy of 'polemical reversal'. This drastic (but typical) procedure inevitably raises questions of credibility, legitimacy and objectivity—for with a competing version (albeit mostly implicit) always present in the background, why should the reader accept without qualification the priority of the *historian's* interpretation, or his claim that the truth, as purveyed by himself, is the polar opposite of what the rebels asserted? In other words, how can the polemical reversals be reconciled with the work's prefatory claims of accurate reporting? The inconcinnity warrants investigation. Once again we are faced with the question of how Josephus gives his subjective interpretation a veneer of plausibility, how his tendentious version is accommodated to the work's self-proclaimed allegiance to Greek theory. Josephus, I shall argue, fully recognized this tension between polemic and

credibility, and attempted to reconcile the two—to his own advantage and apparently without prejudice to the programmatic statements—by assimilating a variety of Thucydidean techniques.

1. *Josephus and Thucydides as* Krisenhistoriker

The Thucydidean subtext shimmers through *BJ* often enough to suggest that it provides a stable point of reference. Leaving aside Josephus' well-known proemial allusions to his predecessor (*BJ* 1.1 ≈ Thuc. 1.1.1-2; *BJ* 1.16, 26 ≈ Thuc. 1.22.2-3), we might note also the suggestive expositional sentence to the Jewish narrative proper, στάσεως τοῖς δυνατοῖς Ἰουδαίων ἐμπεσούσης... (1.31). Civic strife, identified in the preface as one of the work's major themes (στάσις οἰκεία, 1.10), is introduced here in terms that may owe something to Thucydides' description of plague and *stasis*:[1] if intentional, the reminiscence would certainly make good sense in light of a number of other related analogies. Thematic correspondences, duly noted by the commentators, leave little doubt that Josephus knew the celebrated Corcyra excursus, while evidence from *AJ* suggests also a familiarity with Thucydides' description of the Athenian plague.[2] But statistical data of this kind will register only superficial *formal* correspondences, without telling us anything about the intellectual affiliation between the two writers, or the function of the Thucydidean strands in Josephus. These are the central issues addressed in this chapter. The full range of the Thucydidean influences and impulses, I shall argue, cannot be reduced to tidy inventories of lexical parallels or thematic allusions: much rather Thucydides seems to have provided an important *methodological impulse*, traces of which can be detected throughout the Josephan *stasis* narrative. In other words, we need to get beyond the overt allusions to the many subtle resonances of Thucydides, and to consider how and why they are assimilated in *BJ*.

The identifiable allusions are, however, a useful starting point. Corcyrean *stasis* and Athenian plague provide Josephus not only with specific thematic parallels but, more fundamentally, with a broad conceptual frame that he applies to his own analysis of the strife in Jerusalem. Plague and *stasis*, in the political pathology of Thucydides, are complementary paradigms of civic and social dissolution, analysed as a twofold μεταβολή:

---

[1] Cf. Thuc. 3.82.2, καὶ ἐπέπεσε πολλὰ καὶ χαλεπὰ κατὰ στάσιν ταῖς πόλεσι; 3.87.1, ἡ νόσος τὸ δεύτερον ἐπέπεσε τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις; and below, n. 5.

[2] See above, chap. 1, n. 13; on echoes of the Thucydidean plague description in *AJ*, cf. Drüner (1896) 17; Ladouceur (1981) 28-30; Kottek (1994) 156-160.

an external disaster or convulsion precipitates a correlative inward dislocation, expressed typically in the phenomenon of moral anarchy or 'Umwertung der Werte'. These are the 'extreme moments [which] provide the chance to penetrate the repetitive and routine and let us glimpse a deeper reality,'[3] the particular cases from which the general principles can be abstracted. Plague and *stasis* lead by different routes to the same state of desocialization and ἀνομία (Thuc. 2.53 ≈ 3.82). Both analyses include reflexions on the typical phenomenology and on human nature, and in the plague especially μεταβολή appears as an axial notion.[4] Medical and political categories coalesce[5] in an acute diagnosis which fully justifies regarding Thucydides as *Krisenhistoriker*: 'Nicht der Zustand also, sondern seine Unterbrechung wird damit zum Gegenstand der Betrachtung gemacht, die Krise, die Krankheitsepisode, die den Gesundheitszustand des Völkerlebens unterbricht'.[6] And that description applies equally to Josephus, who also analyses the Jerusalem *stasis* as a disruptive and desocializing μεταβολή, with corresponding attention to ἀνθρωπεία φύσις and the typical phenomenology. By way of introduction, a few examples will illustrate this common orientation.

---

[3] Connor (1984) 99. Cf. Raaflaub (1988) 334 (comparing plague with *stasis*): 'Der Firnis der Sozialisation blättert ab, und zum Vorschein kommt auch hier die ungezähmte Menschennatur'. For the typology, see also the more recent examples cited in Sorokin (1942) 65-70, 174-193.

[4] Thuc. 2.48.3, 53.1-3, cf. 61.2. On the concept ofμεταβολή in Thucydides, see Stahl (1966) 79-81; Schubert (1993) 167-170, 175-176. The full extent of the inward μεταβολή is pointedly indexed by juxtaposition of Pericles' funeral speech and the Athenian epidemic, the sublimated picture of the Athenian citizen beside the hopeless man who discards those ideals for the satisfaction of his immediate desires. The thematic parallels are noted by Morgan (1994) 205, 207-208; Orwin (1994) 182-184.

[5] On the paradigmatic function of Thucydides' plague description, see Mittelstadt (1968) 145-154; Horstmanshoff (1989) 203-209. Conversely, medical terminology is used to describe the Corcyrean *stasis*: 3.82.1, καὶ πᾶν ὡς εἰπεῖν τὸ Ἑλληνικὸν ἐκινήθη [≈ 1.1.2]; 3.82.2, καὶ ἐπέπεσε [≈ 2.48.2, 3.87.1] πολλὰ καὶ χαλεπὰ κατὰ στάσιν ταῖς πόλεσι (with LSJ *s.v.* ἐμπίπτω 3); Hornblower (1991) 481; Rechenauer (1991) 330-331. Loraux (1986) 97 aptly comments: 'Ainsi, lorsque... Thucydide traite la *stasis* comme un fléau qui, du dehors, s'abat sur les cités et comme une fatalité inhérente à la nature humaine, cette tension est constitutive d'une pensée traditionelle qui, de la guerre civile, fait tout à la fois un *loimos* et l'un des maux attachés à la condition de l'homme. *Epepese*: avec la guerre civile, les maux tombent sur les cités comme, au livre II, la peste sur les Athéniens...' Plague and *stasis* as cognate and parallel analyses: Hunger (1939) 29-30 (with thematic parallels); Schmid-Stählin (1948) 36, 108-109; Stahl (1966) 118; Schneider (1974) 119-123; Pouncey (1980) 31-33; Connor (1984) 99-101, esp. 100: 'Indeed, we can think of these two parallel episodes as forming a boundary within the work, the one introducing, the other bringing to its culmination a unit exploring the inability of any of the conventional restraints to control the powerful drives of nature'; Orwin (1988), (1994) 172-184; Rechenauer (1991) 326, 336-340.

[6] Strasburger (1975) 20; cf. Rechenauer (1991) 264-273.

Describing the Zealots' reign of terror in Jerusalem, Josephus notes their disregard of burial customs:

> **381**The Zealots reached such a pitch of barbarity that they allowed burial to none, whether killed in the City or on the roads. **382**As if they were pledged to destroy the laws of their country and of nature too, and along with their crimes against mankind to pollute the Deity Himself, they left the dead bodies rotting in the sun. **383**For burying a relative, as for desertion, the penalty was death, and anyone who gave burial to another soon needed it himself. **384**In short, none of the nobler emotions disappeared so completely amid the horrors of the time as pity [καθόλου τε εἰπεῖν, οὐδὲν οὕτως ἀπολώλει χρηστὸν πάθος ἐν ταῖς τότε συμφοραῖς ὡς ἔλεος]: what deserved compassion only provoked these wretches [ἃ γὰρ ἐχρῆν οἰκτείρειν, ταῦτα παρώξυνε τοὺς ἀλιτηρίους], whose venom shifted from the living to those they had murdered, and from the dead back to the living. **385**Paralysed with fear the survivors envied those already dead—they were at peace—and the tortured wretches in the prisons pronounced even the unburied fortunate in comparison with themselves. **386**Every human ordinance was trampled underfoot by these men, every dictate of religion scoffed at... [κατεπατεῖτο μὲν οὖν πᾶς αὐτοῖς θεσμὸς ἀνθρώπων, ἐγελᾶτο δὲ τὰ θεῖα].
>
> (4.381-386)

Here as elsewhere the motif of the unburied corpse, by evoking cultural-specific norms[7] consciously subverted by the Zealots, has an overtly polemical slant. But enclosed between two more general references to Zealot contempt for both human and divine (382 ≈ 386),[8] the specific case itself becomes an emblem of the wider pattern of moral anarchy. In the same way the paradoxically inverted *makarismos* at 385 ('The survivors envied those already dead')[9] is both a specific indictment and, beyond that, a pointer to what we might term the *mundus inversus* syndrome. This fluctuation between general and particular is of some interest. In the manner of Thucydides, Josephus sees the individual enormities as symptoms of a

---

[7] Denial of burial as the ultimate disgrace in the *OT*: *Deut.* 21.22-23, 28.26; *Jer.* 7.33, 8.1-2, 16.14; *Ez.* 6.5, 29.5; *Is.* 14.19; cf. Koep (1954) col. 198. Similarly in the Greco-Roman writers, e.g. Hom. *Il.* 22.337-354, with Griffin (1980) 45-46, 115-118; Soph. *Ant.* 29-30; Eur. *Hipp.* 1030-1031; Catull. 64.152-153; Liv. 1.49.1; Sen. *Thy.* 747-753. This association will explain why Josephus regularly uses the motif to indict the Zealots (e.g. 4.317, 332, 360).

[8] The polarity typically carries the nuance of reckless impiety: for the pathetic effect, compare (e.g.) Thuc. 2.52.3, ἐς ὀλιγωρίαν ἐτράποντο καὶ ἱερῶν καὶ ὁσίων ὁμοίως Cic. *Sest.* 1, *qui omnia divina et humana violarint vesarint, perturbarint everterint*; *Rosc. Am.* 65, *cum omnia divina atque humana iura scelere nefario polluisset*; *Verr.* II 5.34; *Rep.* 6.29; Sall. *Epist. Mith.* 17; *Or. Lep.* 11; Livy 3.19.11, 29.18.10; Luc. 4.689; Tac. *Ann.* 2.14.5; *Hist.* 2.56.1, 3.33.2.

[9] For the motif, cf. Hom. *Od.* 5.306-307, τρὶς μάκαρες Δαναοὶ καὶ τετράκις, οἳ τότ' ὄλοντο / Τροίῃ ἐν εὐρείῃ ...; Eur. *Andr.* 1182-1183; Verg. *Aen.* 1.94-96; Ov. *Met.* 11.539-540; Sen. *Tro.* 142-145, *Ag.* 514-515 etc.

typical pattern: an external crisis (ἐν ταῖς τότε συμφοραῖς) entails a matching μεταβολή in man's inner nature (indexed here as erosion of ἔλεος). Nor is this an isolated observation. Both perpetrators and victims are caught up in the spiral of moral degradation, and where the Zealots are immune to ἔλεος (καθόλου τε εἰπεῖν...), the victims of brutality and famine become correspondingly indifferent to the claims of αἰδώς. With a clinical eye Josephus notes the descent into brutalization and despair:

> **32**The shouts of the combatants rang incessantly day and night, but more frightful still was the terrified moaning of the bereaved. Their disasters provided one cause of grief after another, but their cries were choked by overwhelming dread: while fear suppressed all outward emotion they were tortured with stifled groans [φιμούμενοι δὲ τά γε πάθη τῷ φόβῳ μεμυκόσι τοῖς στεναγμοῖς ἐβασανίζοντο]. **33**No regard for the living was any longer paid by their relatives, and no one troubled to bury the dead [καὶ οὔτε πρὸς τοὺς ζῶντας ἦν αἰδὼς ἔτι τοῖς προσήκουσιν οὔτε πρόνοια τῶν ἀπολωλότων ταφῆς]. The reason in either case was that everyone despaired of his own life; for those who belonged to no party lost interest in everything—they would soon be dead anyway.
>
> (5.32-33)

> **429**Famine, indeed, overpowers all the emotions, and decency is its first victim: what at other times claims respect is then treated with contempt [πάντων μὲν δὴ παθῶν ὑπερίσταται λιμός, οὐδὲν δ' οὕτως ἀπόλλυσιν ὡς αἰδῶ· τὸ γὰρ ἄλλως ἐντροπῆς ἄξιον ἐν τούτῳ καταφρονεῖται].
>
> (5.429)

> **446**Titus sent a detachment of cavalry with orders to ambush those who sallied out along the valleys in search of food. **447**Some of these were combatants..., but the majority were penniless commoners who were deterred from deserting by fear for their families... **449**But famine gave them courage for these sallies [τολμηροὺς δὲ πρὸς τὰς ἐφόδους ὁ λιμὸς ἐποίει]...
>
> (5.446-449)[10]

> **514**As for burying their relatives, the sick lacked the strength, while those who were fit shirked the task because of the number of the dead and uncertainty about their own fate. For many fell dead while burying others, and many went to their graves before their hour struck. **515**In their

[10] Notice how the starving people are here *activated* by hunger to risk their lives in seeking food, while at 5.429 and 514-515 they are reduced to total *apathy and indifference*: this illustrates the principle of the 'diversification and polarization of the effects of the same calamity in the behaviour of the population concerned', on which cf. Sorokin (1942) 56-59.

> misery no weeping or lamentation was heard: famine stifled the emotions [ἀλλ' ὁ λιμὸς ἤλεγχε τὰ πάθη], and with dry eyes and grinning mouths those who were slow to die watched those whose end came sooner.
>
> (5.514-515)

Such observations on the psychological effects of *stasis* and famine suggest a broad Thucydidean orientation: we recall the general principle abstracted in the Corcyrean episode, 'But war... is a harsh master and brings the dispositions of most men to the level of their circumstances' [ὁ δὲ πόλεμος... βίαιος διδάσκαλος καὶ πρὸς τὰ παρόντα τὰς ὀργὰς τῶν πολλῶν ὁμοιοῖ] (3.82.2).[11] As criteria to index debasement, ἔλεος and αἰδώς in Josephus come very close to the ἀναίσχυντον motif in the Thucydidean plague.[12] Further, the thematic nexus 'general moral anarchy —disregard for sacred and profane—burial customs' appears in both Thucydides[13] and at Josephus 4.381-386, quoted above; and it may be more than coincidence that just before the latter passage, the strife in Jerusalem had been metaphorically described as a disease (οὐ δεῖν τοῖς οἴκοι νοσοῦσιν ἐπιχειρεῖν, argues Vespasian at 4.376). Certainly the perspective, perhaps also some of the details, are Thucydidean.

Another significant aspect of the μεταβολή motif surfaces when Josephus reworks Thucydides' famous reflexions on the Corcyrean *stasis*. A lengthy indictment of Zealot atrocities culminates in an emblematic allusion:

---

[11] For an analogousὁμοίωσις πρὸς τὰ παρόντα, compare also the λοιμός/λιμός controversy with reference to an oracle recalled during the Athenian plague. Interpretation, comments Thucydides, will be predicated on the circumstances prevailing at the time: οἱ γὰρ ἄνθρωποι πρὸς ἃ ἔπασχον [≈ πρὸς τὰ παρόντα, 3.82.2] τὴν μνήμην ἐποιοῦντο. ἢν δέ γε οἶμαί ποτε ἄλλος πόλεμος καταλάβῃ Δωρικὸς τοῦδε ὕστερος καὶ ξυμβῇ γενέσθαι λιμόν, κατὰ τὸ εἰκὸς οὕτως ᾄσονται (2.54.3). The psychological mechanism is registered again at Thuc. 1.22.3: cf. De Romilly (1990) 108-110.

[12] The motif appears in Thucydides in relation to burial customs (ἀναισχύντους θήκας, 2.52.4: cf. following note for context), and again in the remark that men now became quite open about acts previously concealed (2.53.1). The *pudor* motif is then used regularly in literary plague descriptions (Lucr. 6.1173; Ov. *Met.* 7.567; Sen. *Oed.* 65; Luc. 6.100-103).

[13] Thuc. 2.52.3-4: 'The disaster was so overwhelming that men, not knowing what was to become of them, became indifferent to every rule of religion and law [ἐς ὀλιγωρίαν ἐτράποντο καὶ ἱερῶν καὶ ὁσίων ὁμοίως]. The customs which they had previously observed regarding burial were all thrown into confusion [νόμοι τε πάντες ξυνεταράχθησαν οἷς ἐχρῶντο πρότερον περὶ τὰς ταφάς], and they buried their dead as each could. And many had recourse to shameless modes of burial [καὶ πολλοὶ ἐς ἀναισχύντους θήκας ἐτράποντο]... Resorting to other people's pyres, some, getting a start on those who had raised them, would put on their own dead and kindle the fire; others would throw the body they were carrying on one which was already burning and go away'.

> **364**There was no section of the people for whose destruction they did not fabricate some pretext [ᾧ μὴ πρὸς ἀπώλειαν ἐπενοεῖτο πρόφασις]. Those with whom any had quarrelled had long ago been put to death; against those who had not collided with them in peacetime they invented carefully chosen accusations [ἐλάμβανε τὰς αἰτίας]: the man who never approached them was suspected of arrogance; one who approached them boldly, of contempt; if he was obsequious, of conspiracy [καὶ ὁ μὲν μηδ' ὅλως αὐτοῖς προσιὼν ὡς ὑπερήφανος, ὁ προσιὼν δὲ μετὰ παρρησίας ὡς καταφρονῶν, ὁ θεραπεύων δ' ὡς ἐπίβουλος ὑπωπτεύετο]. **365**Death was the one penalty for the most serious and the most trifling accusations alike...
>
> (4.364-365)

Broadly speaking, Josephus here transposes into gesture and attitude the pattern of *stasis*-induced reversals which Thucydides had registered with reference to semantic dislocation and the realignment of attributes (3.82.4-7);[14] certainly this represents an innovative adaptation of a celebrated text which resonates widely through ancient accounts of civil strife. As the radicals assume control in Corcyra, Thucydides notes a correlative radicalization in the language itself, a displacement of the conventional (or pre-*stasis*) connotations of political concepts and slogans to match the prevailing ideology. 'The excess of a disposition comes to be admired in place of its mean, and the mean comes to be despised as the deficiency of this excess. Having supplanted the mean as the standard, moreover, the extreme continuously feeds on itself: it enjoins a striving for ever fresh extremes, a frenzied struggle to exceed one's rivals at excess itself'.[15] In this way and on the well-known axiom that 'he is master who can define',[16] language itself, by reframing the norms, becomes a potent instrument in factional politics. Josephus in the above passage notes an analogous pattern of distortion when he shows how, in a climate of extreme polarization, the Zealots re-classify neutral parties as enemies; and by thus re-defining the intrinsically value-neutral gesture (ὁ μὲν μηδ' ὅλως αὐτοῖς προσιὼν, ὁ προσιὼν δὲ μετὰ παρρησίας) into an act of hostility, they fabricate the αἰτίαι to justify vicious reprisals. Nor is this an isolated example of the relationship between *stasis* and dislocation in meaning: in Thucydides as in Josephus the extreme moment highlights and abstracts the general principles which can then be seen operating throughout the work.

---

[14] Stylistically the Thucydidean passage shows greater variation than its adaptation in Josephus. Thucydides first has five pairs of abstract nouns (of the type τόλμα ἀλόγιστος, ἀνδρεία φιλέταιρος) to demonstrate the changing relationship between action and attribute (3.82.4), then a group of participial substantives of the type ὁ μὲν χαλεπαίνων, ὁ δ' ἀντιλέγων αὐτῷ (3.82.5). Josephus at 4.364-365 has three participial substantives.

[15] Orwin (1994) 178.

[16] Thus Stokeley Carmichael in a speech of 1967, as quoted in Graber (1976) 302.

Both effect and significance of Josephus' Corcyrean allusion are additionally enhanced by its position in the context of rampant civic strife. Immediately before the quoted passage, *stasis* had appeared as the climactic item in Niger's curse on the Zealots: 'As he died, Niger called down on their heads the vengeance of Rome, famine and pestilence to add to the horrors of war, and, to crown it all, internecine strife [ἀναιρούμενος δὲ ὁ Νίγερ τιμωροὺς Ῥωμαίους αὐτοῖς ἐπηράσατο, λιμόν τε καὶ λοιμὸν ἐπὶ τῷ πολέμῳ καὶ πρὸς ἅπασι τὰς ἀλλήλων χεῖρας,];[17] all these curses on the scoundrels were ratified by God, including that most righteous fate, by which they were to taste before long in their party strife [στασιάσαντες] the frenzy of their fellow-citizens' (4.361-362). The Corcyrean allusion which follows (4.364-365) now *answers and enacts* that part of Niger's imprecation, i.e. *stasis* is one of the concrete forms through which the curse (and the metaphysical assumptions behind it) are fulfilled.[18] Immediately afterwards, the scene shifts to the Roman camp, where *stasis* appears again as a leitmotiv in the strategic deliberations. 'In the Roman camp all the generals regarded the enemy's internal divisions [τὴν στάσιν] as a godsend, were eager to march on the City and urged Vespasian, as commander-in-chief, to lose no time. Divine providence, they said, had come to their aid by setting their enemies against each other [φάμενοι πρόνοιαν θεοῦ σύμμαχον σφίσι τῷ τετράφθαι τοὺς ἐχθροὺς κατ' ἀλλήλων];[19] but the

---

[17] Niger's curse comprises four discrete components: war against Rome, famine, pestilence, and *stasis*. War, *stasis* and famine are literal realities (cf. Krieger [1994] 286) and appear together several times as a thematic triad (1.27; 4.397; 5.536; 6.40, 205, 216). Pestilence however (λοιμός) is not a factor in the Jerusalem narrative (metaphorical reference to *stasis* as a disease is a separate issue)—and its inclusion in the sequence therefore points to the formulaic-religious character of the imprecation. Pestilence in the *OT* is typically a *punishment* and as such has obvious relevance in a curse; in addition, the triad 'war—famine—pestilence' is topical in the *OT*, e.g. *Jer.* 21.8-9, with Grimm (1965) 18, 43-44. (Cf. also *bellum... famem pestemque* at Hor. *C.* 1.21.13-14). Josephus here uses Niger as mouthpiece to articulate his own religiously tinged *Geschichtsphilosophie* with its characteristic scheme of sin and retribution: this is clear from the reference to divine ratification, and from the τιμωροὺς Ῥωμαίους motif (anticipating the idea that the Romans intervene as God's agents). Since moreover this is specifically a curse (ὁ Νίγερ... ἐπηράσατο), subsequently fulfilled, it might also be relevant to note that the pairing λιμός/λοιμός, first at Hes. *Op.* 243, appears frequently in *oracles* (thus Thuc. 2.54.2-3; *Or. Sib.* 2.23; 3.332; 8.175; 11.46, 240; 12.114): this association (if intentional) would give Niger's imprecation a suitably vatic complexion, hinting at the overarching metaphysical dimension. Typologically therefore the curse would be equally suggestive to Jewish and to Greco-Roman readers.

[18] If the curse points to Josephus' metaphysical scheme of history, as argued in the previous note, the Thucydidean allusion brings out the classical slant: theological and secular strands are skilfully interwoven—with only the pestilence motif making for a slight dissonance between the two.

[19] This remark places *stasis* in the same metaphysical scheme of sin and punishment as

pendulum would soon swing back, and at any moment the Jews might be reunited through weariness of civil strife [ἐν τοῖς ἐμφυλίοις κακοῖς] or through a change of mind' (4.366-367). Vespasian in the event opposes this view and accurately predicts that the internal dissension will be a drawn-out affair which will play into the Romans' hands: 'By waiting, he would find their numbers reduced by internal division [ἐν τῇ στάσει]... Consequently, while their opponents were perishing by their own hands [διαφθειρομένων χερσὶν οἰκείαις τῶν ἐχθρῶν] and suffering from that worst of calamities, civil strife [στάσει], the right thing for them to do was to watch the dangerous conflict from a safe distance, and not to get involved with suicidal maniacs locked in a death struggle' (4.369-372). Framed by these two explicit references to *stasis*, Josephus' Corcyrean allusion at 4.364-365 acquires added point and expressivity: the careful thematic integration shows that our passage is not just an incidental purple patch, but that Josephus was fully aware of its emblematic quality. It establishes the perspective from which he analyses the phenomenon of civic strife in Jerusalem.

Much later, there is another echo of Corcyrean excursus. After the destruction of Jerusalem, Titus praises his troops as follows: 'By their own efforts they had increased the power of their country and had made it plain to all men that neither the number of their enemies, the strength of their defences, the size of their cities, nor the reckless daring [ἀλόγιστοι τόλμαι] and bestial savagery [καὶ θηριώδεις ἀγριότητες] of their warriors could ever hold out against Roman valour...' (7.7). The *junctura* τόλμα ἀλόγιστος appears twice in Thucydides (3.82.4, τόλμα μὲν ἀλόγιστος ἀνδρεία φιλέταιρος ἐνομίσθη; 6.59.1), then also in Polybius (3.19.10, ἀνὴρ θράσος μὲν καὶ τόλμαν κεκτημένος, ἀλόγιστον δὲ ταύτην καὶ τελέως ἄκριτον)—but on formal criteria alone we cannot decide whether Josephus took his cue from Thucydides or Polybius.[20] The respective contexts, however, may provide a clue. Since τόλμα ἀλόγιστος at Thuc. 3.82.4 occurs among the connotational slippages produced by *stasis*, and since this aspect was of interest also to Josephus (cf. 4.364-365 above), the Corcyrean passage is indeed more likely to have been his immediate source. And from the perspective of Corcyrean semantics, a further detail might also be relevant. In Thucydides, conduct that previously carried the pejorative label 'reckless daring' is now positively re-designated as 'courageous loyalty to the party' (ἀνδρεία φιλέταιρος); in Josephus, analogously, the disposition

in Niger's preceding curse.

[20] Thackeray (among others) takes this as a Thucydidean echo (in his note *ad BJ* 7.7); Stein (1937) 64 and 76 inclines towards Polybius.

disparaged by Titus as ἀλόγιστοι τόλμαι is seen, from another perspective, as a high virtue. The general's eulogy has its counterpart in Eleazar's palinode at Masada: 'Weapons, walls, impregnable fortresses, and *a spirit that in the cause of liberty no danger could shake* [φρόνμηα... ἄτρεπτον], encouraged all to rebel' (7.370). First the material resources, then the underlying spirit, as in Titus' speech: pattern and details are close enough to suggest an intentional responsion. This then is another hint that Josephus recognized perceptual refraction and re-naming as typical symptoms of the general convulsion.

Further *stasis*-related motifs in *BJ* probably derived from the Corcyrean excursus will be discussed below (sacrilege, oaths betrayed, ties of kinship perverted); for the moment we might conclude our brief survey with another episode of broad Thucydidean orientation. At the start of the revolt anti-Jewish sentiment flares up in various centres, including Syria. The situation here verges on civil war, and it will hardly be a coincidence that the narrative takes on a Thucydidean complexion. 'The whole of Syria was a scene of frightful disorder [δεινὴ... ταραχή]; every city was divided into two camps, and the safety of one party lay in forestalling the other' [καὶ πᾶσα πόλις εἰς δύο διήρητο στρατόπεδα, σωτηρία δὲ τοῖς ἑτέροις ἦν τὸ τούς ἑτέρους φθάσαι] (2.462). Φθάνειν in particular recalls a recurrent motif in the Corcyrean *stasis* (ἁπλῶς δὲ ὁ φθάσας τὸν μέλλοντα κακόν τι δρᾶν ἐπῃνεῖτο, 3.82.5; cf. 82.7, 83.3). Fear and distrust are rife (2.463), and in addition to hatred (461), πλεονεξία rears its head:

> **464**Even those who had long been deemed the most harmeless of men [τοὺς πάλαι πρᾳοτάτους πάνυ δοκοῦντας] were tempted by avarice [πλεονεξία] to murder their opponents; for they plundered the property of their victims with impunity, and as if from a battlefield carried off the spoils of the slain to their own homes, with special honour being paid to the man who grasped the most, as if he had overcome more powerful enemies [ἔνδοξός τε ἦν ὁ πλεῖστα κερδάνας ὡς κατισχύσας πλειόνων]. **465**The cities could be seen full of unburied corpses, the dead bodies of the aged flung down alongside those of infants, women without a rag to conceal their nakedness, and the whole province full of indescribable horrors...
>
> (2.464-465)

As ordinary men descend into avaricious savagery and the unburied dead testify to their handiwork, the successful plunderer is approvingly termed ἔνδοξος: the semantic relationship between predicate and referent captures the high premium now placed on vindictiveness. We recall Thuc. 3.82.4, 'And they exchanged the usual significations of words for new ones, in light of what they thought justified' [καὶ τὴν εἰωθυῖαν ἀξίωσιν τῶν ὀνομάτων ἐς

τὰ ἔργα ἀντήλλαξαν τῇ δικαιώσει]. Or as one commentator has put it, an 'Umwertung der Werte' has its is lexical expression in a matching 'Umwortung der Worte'.[21]

When subsequently the Jews turn against Scythopolis, where the local Jewish residents side with the Scythopolitans against their co-religionists, we have a *stasis* within a *stasis*:

> **466** So far the Jews had been attacking foreigners, but when they invaded Scythopolis they found the Jews there opposed to them; for they lined up with the Scythopolitans, and treating their own safety as more important than the ties of blood [καὶ τῆς ἑαυτῶν ἀσφαλείας ἐν δευτέρῳ θέμενοι τὴν συγγένειαν], they joined battle with their own countrymen.
>
> (2.466)

External constraints dissolve ties of συγγένεια: this is another typical symptom of *stasis*, recalling Thuc. 3.82.6, καὶ μὴν καὶ τὸ ξυγγενὲς τοῦ ἑταιρικοῦ ἀλλοτριώτερον ἐγένετο. Yet the new alignments are unstable, and by an interesting variation of the Thucydidean ὕποπτον motif, this excessive display of zeal by the Scythopolitan Jews appears suspect to the other Scythopolitans (ὑπωπτεύθη δ' αὐτῶν καὶ τὸ λίαν πρόθυμον, 2.467), and ultimately recoils on their own heads.

If these few examples suggest that Josephus as *Krisenhistoriker* consciously followed the Thucydidean model, they are only a starting point. His elaborate treatment of the μεταβολή/*mundus inversus* system in particular has many ramifications which will require close attention. The Thucydidean substratum in *BJ*, I shall argue, serves Josephus in two significant ways. First and in very general terms, Josephus by evoking the greatest *Krisenhistoriker* creates the impression of allegiance to the rigorous analysis of his predecessor, and such association with an authoritative figure in the genre implicitly enhances his own credibility. Second and more specifically, the μεταβολή/*mundus inversus* system, drawing extensively on Thucydides' account of *stasis* and plague, becomes in *BJ* a background which, in virtue of the recognizable affiliation, gives psychological plausibility to Josephus' own scheme of polemical reversal: the Thucydidean analysis in other words provides a conceptual framework on which Josephus predicates, and simultaneously justifies, his own hostile interpretation. Against many commentators who treat the Thucydidean elements as just a matter of style, or reduce the *stasis* motifs to literary *topoi*, I shall argue that these strands are integral to the polemical design of *BJ*.

---

[21] The expression is from KRAUS (1987) 188 (there with reference to Thuc. 3.82-83).

For an example of this interaction we might begin with Josephus' use of the term μεταβολή itself. A glance at the concordance will show that the word typically designates an external and observable convulsion or transformation (in consequence of war, revolution or the like). Once, however, it is strikingly applied also to a correlative *reversal in attitude*. Appealing to his besieged compatriots in Jerusalem, Josephus remarks: 'Who would not groan with anguish at this amazing inversion that has come over the City [τῆς παραδόξου μεταβολῆς], when foreigners and enemies atone for your impiety, while you, a Jew, brought up in her laws, treat them more harshly than even your enemies?' (6.102). As in Thucydides, the inward μεταβολή is a consequence of the general external convulsion. Very obviously, however, this represents not detached scientific analysis but subjective impression: the speaker is Josephus himself, his whole speech has a marked pro-Roman bias, the word 'amazing' indicates an element of subjectivity,[22] and most importantly, the inversion here described is a typical polemical motif to exonerate the Romans and discredit the insurgents.[23] The whole proposition, in a word, could be dismissed as just another example of polemical reversal. But against the pervasive and overarching *mundus inversus* system, it becomes somewhat less implausible. Since Josephus' polemical reversals and the Thucydidean plague- and *stasis*-induced μεταβολή operate according to a parallel logic (the normal order and dispositions overturned) the distinction between the two begins to dissolve—and if the *particular instance* is viewed against the *general pattern* of reversal throughout the work, the polemical motif is arguably made to coalesce with the typical phenomenology of *stasis*.

Nor is this an isolated case; the interaction posited here is expanded into a broad strategy of impression management which subserves Josephus' art of deformation and defamation. His technique of polemical reversal is regularly predicated on the Thucydidean diagnosis of social dissolution, and derives its contextual legitimacy from that association. For a closer study of this correlation and how it works, we turn to the beginning of book 4, where *stasis* erupts in Jerusalem with the arrival of John of Gischala.

---

[22] Cf. Rhoads (1976) 167: 'Josephus' reference to the "amazing inversion," when gentiles and enemies rectify the impiety of Jews, suggests that he is aware of the dynamics of the argument he is using.'

[23] Cf. Hengel (1976) 189-190.

2. *Enter* Ἰωάννης δολιώτατος *(4.103-135)*

Lying, deception and linguistic manipulation run like a red thread through the Jerusalem narrative. Since I shall argue for a logical interrelationship between this distortion, Josephus' reverse polemic and the Thucydidean *stasis* model, it will be useful to look closely at the introduction and typical applications of these motifs at the beginning of book 4.

Appropriately these strands are initially tied to the person of John of Gischala, himself a veritable personification of duplicity (cf. 2.585-587; 4.85, 208). Josephus, hostile as always, is sharply critical of John's role in the fall of Gischala and reports the whole episode as an elaborate exercise in deception. In response to Titus' offer of capitulation (4.92-96), John requests and is granted a truce for the duration of the Sabbath (4.97-102). This is followed by a scathing editorial comment:

> **103**With such language John beguiled Titus [ἐσοφίζετο τὸν Τίτον], being less concerned for the seventh day than for his own skin. He was afraid of being caught the moment the town fell, and pinned his hopes of life on darkness and flight. **104**But clearly God was preserving John to bring destruction on Jerusalem, and it was His doing that Titus was not only persuaded by this pretext for delay [τῇ σκήψει τῆς ὑπερθέσεως], but even pitched his camp further from the town...
>
> (4.103-104)

Here we have a number of themes that will reappear in the narrative: John's skilful use of pretext, his escape as part of God's preordained plan to punish Jerusalem,[24] and the consummate trickster (ἐσοφίζετο, 4.103; τῇ σκήψει, 104; τῆς ἀπάτης, 116). The departure from Gischala is unambiguously described as a surreptitious flight (φεύγειν and cognates at 4.106, 108, 111, 114, 115), further compromised by John's callous abandonment of many from his group (4.107-111). With these points in mind we can gauge his performance in Jerusalem (which marks the beginning of the *stasis* section itself):

> **121**When John entered the Capital, the whole population turned out, and each of the fugitives was surrounded by a vast crowd, eagerly asking for news of events outside. **122**Still hot and breathless the fugitives could not hide the stress they were under, but they swaggered in their sorry plight

---

[24] Schwier (1989) 147 n. 12 proposes: '...Jos. bezeichnet diese Rettung als "Werk Gottes" (104), jedoch nur um Johannes für das "Verderben Jerusalems" zu bewahren; daß die Flüchtlinge demgegenüber die entgegengesetzte Deutung vertraten, ist m.E. mehr als wahrscheinlich'. In other words, the original claim of John's group is indeed reflected, but its intended sense exactly inverted. This is the same style of polemic encountered at 2.539 with reference to the Beth Horon episode (cf. chap. 2, section 4 above).

> [ἠλαζονεύοντο δὲ κἀν κακοῖς], declaring that they had not fled from the Romans, but had come to give them battle on favourable ground. **123**'It would have been senseless and futile', they said, 'recklessly to risk our lives for Gischala and such defenceless little towns, when we ought to save our arms and energies for the united defence of the Capital'. **124**Then they mentioned in passing the capture of Gischala, but what they euphemistically described as their 'withdrawal' was generally understood to have been a rout [καὶ τὴν λεγομένην εὐσχημόνως ὑποχώρησιν αὐτῶν οἱ πολλοὶ δρασμὸν ἐνενόουν]. **125**But when the story of the prisoners became known, utter dismay seized the people, who saw in it an unmistakable omen of their own impending capture. **126**John however, quite unconcerned at the fate of the captives, went round urging them one and all to war by the hopes he raised, making out the Romans to be weak, exaggerating their own power, **127**and ridiculing the ignorance of the inexperienced. Even if they had wings, he said, the Romans could never get over the walls of Jerusalem, after experiencing such difficulty with the villages of Galilee and wearing out their engines against their walls.
>
> (4.121-127)

John's deception of the Jerusalemites is skilfully unmasked by Josephus: first he exposes the discrepancy between word and deed, stylizes John's group as braggarts, and then uses the ἀλαζονεύεσθαι motif to discredit their political and ideological agenda. John's men, introduced as fugitives (τῶν συμπεφευγότων, 121), distort the facts (as reported at 4.106-111) to their own advantage (ἠλαζονεύοντο..., οὐ πεφευγέναι Ῥωμαίους φάσκοντες, ἀλλ' ἥκειν πολεμήσοντες αὐτούς), and this tension then reappears as καὶ τὴν λεγομένην εὐσχημόνως ὑποχώρησιν (124): the fugitives pose as swaggering heroes, John and his followers are disparagingly cast as *milites gloriosi*. And once the boasting motif is established, it is made to recoil on the braggarts. John's men claim to have come to Jerusalem to fight the Romans on favourable ground. The supporting argument ('It would have been senseless and futile...', 123) makes good strategic sense in light of Titus' scorched-earth tactics,[25] and perhaps alludes also to the inviolability of Jerusalem;[26] but because the tactical and ideological claims are framed by references to bragging (122) and deliberate misrepresentation (124), they are effectively tarnished through assimilation. The technique is used a second time, to equal effect. John's arguments to raise hope ('...making out the Romans to be weak, exaggerating their own power, and ridiculing the ignorance of the inexperienced', 126-127) are palpably misleading and will not bear scrutiny.[27] The hyperbolical rhetoric colours everything that

---

[25] Cf. Krieger (1994) 283.

[26] Thus Schwier (1989) 147-148.

[27] One need only recall the arguments used by Agrippa to dissuade the Jews from war

follows. At the apex of his speech John then includes a clear allusion to the inviolability of the capital ('Even if they had wings, the Romans could never get over the walls of Jerusalem', 127; cf. 6.98)—but the antecedent bombast in effect punctures the apocalyptic motif and ridicules it as extravagant bravado.[28] Again the polemic works through assimilation. Deceit, bragging and distortion are so consistently stressed because they form the necessary background to justify Josephus' own polemical riposte.

But Josephus' slurs cannot obfuscate the evident political success of John—witness his generally enthusiastic reception in Jerusalem—and there remains a perceptible tension between the two perspectives: for if the deception was really as crassly transparent as Josephus implies, how could John have pulled it off so effectively? For the polemical sneers to carry conviction, in other words, the central notions of deception and distortion on which they are premised have to be shown to be inherently logical and objectively plausible *in this particular context*. This is done through a subtle sleight-of-hand: Josephus plays down the distinction between subjective animus and objective analysis by assimilating the unstable situation in Jerusalem to the Thucydidean *stasis* model. This creates the impression that events in Jerusalem, from the arrival of John, conform to a *typical political and psychological dynamic*, the specific case is subsumed under the recurrent pattern and treated as an illustration of it. Evocations of the Thucydidean scheme, that is, provide an external or 'generic' justification to validate the emphasis on distortion and dislocation, which in retrospect become typical symptoms of civic upheaval—and this turmoil is skilfully exploited by Ἰωάννης δολιώτατος.

At 4.128 events in Jerusalem are fused with the overarching phenomenology of *stasis*, and as the emphasis shifts from the particular to the generic, the geographical compass also widens to embrace the whole region affected by civic strife:

> **128** By such talk most of the young men were drawn into John's net [τὸ πολὺ μὲν τῶν νέων προσδιεφθείρετο] and were incited to war; but of the sensible, older men [τῶν δὲ σωφρονούντων καὶ γηραιῶν] there was not one

(esp. 2.346, 357-387).

[28] Schwier (1989) 148 comes to a similar conclusion by a slightly different route. The fate of John's followers who were abandoned or killed during the flight from Gischala is taken as an omen of the eventual capture of Jerusalem (μεγάλα τῆς ἑαυτῶν ἁλώσεως..., 4.125)—which undermines the claim that the capital is inviolable. 'Durch diese Darstellung werden... Motive, Anliegen und Ziele der Aufständischen sowie deren theologische Begründung verschleiert, entkräftet und widerlegt. Man wird daher rückschließen dürfen, daß Jos. die Elemente des Kampfes vom sicheren Ort und der Unüberwindlichkeit der Jerusalemer Mauern bewußt säkularisiert, also ohne deren theologische Begründung mitgeteilt hat'.

> who did not foresee what was coming and mourn for the City as if it had already perished. **129**Such was the confusion among the people [ὁ μὲν οὖν δῆμος ἦν ἐν τοιαύτῃ συγχύσει], but even before faction reared its head in Jerusalem, the country population had been torn by dissension... **131**Every town was seething with turmoil and civil war [ἐκινεῖτο δ' ἐν ἑκάστῃ πόλει ταραχὴ καὶ πόλεμος ἐμφύλιος], and as soon as they had a breathing-space from the Romans, they turned their hands against each other. Between advocates of war and lovers of peace there was fierce contention [ἦν δὲ... ἔρις χαλεπή]. **132**Beginning in the home party rivalry attacked those who had long been living harmoniously; then the nearest kinsmen severed all ties of blood, and joining those who shared their political views aligned themselves with the opposing sides. **133**Faction reigned everywhere [καὶ στάσις μὲν ἦν πανταχοῦ], the revolutionaries and the warmongers with youthful recklessness silencing the old and the sensible [τὸ νεωτερίζον δὲ καὶ τῶν ὅπλων ἐπιθυμοῦν ἐπεκράτει νεότητι καὶ τόλμῃ γηραιῶν καὶ σωφρόνων]. **134**They began one and all by plundering their neighbours, then banding together in companies they extended their brigandage all over the country, so that in cruelty and lawlessness the victims saw no difference between the Romans and their own countrymen: in fact those who were plundered thought it a far lighter fate to be captured by the Romans.
>
> (4.128-135)

Although the individual phenomena abstracted here can in fact all be supported by specifics from Josephus' narrative,[29] both its position at the beginning of the *stasis* section (4.121-365) and its general Thucydidean complexion give the text an expositional character with a corresponding emphasis on the generic and the typical. A Thucydidean overture, moreover, is answered by a Thucydidean epilogue (4.364-365, the Zealot passage discussed above), and within this clearly demarcated section Josephus applies to the Jerusalem *stasis* the categories of his predecessor.

Generational conflict, here exacerbated by internal dissension, is twice invoked to explain, and disparage, John's successes (4.128, 133)—which become equated with the triumph of youthful militancy over the foresight of the mature (νεότης/τόλμα—σώφρονες).[30] The stylization is consistent, its

---

[29] As pointed out by Brunt (1977) 152 and Goodman (1987) 211. The Temple captain Eleazar b. Ananias who stopped the daily sacrifices to the Roman emperor turned against his family at the start of the war (2.418, 426); Josephus himself left his family when he went over to the Romans (5.419). Both Eleazar b. Ananias and Simon are called youths (2.409, 4.503); Josephus was 29 in A.D. 66; and John of Gischala's popularity among the younger men probably indicates that he too was still fairly young.

[30] Just before (4.125) Josephus had asserted, 'Utter dismay seized the people [τὸν δῆμον], who saw [in John's abandoment of some of his group] an unmistakable omen [μεγάλα... τεκμήρια] of their own impending capture'. The foresight here assigned to the people *as a whole* (τὸν δῆμον) reappears at 4.128 as an attribute more specifically of the *older generation* (τῶν δὲ σωφρονούντων καὶ γεραιῶν). The first occurrence of the motif at 4.125 is a

polemical intent apparent.[31] A Greek influence is very likely here, with the Polybian connexion in particular having been stressed: thus one commentator, noting that youthful impulsiveness appears regularly as a negative factor in Polybius' error analysis, suggests this as the immediate source of Josephus' parallel diagnosis.[32] Thucydides on the other hand is given short shrift in this argument: 'But clearly, the destructive rashness of youth was simply not a major Thucydidean theme, any more than was rationality and irrationality'.[33] But if the second proposition is simply incorrect, the first is highly questionable. RAJAK on the other hand relates the theme young/old to Thucydides,[34] a suggestion which deserves serious consideration (although the examples she cites for Alcibiades' youthfulness are on their own not conclusive). Since Josephus' application of the polarity young/old, with attendant attributes, appears among a number of other (likely) Thucydidean strands in this section, Thucydides is indeed more likely to have supplied also this contrast. The syzygy young/old in Thucydides is one aspect of the wider pattern ἐπιθυμία/πρόνοια (6.13.1), and as such is notable less for any intrinsic aspects than as a factor impacting on political decision-making and action (notably on the eve of the Sicilian expedition).[35] It is precisely this causative aspect which is central also in Josephus' analysis, a passage which purports to uncover the typical dynamic behind the particular manifestations in Jerusalem and environs. The Thucydidean correlation between generational tension, political division and impulsive action, between ἐπιθυμία and διάστασις τοῖς νέοις ἐς τοὺς πεσβυτέρους (6.18.6), is applied to the situation in and around Jerusalem to provide a cogent psychological explanation for John's

---

polemical generalization which consciously amplifies the extent of the scepticism towards John.

[31] The revolutionary elements are characterized throughout as hot-headed youths, e.g. 2.225, 267, 286, 290, 303-304; the point is taken up also by the 'wise adviser' Agrippa at 2.346. KRIEGER (1994) 207: 'Dieses Detail ist ein Topos seiner Darstellung... Josephus benutzt diese Kombination, um die, die den Konflikt mit Rom befürworten, zu disqualifizieren...'

[32] ECKSTEIN (1990) 192-194.

[33] ECKSTEIN (1990) 192.

[34] RAJAK (1983) 93. For the rhetorical *topos* young/old, see also Arist. *Rhet.* 1389a-1390b; Tac. *Hist.* 1.15.3; and GOMMEL (1966) 26-27.

[35] See Thuc. 1.42.1, 1.72.l, 1.80.1, 2.8.1, 2.11.1, 2.21.2. Youthful ἀπειρία encourages recklessness, while symmetrically the ἐμπειρία of the mature makes them more cautious. Even when such impulsiveness is checked before it can actually do any damage, its potential danger is regarded throughout as a constant: the opposition young/old must be situated within the Thucydidean matrix of ἀνθρωπεία φύσις (cf. SCHMID-STÄHLIN [1948] 36 n. 2). On generational tension as a factor influencing the Sicilian expedition (Thuc. 6.12.2, 13.1, 17.1, 18.6), see LUSCHNAT (1942) 127-130; DE ROMILLY (1963) 203-205; REINHOLD (1976) 35-36; WASSERMANN (1976) 119-121; KOHL (1977) 71-73.

political success: his jingoist rhetoric strikes a responsive chord with the hot-headed youths, while the misgivings of the mature provide the necessary foil and perspective. Evocations of Thucydides, in other words, tend to objectify Josephus' analysis (the specific viewed through the general), and by extension offer implicit justification for his own critical treatment of John.

Division along generational lines blends into ideological conflict between the advocates of war and of peace (4.131). Fanatical polarization is indexed most notably in the breakdown of traditional allegiances, with party ties subverting loyalty to family and friends: 'Beginning in the home party rivalry attacked those who had long been living harmoniously [ἤπτετο τῶν ὁμονοούντων πάλαι]; then the nearest relations severed all ties of blood [ἔπειτα ἀφηνιάζοντες ἀλλήλων οἱ φίλτατοι], and joining those who shared their political views aligned themselves with the opposing sides' (4.132; cf. 7.266). This is a standard motif in ancient accounts of moral disorder and civic strife,[36] but in light of the emblematic Thucydidean allusion at the end of the whole thematic block (4.364-365), the same Corcyrean excursus is likely to have served as Josephus' immediate model also here: 'Family relations were a weaker tie than party membership, since party members were more ready to go to any extreme for any reason whatever' [καὶ μὴν καὶ τὸ ξυγγενὲς τοῦ ἑταιρικοῦ ἀλλοτριώτερον ἐγένετο διὰ τὸ ἑτοιμότερον εἶναι ἀπροφασίστως τολμᾶν] (Thuc. 3.82.6; cf. 3.81.5). And similarly Thucydides' comment on the inefficacy of religious constraints during *stasis* (3.82.8) will have extensive thematic ramifications in Josephus' narrative. Thucydidean typology, applied to Jerusalem and surroundings, powerfully enhances the *mundus inversus* phenomenon, with a number of possible verbal reminiscences to complete the analogy.[37] Specifics become increasingly submerged in the broad generic contours, creating the impression that the phenomena described conform to a typical pattern.[38]

---

[36] E.g. Hes. *Op.* 182-188; Pl. *Resp.* 8.563a; Lucr. 3.70-73; Luc. 1.373-380, 2.145-151, 4.243-253, 7.177-184, 7.318-325, 7.625-630, 7.760-765; Tac. *Hist.* 1.2.3, 3.25.3, 3.51. Reflexes also at Eur. *Phoen.* 263-272, 361-364. See further Edmunds (1975 *b*) esp. 86; Jal (1963) 396-417; Orwin (1988) 836. Krieger (1994) 285 n. 4 adds some biblical parallels.

[37] Josephus appears to have in mind some central Thucydidean ideas: ἐκινεῖτο δ' ἐν ἑκάστῃ πόλει ταραχὴ καὶ πόλεμος ἐμφύλιος (*BJ* 4.131) ≈ καὶ πᾶν ὡς εἰπεῖν τὸ Ἑλληνικὸν ἐκινήθη (Thuc. 3.82.1); ἔρις χαλεπή (4.131) ≈ ὠμὴ στάσις (3.82.1)/καὶ ἐπέπεσε πολλὰ καὶ χαλεπὰ κατὰ στάσιν ταῖς πόλεσι (3.82.2); καὶ στάσις μὲν ἦν πανταχοῦ (4.133) ≈ ἐστασίαζέ τε οὖν τὰ τῶν πόλεων (3.82.3); ὠμότητος καὶ παρανομίας ἕνεκεν (4.134) ≈ οὕτως ὠμὴ στάσις προυχώρησε (3.82.1).

[38] Thus Horsley-Hanson (1985) 220: '...[Josephus'] description of civil strife reflects more of Thucydides' famous observation on sedition (III.81-84) that it does of the situation in Judaea in the fall of 67'. This is indeed the overwhelming *impression*—although we need to recall that the analysis also fits the particular situation (cf. above, n. 29).

The controlling idea of dislocation reaches its apex in the paradoxical inversion of even the 'normal' conception of enemy: '...so that in cruelty and lawlessness the victims saw no difference between the Romans and their own countrymen; in fact those who were plundered thought it a far lighter fate to be captured by the Romans' (4.134). An external enemy is here surpassed by the ὁμόφυλος within—a conclusion which is both consistent with the wider pattern of *stasis*-induced μεταβολή, and appears as a *topos* in ancient accounts of civic strife.[39] But it is also an accusation regularly thrown at the insurgents—and at 134, therefore, the 'Thucydidean' analysis shades off almost imperceptibly into partisan defamation.[40] When the charge, coming from pro-Roman critics of the insurgents like Ananus (e.g. 4.173, 180-184) or Josephus himself (1.27; 4.375, 397, 412, 558; 5.28, 256-257; 6.102; 7.266), is read *in isolation*, it is indeed easily dismissed as partisan invective; but against the Jerusalem *stasis* and *in relation to* the preceding Thucydidean-type analysis, it becomes contextually intelligible as another expression of the *mundus inversus* syndrome. To that extent it could be argued that the Thucydidean infrastructure supports and gives 'generic' validity to Josephus' polemic.

3. Iusque datum sceleri: *Meaning Destabilized (4.138-146; 147-157)*

The theme of language distortion as a symptom of *stasis*, introduced with John's arrival in Jerusalem (4.121ff.), becomes increasingly prominent as factional strife intensifies. Distortion and manipulation in that expositional section were indexed as a discrepancy between λόγος and ἔργον, between the claim or attribute and the action on which they are predicated (as τὴν λεγομένην εὐσχημόνως ὑποχώρησιν at 4.124 for what was earlier described as φεύγειν). More generally this means that the validity of a speaker's argument is gauged by the extent to which it is confirmed or refuted by the surrounding narrative. In the tradition of Thucydides, who systematically applies the λόγος/ἔργον standard to evaluate political and military performance,[41] Josephus too makes extensive use of this interplay and tension

[39] E.g. Pl. *Resp.* 8.551d-e; Hor. *C.* 1.2.21-24, 1.21.13-16, 1.35.33-40; Luc. 1.30-32, 2.47-56, 6.257-262, 7.799-803; Tac. *Hist.* 1.44, 3.33, 3.83. Cf. Gehrke (1985) 247; Jal (1963) 417-425.

[40] Krieger (1989) 285 remarks, 'Angesichts der in *BJ* 3 unverhohlen beschriebenen Taktik der verbrannten Erde ist dieser Vorwurf zweifellos um des Effektes willen bewußt überzogen'.

[41] See e.g. De Romilly (1963) 205-207; Hunter (1973) 136-139; Stahl (1966) 60-77.

between speech and action—typically to discredit the insurgents as liars and to implode their claims as misleading slogans.

The dissonance between action and predicate, which runs refrain-like through the *stasis* section, is especially clear when terms applied approvingly to the Romans reappear among the Zealots' political slogans (see below). Linguistically these evaluatives are no more than floating signifiers that will 'have different meanings in relation to different assumptions and background conditions', whose precise nuances are 'not determined above the fray but within the fray'[42]—yet Josephus sedulously obscures this relativist aspect by exposing at every turn a contradiction between the honorific terms appropriated by the rebels and the disreputable actions on which they are predicated. The political slogans are one very precise area where Josephus analyses the linguistic shifts, dislocations and manipulations in times of *stasis*. He appears to be consciously applying to the situation in Jerusalem a fundamental principle abstracted by Thucydides: καὶ τὴν εἰωθυῖαν ἀξίωσιν τῶν ὀνομάτων ἐς τὰ ἔργα ἀντήλλαξαν τῇ δικαιώσει (3.82.4).[43] The ὀνόματα in question in *BJ* are precisely the slogans like εὐεργέτης, σωτήρ, ἡ κοινὴ ἐλευθερία, προδότας τῆς κοινῆς ἐλευθερίας, δουλεία and τυραννίς, which appear thick and fast in this part of the narrative. Whenever these catchwords are used by the Zealots in self-justification or to attack their opponents, they are reported by Josephus in a manner calculated to expose them as ὀνόματα εὐπρεπῆ, fraudulent λόγοι at variance with ἔργα; and finally the theme of verbal distortion culminates in a grand Thucydidean-type antilogy at 4.236-282, the only one of its kind in *BJ*, where it is both dramatized and subjected to a penetrating theoretical analysis. The function and strategy of the ὀνόματα εὐπρεπῆ system in Josephus could be described thus: first he shows the Zealots to be wilfully manipulating words to promote their own devious ends (this as a typical symptom of *stasis*), then he himself deploys polemical reversal as a 'corrective' to their distortions—reversing the reversals, as it were. In this sense his own polemic is predicated on the Thucydidean analysis (*stasis* leading to general reversal) and derives apparent legitimacy through that affiliation.

---

[42] Fish (1994) 4.

[43] This is of course a recurrent theme in Thucydides, e.g. 1.32.4, 1.39.2, 1.122.4, 3.10.5, 3.11.3, 3.39.2, 3.44.4, 4.61.7, 5.55.1, 5.89, 5.105.4, 6.8.4, 6.10.2, 6.68.1, 6.76.3, 6.83.2, 6.92.4. The analogous examples at Pl. *Resp.* 560e-561a and 572e come very close to Thuc. 3.82.4-5, as noted by Müri (1969) 73-75. For discussion of Thuc. 3.82 in the wider context of ὀνομάτων ὀρθότης see Wössner (1937) 29-37; Euben (1990) 167-201; Allison (1997) 163-182.

1. *Predicate and πρόφασις (4.138-146)*

An influx of λῃσταί from the surrounding countryside gives impetus to the Jerusalem *stasis* and marks the start of what appears to be a systematic purge of the city's δυνατοί.[44] In the text below Josephus describes the Zealot actions against Antipas, Levias, Syphas and other notables. Thinking it safer to execute their prisoners, they hire a thug to do the dirty work for them. The section ends with the following indictment:

> **146** This outrageous crime they justified with a monstrous lie [παρανομήματι δ' ἐν τηλικούτῳ μεγάλως ἀπεψεύδοντο καὶ προφάσεις ἐνέπλαττον]: they alleged that the men had approached the Romans about surrendering Jerusalem, and had been slain as traitors to the liberty of the state [διαλεχθῆναι γὰρ αὐτοὺς Ῥωμαίοις περὶ παραδόσεως τῶν Ἱεροσολύμων, καὶ προδότας ἀνῃρηκέναι τῆς κοινῆς ἐλευθερίας]. In short, they boasted of their crimes as though they were benefactors and saviours of the City [καθόλου τ' ἐπηλαζονεύοντο τοῖς τολμήμασιν ὡς εὐεργέται καὶ σωτῆρες τῆς πόλεως γεγενημένοι].
>
> (4.146)

Broadly speaking Josephus views the particular incident from the Thucydidean perspective of *stasis*-related distortion. It is clear, first, that the Zealot actions here reported follow a consistent pattern: the preceding section (4.138-145) had identified the victims as royalists and nobles (οἱ ἐπισημότατοι, οἱ ἐπίσημοι, βασιλικὸν τὸ γένος, δυνατοὶ ἄνδρες), and attacks on this élite continue throughout the *stasis* (4.314-315, 326-344, 357-358, 560; 5.439-441, 527-533). Zealot suspicion of this group is fully intelligible in light of the known pro-Roman leanings of the aristocracy,[45] and the charges of attempted betrayal are therefore less fanciful than Josephus would have us believe. 'Not only was the Zealots' charge that the Herodian nobility were betraying the city to the Romans highly credible, it

---

[44] Cf. Rajak (1983) 132: 'The men who now entered the city tend to be referred to by Josephus as "brigand chiefs" and "brigands", and it is probable that their sentiments towards men of property were more vindictive than those of the Jerusalem nobles. Social distress and the effects of bad harvests must have been worse in the country... Landowners, however, must often have lived in town..., and there they could be attacked... The irruption into the city led to the wholesale destruction of the old ruling class, and to what seems to have been quite a systematic take-over of the organs of power'.

[45] Josephus consistently represents the leading citizens and chief priests as favouring an accommodation with Rome (*AJ* 18.3; 20.120-123, 178; *BJ* 2.237, 444-446, 315-325, 331-332, 338, 411-422, 533; 4.321; 6.113): hence the Zealot attacks. For discussion of the political role and attitudes of the Jewish aristocracy, see Brunt (1977); Horsley-Hanson (1985) 223-229; Horsley (1986 *a*) 171-176, (1986 *b*) 27-31, (1995) 72-75; Goodman (1987) 29-50, 109-133. Rhoads (1976) 152f. n. 2 defines as moderates 'those who remained in Jerusalem preparing to defend against the Romans but who would have been willing to accept the right kind of terms, were they offered'.

was almost certainly true'.[46] Simply to *deny* the allegations of treason would therefore have sounded lame and unconvincing; but by labelling the charge a fraudulent pretext (μεγάλως ἐπεψεύδοντο καὶ προφάσεις ἀνέπλαττον, harking back to the σκῆψις and ἀπάτη motif, with reference to John), Josephus implicitly brackets it with the earlier *stasis*-induced deceptions: thematic continuity, slurring through association, creates the impression of a consistent pattern of behaviour by the στασιασταί. And as the specific allegation coalesces with the typical phenomenology, subjective animus begins to look like impartial analysis.

So too in the second sentence ('In short, they boasted of their crimes...'). The terminological confusion here results from juxtaposition of two competing interpretations of the purge: from the Zealots' perspective this is a patriotic act which justifies their honorific titles εὐεργέται καὶ σωτῆρες τῆς πόλεως, while the same action is condemned by Josephus as τὰ δεινά, παρανομία, παρανόμημα and τολμήματα, terms which clearly reflect his own pro-aristocratic and pro-Roman bias. In other words the predicates themselves register no more than a polemical tension between two subjective viewpoints—but the suggestive *presentation* of the contrast creates a rather different impression: clamped together in a comparative structure and in a logical relationship of norm and deviation, the discordant attributes τολμήματα/εὐεργέται καὶ σωτῆρες, like the πρόφασις motif just before, are formally accommodated to the overarching ὀνόματα εὐπρεπῆ pattern.[47] And from this perspective the Zealots' designation of themselves as εὐεργέται could be seen as a species of the παράδοξος μεταβολή, another example of *stasis*-induced inversions. Like his predecessor Thucydides, Josephus here shows 'ein klares Bewußtsein der Lösung von Wort und Begriff, der Zerstückelung bisher anerkannter Wertsysteme, der Manipulierbarkeit der Wertbegriffe, der Instrumentalisierung von Wertbezeichnungen und ihrer gesteuerten Benutzung im Machtkampf'.[48] When polemical

[46] Horsley-Hanson (1985) 229. Josephus in fact provides clear evidence to this effect. Zealot allegations that Ananus and others were planning betrayal are consistently disparaged as lies, but in the encomium on the high priest, Josephus himself says that if Ananus had not been killed, he would have come to terms with the Romans (4.320-321). This attitude will have been typical for men of Ananus' class.

[47] On the question of thematic continuity and integration, note also how the Zealots' pose here harks back to the earlier entry of John (ἐπηλαζονεύοντο, 4.146 ≈ ἠλαζονεύοντο δὲ κἀν κακοῖς, 4.122), and how their pointed 'we/they' rhetoric (εὐεργέται καὶ σωτῆρες—προδότας τῆς ἐλευθερίας) captures the ideological polarization thematized in general terms at 4.131-134. Josephus by thus linking (and slurring) like-minded rogues, encourages the impression of a consistent Corcyrean-type dynamic.

[48] Thus Müri (1969) 72 of the Corcyrean excursus. In a related vein he notes, with reference to verbal manipulation by the Nazi propaganda machine: 'Die erlaubte und gebotene Sprache und in ihr, mit ihr die neuen Werttafeln werden durch eine kleine

reversal replicates the Corcyrean dynamic, his own interpretation begins to look like an extension of the typical pattern.

Finally, the Zealots' titles themselves have an ironic nuance which was surely intended to be recognized as such. The formulaic εὐεργέτης καὶ σωτήρ, which passes from Hellenistic ruler cult into imperial panegyric, is applied to Vespasian himself at 3.459 and 7.71,[49] and in the ideological casting of *BJ* this describes the role assigned to the Romans (cf. below, n. 50). To the extent therefore that the honorific title in our passage implies an ironic contrast with the Romans, the Zealots' right to it is additionally undermined: while masquerading as the city's saviours, they really enslave it. Their misappropriation of the title is then 'corrected' (from the perspective of Josephus) by remarks such as the following:

> **27**The entire City was the battleground for these plotters and their rabble, and between them the people were being torn to pieces like a great carcass. **28**Old men and women, overwhelmed by the miseries within, prayed for the Romans to come, and looked forward to the external war to liberate them from their internal miseries [καὶ τὸν ἔξωθεν πόλεμον ἐπ' ἐλευθερίᾳ τῶν εἴσω κακῶν ἐκαραδόκουν].
>
> (5.27-28)[50]

2. *The appointment of Phanni (4.147-157)*

Regular appearances of the πρόφασις and ὀνόματα εὐπρεπῆ motifs over stretches of narrative have the effect of conditioning and predisposing the reader to accept explanations based on this pattern, and to fit subsequent occurrences into the same dramatic structure. Partisan interpretation is again presented as a symptom of *stasis* in the next example, where Josephus deals with the Zealots' election of a new high priest:

> **147**In the end the people became so cowed and abject, and the terrorists so rabid, that they actually took it upon themselves to elect the high priests.

Gruppe bestimmt' (219). Some modern variants of this phenomenon are discussed in SCHNEIDER (1978) 145-151.

[49] The formulaic character of the expression is apparent from *BJ* 1.530 and *AJ* 12.261; Josephus in evident self-flattery twice applies the pairing to himself in the autobiography (*Vita* 244 and 259). Εὐεργέτης alone also of the Roman people and of Augustus at *AJ* 14.257 and 16.98. On the background to the εὐεργέτης καὶ σωτήρ formula, see SCHUBART (1937) 105-107; KÖTTING (1966).

[50] For the Romans as liberating the Jews from faction and internal tyranny, cf. also 2.258, δεξόμενοι τὸν Κέστιον ὡς εὐεργέτην; 4.113, ἀνευφήμουν ὡς εὐεργέτην καὶ φρουρᾶς ἐλευθερώσαντα τὴν πόλιν; 4.397, 412; 5.256-257. Within this scheme it is interesting to note how Titus' entry into Gischala (4.113) is balanced—and parodied—by John's subsequent arrival in Jerusalem (4.125, 128).

148 Setting aside the claims of those families from which the high priests were traditionally drawn in succession, they appointed obscure persons of no family, in order to gain accomplices in their crimes; **149**for those who found themselves in the highest office without deserving it were inevitably the lackeys of those who had put them there. **150**Again, by various tricks and scandalous stories [ποικίλαις ἐπινοίαις καὶ λογοποιίαις] they sowed dissension among the authorities... until, sated with their crimes against men, they transferred their insolence to the Deity and entered the Sanctuary with their polluted feet. **151**The people were now seething with discontent against them, urged on by Ananus, the oldest of the high priests, a man of the soundest judgement [ἀνὴρ σωφρονέστατος] who might have saved the City if he had escaped the hands of the plotters. They made the Temple of God their stronghold and refuge from popular upheavals, and the Sanctuary became the centre of their tyranny [καὶ τυραννεῖον ἦν αὐτοῖς τὸ ἅγιον]. **152**Through their atrocities ran a vein of ironic mockery [παρεκίρνατο... εἰρωνεία] more exasperating than the actions themselves. **153**For to test the submissiveness of the people and prove their own strength, the Zealots attempted to appoint the high priests by lot, although as we said before, the succession was hereditary. **154**As pretext for this arrangement [πρόσχημα μὲν τῆς ἐπιβολῆς] they cited ancient custom, asserting that from time immemorial the high priesthood had been conferred by lot; but in reality [τὸ δὲ ἀληθὲς] this was a reversal of the regular practice and a trick for consolidating their power by getting the appointments into their own hands. **155**Accordingly they summoned one of the high-priestly clans, called Eniachin, and cast lots for a high priest. By chance the lot fell to one who manifestly demonstrated their own depravity; he was an individual named Phanni, son of Samuel, of the village of Aphtha, a man not only not descended from high priests but too boorish to have any clear idea of what the high priesthood meant. **156**At any rate they dragged the reluctant fellow from the country, dressed him up, as on a stage, for this unsuitable role, robed him in the sacred vestments and taught him his cues. **157**To them this shocking sacrilege was a subject for ribald mirth, but the other priests, watching from a distance this mockery of their law, burst into tears, cut to the heart by this travesty of the sacred rites.

(4.147-157)

The Zealots' appointment of Phanni represents an overt challenge to the established priestly hierarchy; Josephus denounces the move and vocally defends the legitimacy of the incumbent Jerusalem priests. As in the previous example, the opposing arguments proceed from diametrical premises, with the two perspectives mutually exclusive. According to the Jewish conception, a single high-priestly family, the Zadokites, had held the office of high priest in unbroken succession from the time of Aaron until Antiochus Epiphanes, whose interference with the appointments in 175 B.C. brought the ancient line to an end. Their non-Zadokite successors—first the Hasmonaeans, then Herodian and Roman appointees—were held

to be illegitimate usurpers with no credibility.[51] From this perspective the Zealot action as described by Josephus yields a coherent theological and political rationale. First, the new appointee Phanni was linked through his clan, the Eniachin, to the ancient Zadokite line, which gave him the legitimacy that the encumbent Herodian and Roman ciphers lacked: thus the Zealots could justifiably claim to be acting as custodians of the ancient religious tradition.[52] In addition, the appointment also looks like an attempt to place their own supporters in the key priestly roles as nominal leaders of their egalitarian theocracy.[53] On both counts therefore the move marks the formation of an alternative government.

Josephus however proceeds from the opposite assumption: with the exclusive legitimacy of the *established* priestly aristocracy as his point of reference, he regards as subversive any attempt to interfere with these structures. The contested notion is therefore the hereditary principle itself, understood here in two different ways. When Josephus charges the Zealots with violating the hereditary succession (148), he speaks from the perspective of the Herodian and Roman appointees—while to the Zealots hereditary succession would have meant returning a legitimate Zadokite to office. Then Josephus makes the hereditary principle and appointment by lot mutually exclusive (153). Again this is said from the perspective of the priestly establishment which he seeks to defend. For the Zealots on the other hand the two principles were not contradictory, as the appointment procedure makes clear: the eligible Eniachin clan is summoned (this in accordance with the hereditary principle), lots are cast, and Phanni selected (155). The 'ancient custom' invoked by the Zealots (154) refers precisely to this selection by lot, a priestly-cultic procedure known from the *OT* and applied here to the appointment of the new priest. In this way they could reconcile the two principles.[54]

Josephus' partisan counterthrust relies for its effect not on logical argument but on skilful impression management. The Phanni episode is assimilated to the overarching pattern of reversal and viewed again through the familiar categories of distortion and misrepresentation: in this way literary and thematic structure tend to reinforce the perspective urged by Josephus. Most notably, there is the πρόσχημα μέν/τὸ δ' ἀληθές

---

[51] Details in Jeremias (1969) 181-198. On the Roman appointees, see Goodman (1987) 111-120.

[52] Cf. Hengel (1976) 224-226; Schwier (1989) 139-142.

[53] Cf. Horsley-Hanson (1985) 229-236; Horsley (1986 *a*) 177-185; Goodman (1987) 186.

[54] Cf. Michel-Bauernfeind 4 n. 37; Horsley-Hanson (1985) 232-233.

antithesis at 154. As value judgement, this dismisses the Zealot claims as spurious pretexts (cf. εἰρωνεία, 152; χλεύη... καὶ παιδιά, 157) against the truth of Josephus' own view. Thematically the πρόσχημα motif also harks back to the previous episode, where honorific Zealot motives were slurred as transparent pretexts (μεγάλως ἀπεψεύδοντο καὶ προφάσεις ἀνέπλαττον, 4.146), and beyond that to the earlier antics of John (τοιούτοις ἐσοφίζετο τὸν Τίτον, 4.103; πεισθῆναι Τίτον σκήψει τῆς ὑπερθέσεως, 104; καὶ τὴν λεγομένην εὐσχημόνως ὑποχώρησιν αὐτῶν οἱ πολλοὶ δρασμὸν ἐνενόουν, 124). The individual instances gain in plausibility against the recurrent λόγος/ἔργον and ὀνόματα εὐπρεπῆ patterns, and from this perspective it is easier to accept Josephus' strictures that the insurgents are guilty of consistent misrepresentation. Thematic structure, in other words, functions as a means of persuasion.

Josephus' polemic, it is suggested, relies extensively for its effect on impression, association and thematic continuity. On this point it is also worth noting how two subsidiary strands woven into the Phanni passage reinforce the historian's hostile re-interpretation: first the religious censure (ὕβρις and μιαίνειν, 150; ἀσέβημα, 157), expressed in the typical polarity human/divine (cf. 4.381-386 and above, n. 8), then the tyranny motif (151). Reference to their *hybris*[55] makes the Zealots' appointment of the new high priest a blatant sham, while the tyranny motif reduces it to a transparent political ploy (cf. 148, 154). Both points lend additional support to the value judgement conveyed in the πρόσχημα/ἀληθές antithesis: the Zealots' ἔργα crassly belie their stated λόγοι.

Finally, we should note two further stratagems of reader-manipulation in our passage. Phanni is dragged in from the country and dressed up for his new role; to the Zealots 'this shocking sacrilege was a subject for ribald mirth [χλεύη δ' ἦν ἐκείνοις καὶ παιδιὰ τὸ τηλικοῦτον ἀσέβημα], but the other priests, watching from a distance this mockery of their law, burst into tears' (156-157). In the antithesis ἐκείνοις/τοῖς δ' ἄλλοις ἱερεῦσιν we have the insidious 'recours à la tierce personne' by which Josephus uses a third party to express his own views, thereby creating the illusion of detached reporting (cf. below, n. 76). The lamenting Jerusalem priests who condemn the procedure as an ἀσέβημα and τὴν τῶν ἱερῶν τιμῶν κατάλυσιν appear to give objective validity to the partisan interpretation (until we recall that these are the very Herodians whose legitimacy Josephus defends against the Zealots' rival candidate). Next, Josephus stylizes the appointment of

[55] The phrase καὶ μεμιασμένοις τοῖς ποσὶ παρῆεσαν εἰς τὸ ἅγιον (4.150) is a variation on the polemical καταπατεῖν motif (on which see chap. 2, n. 24 above).

Phanni as a grotesque farce in order to slur it as illicit usurpation; the point is effectively reinforced by the transvestite motif (ὥσπερ ἐπὶ σκηνῆς ἀλλοτρίῳ κατεκόσμουν προσωπείῳ, τήν τ' ἐσθῆτα περιτιθέντες τὴν ἱερὰν καὶ τὸ τί δεῖ ποιεῖν ἐπὶ καιροῦ διδάσκοντες),[56] with the outward tokens of office calling attention to the illegitimacy of the wearer. The legitimate incumbents (in Josephus' view) are men like Ananus—a point subtly made by the re-appearance of the ἐσθής motif in the high priest's anti-Zealot tirade, this time to emblemize the wearer's piety: 'How wonderful it would have been if I had died before seeing the house of God full of countless abominations... Yet I who wear the vestments of a high priest and answer to the most honoured and august of names [περικείμενος τὴν ἀρχιερατικὴν ἐσθῆτα καὶ τὸ τιμιώτατον καλούμενος τῶν σεβασμίων ὀνομάτων], am alive and in love with life...' (4.163-164, cf. 324). This perspective gives point to Josephus' earlier criticism.

The Phanni episode, says Josephus, leads to a wave of popular indignation, and as the emotional pitch rises the polemical focus widens to include also other typical motifs from the anti-Zealot arsenal (tyranny, destruction of liberty, pollution of the Temple). Josephus' indignation culminates in one of the most memorable outbursts in *BJ*:

> **158**This latest outrage was more than the people could stand, and all were now roused as if for the overthrow of the tyranny [ὥσπερ ἐπὶ τυραννίδος κατάλυσιν ὥρμηντο πάντες]. **159**Natural leaders like Gorion, son of Joseph, and Symeon, son of Gamaliel, by passionate appeals to public meetings and by a door-to-door canvass urged them to act now, punish the destroyers of liberty, and purge the Sanctuary of those blood-guilty men [τίσασθαι τοὺς λυμεῶνας τῆς ἐλευθερίας καὶ καθᾶραι τῶν μιαιφόνων τὸ ἅγιον]. **160**The most respected of the high priests, Jesus, son of Gamalas, and Ananus, son of Ananus, held meetings at which they took the people severely to task for their apathy and incited them against the Zealots; **161**for so these scoundrels called themselves, as though they were devoted to good works and not zealous for all that was vile, in which they surpassed themselves [...τοῖς ζηλοταῖς· τοῦτο γὰρ αὑτοὺς ἐκάλεσαν ὡς ἐπ' ἀγαθοῖς ἐπιτηδεύμασιν, ἀλλ' οὐχὶ ζηλώσαντες τὰ κάκιστα τῶν ἔργων καὶ ὑπερβαλλόμενοι].
>
> (4.158-161)

---

[56] For the theatrical imagery, again to bring out the illegitimacy of Zealot actions, compare the later mock trials of the nobility: 'So they issued a categorical order, summoning seventy of the leading citizens to appear in the Temple, where they turned them into a stage jury with no authority' [ὥσπερ ἐπὶ σκηνῆς σχῆμα δικαστῶν ἔρημον ἐξουσίας] (4.336); 'the Zealots howled with rage and could hardly keep their hands off their swords, determined as they were to play out this farce, this sham trial to the end...' [τὸ σχῆμα καὶ τὴν εἰρωνείαν τοῦ δικαστηρίου μέχρι τέλους παῖξαι] (4.340). KRIEGER (1994) 288 well remarks, 'Josephus spricht den Zeloten jede Ernsthaftigkeit ihres Handelns ab'.

Typologically the concluding generalization, which subsumes the preceeding purge of the aristocrats and the appointment of Phanni, is an emblematic example of Josephus' polemical technique,[57] but at the same time the characteristic dissonance between λόγος and ἔργον, title and action anchors it firmly in the wider pattern of ὀνόματα εὐπρεπῆ and *stasis*-related inversions. Thus 4.161 forms an unbroken thematic line with 4.103-104, 121-127, 128-135, 146 and 154. Polemical reversal coalesces with the Thucydidean analysis of social and political dissolution, leaving us with the impression that events in Jerusalem follow the typical dynamic.

4. Ἐτύμους τοῖς πράγμασι τὰς κλήσεις ἐφαρμόζειν: *Meaning Reconstituted (4.162-192)*

Verbal dislocation and manipulation are registered on two axes, λόγος/ἔργον and λόγος/λόγος. Besides the contradiction between word and action noted above, Josephus also employs the phenomenon of *semantic relativism* (i.e. the λόγος/λόγος axis) for its polemical effect. Thus the Zealot slogan ὡς εὐεργέται καὶ σωτῆρες τῆς πόλεως (146) is not only contradicted by their own actions (as reported by Josephus), but is also brought into a conscious lexical and conceptual tension with the predicates applied to Titus: the Roman general, we recall, had shortly before been hailed in almost identical terms but for exactly opposite reasons, ἀνευφήμουν ὡς εὐεργέτην καὶ φρουρᾶς ἐλευθερώσαντα τὴν πόλιν (4.113). The conspicuous responsion at short interval brings into focus the competing claims and ideologies: the two propositions are in logical tension, as a foil the former relativizes the latter, and by their specious rhetoric the self-styled liberators of the city are exposed as its enslavers. This theme of semantic ambiguity is systematically developed as the narrative proceeds.

---

[57] Rhoads (1976) 104 n. 12 (on 4.161): 'The fact that Josephus notes that they claimed to be zealous for the good shows that among the members of the party the title was honorific.' At 7.268-270 Josephus repeats the charge that the title is a misnomer: 'In lawlessness the so-called Zealots were unsurpassed [τὸ τῶν ζηλωτῶν κληθέντων γένος ἤκμασεν], a party which justified their title by their deeds [οἳ τὴν προσηγορίαν τοῖς ἔργοις ἐπηλήθευσαν]; for they followed every bad example, and there was no crime in the records that they did not zealously emulate. And yet they took their title from their professed zeal for what was good, either mocking their victims, so brutal was their nature, or regarding the greatest evils as goods' [ἢ τὰ μέγιστα τῶν κακῶν ἀγαθὰ νομίζοντες]. In the moral calculus of *BJ*, the emblematic κακία of the Zealots (4.161 and 7.268-270) has its thematic counterpoise in the shining ἀρετή of their victims: the symmetry is well brought out in Josephus' encomium on Ananus and Jesus (4.318-325), which ends with the remark, αὐτὴν ἐπ' ἐκείνοις στενάξαι τοῖς ἀνδράσι δοκῶ τὴν ἀρετήν, ὀλοφυρομένην ὅτι τοσοῦτον ἥττητο τῆς κακίας (325).

But the λόγος/λόγος tension is less straightforward than appears at first sight, and the verbal responsion conceals the more fundamental difficulty that the two instances cannot always be reduced to a common denominator—for while Titus' liberation of Gischala is a straightforward military affair, the term 'liberty' as used by the Zealots is more than just a political slogan: it is a multi-layered concept which includes both a political *and* a religious-eschatological component. In the mouths of the Zealots, therefore, the terms 'liberty', 'liberation', and consequently also 'benefactor', 'saviour' etc. typically carry an ideological as well as a political nuance. Josephus' clever use of responsion however levels this important distinction to a case of lexical relativism (in consequence of *stasis*), and so reduces their key terms to simple political slogans—duly exposed in the narrative as fraudulent προφάσεις. It would be hard to explain this evident interest in the relationship between word and referent without assuming a Thucydidean influence.

Distortion and verbal manipulation, registered as both the λόγος/ἔργον and λόγος/λόγος antitheses, move towards a climax as the strife in Jerusalem intensifies, and increasingly the political catchwords come under scrutiny. The political invective that accompanies Josephus' moral indignation draws a consistent profile of the Zealots as tyrannical destroyers of the liberty which their opponents strive to uphold, and the political discourse in the *stasis* narrative oscillates between these poles of reference. Both sides appropriate a common political vocabulary to articulate their diametrical positions—and the terminological ambiguity and paradox thus generated are a useful matrix within which to analyse the thrust and counterthrust of the competing claims. Josephus, fully aware of the dynamics involved, purports to 'stabilize' the semantic fluidity (in his own favour, of course) by first thematizing the phenomenon of lexical manipulation and relativism, and then including scattered quasi-theoretical observations which incline the reader to accept his own perspective as the necessary 'corrective'. What we have, in effect, is a subtly self-reflexive discourse in which Josephus applies and adapts to his own purposes the famous theoretical observations of Thucydides' Corcyrean excursus (3.82.4, 8). In this way Josephus—in the very process of defamation—uses the transparent Thucydidean affiliation to assert the priority of his own version.

Ananus the high priest in a major speech rousing the populace against the Zealots (4.163-192) draws together a number of important strands. One function of this speech is to bring out the themes of ὀνομάτων ὀρθότης and conversely also of ὀνόματα εὐπρεπῆ. Ananus—aristocrat, pro-Roman, and stylized against all plausibility as the passionate democrat—

simultaneously constructs *and justifies* his own interpretation of the situation by explicitly reconciling attributes with their appropriate referents. Contrasting Zealot brutality and desecration with the Romans' greater restraint and reverence (4.173, 180-183), he concludes: 'Indeed, if one must exactly fit the phrase to the fact [καὶ γὰρ ἄν, εἰ ἐτύμους δεῖ τοῖς πράγμασι τὰς κλήσεις ἐφαρμόζειν], we might well find that the Romans are the champions of our Law, and its enemies are inside the City' (4.184). This is exactly the παράδοξος μεταβολή of 6.102, here formulated more precisely as a semantic relationship between κλήσεις and πράγματα. The disjunction between λόγος and ἔργον noted repeatedly through the preceding narrative section has become the subject of conscious theorizing by Josephus through his mouthpiece Ananus. Only a historian with a Thucydidean-type interest in political linguistics writes thus. For the sake of perspective we recall the emblematic remark, just before, on the Zealots' name: 'For so these scoundrels called themselves, as though they were devoted to good works and not zealous for all that was vile, in which they surpassed themselves' (4.161). Where the Zealots (according to Josephus) distort meaning by severing attribute from referent, Ananus by an opposite and symmetrical logic professes to re-unite πρᾶγμα and κλῆσις in their 'correct' relationship—thereby reversing the original reversal. As a foil, therefore, the first inversion legitimates the second, with the antecedent ὀνόματα εὐπρεπῆ system giving Ananus' counter-interpretation both the moral and the logical advantage. Thus the high priest's theorizing pulls the earlier theme of Zealot verbal misuse and Josephus' own strategy of polemical inversion into a logical reciprocity—for as the reader is progressively conditioned to treat all the rebel claims as lies and pretexts, the reverse polemic itself becomes the mechanism to bring the situation back into semantic (and political) focus.

Ananus himself, while ostensibly reclaiming the language from Zealot misrepresentation, gives a privileged position to his own definitions and political perspective: so much is clear from his use of the central term ἐλευθερία. Ananus' speech is in a sense both counterpart and complement to the earlier appeal by Agrippa (2.345-401), and comparison is helpful. Both speakers wax eloquent on liberty: the high priest in rousing the people against their internal oppressors appeals to their sense of freedom (ἐλευθερίας ἐπιθυμία, 4.175) where Agrippa, attempting to dissuade the Jews from rebellion, had vainly tried to check their desire for independence (τό γε νῦν ἐλευθερίας ἐπιθμνεῖν 2.355);[58] and correlatively both orators

[58] The nature of ἐλευθερία in the two speeches must be distinguished: Ananus uses

insist that the slogan 'liberty', as used by the insurgents to justify war with Rome, is a misnomer and a transparent pretext (πρόφασιν, 4.177 ≈ προφάσεων 2.348). This emphasis on ἐλευθερία represents a concerted attack on a core element of rebel ideology: the insurgents who had just before posed as εὐεργέται καὶ σωτῆρες and champions of κοινὴ ἐλευθερία (4.416) now become, in Ananus' philippic, ὁμόφυλοι τύραννοι (178) and οἱ ἐπίβουλοι τῆς ἐλευθερίας (185), their collaborators φιλόδουλοι (175). The point, of course, is that this redefinition will hold only within a secular, political matrix: through the speeches of Agrippa and Ananus, both arguing from a strictly political notion of ἐλευθερία, Josephus tendentiously drains the term of its intended and more complex content, reduces this and other Zealot catchwords to empty slogans and then batters them with arguments from the Hellenistic arsenal.

The syzygy ἐλευθερία/δουλεία, which runs refrain-like through *BJ* from the first appearance of Judas of Galilee to Eleazar's death-speech at Masada, is consistently used by the insurgents to articulate both their religious-eschatological ideal and its political realization: the theocratic conception has its concrete socio-political expression in a comprehensive σύγχσις τῶν πραγμάτων (4.339) with the two dimensions necessarily constituting an inextricable reciprocity.[59] Josephus, consciously ignoring

---

liberty to mean freedom from the internal tyranny of the Zealots, while in the earlier speech of Agrippa it designated political independence from Rome. That distinction is crucial. On the interpretation of both Ananus and Josephus, the conquest of Pompey marks a decisive historical caesura which inaugurates Jewish servitude (2.355-357, 5.395-397), and all subsequent attempts at independence are futile, misguided and contrary to God's design (see esp. LINDNER [1972] 22-23, 143-144). In light of this overarching *Geschichtsphilosophie*, Ananus' statement that the desire for liberty is τὸ τιμιώτατον τῶν παθῶν καὶ φυσικώτατον (4.175) can hardly claim absolute validity: it is adduced simply to buttress his specific political argument. The *ad hoc* rhetoric of the high priest is apparent also elsewhere. Where Agrippa, articulating Josephus' own philosophy of history, had regarded Jewish subservience (to Rome) as a hereditary condition (ὑμεῖς δὲ οἱ τὸ μὲν ὑπακούειν ἐκ διαδοχῆς παρειληφότες, 2.357), Ananus adjusts the proposition in accordance with his own purpose: 'Are we in love with slavery and devoted to our masters [= the Zealots], as though submission were a heritage from our forefathers?' (4.175). Ananus' political and rhetorical perspectives are determined by the antithesis τὸ μὲν τοῖς ἔξωθεν ὑπακούειν—τὸ δὲ τοῖς οἰκείοις εἴκειν πονηροῖς (4.179), and here the first option is preferable. 'Ελευθερίας ἐπιθυμία is legitimate only against an internal oppressor (cf. HENGEL [1976] 117-118): thus there is no contradiction with the earlier speech of Agrippa. There is even an interesting convergence of perspectives. 'Yet submission to a foreign power might be attributed to one crushing blow of fortune' (4.179): Ananus' reference to τύχη here echoes the *Geschichtsphilosophie* as expressed by both Agrippa (2.360) and Josephus (5.367).

[59] Cf. above, chap. 1. Scholarly debate on the subject is concerned largely with the relative priority of these two components. The fullest exposition of the eschatological character of Zealot ἐλευθερία is in HENGEL (1976) 114-127. The reciprocity between theocratic ideal and social revolution is well treated by BAUMBACH (1967) esp. 16-17,

the eschatological dimension, secularizes the catchwords to political slogans and rebuts them in kind. 'Die Zeloten traten mit der Parole ἐλευθερία auf, zerstörten aber gerade die Freiheit... Ihre Herrschaft ist eine τυραννίς und bewirkt δουλεία (4.344). Die Entgegensetzung τυραννίς—ἐλευθερία zeigt, daß Josephus den Begriff ἐλευθερία von seiner hellenistischen Bedeutung her verstanden hat'.[60] The implications of this comment can be further pursued.

Most generally, Ananus' speech has a consciously Greek complexion, with his political vocabulary and conceptual frames encouraging the reader to see the situation in Greek rather than Jewish terms. The high priest's rhetoric of crisis, turning on the armature ἐλευθερία/δουλεία and τυραννίς/δῆμος, takes as its point of orientation the classical tradition of democratic discourse and anti-tyrannical invective (e.g. Hdt. 6.109.3, Dem. 6.25, 10.4).[61] Additional details enhance the Greek tinge. When Ananus complains that the people watched passively while the tyrants' victims were unjustly condemned (ἀλλ' ἀκαταιτιάτοις ἀκρίτοις οὐδεὶς ἐβοήθησε τοῖς δεδεμένοις, 4.169), his use of the ἄκριτον motif echoes another theme from the anti-tyrannical arsenal.[62] Throughout his speech Ananus castigates his compatriots and sees their apathy and indifference (νωθεία, ἀνεξικακία, ἀμέλεια) as the principal cause of the Zealots' successes (4.160, 166-168, 171, 187). His sustained emphasis on this correlation, sharpened at 171 to near paradox, might owe something to Demosthenes' parallel indictment of his supine countrymen in an attempt to rouse them against Philip (Dem. 1.9, 2.3-4, 3.28, 4.11).[63] The case for a

---

where he summarizes: 'Es geht also bei dieser "Freiheit" um die Aufrichtung von Gottes Herrschaft über das Land und von Gottes Gerechtigkeit in dem Land. Da die Unterdrückung der Armen eine Mißachtung des göttlichen Willens und insofern eine eklatante Gottlosigkeit darstellt, erscheinen in der apokalyptischen Literatur die Reichen und Mächtigen als die Gottlosen *kat' exochen*. Die Beseitigung dieser Unterdrücker und die Befreiung der verskalvten Landbevölkerung gehörten darum notwendig in die Zukunftserwartung hinein...' (17). Rajak (1983) 139-142 argues (with others) for the priority of political liberation: '...we can also say that the zealots (in the wide sense) paralleled Josephus in being, for all their piety, political animals' (139).

[60] Krieger (1994) 289.

[61] For the Greek background and ideological significance of the ἐλευθερία/τυραννίς antithesis in that context, see Raaflaub (1981) 217-219, 258-266; (1985) 118-125, 258-261.

[62] Cf. Hdt. 3.80.5, νόμαιά τε κινέει πάτρια καὶ βιᾶται γυναῖκας κτείνει τε ἀκρίτους; Dem. 17.3, τοὺς δὲ τυραννουμένους ἀκρίτους ἔστιν ὁρᾶν ἀπολλυμένους ἅμα καὶ ὑβριζομένους εἰς παῖδας καὶ γυναῖκας; Sen. *Oed.* 695, *incognita igitur ut nocens causa cadam?*

[63] The thematic similarity is conspicuous, e.g. τί δὲ μέμφομαι τοὺς τυράννους; μὴ γὰρ οὐκ ἐτράφησαν ὑφ' ὑμῶν καὶ τῆς ὑμετέρας ἀνεξικακίας; (4.166); ταῦτα δ' ὥσπερ συνέστη διὰ τὴν ὑμετέραν ἀμέλειαν, καὶ νῦν αὐξηθήσεται πλέον ὑπερθεμένων (4.187) οὐδὲ γὰρ οὗτος παρὰ τὴν αὑτοῦ ῥώμην τοσοῦτον ἐπηύξηται, ὅσον παρὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν ἀμέλειαν (Dem. 4.11).

Demosthenic connexion is in fact supported by Ananus' striking phrase ἔχοντες δ' ἐπιτετειχισμένην τυραννίδα τοσαύτην (4.172), a likely imitation, as commentators have noted, of [Dem.] 10.8, καὶ τυραννίδ' ἀπαντικρὺ τῆς Ἀττικῆς ἐπετείχισεν ὑμῖν ἐν τῇ Εὐβοίᾳ.[64] All this cannot be dismissed as just a rhetorical flourish, for in proportion as Ananus frames the situation in Greek terms, the political categories push the religious-eschatological dimension out of the picture—leaving a suggestive backdrop that supports his own interpretation.

Yet Ananus clearly had to go to great lengths to rouse the people, and one reason must be that antipathy towards the Zealots was *not* as universal as Josephus would have us believe. 'The high priestly government... apparently found it necessary to mount a major effort to incite the city people against the Zealots. They worked both through public assemblies and private visits. That they had to cajole the city people behind the scenes and "upbraid the people because of their apathy" indicates both that the aristocracy were a good deal more alarmed than the people and that the city people were hardly unanimous in their opposition to the Zealots, or even necessarily against them at all. Josephus has helped to obscure this situation...'.[65] He obscures it, more precisely, by assimilating the situation in Jerusalem to the Greek frames. If we recognize an implicit analogy between the supine Jewish *demos* and the indifferent Athenians of Demosthenes' *Philippics* and *Olynthiacs*, the literary association has the effect of stylizing the scene in Jerusalem as a grand and tragic duel between democracy and tyranny, in which the high priest stands out as heroically sublime. Ananus' strictures against the tyrannical oppressors are balanced by Josephus' own fulsome encomium (4.319-321), where the priest is cast as passionate democrat (φιλελεύθερός τε ἐκτόπως καὶ δημοκρατίας ἐραστής). The characterization is as consistent with his antecedent political rhetoric as it is historically implausible: Ananus serves as a foil to discredit the Zealots, to debunk their ideological catchwords, and to reinterpret the situation through the 'Hellenizing glass'.

5. *Deception Unmasked: John and the Idumaeans (4.193-235)*

Ananus' philippic does indeed produce a short burst of anti-Zealot opposition (4.193-207), but the *peripeteia* occurs when John re-enters as

---

[64] Thus Stein (1937) 94; Thackeray (Loeb edition) *ad* 4.172.
[65] Horsley-Hanson (1985) 238.

protagonist. He returns to centre stage and is assigned the leading role in the next act of the drama: 'The subsequent destruction of Ananus' entire party was largely due to John, whose escape from Gischala we have related. He was a man of extreme cunning, consumed with a dire passion for despotic power and had long been engaged in treasonable activities' (4.208). John not only sets in motion the process that culminates in the destruction of Ananus and his supporters, but also personifies the principal ideas that shape this section of the narrative. As the *stasis* gains in momentum, deception and distortion become increasingly prominent, operating at two levels: first we witness John's political intrigues, then lying and deceit are analysed as lexical and rhetorical phenomena. At both levels Josephus appears to have taken his cue from Thucydides.

John is cast as δολιώτατος ἀνὴρ καὶ δεινὸν ἔρωτα τυραννίδος ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ περιφέρων, ὃς πόρρωθεν ἐπεβούλευε τοῖς πράγμασιν (4.208). Whether or not this is modelled on Sallust's portrait of Catiline, as Thackeray suggested, it is perfectly integrated into Josephus' narrative. Δολιώτατος harks back to John's consummate deceit (cf. 4.121-127) and signals a leitmotiv in the following section, while δεινὸν ἔρωτα τυραννίδος picks up the despotism motif from Ananus' preceding indictment. In the work's ideological design, John and the high priest are stylized as political antipodes. A demonstration of John's δόλοι follows immediately in his feigned attachment to the party of Ananus (τὰ τοῦ δήμου φρονεῖν ὑποκρινόμενος, 209), whose secrets he promptly carries over to the Zealots at night. His duplicity elicits the following comment:

> **210**Contriving to avoid suspicion, John showed the utmost obsequiousness [μηχανώμενος δὲ τὸ μὴ δι' ὑποψίας ἐλθεῖν ἀμέτροις ἐχρῆτο ταῖς θεραπείαις] to Ananus and the leaders of the citizens. **211**But this servility [τὸ φιλότιμον] produced the opposite result; for his extravagant flatteries only brought him under greater suspicion [διὰ γὰρ τὰς ἀλόγους κολακείας μᾶλλον ὑπωπτεύετο], and his ubiquitous and uninvited presence made it look as if he was betraying secrets. **212**For it was observed that their enemies knew all their intentions, and there was no one more open to the suspicion of disclosing them than John.
>
> (4.210-212)

John's unctuous histrionics are described, here from the perspective of the *agens*, in terms of the same principles which later rouse the suspicion of cynical observers:

> **364**The man who never approached them was suspected of arrogance; one who approached them boldly, of contempt; if he was obsequious, of conspiracy [ὁ θεραπεύων δ' ὡς ἐπίβουλος ὑπωπτεύετο].
>
> (4.364)

The Thucydidean influence on the latter passage has already been noted: inconcinnity between word and signification is transposed into an analogous tension between gesture and intent. *BJ* 4.210-212 complements this analysis from the opposite perspective, subsuming John's artful deceit into the same matrix of inversion.

A further emphasis also recalls the Thucydidean diagnosis. As a precaution against their misgivings, Ananus' group gets John to swear an oath of allegiance to the provisional government (ἐδόκει δ' αὐτὸν ὅρκοις πιστώσασθαι πρὸς εὔνοιαν, 4.213). Such oaths by appointees to high office are in themselves quite normal, but here Josephus by insinuating a causal connexion between Ananus' suspicions and the subsequent oath casts a deliberate slur on John (i.e. the man is not to be trusted).[66] The hostile accentuation is sustained in what follows. John complies readily—only to reveal himself as the unscrupulous perjurer who uses the oath as an instrument against his enemies:

> **214**John promptly swore [ὤμνυε δ' ὁ Ἰωάννης ἑτοίμως] to be loyal to the citizens, to betray neither action nor intention to their enemies, and to put his powers of body and mind at their service to destroy their assailants. **215**Relying on these oaths [πιστεύσαντες τοῖς ὅρκοις], Ananus and his friends now invited him without suspicion to their discussions: they even commissioned him to arrange a truce with the Zealots; for they were anxious that no act of theirs should desecrate the Temple and that no Jew should fall within its precincts. **216**But John, as if he had sworn loyalty to the Zealots and not against them [ὥσπερ τοῖς ζηλωταῖς ὑπὲρ εὐνοίας ὀμόσας καὶ οὐ κατ' αὐτῶν], went in, and standing in their midst, addressed them as follows...
>
> (4.214-216)

The ὅρκος motif, as indicated in the quoted text, is perceptibly stressed. As *tertium comparationis*, it brings out the polemical contrast between John's treacherous opportunism and the good faith and religious scruple of Ananus' group.[67] But in addition to its specific contextual function, the motif also converges with another typical symptom of *stasis*, and this may not be coincidental. Oaths, in the Corcyrean strife, are similarly debased into instruments of convenience or deception:

> καὶ τὰς ἐς σφᾶς αὐτοὺς πίστεις οὐ τῷ θείῳ νόμῳ μᾶλλον ἐκρατύνοντο ἢ τῷ κοινῇ τι παρανομῆσαι... καὶ ὅρκοι εἴ που ἄρα γένοιντο ξυναλλαγῆς, ἐν τῷ

---

[66] Noted by Zeitlin (1978) 66.

[67] Compare also the ὅρκος motif at the surrender of Metilius (2.450-453): oaths given at 451 (δεξιάν τε καὶ ὅρκους) are perfidiously betrayed by Eleazar and his men, amid pathetic Roman appeals to the pledges, μόνας δὲ τὰς συνθήκας καὶ τοὺς ὅρκους ἀναβοῶντας (453).

> αὐτίκα πρὸς τὸ ἄπορον ἑκατέρῳ διδόμενοι ἴσχυον, οὐκ ἐχόντων ἄλλοθεν δύνανιν· ἐν δὲ τῷ παρατυχόντι ὁ φθάσας θαρσῆσαι, εἰ ἴδοι ἄφαρκτον, ἥδιον διὰ τὴν πίστιν ἐτιμωρεῖτο ἢ ἀπὸ τοῦ προφανοῦς.
>
> Their pledges to one another were confirmed not so much by divine law as by common transgression of the law... And if oaths of reconcilement were exchanged, they were binding only for the moment, since each side had given them merely to meet an emergency, having no other resource; but he who, when the opportunity offered and he saw his enemy off his guard, was the first to pluck up courage, found his revenge sweeter because of the violated pledge than if he had openly attacked.
>
> (Thuc. 3.82.6-7)

'In times of *stasis*, oaths are perverted and figure only as a means of the very deceit against which they are supposed to guard'.[68] This applies to Corcyra as well as to Jerusalem, and if we suppose that Josephus had the Thucydidean typology in mind, our passage is another specific application of the general pattern.

Deception at the level of ἔργα is balanced by John's equally deft manipulation of λόγος, or so at least Josephus would have us believe. John systematically smears Ananus as traitor: 'For Ananus, impatient of delay, has persuaded the people to send a delegation to Vespasian, requesting him to come at once and take over the City' (4.218). Thus John to the Zealot assembly. Josephus however by regularly linking the διαβάλλειν and treachery motifs, simultaneously pursues a polemical and an apologetic objective. The strident allegations of collaboration with the Romans, answered by equally vocal denials from Ananus and his circle, point very clearly to a central issue which was inherently plausible, and very likely real rather than just a bogeyman of Zealot propaganda (cf. above, nn. 45, 46). But by placing the allegations in the mouth of a speaker who has been discredited in advance (4.208), Josephus in effect assimilates the controversial question of collaboration and betrayal to the recurrent pattern of deception—thereby sustaining the polemical characterization of John as slanderer and δολιώτατος ἀνήρ while at the same time exonerating the aristocrats (who become the victims of his smear campaign). Since, further, we are informed in the exposition to this section that John had set his sights on tyranny (4.208), his attack on the aristocracy becomes, by implication, a screen to pursue his own devious political agenda.

These thematic interactions are systematically expanded. Whenever the charge of collaboration is heard, it is either explicitly refuted (by aristocratic

---

[68] Orwin (1988) 873; cf. Barnard (1980) 138; Gehrke (1985) 248. The motif occurs also in Hesiod's description of the iron age, *Op.* 190-194.

spokesmen) or dismissed as slander (through editorial comment); allegations of betrayal are so regularly paired with the distortion motif that the reader comes to equate the two. John's claim that Ananus is planning betrayal (218) is answered by the contemptuous remark: 'Such was the fanciful story John told to frighten them all' [τοιαῦτα μὲν ἐποίκιλλεν ἀθρόως δεδισσόμενος] (4.224). The presentation is typical: Josephus not only disputes the veracity of the allegation,[69] but implies that the lie was put out as an alarmist tactic to mobilize sentiment against Ananus. Nor does it fail to have the desired effect on the Zealots. Betrayal and distortion are again tendentiously linked:

> **226** When the Zealot leaders heard the general threats and then those directed against them personally, and were told that Ananus and his friends in their determination to make themselves dictators were calling in the Romans—this was another of John's slanders [καὶ γὰρ τοῦτο Ἰωάννης προσεψεύσατο]—they were quite at a loss what to do... All the same, they decided to call in the the Idumaeans...
>
> (4.226)

Their letter inviting Idumaean intervention fits into the same thematic structure:

> **228** ...They drafted a letter stating that Ananus had deceived the people and was betraying the Capital to the Romans [ὡς Ἄνανος μὲν προδιδοίη Ῥωμαίοις τὴν μητρόπολιν ἐξαπατήσας τὸν δῆμον]; that they themselves had revolted in defence of their freedom [ὑπὲρ τῆς ἐλευθερίας ἀποστάντες] and as a result were imprisoned in the Temple; **229** that a few hours would now decide their fate; and that unless the Idumaeans came to their aid with all speed, they would soon be in the hands of Ananus and their mortal enemies, and the City in the hands of the Romans.
>
> (4.228-229)

John's message to the Idumaeans, containing all the key themes previously encountered, has the value of a Zealot manifesto: Ananus as traitor and deceiver, the Zealots as champions of liberty. As programmatic statement this is nothing unusual, but it acquires its full contextual significance through multiple backward responsions. When the Zealots take up the slogans that have just been debunked by the high priest, Josephus again calls attention to deliberate verbal manipulation in a manner that does little credit to his opponents.[70] The tension fluctuates between the

---

[69] The διαβάλλειν—ποικίλλειν—ψεύδεσθαι nexus, like the analogous πρόφασις—πρόσχημα motif, reports Zealot claims only to discredit them: both are a species of polemical reversal.

[70] Josephus, discrediting Zealot claims at every turn, ascribes Idumaean intervention

λόγος/ἔργον and the λόγος/λόγος axes, i.e. Zealot claims are measured both against their own performance (see below) and against the counter-claims of their political opponents. We recall the earlier critique of Ananus, who had exposed their slogans as a fallacious semantic construct (4.184): this theoretical aspect—political discourse as conscious refractor of meaning—becomes increasingly prominent as the narrative approaches a climax. The letter to the Idumaeans, in fact, might be seen as both literal conveyor of misinformation and as a symbol of the whole process of deliberate misrepresentation which it sets in motion.

6. *The Grand Antilogy as Self-Reflexive Discourse (4.236-282)*

The Idumaeans respond with alacrity to the Zealots' call. The re-appearance, at their intervention, of the key term ἐλευθερία—'and they all took up arms to defend the freedom of the Capital' (4.234)—implies that they have been successfully duped by Zealot propaganda (≈ 4.228-229), and this deception remains the focus of Josephus' interest. Arrived at Jerusalem, they find the gates barred to them by the aristocratic faction. Jesus, deputy to Ananus and mouthpiece of Josephus, in a lengthy oration attempts to persuade them to put down their arms (4.238-269); Simon, replying for the Idumaeans, rebuts Jesus, in studied symmetry, with equally elaborate counter-arguments (4.270-282). The function of this stylized antilogy, the only one of its kind in *BJ*,[71] is not just to restate the diametrical and ideologically irreconcilable positions (familiar enough by now), but to explore this opposition *as a lexical phenomenon* in the categories of πράγματα and κλήσεις as used earlier by Ananus (εἰ ἐτύμους δεῖ τοῖς πράγμασι τὰς κλήσεις ἐφαρμόζειν, 4.184). In its contrapuntal arguments the antilogy gives formal expression to ideological disjunction, and at the same time provides a matrix within which Ananus' theory is illustrated—and devastatingly turned against the Zealots.

---

less to ideological conviction or solidarity with the Zealot cause than to their natural belligerent temperament: 'For the Zealots knew that the Idumaeans would promptly agree, as they were an excitable and undisciplined people, always on the look-out for trouble and with an appetite for revolution, ready at the least flattery from those who sought their aid to take up arms and dash into battle as if to a banquet' (4.231). Later they are termed 'by nature most barbarous and bloodthirsty' (4.310). Such characterization reflects badly on both the Idumaeans and their Zealot hosts.

[71] The suicide speeches of Josephus (3.361-382) and Eleazar (7.323-388) are of course a balancing pair, but the duel between Jesus and Simon is the only case in *BJ* where the first speaker is answered *immediately* by his opponent (in the manner of the Thucydidean antilogies).

Jesus' whole argument (4.238-269) turns on the aspect of the paradoxical reversal, which anchors it in the wider *mundus inversus* system. The ἀπροσδόκτον here in question, formally underscored by the ring-structure framing his exposition (238-243), is the absurdly incongruous alliance of Idumaeans with brazen πονηροί. 'Many different disorders have gripped the City: no trick of fortune has astonished me so much as the way scoundrels have received support from unexpected quarters [ἐν οὐδενὶ θαυμάσαι τὴν τύχην οὕτως, ὡς τῷ συμπράττειν τοῖς πονηροῖς καὶ τὰ παράδοξα]. You Idumaeans, for instance have come here to help these dregs of humanity [παρεῖναι... ἀνθρώποις ἐξωλεστάτοις] against us with more alacrity than could be expected even if the Capital had called on you to resist a foreign attack' (238-239). The individual motifs reappear, in chiastic variation, at the end of the prologue: 'But your great army in its shining array is a sight that would be welcomed if the Capital had by common consent invited you to support us against a foreign enemy. What could anyone call this but one of fortune's meanest tricks [τύχης ἐπήρειαν], when he sees an entire nation take up arms for the sake of the most despicable scoundrels?' (243). Role-reversal and contradiction are then stated still more drastically: those who arrive as allies (to the Zealots) should really have come as avengers (264). If Jesus treats the present coalition as a paradoxical *coniunctio oppositorum*, the scheme that he himself regards as normative is based on exactly opposite assumptions: only external invasion by a foreigner could have justified such assistance. The point implicitly counters, and corrects, the divisive we/they rhetoric used by the Zealots to discredit their political opponents; to this end, too, Jesus posits an alternative we/they configuration in which Jerusalemites and Idumaeans are united through common bonds of kinship against the πονηροί/Zealots (cf. 244, 265).

This egregious partnership of πονηροί with men quite literally in shining armour is itself the product of an equally devious exercise in Zealot public relations—which Jesus procedes to demolish by applying the lexical categories of Ananus. Zealot slogans are first dismissed as lies,[72] then the characteristic λόγος/ἔργον antithesis reappears to index the divergence between words and the sets they purport to describe: 'You Idumaeans however ought to reflect who are the slanderers [τούς τε διαβάλλοντας] and who the victims, and gather the truth not from fictitious tales but from known facts' [συνάγειν τε τὴν ἀλήθειαν οὐκ ἐκ τῶν ἐπιπλάστων λόγων ἀλλ'

[72] Note the recurrent vocabulary of artifice: τῆς... ψευδοῦς ἐπινοίας (4.245), λογοποιήσαντας (246), διαβάλλοντας, τῶν ἐπιπλάστων λόγων (247), σκῆψις (257), τῆς ἀπάτης (264).

ἐκ τῶν κοινῶν πραγμάτων] (247). Both assumptions and procedure parallel the earlier statement of Ananus. First the pattern of verbal anarchy is applied to expose Zealot slogans as a web of ἐπίπλαστοι λόγοι, refuted by the facts themselves, then the speaker advances an alternative interpretation whose validity and theoretical justification rest on the premise that he himself reconstructs the truth by properly reconciling λόγοι and ἔργα (in the sense of 4.184, εἰ ἐτύμους δεῖ τοῖς πράγμασι τὰς κλήσεις ἐφαρμόζειν). Jesus, like Ananus, claims to be undoing the semantic mischief of the Zealots.

Thus Jesus' interpretation of the situation answers the Zealot construct in antithetical symmetry, with the political catchwords providing a precise point of reference. The Idumaeans, mouthing Zealot slogans, claim to be the champions of freedom (καὶ τῆς μητροπόλεως ἐπ' ἐλευθερώσει παρεῖναι, 245) against Roman sympathizers suspected of plotting betrayal. Jesus appropriates the key terms but reverses their thrust: the Zealots alone are capable of treason (257), they are the real conspirators (τοῖς ἐπιβούλοις τῆς μητροπόλεως, 267), and 'defence of the Capital' means, more properly, ridding it of just these tyrants (χρὴ δὲ ὑμᾶς... ἀμύνειν τῇ μητροπόλει καὶ συνεξαιρεῖν τοὺς... τυράννους, 258). This is the perspective of the Jerusalem 'moderates'.[73] Paradox results from subjective combination of κλήσεις and πράγματα by either side according to their respective frames or reference, and plainly Jesus himself is no less adept at the semantic game which he denounces in the Zealots. Yet Ananus/Jesus/Josephus together create the illusion—through the Thucydidean *stasis* model as implicit point of reference—that what we are witnessing is a typical process in which the Zealots (and associates) dissolve and pervert meaning, while their opponents reconstitute it. Therein lies the historian's art, and therein his design: for if meaning is first shown to be dislocated by unscrupulous demagogues to serve their own political ends, its reconstitution by unimpeachable (in Josephus' view) spokesmen will tacitly assume absolute status.

The antilogy itself contributes significantly towards reinforcing this illusion and giving it the mask of objectivity. Simon, mouthpiece for the Idumaeans, in symmetrical responsion reverses the arguments of Jesus and endorses the original Zealot version (4.271-282): Jesus and the priests are stylized as traitors (273, 281), tyrants (278) and enemies of liberty (282)

---

[73] It is interesting to note that Jesus argues from the same perspective as Ananus, but tones down the rhetoric in view of his Idumaean interlocutor. Zealot impiety appears in both speeches. But where Jesus uses the motif *on its own* (4.242), Ananus, less elliptical, had completed the polemical contraposition: the Zealots subvert Jewish laws, the Romans uphold them (4.173, 180-183). Jesus implies the contrast, Ananus articulates it.

who repudiate ties of kinship (274, 275, 278); the Zealots are victims of tyranny (278) and champions of liberty (272), a pose they share with their Idumaean allies (273, 276). Most evidently, the studied thematic symmetry dramatizes and gives formal expression to ideological polarity and disjunction. But in addition to its immediate function as purveyor of opposing views, the antilogy, as a verbal construct of the author, also has a distinct meta-literary dimension: as self-reflexive discourse it provides criteria by which we can judge the performance of the rhetors themselves, and so also the validity of their divergent arguments.

Simon takes up not only the political keywords of his interlocutor but also imitates the *style* of Jesus' speech—which in turn suggests that the second oration is intended to be read as a conscious parody of the first. Expositional θαυμάζειν, linked by Jesus to the reversal motif (ἔφη... ἐν οὐδενὶ θαυμάσαι τὴν τύχην οὕτως..., 238; cf. μέχρι πολλοῦ μὲν ἀπορῶ, 244), is sarcastically echoed in Simon's own opening sentence (οὐκέτι θαυμάζειν ἔφη, 272),[74] again with reference to the idea of role-reversal (this time from his own perspective). Both orators explicitly analyse the situation as a paradoxical inversion. Thus Jesus: 'The right and proper course for you Idumaeans is to help us to exterminate the ruffians, and to punish them for cheating you by daring to call you in as allies when they ought to have feared you as avengers' [συνεξαιρεῖν τοὺς ἀλιτηρίους καὶ ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς τῆς ἀπάτης ἀμυνομένους, ὅτι συμμάχους ἐτόλμησαν καλεῖν οὓς ἔδει τιμωροὺς δεδιέναι] (264). Simon retorts in symmetrical logic: 'You complain that you are under the thumb of tyrants and hurl a charge of despotism against the victims of your own tyranny' [τυραννεῖσθαι λέγετε καὶ τὸ τῆς δυναστείας ὄνομα τοῖς ὑφ' ὑμῶν τυραννουμένοις περιάπτετε] (278). The last-quoted sentence draws attention to the *verbal* basis of the whole phenomenon (λέγετε, ὄνομα), and here indeed we have the most striking responsion of all. The crucial λόγος/ἔργον antithesis in Jesus' speech (συνάγειν τε τὴν ἀλήθειαν οὐκ ἐκ τῶν ἐπιπλάστων λόγων ἀλλ' ἐκ τῶν κοινῶν πραγμάτων, 247) has its exact counterpart in Simon's reply: 'Who could tolerate such ironical language, which he sees to be flatly contradicted by the facts? [τίς ἂν ἐνέγκαι τὴν εἰρωνείαν τῶν λόγων ἀφορῶν εἰς τὴν ἐναντιότητα τῶν πραγμάτων;] Unless indeed it is the Idumaeans who are now shutting you out of the Capital, and not you who are excluding them

---

[74] Both speakers employ a standard expositional technique (which formally underscores the ironic responsion): Arist. *Rhet.* 1415b2 includes τὰ θαυμαστά among proemial features to catch audience attention. Thus (e.g.) Lys. 7.1; Cic. *Sest.* 1; Liv. 21.3.3-4, 30.2; Prop. 3.11.1, 3.14.1.

from their ancestral rites' (279).[75] If semantic manipulation and the *mundus inversus* system are thus invoked by *both* speakers to support mutually exclusive positions, the categories themselves would appear to have some objective validity: the only question now is which of the two views will stand. The dilemma thus conspicuously thematized is a challenge to read the antilogy in terms of its own λόγος/ἔργον standard. Who is right, and who wrong? To answer this question we need to look to the interaction of speech and narrative.

The wider context unambiguously supports the interpretation of Jesus. His view on the divergence of λόγοι and πράγματα (247) is not only correlative to the analysis of Ananus (184), but also coincides with with the scheme used by Josephus himself at 4.161 and 7.268-270 (with reference to the Zealots' name). These affiliations endorse Jesus' perspective in terms of the historical narrative, i.e. this is the view that the historian himself presents as valid. Then again, Josephus like others (cf. Arist. *Rhet.* 1356) posits a correlation between a witness' moral character and the cogency of his testimony. The shining encomium on Ananus and Jesus (4.318-325) retrospectively vindicates the views they articulate, while conversely the discourse of men who have been discredited in advance will necessarily be treated with scepticism. Against this background, Simon's protest that words are contradicted by facts (279) cannot be taken seriously: the observation is included as a meta-literary comment to alert the reader that Simon himself is guilty of misappropriating a legitimate criterion to justify an illegitimate cause, speciously making the weaker cause the stronger. This, I think, is the crucial irony which the responsion is intended to bring out. And in proportion as Simon's own argument is shown to be flawed, the reader is inclined to accept the interpretation of Jesus.

The validity of Simon's claims, most especially of his central proposition on the distorted relationship between λόγοι and πράγματα (279), can also be tested within the immediate context. The Idumaean captain waxes indignant on Jesus' alleged misuse of language—yet he is hoist by his own petard, and on the λόγος/ἔργον standard all the major assertions in his speech are refuted in the subsequent narrative. In this way his 'theoretical' claim at 279 is ironically turned against him, his own arguments exposed as fraudulent ἐπίπλαστοι λόγοι, while the antecedent claim by Jesus (247) is

---

[75] The appended εἰ μή clause precisely illustrates—and sarcastically parodies, as *reductio ad insanitatem*—the εἰρωνεία attributed by Simon to Ananus: by pushing the discrepancy between λόγος and ἔργον to its egregious limits, he effectively underscores the phenomenon of semantic dislocation in a manner that simultaneously relates it to the *mundus inversus* theme.

fully vindicated. Three crucial motifs make a strategic reappearance to index the fallacy of Simon's iterpretation: kinship, treason and despotism. We noted earlier that appeals to συγγένεια are a conspicuous theme in the antilogy—but the indiscriminate slaughter that follows makes a mockery of the Idumaeans' claim to be intervening as concerned kinsmen: 'No distinction was made between suppliants and combatants, and many who reminded the Idumaeans of the ties of blood [τήν τε συγγένειαν ἀναμιμνήσκοντας ≈ 244] and begged them to respect their common Temple were run through with swords' (311). Simon's charges that Jesus and Ananus are betraying the liberty of Jerusalem are dealt an even more devastating blow when a repentant Zealot approaches the Idumaeans, denounces his own party as despotic and persuades the Idumaeans to quit Jerusalem. This ἀναγνώρισις-like admission gains in cogency (and apparent objectivity) from being pronounced by an *enemy*.[76] The unnamed Zealot spokesman thus corrects the distorted Zealot picture in terms that explode the antecedent posturings of both John and Simon:

> **347**He reminded them that the Idumaeans had taken up arms in the belief that the high priests were betraying the Capital to the Romans [≈ 4.218, 226, 228, 245, 268], yet they found no evidence of treason whatever [≈ 248-257]. But its so-called defenders [τοὺς δ' ἐκείνην ὑποκρινομένους[77] φυλάττεσθαι] were all out for war and personal domination [≈ 258-263,

---

[76] A frank admission by an *enemy* that he was wrong is a highly effective device to discredit an opponent under the veneer of objective reporting: thus the contrite renegade Simon at Scythopolis (2.469-476) and, more spectacularly, Eleazar's palinode at Masada. For Josephus' use of the technique ('le recours à la tierce personne', or 'le recours à l'adversaire'), see Thérond (1979) 75-78: 'Josèphe se sert des personnages de son histoire comme de porte-parole pour indiquer aux lecteurs quelles sont ses sympathies et ses aversions. Il se montre parfois très habile, respectant parfaitement les dehors de l'objectivité' (75). One might compare also an analogous biblical technique noted by Farmer (1956) 96 (with his n. 28): the 'literary device of making a pagan witness to the truth of a particular religious belief...' Modern propaganda has perfected the strategy; the psychological assumptions are well brought out by Ellul (1965) 11-12: 'Extreme propaganda must win over the adversary and at least use him by integrating him into its own frame of reference. That is why it was so important to have an Englishman speak on the Nazi radio or a General Paulus on the Soviet radio... Clearly, the ultimate was achieved by Soviet propaganda in the self-criticism of its opponents. That the enemy of a regime... can be made to declare, *while he is still the enemy*, that this regime was right, that his opposition was criminal, and that his condemnation is just—that is the ultimate result of totalitarian propaganda. The enemy (while still remaining the enemy, and because he is the enemy) is converted into a supporter of the regime'. So too in Arthur Koestler's *Darkness at Noon* (Penguin edition, 1977), where the inquisitor says, 'The political utility of your confession at the trial will lie in its voluntary character' (177); and again, 'You and your friends, Citizen Rubashov, have made a rent in the Party. If your repentance is real, then you must help us heal this rent. I have told you, it is the last service the Party will ask of you' (190).

[77] The expression harks back to the motifs of deception and verbal distortion.

> 267]... **352**And so, as the allegation of treason had been exploded [≈ 245] and there was no Roman invasion on the horizon, while the City was at the mercy of a despotism that could not easily be overthrown, the right course for the Idumaeans was to return home and have nothing more to do with these scoundrels, and so blot out the memory of all the crimes in which they had been tricked into taking part [≈ 4.224, 226].
>
> (4.347-352)

The multiple backward responsions vindicate the analysis of Jesus (and of Ananus before that) on every count. The admission by the unnamed Zealot, reversing roles and attributes, endorses and complements the earlier reflexions on κλήσεις and πράγματα (184, 247, 279), and in this way re-establishes a 'correct' perspective on the chaotic *mundus inversus*.

The semantic slippage and dislocation dramatized in the antilogy are ultimately inspired, I have suggested, by Thucydides' reflexions on the Corcyrean *stasis*: Josephus takes his cue from that celebrated description and transposes the phenomenon into the context of analogous factional strife in Jerusalem, subjecting current political discourse to a comparable 'Thucydidean' analysis. The antilogy expresses monumental polarization and static disjunction: Jesus' thesis is parried and parodied by Simon's antithesis, but the tension is not resolved into a reasoned modification of position. The verbal duel is less a rational debate than a butting of heads — and as such produces no clear winner (note Jesus' dejection at 4.283).[78] Where dialectic collapses, however, value judgement is implied by other means. To dispel any doubt about the relative merit of the two speeches Josephus applies another typically Thucydidean technique: the divergence between speech and course of events is minutely thematized to expose Simon's analysis as flawed and fraudulent. Thus Simon's loss is Jesus' gain. Since, further, the views ascribed to Jesus converge with those of Josephus himself, we are inclined to read his speech from this authorial perspective. Finally, though the antilogy as a rhetorical exercise produces no winner, it does produce two distinguished martyrs (Ananus and Jesus), and it is this that finally clinches the issue. In that sense the antilogy implies what the later encomium states more plainly: 'Virtue herself, I believe, wept for these men, bewailing her total defeat at the hands of vice' (325).

---

[78] Bailey (1991) 119-120 has an apposite comment in this regard: 'Often political discourse is a matter of ideologues talking less *to* each other than *at* each other. True-believers in one ideology have trouble communicating with those of a different persuasion and often seem not to be trying to understand any position other than their own: at the level of debate they end up, whatever the façade of reason, essentially shouting slogans and abuse. This happens because political ideologies, like other dogmas, claim to have an exclusive handle on *the* truth, and therefore to be unique'.

The overtly anti-Zealot slant of Jesus' speech is hardly remarkable and in a sense even incidental: what is at least as significant is that the Idumaeans embrace this cause so fervently and—as subsequently shown—so unthinkingly. The antilogy should be read first and foremost as an analysis of ideological deception through distortion of meaning. Simon's initial commitment to the Zealot cause—unrestrained, unqualified, unreflecting—is put in perspective by the later ἀναγνώρισις and departure of the Idumaeans, acting on the advice of the contrite Zealot. This is the highly stylized and distinctive accentuation of the historian who uses ἔργα as devastating comment on antecedent λόγοι. The whole Idumaean episode, turning on the armature of deception, is less an indictment of the dupes than of their Zealot hosts, and of John in particular. Its intrinsic literary structure, hinging on deception (deceitful letter → cause embraced: deceit exposed → cause dropped), is itself a highly effective means of throwing into relief this central idea. The wider significance of the antilogy is not in its influence on the course of events, but precisely in its *failure* to influence them, less on the dramatic plane than at the level of ideas and ideology: in the manner of Thucydides' Corcyrean excursus, the paired speeches analyse how in a climate of *stasis* language becomes distorted and exploited an instrument of factional politics.

With the 'moderates' Ananus and Jesus removed, cast out unburied (4.315-317), and with the Idumaeans gone, the way is now open for unchecked Zealot excesses (355-356). In that sense the death of the two priests is a significant pivotal event, an aspect which is brought out by another intertextual allusion. Josephus' *laudatio*, as commentators generally agree, extols Ananus in terms that recall Thucydides' tribute to Pericles (Thuc. 2.65):

> **319**He was a man revered on every account and of the highest integrity, and although so distinguished by birth, position and reputation [≈ Thuc. 2.65.8], he loved to treat even the humblest as equals. **320**Utterly devoted to liberty and with a passion for democracy, he always made his own interests take second place to the public advantage [≈ 2.65.7] and made peace the aim of his life; for he knew that Rome was invincible. But when he had no option he made careful preparations for war, in order that, if the Jews would not come to terms, they might carry on the fight effectively. **321**In a word, had Ananus lived, hostilities would indeed have ended; for he was an eloquent speaker who could mould public opinion [≈ 2.65.9] and had already silenced his opponents: if hostilities had continued, the Jews would have held up the Roman advance a very long time under such a general [≈ 2.65.7].
>
> (4.319-321)

And as with Pericles (2.65.6), the πρόνοια of Ananus is vindicated after his death. But the Thucydidean reminiscences go beyond just individual echoes. Pericles' standing is evaluated as much by reference to his intrinsic virtues as statesman as through the contrast with his successors, and in this respect his death marks a decisive caesura in Athenian politics: οἱ δὲ [his successors] ταῦτά τε πάντα ἐς τοὐναντίον ἔπραξαν... (2.65.7); οἱ δὲ ὕστερον ἴσοι μᾶλλον αὐτοὶ πρὸς ἀλλήλους ὄντες... (2.65.10). Ananus' death too is interpreted as a fateful political *peripeteia*, a notion conspicuously emphasized in the thematic frame enclosing the encomium: 'I should not be far wrong if I said that the fall of the City began with Ananus' death, and that the overthrow of the walls and the destruction of the Jewish state dated from the day when they saw the high priest, the champion of their cause, assassinated in the middle of the City' (4.318) ≈ 'Virtue herself, I believe, wept for these men, bewailing her total defeat at the hands of vice' (4.325). The Thucydidean reminiscences, in other words, fully functional within their new context, at once implicitly elevate Ananus to Periclean status, signal a decisive victory for the anti-Roman hardliners, and imply that the priest's demise will be as far-reaching as that of his Athenian prototype. This interpretion seems fully justified by the wider context.

And in this connexion a final suggestion might be ventured. The Idumaean intervention is the decisive external factor which precipitates the fateful *peripeteia*. Their entry into Jerusalem is described in a pathos-laden passage (4.305-313) which more than once seems to recall Vergil's account of the fall of Troy in *Aeneid* 2. Josephus may indeed have known that text;[79] in light of the above it is tempting to see the possible Vergilian reminiscences too as enhancing, in a suggesive way, the final collapse of the old order and an irrevocable turning point in the course of events (*venit summa dies et ineluctabile tempus*...). A number of common elements might not be coincidental: the decisive role of treachery in both accounts; massacre of the sleeping guards; the two columns join; initial confusion of identity; heroic resistance by the younger men; confused shouting and lamentation; brutal and impious massacre of victims. The evident literary quality of Josephus' brief description[80] might perhaps support such a link.

---

[79] Cf. Michel-Bauernfeind in their introduction (I xxiv) and Thérond (1979) 23, who detect possible reminiscences of *Aen.* 2 in Josephus' account of the fall of Jotapata (3.317ff.).

[80] Thus, for example, balancing references to the *ordo naturalis* mark off the interlude as a structural unit: first night and sleep (298, 306), then dawn (313). The episode's dramatic pivot is marked by an elegant *hendiadyoin*: 'Then the greater number flung away courage and weapons together [ἅμα ταῖς ψυχαῖς κατέβαλλε τὰ ὅπλα] and abandoned themselves to lamentation' (4.308).

7. *Summary*

In a well-known study of Thucydides' treatment of political *metonomasia* in the Corcyrean episode, Walter Müri has remarked: '...[Es gibt] eine Kette von Thukydides-Lesern, die durch seine Analyse der Ereignisse von Kerkyra und durch das Modell seiner Metonomasien immer wieder gefangen worden sind. Es böte einen eigenen Reiz, diese Fortwirkung zu verfolgen, in ihrem Wechsel von origineller Abwandlung und pedantischer Übernahme'.[81] This observation is singularly relevant also to Josephus, for although commentators regularly note the Thucydidean inspiration at *BJ* 4.364-365, that reminiscence, however striking, is no more than a starting point; the full extent, complexity and especially the *function* of Josephus' reception of the Corcyra episode have gone largely unnoticed. So too with Thucydides' famous description of the Athenian plague, which has also left traces in the Jerusalem narrative. The foregoing analysis would justify the conclusion that Josephus was extraordinarily receptive to a number of significant Thucydidean impulses which are assimilated, adapted and fully integrated into the intellectual design of *BJ*.

I have argued that the Thucydidean strands in *BJ* 4.121-282, far from being just a matter of literary style, were consciously introduced to underpin and legitimate Josephus' interpretation of the Jerusalem *stasis*, and in particular his characteristic technique of polemical reversal. Josephus by assimilating his own account of factional strife to the Thucydidean paradigm places himself in the tradition of antiquity's greatest *Krisenhistoriker*, and like his predecessor views the particular events through the general patterns; the crucial distinction however is that while Thucydides' stated purpose in his pathology is to uncover the typical dynamics of the historical process (3.82.2), Josephus' implicit aim in applying this model is to convey a *value judgement* under the guise of objective diagnosis. Josephus' analysis in other words is Thucydidean in *form* but not in *intent*, the austere and scientific method of the archetype becomes in *BJ* an instrument of subtle persuasion.

Here a broad strategy has emerged: first meaning is shown to be dislocated in consequence of *stasis*, then it is reconstituted in a manner that validates Josephus' own interpretation. Wilful semantic distortion by the Zealots is indexed in three ways. Most generally, deceit and deception are so consistently pinned on John and his associates that *all* their words and actions tend to become tarnished and suspect; repeated often enough,

---

[81] Müri (1969) 76.

these charges create an impression that soon sticks—both on John and the Zealots, and in the reader's mind. Next, Josephus systematically applies the λόγος/ἔργον antithesis to drive a wedge between the culprits' words and their deeds: this discredits their slogans and signals the pervasive theme of false naming. Finally, the process is also analysed at a theoretical level on the λόγος/λόγος axis, notably in the grand antilogy between Jesus and the Idumaean captain. These are Josephus' most sophisticated reflexions on the phenomenon, and would be hard to explain without assuming the influence of Thucydides' classic analysis of verbal anarchy in Corcyra (a passage which our historian certainly knew).

Clearly there is a precise correlation between Josephus' defamation of the Zealots on the one hand, and the credibility of his own interpretation on the other. By first exposing the Corcyrean-type antics of his opponents, and by showing their slogans to be inherently fraudulent and self-contradictory, Josephus implicitly justifies his own claim to reconstruct the truth from the debris of their deceptions—for in proportion as *they* are denounced as liars, *his* pronouncements acquire a ring of authority and come to be seen as a legitimate corrective. The historian's credibility, in other words, is predicated on his antecedent and (seemingly) *objectively valid* demolition of the Zealots.

To that end he evokes the Thucydidean paradigm. The pattern of events in and around Jerusalem is made to converge with the phenomenology of *stasis* as described in Thucydides, the specific is viewed through the typical and the generic—which creates the impression that external criteria are being applied in an objective analysis. The semantic anarchy in Jerusalem, subsumed in this matrix, becomes therefore another typical symptom of *stasis*, and from this perspective Josephus' subjective interpretation is presented as quasi-objective analysis. The analytical frames of the Thucydidean archetype, striving austerely after τὸ σαφές and τὸ ἀκριβές, become the infrastructure to support Josephus' own tendentious ἀφήγησις πραγμάτων.

The Jerusalem *stasis* is stylized along the lines of the Corcyrean civil strife as a chaotic *mundus inversus*. In a world where current notions and criteria have crumbled and been inverted, moral and political anarchy is indexed most subtly as a lexical phenomenon. Applying the Thucydidean model of verbal dislocation, Josephus first exposes Zealot propaganda as a process of false naming, then through a variety of (unimpeachable) spokesmen and with ὀνόματα εὐπρεπῆ/ὀνομάτων ὀρθότης as conceptual frame, he purports to undo their lexical mischief by reuniting κλήσεις and πράγματα in a 'correct' semantic relationship. And by reclaiming the

language from Zealot distortions, he imposes his own definitions and interpretation on the situation. Given the antecedent barrages against his opponents, his 'corrections' acquire an intrinsic plausibility, for he appears merely to be driving out the demons from their reprehensible semanticide. Thus from the ashes of the demolished Zealot edifice he resurrects and reshapes the truth—on his own terms.

This page intentionally left blank

CHAPTER FOUR

MESSAGE AND MEDIUM: FURTHER LINES OF COHESION

> Denique sit quidvis simplex dumtaxat et unum.
> HORACE, *Ars Poetica* 23.
>
> A mighty maze! but not without a plan.
> Alexander POPE, *Essay on Man*, Epistle I (preface).
>
> Glaubwürdigkeit hat nichts mit 'Wahrheit an sich' zu tun, sondern hängt vom kognitiven Bezugsrahmen des jeweiligen Zielpublikums ab.
> Michael KUNCZIK, *Die manipulierte Meinung* (1990), 72.

1. Ἀριστεία, *Art and Ideology*

Exceptional exploits by individual heroes are standard fare in the war narratives of classical historiography. These episodes belong to a literary tradition that goes back ultimately to the stylized battles of epic poetry, the ἀριστείαι or fighting scenes in which a particular hero is pre-eminent (ἀριστεύειν), though not necessarily victorious.[1] In the historians as in high poetry such military encounters by their nature often provide material for conscious literary showpieces—*aristeiai* at decisive moments in Caesar or Livy are well-known cases in point—and invariably these episodes are also focal points at which the work's central themes come into prominence. The *aristeiai* in the Jerusalem narrative on the other hand have received relatively little attention: only WEBER, from source critical perspective, identifies them as a group and suggests that the details must derive from the notes and records of Titus.[2] I am concerned here with the question of how Josephus reworked this source material, transforming the official

---

[1] On the literary background, see RAABE (1974) 216-241; NIENS (1987) 17-142; and esp. FRIES (1985) *passim*. The continuity between epic and historiographic *aristeiai* is well illustrated at [Caes.] *Bell. Hisp.* 25.3-4: *Illi tamen procul dubio ad congrediendum in aequum locum non sunt ausi descendere praeter unum Antistium Turpionem; qui fidens viribus ex adversariis sibi parem esse neminem agitare coepit. Hic,* ***ut fertur Achillis Memnonisque congressus****, Q. Pompeius Niger, eques Romanus Italicensis, ex acie nostra ad congrediendum progressus est.* For an *aristeia* ending in heroic death, compare Crastinus in Caesar (*BC* 3.91 and 99) or Lucan's Scaeva (6.118-262).

[2] WEBER (1921) 227-228; cf. RAJAK (1983) 216.

reports into stylized and self-contained episodes to subserve the work's broad ideological thrust. It is argued that the *aristeiai* function typically to individualize the pervasive contrast between Jews and Romans whose collective expressions were noted earlier, to thematize the bond between Titus and his army (with an eye to the propaganda of legitimacy), and in this way to reinforce the image of Titus as ideal general. The specific instances, less abstract than the anonymous generalizations, tend to make a stronger impression not least because of their conscious literary complexion: form and generic affiliation—in other words, the literary medium—are demonstrably related to a consistent strategy of persuasion.

1. *Longinus (5.309-316)*

> **309**Among the Jews the great ambition was to show outstanding courage and win favour with their officers. Simon in particular was held in special respect and awe, and every man under his command was so devoted to him that none would have hesitated a moment to kill himself at Simon's bidding. **310**With the Romans, on the other hand, the incentives to valour were the habit of victory and unfamiliarity with defeat, their constant campaigning and uninterrupted training, the greatness of their empire—and above all Titus, always and everywhere present by every man. **311**To show cowardice when Caesar was there fighting at their side was unthinkable, while the man who fought bravely did so before the eyes of the one who would also reward him; indeed, he was paid already if Caesar had recognized his courage. As a result many through sheer enthusiasm showed a courage beyond their strength [διὰ τοῦτο πολλοὶ τῆς κατὰ σφᾶς ἰσχύος ἀμείνους τῇ προθυμίᾳ διεφάνησαν]. **312**Thus on one of those days the Jews were drawn up before the wall in force, and the opposing lines were still exchanging spears at long range. Suddenly Longinus, a cavalryman, leapt out of the Roman lines and charged the very middle of the Jewish phalanx. **313**Breaking their ranks by his onslaught, he killed two of their bravest, striking one in front as he came to meet him, withdrawing the spear and transfixing the other through the side as he turned away. Then he escaped unscathed from the middle of the enemy to his own lines. **314**His prowess earned him distinction and led many to emulate his valour. **315**The Jews on their side, heedless of the damage they suffered, were concerned only with what they could inflict, and death seemed trivial to them if only it fell on one of the enemy too. **316**Titus on the other hand was as anxious for the safety of his men as for victory itself. He declared that incautious enthusiasm was utter madness, and heroism was heroic only when it went with a prudent regard for the hero's safety. His men were forbidden to risk their own lives in order to display their fearlessness [Τίτος δὲ τῆς τῶν στρατιωτῶν ἀσφαλείας οὐχ ἧττον τοῦ κρατεῖν προυνόει, καὶ τὴν μὲν ἀπερίσκεπτον ὁρμὴν ἀπόνοιαν λέγων, μόνην δ' ἀρετὴν τὴν μετὰ προνοίας καὶ τοῦ μηδὲν τὸν δρῶντα παθεῖν, ἐν ἀκινδύνῳ τῷ κατὰ σφᾶς ἐκέλευσεν ἀνδρίζεσθαι].
>
> (5.309-316)

The episode is shaped as a coherent structural entity: two general contrasts between Jews and Romans (309-311, 315-316) enclose a kernel (312-314) relating the *aristeia* proper; this nucleus is introduced by the temporal formula κατὰ ταύτας τὰς ἡμέρας and ends with the ἐπίσημος and emulation motifs, which in turn echo the categories in the first part of the frame (καὶ παρὰ μὲν Ἰουδαίους ἔρις ἦν ὅστις προκινδυνεύσας χαρίσαιτο τοῖς ἡγεμόσιν, 309). From this dispositional pattern—general to specific and back to general[3]—it is clear that Longinus' feat is intended to individualize the reflexions contained in the framing segments: not an isolated or gratuitous display of bravura, therefore, but a particular expression of the typical ideals. The individual θαυμαστόν, subsequently acknowledged and emulated, is reported as an *exemplum* to illustrate Titus' criteria of safety (ἀσφάλεια) and forethought (πρόνοια).

In these two notions is crystallized a pervasive contrast between Jews and Romans. While Longinus comes through his *aristeia* unscathed (ἄτρωτος, 313), Jewish recklessness is twice emphasized: their willingness to kill themselves instantly at Simon's behest (309) is dictated not by *ratio militaris* but by fanatical devotion, and similarly their contempt for death in battle (315) evinces not strategic calculation but a suicidal ἀπερίσκεπτος ὁρμή, itself a form of ἀπόνοια (316).[4] Longinus' action on the other hand, directed specifically against δύο τοὺς γενναιοτάτους (313), has a clear focus and is executed with geometric precision.[5] The *aristeia* thus serves to dramatize, *speciale pro generali*, the pervasive ὁρμή/πρόνοια antithesis, and no less importantly it pays tribute to the general whose presence can inspire such superlative efforts (311).[6] This latter aspect is further developed in the next example.

---

[3] The same symmetry also with reference to the Romans: πολλοὶ τῆς κατὰ σφᾶς ἰσχύος ἀμείνους τῇ προθυμίᾳ διεφάνησαν (311)—Λογγῖνός τις (312)—ζηλωταὶ δὲ τῆς ἀνδρείας ἐγίνοντο πολλοί (314).

[4] Jewish irrationality comes out especially at 5.315: 'The Jews on their side, heedless of the damage they suffered, were concerned only with what they could inflict, and death seemed trivial to them if only it fell on one of the enemy too'. For the blindly self-destructive rage, compare Sen. *Ira* 1.1.1, *hic* [*affectus*]... *dum alteri noceat sui neglegens, in ipsa irruens tela et ultionis secum ultorem tracturae avidus*; 3.3.2, *ante oculos ponere quantum monstri sit homo in hominem furens quantoque impetu ruat non sine pernicie sua perniciosus.*

[5] The choreographic symmetry of the exploit has a distinct literary complexion: Longinus dispatches the first Jew as he advances (τὸν μὲν... ὑπαντιάσαντα), the second while he flees (τὸν δ'... τραπόμενον), both with the same weapon.

[6] For the psychological effect of fighting *in conspectu imperatoris* (as at 5.311), cf. Caes. *BG* 2.25.3, 3.14.8, 6.8.4, 7.62.2; Liv. 21.43.17.

2. *Sabinus the Syrian (6.54-67)*

This incident occurs during the Roman assault on the Antonia fortress. Part of the outer wall has fallen, only to reveal a second inner wall constructed by the Jewish defenders. Roman spirits sink: 'No one dared to climb up: for those who led the way it meant certain death' (32). Titus attempts to raise the morale in a lengthy exhortation (33-53), promising handsome rewards to the man who leads the attack (τὸν δὲ καταρξάμενον, 53). Fully acknowledging the dangers of the situation (36), he gives a corresponding emphasis to the ideal of the heroic death and subsequent immortality (46-49, 53):[7] this exactly prefigures the course of the *aristeia* that now follows, and also supplies the criteria by which Sabinus' action is to be judged.

> **54**Listening to this speech, the troops in general were appalled by the greatness of the danger; but in one of the cohorts there was a man named Sabinus, a native of Syria, who in prowess and courage proved himself outstanding. **55**Yet anyone who had seen him before would have concluded from his physical appearance that he was not even an average soldier. His skin was black, his flesh shrunken and emaciated; but in his frail body, far too slender for its own prowess, there dwelt a heroic soul. **56**He was the first to rise [πρῶτος... ἀναστάς]. 'Caesar', he said, 'to you I gladly offer myself. I am the first to scale the wall [πρῶτος ἀναβαίνω τὸ τεῖχος]. **57**I pray that my strength and determination will have the benefit of your usual good fortune. But if I am thwarted in my efforts, rest assured that I am quite prepared for failure, and that for your sake I have deliberately preferred to die'. **58**So saying, with his left hand he held his shield in front of and over his head, and drawing his sword with his right hand stepped out towards the wall, at just about midday. **59**He was followed by eleven others, the only ones to emulate his courage; but he went on far ahead of them, driven by some supernatural impulse [προῆγε δὲ πολὺ πάντων ὁ ἀνὴρ ὁρμῇ τινι δαιμονίῳ χρώμενος]. **60**The guards on the battlements flung spears at them, discharged volleys of arrows from all directions and rolled down great lumps of rock, which swept away some of the eleven; **61**but Sabinus, charging into the missiles and buried under the arrows, did not falter for a moment till he had got to the top and routed the enemy. **62**For the Jews, amazed at his dynamic energy and remorseless determination, and thinking too that others had climbed up, turned and fled. **63**And here one might well complain of Fortune, so jealous of heroic deeds and always ready to prevent brilliant successes. **64**For this brave man, just as he achieved his purpose, tripped up, and stumbling over a big stone fell headlong on top of it with a great crash. The Jews, turning and

[7] Colombo (1983) 256-257 suggests that the theme of astral immortality, probably of oriental origin, may have been intended especially for the easterners in Titus' army—and it might therefore be significant that the first man to take up the challenge is a Syrian. Ideas of this kind however would have been equally familiar to the Romans: cf. Cic. *Rep.* 6.13, 26, 29, with Michel-Bauernfeind II,2 162-163 (Exkurs XII).

> seeing him alone and on the ground, pelted him from all directions. **65**He got up on one knee, and covering himself with his shield for a time fought back, wounding many who came near him; **66**but soon, riddled with wounds, he lost the use of his right hand and at length, before he breathed his last, he was buried under the arrows. So brave a man deserved a better fate, yet his fall was a fitting end to such an enterprise. **67**Of the others, three who had already reached the top were battered to death with stones, the other eight were dragged down wounded and carried back to the camp. This incident took place on the third of the month of Panemus.
>
> (6.54-67)

Sabinus promptly answers the challenge to lead the attack and becomes, in word and action, an *exemplum* of the heroic ideal just urged by Titus. In the event he neither succeeds in reversing the general fear (only eleven others follow) nor in turning the tide of battle—and the valiant attempt is therefore singled out not for its military consequences but as evidence of an exemplary *inward attitude.* The introductory superlative (ἀνὴρ καὶ κατὰ χεῖρα καὶ κατὰ ψυχὴν ἄριστος ἐφάνη, 54), used to designate the champion also at 2.469, 6.81 and 6.186, is reinforced by repeated πρῶτος (56), by the discrepancy between the man's slight frame and his ἡρωικὴ ψυχή (56), and by the emulation motif (εἴποντο δ' αὐτῷ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἕνδεκα μόνοι ζηλωταὶ τῆς ἀνδρείας γενόμενοι, 59)[8]—all enhancing the paradigmatic status of the episode. The *oratio recta* at 56-57 marks the ideological nucleus of the whole scene: reappearance here of the ἐν πολέμῳ τελευτή motif from Titus' preceding exhortation fully justifies treating the *aristeia* as an enactment of the general principle, while Sabinus' declaration of devotion (ἐπιδίδωμί σοι... προθύμως ἐμαυτόν, and again ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ σοῦ κρίσει τὸν θάνατον ἠρημένον) emblemizes, idealizes and individualizes the sentiments that were expressed in general terms in the Longinus *aristeia*. There Josephus had noted how Titus inspired his troops: '...many through sheer enthusiasm showed a courage beyond their strength' (5.311); here Sabinus, impelled by ὁρμὴ δαιμόνιος (59), acts as an extension of the general's own will. 'Die überschäumende Kraft des Feldherrn überträgt sich auf die Soldaten':[9] the episode is as much a glorification of Sabinus as of Titus—but most especially of the *concordia* uniting them.

---

[8] Note how ἕνδεκα μόνοι ζηλωταί here represents an intensification as against the preceding Longinus episode, ζηλωταὶ δὲ τῆς ἀνδρείας ἐγίνοντο πολλοί (5.314).

[9] Weber (1921) 235. The ὁρμή δαιμόνιος at 6.59 (contrast suicidal ἀπερίσκεκπτος ὁρμή and ἀπόνοια censured at 5.316), harking back to Sabinus' wish to share in the τύχη of Titus (57, cf. 6.88, 413), says something about the general's charismatic personality. Michel-Bauernfeind 6 n. 16 comment on the sacral ring of Sabinus' language (ἐπιδίδωμί σοι, εὔχομαι): this too has the effect of indirectly characterizing Titus as a quasi-numinous presence. On the 'irrational' elements in Josephus' portrait of Titus, see Weber (1921) 235-237.

But success eludes the Syrian hero. The *peripeteia* is placed exactly at the apex of the *aristeia* (6.63), its pathos enhanced by the interjection on τύχη (63)—echoing, and fulfilling, a possibility reckoned with by Sabinus himself (εἰ δὲ νεμεσηθείην τῆς ἐπιβολῆς..., 57). Style and structure consciously enhance the central notion of the heroic death, what Titus had called τὴν ἐν πολέμῳ τελευτήν (46). Sabinus' attempt is judged not on its outcome but on its *intention*, and to this end the latter aspect is perceptibly stressed. Strength is paired with resolution (τῇ τε ἰσχύι καὶ τῇ γνώμῃ, 57) in a manner that recalls 5.316, heroic intent is matched against nemesis (57) and the final pronouncement pays tribute to the hero's lofty purpose (πεσὼν δὲ τῆς ἐπιβολῆς ἀναλόγως, 66). The intention, in other words, as sole criterion vindicates the action and survives the failure.

Reviewing the episode as a whole, we need to distinguish between the factual kernel and the final literary presentation. The exact date (67) and even the time of the incident (58) are the kind of details that Josephus would have found in the military records he consulted—but he himself must take credit for style and structure, for giving the original report its distinct literary shape and panegyric slant. And style is directly related to propagandistic intent: the dramatic moment acquires exemplary status, it becomes a focal point to idealize the bond between charismatic general and devoted troops.[10]

3. *Julianus the Bithynian (6.81-91)*

> **81**But a centurion from Bithynia named Julianus, a man of note and of all whom I met during the war the most distinguished for skill in arms, physical strength, and fearless spirit, **82**seeing that the Romans were already giving way and offering a poor resistance, sprang forward—he had been standing beside Titus on the Antonia—and single-handedly drove back the Jews, already victorious, as far as the corner of the inner court of the Temple. The whole mass fled, convinced that such strength and audacity could not be those of a mere man. **83**This way and that he charged through their midst as they scattered, killing all he could reach: and there was no spectacle more amazing to Caesar or more terrifying to the other side. **84**But he too was pursued by Fate, from whom there is no escape for mortal man. **85**He was wearing the ordinary military boots

[10] In this sense the Crastinus *aristeia* in Caesar provides an instructive analogy. There too the initial pledge is fully vindicated in the hero's death: *Simul respiciens Caesarem 'Faciam', inquit, 'hodie, imperator, ut aut vivo mihi aut mortuo gratias agas'* (*BC* 3.91.3); *interfectus est etiam fortissime pugnans Crastinus, cuius mentionem supra fecimus, gladio in os adversum coniecto. Neque id fuit falsum quod ille in pugnam proficiscens dixerat. Sic enim Caesar existimabat eo proelio excellentissimam virtutem Crastini fuisse optimeque eum de se meritum iudicabat* (3.99.2-3). Cf. Rasmussen (1963) 124-125; Mutschler (1975) 223-225.

> thickly studded with sharp nails, and as he ran across the stone pavement he slipped and fell on his back, his armour clanging so loudly that the fugitives turned to look. **86**A shout went up from the Romans in the Antonia, alarmed for their champion, while the Jews crowded round him and aimed blows from all sides with lances and swords. **87**Many heavy blows he stopped with his shield, and many times he tried to stand up but was knocked down by the mass of assailants. Though grounded he stabbed many with his sword; **88**for he could not be finished off easily, being protected in every vital part by helmet and breastplate and keeping his head down. But finally, when all his limbs were slashed and no one dared to come to his aid, he gave up the struggle. **89**Caesar was deeply moved at the death of such a gallant soldier, killed before the eyes of so many; and though he was anxious to assist him personally, he was prevented by the situation, while those who might have gone were too terrified. **90**So Julianus, after a hard struggle with death and letting few of his assailants go unscathed, was killed with difficulty, leaving behind him the highest reputation, not only with the Romans and Caesar but even with his enemies. **91**The Jews snatched up the body and again drove the Romans back, shutting them up in the Antonia.
>
> (6.81-91)

The Julianus and Sabinus episodes share a number of common features: introductory superlative in relation to the hero's physical strength and valour (6.81 ≈ 6.54), his performance as superhuman (6.82 [11] ≈ 6.59), approval by Titus (6.83, 90 ≈ 6.56-57), the *peripeteia* caused by a fall, with authorial interjection on destiny or fortune (6.84-85[12] ≈ 6.63). The style is again consciously dramatic, with the performance explicitly cast as a spectacle (83, 89), effective alternation between Roman and Jewish perspectives, emphasis on audience reaction (83, 86, 90)—all typical features of the literary *aristeia*[13]—the tenacity of the grounded fighter stressed by a pathetic tricolon (ὁ δὲ πολὺν μὲν... πολλάκις δὲ... καὶ... πολλοὺς, 87), and even a Homeric echo to give the incident an epic tinge (ὑποδήματα πεπαρμένα... ἥλοις, 85 ≈ ἥλοισι πεπαρμένον, *Il.* 1.246, 11.633).

But formal correspondences apart, the accentuation differs slightly from the previous examples. The heroic impulse here is not a response to a preceding exhortation or even to the knowledge that Titus is watching, but

---

[11] The statement ἔφευγε δὲ τὸ πλῆθος ἄθρουν (82) reinforces the preceding μόνος motif (τοὺς Ἰουδαίους τρέπεται μόνος): a single hero puts to flight the entire crowd. For the hyperbolical disparity, cf. Luc. 6.191-192 (the *aristeia* of Scaeva), *parque novum Fortuna videt concurrere, bellum / atque virum*; Quint. 8.5.24, (*dictum*) *de viro forti: 'bella umbone propellit'*.

[12] The pathos of the *peripeteia* is enhanced by the phrase ἐδιώκετο δ' ἄρα καὶ αὐτὸς ὑπὸ τῆς εἱμαρμένης, ἣν ἀμήχανον διαφυγεῖν θνητὸν ὄντα (84)—ironically echoing the earlier reference to the hero's almost *super*human strength (82).

[13] See (e.g.) the duel of Horatii and Curiatii at Liv. 1.25 and Dion. Hall. 3.18-20, with Borzsák (1973); and, on a smaller scale, also [Caes.] *Bell. Hisp.* 25.3-9.

we witness instead the *spontaneous* intervention by a centurion to save a dangerous situation: 'Seeing that the Romans were already giving way and offering a sorry resistance, Julianus sprang forward... and single-handedly drove back the Jews, already victorious, as far as the corner of the inner court of the Temple' (82). Titus is indeed present (82), but Julianus is described as acting on his own initiative. He assesses the precarious situation and intervenes to stabilize it: this is why, in the introduction, Josephus mentions not only the centurion's strength and disposition, but also his *scientia militaris*, ὅπλων τ' ἐμπειρίᾳ καὶ ἀλκῇ σώματος καὶ ψυχῆς παραστήματι πάντων ἄριστος (81).

Yet Titus remains an integrating presence. Physical proximity (παρειστήκει δὲ Τίτῳ κατὰ τὴν Ἀντωνίαν, 82) implies also a unity of purpose which is fully borne out in the *aristeia*: Titus' reactions to the exploit—first amazement (83), then grief at the hero's death (89)—endorse the centurion's action and in effect stamp it as an implementation of his own will.[14] At both these crucial moments the combat is explicitly cast as a spectacle (καὶ τῆς ὄψεως ἐκείνης οὐδὲν... παρέστη φρικωδέστερον, ἐν ὄψει τοσούτων)—a point of some interest since it shows how Josephus uses a typical feature from the literary *aristeia* to enhance the *concordia* motif in his own account.

4. *Jonathan, Pudens and Priscus (6.169-176)*

> **169**In the course of these days one of the Jews named Jonathan, a man of small stature and contemptible in appearance, undistinguished in birth or otherwise, stepped forward opposite the tomb of the high priest John, loudly hurled abuse at the Romans and challenged their best figher to single combat. **170**Of the Romans lined up at that point, the majority regarded him with contempt, some were probably frightened, while others again were struck by the reasonable thought that they should avoid engaging a man who was courting death: **171**those who despaired of their lives had uncontrollable passions and might easily influence the Almighty;[15] and to risk everything in a duel with those whose defeat would be nothing to boast of, while to be beaten would be disgraceful as well as dangerous, was an act not of courage but of recklessness. **172**For a long time no one came forward and the Jew continued to taunt them with

[14] Compare the *aquilifer decimae legionis* at Caesar *BG* 4.25.3, who also intervenes spontaneously to save the situation. Rasmussen (1963) 23: 'Der Soldat tritt für Augenblicke an die Stelle seines Feldherrn; auch er hat für seinen Teil die Situation überblickt, und so ist sein Handeln die Verwirklichung des als notwendig Vorgestellten'. The Julianus episode makes exactly this point and assumes a similar unanimity ('eine Art innerer Abhängigkeit', *ibid.*) betweeen the two men.

[15] Translation and meaning of the clause καὶ τὸ θεῖον εὐδυσώπητον (ἔχειν) are unclear: the problems are stated at Michel-Bauernfeind 6 n. 63.

> cowardice, for he swaggered loudly in his own ability and was contemptuous of the Romans. At last one Pudens, a member of the cavalry squadron, disgusted by his arrogant bluster, **173**and perhaps also thoughtlessly over-confident because of his small stature, rushed forward, joined battle, and was otherwise getting the better of his Jewish opponent when Fortune left him in the lurch: for he fell, whereupon Jonathan ran up and dispatched him. **174**Then standing on the body he brandished his dripping sword and with his left hand waved his shield, shouting vociferously at the army, boasting over the fallen man and scoffing at the Roman spectators. **175**But at last, while he was prancing and performing, Priscus, a centurion, shot an arrow and transfixed him; at this, simultaneous shouts of an opposite nature went up from Jews and Romans. **176**Jonathan, writhing in agony, fell down on the body of his foe—clear proof that in war vengeance instantly overtakes irrational success.
>
> (6.169-176)

In our next example, stylized as a regular monomachy (cf. 169), the emphasis shifts to the Jewish challenger who is fully individualized and becomes the focus of attention (this in contrast to the earlier groups of undifferentiated Jews). Where the *aristeia* in the examples above was used to bring out the specifically Roman virtues, the duel here has the symmetrical function of discrediting the Jews.

The episode reads like a parody of the *aristeiai* of high poetry and historiography. In conspicuous contrast to his grand epic counterparts, Jonathan lacks distinction in both birth (γένους θ' ἕνεκα... ἄσημος) and appearance (τὴν ὄψιν εὐκαταφρόνητος);[16] yet he steps forth like a duelling hero (προελθών)[17] and arrogantly challenges the Roman champion, τὸν ἄριστον αὐτῶν εἰς μονομαχίαν προυκαλεῖτο;[18] initial hesitation (172) adds to the dramatic tension[19] and further encourages the braggart. The dissonance between posture and appearance is consciously exploited to discredit Jonathan as a mean Thersites (this in contrast to Sabinus, whose emaciated appearance was a splendid foil to a truly ἡρωικὴ ψυχή). The literary

---

[16] For the epic genealogy in pre-battle speeches, cf. Hom. *Il.* 6. 150-211, 20.200-243. Reference to the fighter's physical appearance in this context is also topical, e.g. Liv. 7.9.8, 26.1.

[17] For the epic gesture, cf. Hom.*Il.* 3.341 (Paris and Menelaos), ἐς μέσσον... ἐστιχάοντο; 6.120 (= 20.159, 23.814), ἐς μέσον ἀμφοτέρων συνίτην μεμαῶτε μάχεσθαι; 20.178-179, Αἰνεία, τί σὺ τόσσον ὁμίλου πολλὸν ἐπελθὼν / ἕστης; Liv. 1.25.1 (Horatii and Curiatii), *in medium... procedunt*; 7.9.8, *tum... in vacuum pontem Gallus processit*; 7.26.2, *in medium armatus processit*.

[18] The expression appears to be formulaic: compare the Gaul's challenge to Manlius Torquatus at Liv. 7.9.8, *'Quem nunc' inquit 'Roma virum fortissimum habet, procedat agedum ad pugnam...'*

[19] Cf. Liv. 7.10.1, *diu inter primores iuvenum Romanorum silentium fuit, cum et abnuere certamen vererentur et praecipuam sortem periculi petere nollent...* For the dramatic effect of such silences, cf. Walsh (1961) 205-206.

complexion of the scene is further enhanced by the traditional abuse motif both before the duel (ἄλλα τε πολλὰ πρὸς τοὺς Ῥωμαίους ὑπερηφάνως ἐφθέγγετο, 169; πολλὰ κατακερτομοῦντος αὐτοὺς εἰς δειλίαν, 172)[20] and again over his victim's body (καὶ πρὸς τὸν πεσόντα κομπάζων καὶ τοὺς ὁρῶντας Ῥωμαίους ἐπισκώπτων, 174). This is not to dismiss such taunts as an invention of Josephus, but the concentration of traditional strands does suggest an element of conscious literary stylization. The resulting portrait fully justifies the reflexions now attributed to the Romans, while conversely the observation that Jonathan is motivated only by desperation and ὁρμὰς ἀταμιεύτους (171) further discredits his performance.

Jonathan's taunts eventually goad Pudens into action. In the context, the Roman's motives are fully legitimate (βδελυξάμενος αὐτοῦ τά τε ῥήματα καὶ τὸ αὔθαδες, 172), but the preceding reflexions on caution and recklessness (170-171) give ἀσκέπτως a slightly ominous tinge. Just as Pudens is gaining on Jonathan (καὶ τὰ μὲν ἄλλα περιῆν συμβαλών, 173) the *peripeteia* occurs, marked again by the τύχη motif (προεδόθη δ' ὑπὸ τύχης, 173 ≈ 5.63; 6.84); Pudens falls and is dispatched. His ill luck becomes Jonathan's short-lived moment of triumph, duly accompanied by fitting (or unfitting) gestures of victory (174). But the braggart is in turn laid low by Priscus, thereby falling victim to the same nemesis that had overtaken his own victim.

The whole episode has a highly stylized and literary character. An introductory temporal formula (κατὰ ταύτας τὰς ἡμέρας, 169 ≈ 5.312) and terminal *sententia* (176) mark off the duel as a discrete entity, while a further temporal reference (ἐπὶ πολύ, 172) prefaces the intervention of Pudens; formal elements noted above recall the literary monomachy; and thematic cohesion is enhanced by the two interlocking rise-and-fall curves. Jonathan himself belongs to the literary tradition of the braggart laid low, a type well known from epic poetry.[21] Again the specific duel dramatizes and individualizes the familiar pattern of binary characterization,[22] the historian's perspective is conveyed through the traditional literary frame.

---

[20] For pre-battle abuse in word and gesture, cf. 1 *Sam.* 17.42-44 (Goliath taunts David); Hom. *Il.* 5.633-646; 20.178-198, 423-437; [Caes.] *Bell. Afr.* 16.1; Liv. 7.10.5-8, 23.47.6-7; Verg. *Aen.* 2.547-550, 9.737-742; Stat. *Theb.* 9.137; and further Glück (1964); Letoublon (1983).

[21] E.g. Verg. *Aen.* 9.441-443, 590-637 (Numanus Remulus); 10.322-323, 545-549, 581-601.

[22] In all the *aristeiai* discussed above the Jews come off badly on the θρασύς/πρόνοια antithesis. It is worth noting that they fare much better in an analogous episode from the siege of Jotapata, i.e. before Josephus had gone over to the Romans and while he was still writing from *Jewish* perspective. Thus a Jewish *aristeia* in that siege receives a highly favourable press (3.229-233). On Jotapata as an intellectual caesura in Josephus' historiography, see Cohen (1982).

5. *Longus (6.186-190)*

The feat of Longus is reported in the context of a successful Jewish ruse (6.177-192). The Temple defenders by a feigned retreat lure a group of Romans onto an adjoining colonnade, which turns out to be a deadly booby-trap: when the structure is suddenly torched from below, the legionaries are caught in a blazing inferno (177-185). From the particular incident Josephus draws out the typical aspects. The characteristic affective terminology which describes the initial Roman response implies censure of their impulsiveness, and sounds an ominous note: 'Thereupon many thoughtless soldiers, carried away by reckless eagerness [τῶν μὲν ἀσκέπτων πολλοὶ ταῖς ὁρμαῖς φερόμενοι], started in pursuit of those retreating, and erecting ladders ran up to the colonnade. The more sensible men however [οἱ δὲ συνετώτεροι], suspicious of the unexplained Jewish withdrawal, made no move' (179). As usual, such ὁρμή leads to disaster—but the dying Romans put on a good show.

> **186**The last to fall was a young man named Longus, who added glory to the whole tragedy and who, though every single one of the men who died deserved to be mentioned, outshone them all. **187**The Jews, full of admiration for his prowess and in any case unable to get at him, invited him to come down to them on pledge of safety; his brother Cornelius, on the other hand, implored him not to disgrace his own reputation or the Roman army. Influenced by his words, Longus held up his sword in full view of the opposing lines, and killed himself. **188**Among those trapped by the flames one Artorius saved his life by a trick. Calling to a fellow-soldier Lucius, with whom he shared a tent, he said loudly, 'I leave you everything I have if you come close and catch me'. **189**Lucius promptly ran up; then Artorius plunged down on top of him and was saved, but his weight dashed his rescuer on the pavement and killed him instantly. **190**For a time this disaster filled the Romans with despondency; but in the long run it proved beneficial by making them less receptive to such invitations and more cautious against Jewish ruses, by which they suffered mainly through ignorance of the ground and the character of their opponents.
>
> (6.186-190)

The familiar superlative (186) introduces the brief but poignant death scene: faced with a Regulus-type choice between expediency with disgrace and an honourable death, Longus yields to his brother's exhortation and refuses to compromise his κλέος (cf. 187, μὴ καταισχῦναι τὸ σφέτερον κλέος καὶ τὴν Ῥωμαίων στρατίαν). The action is judged on its motives, which in turn bring out the underlying priorities: Longus' willingness to uphold his κλέος places him on a level with Sabinus and Julianus, and makes his suicide a variation on the 'patriotic death' motif. By way of contrast we

recall the earlier sneer that the Jews were quite ready to kill themselves out of fanatical devotion to Simon (ὡς καὶ πρὸς αὐτοχειρίαν ἑτοιμότατος εἶναι, 5.309).

The idealistic component in Longus' choice is further enhanced through an effective juxtaposition (188-189): here the artful Artorius, less mindful of κλέος, does not disdain to employ a ruse to save his own skin (πανουργίᾳ with a nuance of censure), thereby exactly reversing the priorities of Longus. Self-serving opportunism is a foil to selfless idealism. Artorius' ambivalent promise to his comrade in arms is in a sense as sinister as the Jews' offer to Longus (καταβῆναι πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἐπὶ δεξιᾷ παρεκάλουν, 187), i.e. Artorius succeeds in duping Lucius where Longus had thwarted potential deceit.[23]

The brief death scene is steeped in Roman categories, while the very allusiveness of Josephus' treatment takes for granted his thorough acquaintance with their ideas and ideals. Most obviously, Longus' hierarchy of priorities reflects the orthodox Roman concept of *virtus*, which Titus himself had addressed in his earlier speech (esp. 6.46-49). Next, Artorius' πανουργία in duping his comrade Lucius consists specifically in the conscious discrepancy between the letter and the spirit of his promise: in traditional terminology, this is a variation on the *fraudulenta calliditas* censured by Roman morality in analogous situations (e.g. Cic. *Off.* 1.40, 3.113; Gell. 6.18). But the single most interesting aspect is the way in which the suicide itself is reported. Earlier in the work Josephus, speaking as a Jew to his co-religionists after the fall of Jotapata, had constructed an elaborate religious and philosophical argument against suicide (3.361-382), condemned as 'repugnant alike to that nature which all creatures share, and an act of impiety towards God who created us' (3.369).[24] The suicide of Longus, contrarily, not only has no opprobrium attached to it, but is reported as a *letum nobile* in the best Roman tradition.[25] The two examples show how easily Josephus moves between the two cultures, adjusting discourse and perspective as the narrative requires.

---

[23] There is some justification for assigning this sinister nuance to ἐπὶ δεξιᾷ at 6.187. Josephus' more expansive treatment of an earlier ruse by Castor the Jew (5.317-330) operates with similar notions and predisposes the reader towards a cynical view which lingers beyond that episiode: pledge and supplication by the Jews on that occasion are simply a screen for ἀπάτη. (The recurrent emphasis on artifice and deception in the Castor episode is telling).

[24] In the thematic design of *BJ*, Josephus' speech against suicide is the ideological counterpoise to Eleazar's death-speech at Masada: cf. Ladouceur (1987) 97-99.

[25] See (e.g.) Cic. *Att.* 12.4; *Fam.* 9.18; Hor. *C.* 1.12.35-36; Sen. *Prov.* 2.9-12; *Const.* 2.1; *Ep.* 24.6-9, 67.13, 82.12-13, 104.27; with Schunck (1955) 56-66.

Structurally our passage 186-190 marks the dramatic apex of a larger section relating the Jewish ploy (177-192). Authorial judgement is implicit throughout this block. First the affective categories carry a hint of censure of the impulsive Roman reaction (179), then the tenor changes with Longus' exemplary death, and finally the introductory perspective reappears to round off the larger section: 'For a time this disaster filled the Romans with despondency; but in the long run it proved beneficial by making them less receptive to such invitations and more cautious against Jewish ruses...' (190). In this way the whole block is marked off as a self-contained unit. And finally when, in the second part of the frame, Josephus notes that the Longus incident did have one positive consequence, this has the effect of stressing the exemplary character of the preceding death scene—a cautionary *exemplum* to be sure, but an *exemplum* none the less.

6. *Simon (2.469-476)*

In the cases discussed so far Josephus employs the traditional framework of the literary *aristeia* to bring out what he regards as prominent traits in both Romans and Jews, with the individual characterizations giving depth to his collective contrasts. This typical function of the single combat scenes applies regardless of the specific circumstances and content of the *aristeia* itself, which may vary considerably. Our final example, the earliest in the work, comes from the second book: a bloody wave of anti-Semitism sweeps through Caesarea, Syria and elsewhere, provoking an equally vigorous Jewish response (2.457-465). At Scythopolis the resident Jews side with the local population against their co-religionists, and even give pledges of allegiance to their new allies; but the Scythopolitans remain suspicious of the Jewish defectors, treacherously lure them into a grove and there slaughter them all (2.466-468). Simon alone dies at his own hand in an episode that might be termed an 'inverse *aristeia*':

> **469** An account must be given of the fate of Simon, son of a not undistinguished father, Saul. His bodily strength and personal courage were exceptional, but he abused both to the detriment of his countrymen. **470** Every day he went out and killed many of the Jews who were attacking Scythopolis; often he routed their whole force, deciding the outcome of the engagement single-handed. **471** But he met with a punishment fitting the slaughter of his own flesh and blood. When the Scythopolitans had surrounded the grove and were shooting down the men inside, he drew his sword and then, instead of rushing against the enemy, for he saw that their numbers were overwhelming, he exclaimed with great emotion: **472** 'This is the just punishment, men of Scythopolis, for what I have done on your side—I and the others who by such slaughter of our own kinsmen have

> sealed our loyalty to you. Well then, let us who have with good reason experienced the treachery of foreigners, and who have committed the ultimate impiety towards our own people [οἷς... ἠσέβηται δὲ εἰς ἔσχατα τὸ οἰκεῖον], let us die in disgrace at our own hands; for we are not fit to die by those of the enemy. **473**The same act shall be both fitting retribution for my foul deeds and proof of my courage, so none of my foes shall be able to boast of my death or gloat over my body'. **474**With these words he glanced round with mingled pity and rage at his own family; he had a wife, children and aged parents. **475**Then first seizing his father by his grey hair he ran him through with the sword; next he killed his unresisting mother and then his wife and children, each one of them almost rushing on the sword, so eager were they to forestall the enemy. **476**After slaying every member of his family, he stood over the corpses in full view, and raising his right hand aloft for all to see, he plunged the full length of his sword into his own throat. The young man deserved pity for his prowess and courage, but his trust in foreigners made his tragic end inevitable.
>
> (2.469-476)

Granted that this is not a contest of Jews against Romans, as in all the preceding examples, both form and function of the episode are sufficiently close to the *aristeiai* discussed above to justify treating it under the same rubric. Like other protagonists who distinguish themselves in single combat, Simon is introduced in quasi-superlative terms (469) further reinforced by the hyperbolical μόνος motif (470 ≈ 6.82). Josephus' tendency to structure his *aristeiai* as self-contained units is quite familiar by now; here the framing responsions are particularly clear (ῥώμῃ δὲ σώματος καὶ τόλμῃ διαφέρων, 469 ≈ νεανίας δι' ἀλκὴν σώματος καὶ ψυχῆς παράστημα, 476).

Simon's formidable prowess however is misdirected against his fellow Jews, and this is the central aspect brought out in the poignant episode. Where other *aristeiai* had been structured around a fateful *peripeteia*, this one turns on an equally poignant *anagnorisis*: Simon's recognition, in an emotional direct speech,[26] that his φόνος συγγενῶν is a sin which calls for retribution. This insight coincides with a core element of Josephan *Geschichtsphilosophie*, and we can confidently assert that the individual incident is dramatized to make precisely this point: the specific instance brings into focus the controlling and overarching principles. When, at this early point in the work, Simon acknowledges ὁμόφυλος φόνος as a sin and a crime (ἠσέβηται δὲ εἰς ἔσχατα τὸ οἰκεῖον), and accordingly inflicts punishment on himself, he not only identifies and enacts the metaphysical pattern, but also prefigures *in nuce* the more spectacular catastrophe at Masada in the work's final book. In terms of Josephus' theology of history,

---

[26] For the stylistic register, compare 6.56-57 in the Sabinus *aristeia.*

the assumptions are the same in both cases. The responsion is plainly intentional, and contributes effectively to the work's structural and intellectual cohesion. Thus where the other *aristeiai* had served to dramatize and individualize national τρόποι and psychological factors—i.e. the *human* and *political* plane of historical causation—the episode with Simon has the correlative function of alerting the reader to the work's *metaphysical* dimension, the recurrent sequence of sin and retribution around which the narrative is shaped. Through the particular episodes we glimpse the general principles and the work's deep thought structure.

7. *Form and function*

A balanced assessment of the Josephan *aristeiai* requires us to consider both their distinctive literary character and their function in the historical narrative. A number of compositional features occur so regularly in these episodes that one is tempted to describe them as 'typical scenes'. We noted first Josephus' tendency to shape the individual accounts as coherent and self-contained structural segments, thematically related of course to the military narrative, yet also intended to stand out from it: to this end he uses framing responsions, formulaic introduction of the protagonist, or the terminal *sententia*. Stylistically too the various episodes show a high degree of uniformity. The hero's performance is typically exalted by the recurrent emulation, approbation and μόνος motifs, while spectator reaction, the carefully structured *peripeteia* and authorial interjection at climactic moments all heighten the dramatic pitch. Κατάπληξις, δεινότης, θαυμαστόν, πάθος and ὄψις never allow the tension to slacken;[27] this is the stuff of 'tragic' historiography—only that Josephus is concerned with more than just the entertainment or aesthetic value of these encounters.

In a compressed and consciously literary form these episodes distil and dramatize some of the work's central motifs: the national τρόποι, the bond between commander and troops, panegyric of the general Titus, the Roman hierarchy of values, even the overarching metaphysical scheme. Josephus accommodates to his own purposes in *BJ* a typical function of the

[27] Thus (e.g.) καὶ τῆς ὄψεως ἐκείνης οὐδὲν οὕτε τῷ Καίσαρι θαυμασιώτερον οὔτε τοῖς ἄλλοις παρέστη φρικωδέστερον (6.83); δεινὸν δὲ πάθος εἰσῄει Καίσαρα ἀνδρὸς οὕτως ἐναρέτου καὶ ἐν ὄψει τοσούτων φονευομένου (6.89); καὶ τοὺς ὁρῶντας Ῥωμαίους ἐπισκώπτων (6.174); πρὸς ὃ τῶν τε Ἰουδαίων καὶ τῶν Ῥωμαίων κραυγὴ συνεξήρθη διάφορος (6.175); διαράμενος φανερὸν ἑκατέροις τοῖς τάγμασι τὸ ξίφος αὐτὸν ἀναιρεῖ (6.187). The intended literary effect of these episodes *on the reader* can be approximately gauged by observing the corresponding reactions *of the spectators* at the *aristeiai* (6.83, 175). On the main features of 'tragic' historiography, see Borzsák (1973), with further literature there cited.

aristeia as we know it from Caesar, Livy and others. As luminous defining moments in the narrative, crystallization points at which the larger issues are articulated and showcased, the Josephan *aristeiai* correspond exactly to what GÄRTNER has identified as the characteristic *Einzelszenen* of classical historiography:

> In den *Einzelszenen* wird im Unterschied zum umgebenden Textzusammenhang in größerer Breite ein Teil des großen Geschehens gewissermaßen als Ausschnittsvergrößerung gebracht; es werden die nach der Ansicht des Geschichtsschreibers im großen Geschehenszusammenhang wirkenden Kräfte veranschaulicht, und es wird repräsentativ das menschliche Verhalten im Einzelfall gezeigt.[28]

At these moments, in other words, the specific event widens into a symbolical representation. In addition Josephus appears to have recognized the strategic value of pouring new wine into old bottles—conveying the particular idea through the typical form, casting his own ideologically tinged interpretation in the recognizable generic frames. To that extent the medium facilitates acceptance of the message.

The *aristeiai* of Longinus, Sabinus and Julianus in particular form a distinct subgroup typologically comparable to a class of well-known episodes in Caesar's *commentarii*—the *aquilifer decimae legionis* and Labienus in *BG*, in *BC* the centurion Scaeva, the *aquilifer gravi vulnere adfectus* and Crastinus—for there too the dramatic moments are conceived as *exempla* to emblemize the *concordia* and reciprocal *fides* between commander and troops,[29] in either case with an eye to the public image thus projected. And once the Caesarian analogies have sensitized us to the propagandistic aspects, Longinus and the others also take their place in the larger thematic structure of *BJ*. Titus' congratulatory speech to his army after the destruction of Jerusalem supplies the ideological frame which gives meaning to the preceding *aristeiai*:

> **5**Titus desired to congratulate the whole army on its achievements and to bestow suitable rewards on those who had especially distinguished themselves [τοῖς ἀριστεύσασιν]... **6**...He expressed deep gratitude to them for their unfailing loyalty to him, **7**and praised their obedience throughout the war, shown along with personal heroism in many dangerous situations... **8**It was a glorious feat to have brought to an end a

---

[28] GÄRTNER (1975) 2.

[29] Cf. Caes. *BG* 4.25, 6.8; *BC* 3.53, 64, 91 and 99, with VOGT (1940) 91-92, 105-106; RAMBAUD (1953) 244-245, 272-283; RASMUSSEN (1963) *passim*. Similarities between Caesar and Josephus in this respect are noted in passing by WEBER (1921) 228-229: 'Die *commentarii* Cäsars sind das Vorbild auch in der Darstellung dieses Verhältnisses zwischen Titus und seinem Heer' (229).

> war that had raged so long: they could not have wished for anything better when they embarked on it. **9**But it was a still more glorious and brilliant achievement that they had elected and sent home as rulers and governors of the Roman empire men whom all were delighted to welcome, and whose decisions they loyally obeyed, full of gratitude to those who had chosen them. **10**Therefore, he continued, he was full of admiration and affection for them all, knowing that every man's ability had been fully matched by his enthusiasm; **11**but on those who had more illustriously distinguished themselves in the fight by superior energy [τοῖς μέντοι διαπρεπέστερον ἀγωνισαμένοις ὑπὸ ῥώμης πλείονος], not only shedding glory on their own lives by their gallant deeds, but making his campaign more brilliant by their exploits, he would at once bestow their rewards and distinctions, and no one who had chosen to exert himself above his fellows [καὶ μηδένα τῶν πλέον πονεῖν ἑτέρου θελησάντων] would get less than his due. **12**He would, indeed, give the matter his closest attention, since he was more concerned to reward the courageous deeds of his fellow-soldiers than to punish slackers. **13**Accordingly he at once ordered officers detailed for the task to read out the names of all who had performed any outstanding exploit during the war [ὅσοι τι λαμπρὸν ἦσαν ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ κατωρθωκότες]. **14**Calling them up by name he praised them as they came forward, no less delighted at their exploits than if they were his own.
>
> (7.5-14)

The warm praise of the champions here, generalizing and subsuming the earlier specifics, judges the outstanding achievements in relation to the collective effort and on the criteria of loyalty (εὔνοια), obedience (πειθαρχία), courage in danger (ἐν κινδύνοις ἀνδρεία) and valour (ἀρετή): these are the categories that were applied in the *aristeiai*, which confirms our interpretation of the latter as personifications of the defining Roman virtues. And Titus' delight in the heroes' successes as though they were his own (ἐπῄνει τε παριόντας ὡς ἂν ὑπερευφραινόμενός τις ἐπ' οἰκείους κατορθώμασι, 7.14) nicely captures the mutual understanding between *imperator* and *miles*,[30] another familiar motif. Most telling however is the unmistakable correlation between military success and political legitimacy (καλὸν μὲν οὖν—τούτου δὲ κάλλιον αὐτοῖς καὶ λαμπρότερον..., 7.8-9)[31]—and from this perspective the sustained panegyric on the army and its heroes is directly related to the public image the Flavians were keen to project, i.e. καλόν and λαμπρόν converge with political expediency.

---

[30] Note how the soldiers' πειθαρχία and εὔνοια towards their general are answered by Titus' remark θαυμάζειν μὲν οὖν ἔφη πάντας καὶ ἀγαπᾶν (10), and in his use of the appellative συστρατευόμενοι (12; cf. συστρατιῶται, 6.34; and for the nuance, Suet. *Div. Caes*. 67: *nec milites eos pro contione, sed blandiore nomine commilitones appellabat*).

[31] The model which evolved during the power struggles of the late Republic had become practically institutionalized under the Principate: cf. Levi (1938) 4-5; Colombo (1983) 252-253.

Related testimonia fill in the picture. The popularity of the Flavian soldier-emperors with the military is noted also in other sources,[32] while conversely *consensus exercituum* and *fides exercituum*, the necessary conditions for their success, are given due publicity from the early 70s on Vespasian's coinage.[33] The support of the military, like the *Judaea capta* legend on Flavian issues of the same time, is understandably an idea that would appeal to the *novi homines* seeking *maiestas*, *auctoritas* and legitimacy. And this in turn reinforces the public image, as Tacitus explicitly notes: *atque ipse* [= Titus], ***ut super fortunam crederetur***, *decorum se promptumque in armis ostendebat, comitate et adloquiis officia provocans ac plerumque in opere, in agmine gregario militi mixtus, incorrupto ducis honore* (*Hist.* 5.1.1). The death-defying heroics of Titus on the battlefield are one aspect of this image, balanced in the *aristeiai* by the equally notable *concordia* motif: in the ideal general the two conjoin. Finally, Cicero in his panegyric on Pompey had stated a basic principle which applies also to the Flavian soldier-emperors: *vehementer autem pertinere ad bella administranda, quid hostes, quid socii de imperatoribus nostris existiment, quis ignorat, cum sciamus homines in tantis rebus, ut aut contemnant aut metuant, aut oderint aut ament, opinione non minus et fama quam aliqua ratione certa commoveri?* (*Leg. Man.* 43). Titus certainly recognized the value of such *fama* and *opinio*—and Josephus served his patron well in promoting the official image. *Ut super fortunam crederetur...*

But notwithstanding their evident literary texture, the *aristeiai* are not fictions created by Josephus. For specialized technical information in the second half of his work (specifically from Titus' departure from Alexandria against Jerusalem) he must have drawn extensively on the general's notes and records: thus for example the detailed itinerary via Caesarea to Jerusalem (4.659-663, 5.40-70), and the meticulous attention to chronology throughout the siege narrative.[34] When at the victory celebrations the war heroes were individually decorated, their names were read out (7.13-15)—clearly from the official records which were kept throughout the campaign.[35] From the original entries in the *commentarii* however to the finished product in Josephus a considerable amount of reworking and refinement must have taken place, as I have tried to show in the analysis above. The

---

[32] For Titus' popularity with the troops, see Tac. *Hist.* 5.1.1; Suet. *Tit.* 5.2; and on Vespasian, Tac. *Hist.* 2.5.1.

[33] See Mattingly (1930) 67, 69, 74, 78, 85, 114, 184, 197; with Simon (1952) 56-57, 59-60, 116-117.

[34] The full argument in Weber (1921) 185ff.; cf. Broshi (1982).

[35] Cf. Weber (1921) 227-228.

historian's art lies in transforming the source material into engaging *Einzelszenen*, in the tradition of the literary *aristeia*, to convey the work's pro-Flavian tendency. Like Caesar before him, Josephus in these passages consciously applies the dramatic style 'pour mieux insinuer sa thèse'.[36]

2. Κινεῖν τὰ ἀκίνητα: *Dramatizing* ἀσέβεια

The whole of *BJ* is framed by two conspicuous references to ἀσέβεια. After the preface, the historical narrative commences with the intervention of Antiochus Epiphanes in Jewish affairs and his desecration of the Jerusalem Temple (1.32). He is the first θεομάχος in the work guilty of this form of sacrilege, and at *AJ* 12.358f. his death is explained as divine retribution for the impious act. This overture is answered by the final incident in the work, set in Cyrene against the background of agitation by the Sicarii (7.437-453). An informant falsely incriminates the Jews in the political unrest, thereby supplying Catullus, governor of Pentapolis, with a welcome pretext for a pogrom. Catullus extends his campaign to Rome, hoping there also to implicate Josephus, but is blocked by Vespasian; and although he receives only an imperial reprimand, he dies shortly afterwards, afflicted in body and mind by a hideous disease. The persecutor's fate, on the interpretation of Josephus, demonstrates 'how God in his providence inflicts punishment on the wicked' (7.453). Nor is this just a trite moralizing tale. 'Dies der Schluß, und das Grundmotiv des Werkes: Wer gegen Gott frevelt, indem er sich an seinen Heiligen vergreift, fällt seinem Gericht anheim... So ist das Endthema auch das Anfangsthema des Werkes; vom Anfang zum Ende schlingt sich ein Band: der Gotthasser wird verderben'.[37] The framing episodes support a wide thematic arc that spans the whole *BJ*. The ἀσέβεια and θεομάχος motifs appear in many variants throughout the work, applied to both Jews and non-Jews; with reference to the insurgents in particular, they add to the structural cohesion of the Jerusalem narrative, function as highly effective instruments of polemic, and consistently bring out the historian's metaphysical assumptions.

Of the Zealots' atrocities, it is their desecration of the Temple and surrounding area by indiscriminate slaughter which elicits Josephus' most vehement condemnations (4.150, 159, 183; 5.18-19, 402; 6.122-128), and this pollution finally brings down divine punishment in the form of Roman

---

[36] Rambaud (1953) 230.
[37] Weber (1921) 64-65.

intervention (2.455; 5.566; 6.250). This punishment in Josephus' scheme is simultaneously an act of purification. The Temple is throughout a fixed point of reference in *BJ*'s anti-Zealot polemic. Defiling it with kindred blood is the emblematic enormity, but not the only one: subsidiary strands are woven into the narrative in a manner that reinforces the overall thematic, polemical and philosophical structure.

Pollution, *hybris* and impiety in *BJ* are indexed typically as the wilful confounding of sacred and profane—τά τε ἱρὰ καὶ τὰ ἴδια ἐν ὁμοίῳ [ποιεῖν], as Themistocles had said of the godless Xerxes (Hdt. 8.109.3). The principle operates most visibly with reference to sacred space and boundaries (cf. *Exodus* 3.2-5), with physical transgression becoming an expression of moral trespass (πατούμενα τὰ ἅγια). Thus while Ananus and the Romans scrupulously observe the discrete domains (4.182-183, 204-205; 5.402; 6.122-128), the Zealots' contempt brazenly flaunts their impiety (4.261-262). A number of other details which are easily glossed over in isolation also acquire added point when seen from this perspective.

The Zealots, blockaded by Ananus in the inner Temple court (4.203-207), break out during a violent thunderstorm and open the city gates to their Idumaean allies. They effect their escape, first, by cutting through the gates with the Temple saws:

> **295**The more sensible [among the blockaded Zealots] opposed the use of force, seeing not only that the guards [i.e. Ananus' men] encircling them were at full strength, but that because of the Idumaeans the city wall was carefully guarded. They watched on account of the Idumaeans. **296**They also imagined that Ananus was everywhere, visiting the sentries at all hours. **297**On other nights this was indeed the case, but on this one it was omitted, not through any neglect on Ananus' part, but because Fate had decreed [στρατηγούσης τῆς εἱμαρμένης] that he and all his guards should perish. **298**It was she who as the night advanced and the storm reached its climax [τῆς νυκτὸς προκοπτούσης καὶ τοῦ χειμῶνος ἐπακμάζοντος] put to sleep the sentries posted at the colonnade, and gave the Zealots the idea of taking some of the Temple saws [τῶν ἱερῶν αἴροντας πριόνων] and cutting through the bars of the gates. **299**They were aided by the roaring wind and the continuous crash of thunder, which prevented the noise from being heard.
>
> (4.295-299)

Then, lest we miss the point, these same Temple saws re-appear when the Zealots open the city gates: 'They stole out of the Temple and made for the wall, and using the same saws [καὶ τοῖς αὐτοῖς πρίοσι χρώμενοι] they opened the gate nearest the Idumaeans' (4.300). The context gives this detail its poignancy. Coinciding with the apex of the storm, the Zealots' escape from the Temple has an intrinsically dramatic complexion, fully

justified by subsequent events: as a direct consequence the Idumaeans enter Jerusalem, which in turn leads to the decisive defeat of Ananus and his 'moderates' by the radical elements. More telling still is the explicit remark that the action is part of a preordained plan (στρατηγούσης τῆς εἱμαρμένης), here aided and abetted by the raging storm.[38] The εἱμαρμένη motif at this point integrates the Zealots' escape into a concatenation of pivotal events in which Josephus sees the hand of God working the punishment of Jerusalem.[39] Typologically too the specific action by the Zealots here fits into the pattern of ἀσέβεια. The twofold emphasis on the saws is not without irony, for here the ritual instruments[40] are (mis)used to initiate a process which will lead to violent atrocities and vocal accusations of impiety (317-318, 325, 382): in this way Josephus subtly calls attention to the collapse of distinctions between sacred and profane, to the subversion of religious scruple *from within*. The polemical tinge is unmistakable.

Josephus again suggests a blurring of boundaries between sacred and profane when Simon subsequently falls out with John and the Zealots, and the latter are confined in the Temple. Here John further increases the tactical advantage of an already elevated position by constructing four towers from which to bombard his rivals. The position of the first three structures is quickly passed over, while the last receives more detailed comment:

> **581**...one at the north-east corner, the second above the Xystus and the third at another corner opposite the lower city. **582**The last was set up over the roof of the priests' chambers, where it was the custom for one of the priests to stand and proclaim by trumpet-blast the approach of the seventh day in the late afternoon and its close the next evening, calling on the people in the first case to cease work and in the second to resume it.
>
> (4.581-582)

The perceptible emphasis on the *ritual* significance of the last site gives the fourth item an added weight and pathos: a war tower over the sacred chambers powerfully symbolizes the invasion of religious space,[41] the

---

[38] The phrase συνήργησε δ' αὐτοῖς πρὸς τὸ μὴ κατακουσθῆναι τὸν ψόφον ὅ τε τῶν ἀνέμων ἦχος καὶ τὸ τῶν βροντῶν ἐπάλληλον (4.299), as THACKERAY points out *ad loc.*, recalls Thuc. 3.22, ψόφῳ δὲ... ἀντιπαταγοῦντος τοῦ ἀνέμου οὐ κατακουσάντων: it is interesting to note how Josephus incorporates a Thucydidean echo into his religious interpretation of the event, making the natural phenomenon an instrument of divine εἱμαρμένη.

[39] 2.539; 4.104, 297-298, 323; 5.343, 559, 572; 6.250, 267-270.

[40] Cf. MICHEL-BAUERNFEIND 4 n. 72.

[41] The location of the tower is however problematical (see MICHEL-BAUERNFEIND 4 n. 196): Josephus seems more concerned with polemical effect than with topographical accuracy.

physical detail brings out the inner attitude of the fighters who erect it. This is a suggestive variation on the polemical πατούμενα τὰ ἅγια motif (4.171).

Josephus, as noted earlier, pays close attention to the morally corrosive effects of the war on men's attitudes. With the intensification of the fighting against the Romans, he notes a corresponding debasement among both the 'tyrants' and their victims:

> **33**No regard for the living was any longer paid by their relatives, and no one troubled to bury the dead. The reason in either case was that everyone despaired of his own life; for those who belonged to no party lost interest in everything—they would soon be dead anyway. **34**The partisans meanwhile were locked in strife, trampling on the bodies heaped upon each other [πατοῦντες δὴ τοὺς νεκροὺς ἐπ' ἀλλήλοις σεσωρευμένους], and drawing in draughts of frenzy from the corpses under their feet they became more savage still [καὶ τὴν ἀπόνοιαν ἀπὸ τῶν ἐν ποσὶ πτωμάτων σπῶντες ἦσαν ἀγριώτεροι]. **35**They were constantly devising some new means of mutual destruction, and relentlessly putting every plan into practice, they left untried no method of outrage or brutality [οὐδεμίαν οὔτ' αἰκίας ὁδὸν οὔτε ὠμότητος παρέλειπον]. **36**Indeed John actually purloined the sacred timber to construct engines of war [ἀμέλει Ἰωάννης ἱερὰν ὕλην εἰς πολεμιστηρίων κατασκευὴν ὀργάνων ἀπεχρήσατο]. For the high priests and people had once decided to underprop the Sanctuary and to increase its height by twenty cubits, and King Agrippa at very great labour and expense had brought the necessary timber from Lebanon, beams remarkable for their straightness and size. **37**But war had interrupted the work and John, finding them long enough to reach his enemies on the Temple above, cut them up and built towers with them, **38**which he then pushed forward and placed behind the court... **39**With the engines so impiously constructed he hoped to defeat his enemies, but God thwarted his efforts by bringing the Romans upon him before he had posted a single man on the towers.
>
> (5.33-39)

The significance of the last action is brought out not least by its *position* in the text: where the ordinary people, through debilitating despondency, become indifferent towards burying their dead, the rival factions become progressively more brutalized, energetic and perversely inventive[42]—and at this point Josephus adds the account of John's military machines. Thus even before the attempt is explicitly condemned as impious (ἀμέλει Ἰωάννης.., 36; ἐξ ἀσεβείας, 39), it is tarnished by the preceding πατοῦντες τοὺς νεκρούς motif (34)—which predisposes the reader to see all that follows from the same perspective. And when Josephus finally says that

[42] The motif of criminal innovation again at 7.259f.

John's attempt was thwarted by God acting through the Romans (39),[43] we recognize this as a particular case to illustrate the general principles. The metaphysical mechanism here posited replicates *in nuce* the overarching pattern of sin and retribution, and echoes in particular an earlier piece of anti-Zealot diatribe by Ananus: 'Perhaps the Deity they have offended will turn their missiles back on them, and the ungodly wretches will die by their own weapons' (4.190). Even if the details are not identical, John's failure at 5.39 fully vindicates the general principle articulated by Ananus. And the clear implication here that the Romans intervene as God's agents (5.39)[44] adds a further polemical edge: this will become a recurrent motif in the latter half of *BJ*. In sum, John's transgression at 5.33-39 is a specific case to illustrate the work's controlling *Geschichtsphilosophie*, another *Einzelszene* to dramatize the Zealots' ἀσέβεια which is finally punished by the destruction of Jerusalem.

Here as elsewhere gesture is important, and John's action would doubtless have impressed Jewish and non-Jewish readers alike. Physical violation of sacred spaces or objects is an archetypal expression of impiety: among the classical examples we recall such diverse instances as Cleomenes' violation of the grove at Argos (Hdt. 6.75.3), Ovid's impious Erysichthon (*Met.* 8.739-776) or Caesar's desecration of the Massilian grove (Luc. 3.399-452).[45] John's misuse of the timbers, on a level with these impieties, emblemizes the θεομάχος and plays on the reader's sense of the sacred violated. This emphasis in turn anticipates, and justifies, the theme of divine retribution.

Eating and drinking as dietary transgression are a further index of impiety. The motif first appears in the anti-Zealot tirade of the chief priest Jesus, a context which establishes its characteristic polemical ambit:

> **241**The scum and dregs of the whole country, they have squandered their own property and practised their madness on the surrounding villages and towns, and have finally poured in a stealthy stream into the Holy City, **242**bandits so utterly ungodly that they have desecrated even hallowed ground. They can now be seen shamelessly getting drunk in the Sanctuary and squandering the spoils of their murdered victims to satisfy their insatiable appetite.
>
> (4.241-242)

---

[43] Here God, through the agency of the Romans, *thwarts* the nefarious attempt, while in the analogous incident with the Temple saws (4.298) εἱμαρηένη *connives* to hasten the ultimate downfall of Jerusalem: the accents differ, but the polemical tendency is the same.

[44] Possibly intended as a counterthrust to claims of divine symmachy emanating from John's circles.

[45] For other examples of this kind cf. Thomas (1988).

Specifics to support this indictment come only much later,[46] when Eleazar splits off from John and factional rivalry leads to new excesses:

> **7**As each had a considerable following of Zealots, they seized the inner court of the Temple and took up positions [τίθενται τὰ ὅπλα] above the Holy Gates on the sacred pediment. **8**Provisions were ample, and they had no fears on that score: there was an unlimited supply of sacred commodities for those who considered nothing impious [καὶ γὰρ ἀφθονία τῶν ἱερῶν ἐγίνετο πραγμάτων τοῖς γε μηδὲν ἀσεβὲς ἡγουμένοις]. But they were alarmed by the smallness of their numbers...
>
> (5.7-8)

Men who unscrupulously set their weapons over the Holy Gates (the gesture recalls 4.581-582) will not abstain from the sacred offerings within; bracketed with the ὅπλα motif, this form of eating is marked as a correlative sacrilege, an expression of τὸν θεὸν ἀσεβεῖν. The charge is heard again with reference to Eleazar (5.21) and John (5.563-566; 7.264). The passage relating to John in book 5, fuller than the other passing references, deserves separate comment:

> **562**When there was nothing more for John to plunder from the people, he turned to sacrilege [πρὸς ἱεροσολίαν ἐτρέπετο] and melted down many of the offerings in the Sanctuary and many of the vessels required for public worship, basins, dishes and tables; nor did he keep his hands off the flagons [ἀπέσχετο δ' οὐδὲ...] presented by Augustus and his consort. **563**For the Roman emperors honoured and adorned the Temple at all times. But now this Jew stole even the gifts of foreigners, **564**telling his companions that they need not hesitate to use God's property on God's behalf, and that those who fought for the Sanctuary were entitled to be supported by it [ὡς δεῖ μετ' ἀδείας καταχρήσασθαι τοῖς θείοις ὑπὲρ τοῦ θείου καὶ τοὺς τῷ ναῷ στρατευομένους ἐξ αὐτοῦ τρέφεσθαι]. **565**Accordingly he drew out the sacred wine and oil, which the priests kept in the inner court of the Temple to pour on the burnt offerings, and shared them out to his crowd, who without scruple [δίχα φρίκης] anointed themselves with more than a pailful and drank from it. **566**Nor can I refrain here from saying what my feelings dictate [οὐκ ἂν ὑποστειλαίμην εἰπεῖν ἅ μοι κελεύει τὸ πάθος]. I believe that if the Romans had delayed their attack on these sacrilegious ruffians, either the earth would have opened and swallowed up the City, or a flood would have overwhelmed it, or lightning would have destroyed it like Sodom. For it produced a generation far more godless than those who perished thus, a generation whose frenzy involved the nation in ruin.
>
> (5.562-566)

---

[46] The sequence is interesting. Since there is no reference, prior to the speech of Jesus quoted above, to such drinking in the sanctuary, the motif is strictly not justified by its immediate context. It would appear that the omniscient narrator (through his mouthpiece) has retrojected into Jesus' speech an element from the later narrative—clearly for its polemical effect.

The argument here is shaped around two competing models and interpretations. John's claim that 'they need not hesitate to use God's property on God's behalf, and that those who fought for the Sanctuary were entitled to be supported by it' (564) reflects his self-conception as fighter for God, and invokes the principle that the defenders of the Temple are entitled to support from it.[47] Josephus on the other hand reports the letter of the claim but exactly inverts its original intent, making it a paradigmatic impiety on a level with Korah, the deluge and Sodom. Context and disposition consciously reinforce his hostile re-interpretation. Thus the introductory keywords 'plunder' and 'sacrilege' (ἁρπαγαί, ἱεροσυλία) predispose the reader to view all subsequent specifics as illustrations of this impiety, while a climactic *gradatio* further locks together the various items and enhances a sense of revulsion. Rhetorical effects however lead to a certain levelling of detail, and the Temple offerings (ἀναθήματα) are conveniently treated as identical with the ritual items themselves, their melting down as the first example of John's alleged sacrilege; whether this qualifies as ἱεροσυλία *stricto sensu*, however, is at least open to discussion.[48] Similarly with the gifts of Augustus: the suggestive ἀπέσχετο δ' οὐδὲ... (562) implies a progression in sacrilege, but it is again questionable whether the action itself could technically be classified as such. Mention of Augustus leads on seamlessly to more general reflexions, with the polemical contraposition (οἱ μέν γε Ῥωμαίων βασιλεῖς... τότε δ' ὁ Ἰουδαῖος..., 563) arising naturally out of the preceding specifics. And at this point Josephus attaches John's justification for using the sacred wine and oil (πρὸς δὲ τοὺς συνόντας ἔλεγεν..., 564): clamped onto the preceding recital, the explanation itself becomes a continuation of sacrilege motif. This is the same mechanism of polemical assimilation noted earlier at 4.127: through suggestive literary disposition, Josephus slurs the religious motives of his opponents by bracketing them with other disreputable (secular) actions, so that the resulting thematic continuity (πρὸς ἱεροσυλίαν ἐτρέπετο—ἀπέσχετο δ' οὐδὲ τῶν... ἀκρατοφόρων—δίχα φρίκης—οὐκ ἂν ὑποστειλαίμην εἰπεῖν ἅ μοι κελεύει τὸ πάθος) effectively tarnishes also the religious motives of the Temple defenders.

The passionate authorial interjection at the rhetorical apex of this section (566) integrates it into the wider polemical context: if the ἀλιτήριοι

---

[47] For the religious assumptions, cf. *Num.* 18.8-19, *Dtn.* 18.1-8, and 1 *Cor.* 9.13, with Michel-Bauernfeind 5 n. 218; Schwier (1989) 159, with his n. 12.

[48] Thus Michel-Bauernfeind 5 n. 216. To the ancient mind the melting down of objects such as statues of the gods is an archetypal impiety (e.g. Luc. 1.380; Sen. *Const.* 4.2, *Phoen.* 344-345; Suet. *Ner.* 32.4; Lucian *Iupp. Conf.* 8), a nuance certainly felt also at *BJ* 5.562.

had not been punished by the Romans, God himself would engulfed them in an archetypal catastrophe.[49] Three significant motifs of *BJ* are here closely interwoven: trespass against the sacred, divine retribution, and the suggestion that the Romans intervene as God's human agents. The thematic configuration, exactly parallel to 5.39 (John and the sacred timbers), brings out clearly the function of the ἀσέβεια panels: they are focal points to articulate and dramatize, within the narrowest compass, the work's controlling metaphysical assumptions. 'Die Geschichte wird von Josephus... als ein Rechtsverfahren zwischen Gott und dem zu seiner kultischen Verehrung verpflichteten Volk verstanden'.[50] This is the kernel of Josephus' philosophy, vividly illustrated in the *Einzelszenen* discussed above (notably 5.33-39 and 5.562-566).

Agrippa in a programmatic speech at the start of the work had pointed to the fundamental paradox that war against Rome would cause the Jews to violate the very principles whose preservation they claimed to be defending (2.391-394). That prediction, vindicated on several other counts as well, holds also in the present case, and we need to consider the ἀσέβεια episodes also from the perspective of Agrippa's prognosis: what the wise warner had abstracted as παραβαίνοντες δ' ἐν πολέμῳ τὸν πάτριον νόμον (2.393) is subsequently enacted, to the last detail, in the various forms of desecration catalogued during the Jerusalem *stasis*. The precise responsion between λόγος and ἔργον constitutes a clearly structured polemical system: with the Temple and associated ritual as fixed points of reference, 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 the traditional religion, but its subverters and polluters. This characteristic emphasis of course presupposes the centrality in the insurgents' own ideology of Temple and Temple cult,[51] and only makes sense as a concerted counterthrust to the sort of propaganda claims they must have been making.

If we read the Zealot impieties against the background of Agrippa's warning, a further aspect of the polemic also comes into clearer focus. Agrippa by *dissociating* the insurgents from the main body of Jews had pursued the apologetic aim of exonerating the peace-loving 'majority' at the expense of the warmongers—for as the one group was particularized and stigmatized, the other was correspondingly absolved. A related duality

---

[49] The interjection underlines the climactic character of the passage, as Weber (1921) 68 has noted: 'Das ist offenbar wieder ein Gipfel'.

[50] Lindner (1972) 143.

[51] On which see esp. Schwier (1989) 55-170.

is inherent also in the ἀσέβεια system, where the process of 'othering' is pushed to its polemical limits. Josephus constructs two polar identities (personified at 4.325 as ἀρετή and κακία) locked in a titanic struggle, and in proportion as the Jewish identity of the Zealots is demolished,[52] the symmetrical logic of the antithesis reaffirms that of their opponents. In this way, prejudice is hardened and codified into a pattern of polemical stereotypes.

Intensified to this pitch of vilification and systematic alienation, the 'othering' slides into what psychologists of war have termed the phenomenon of 'enmification': 'Whatever a society considers bad, wrong, taboo, profane, dirty, desecrated, inhumane, impure, will make up the epithets assigned to the enemy. The enemy will be accused of whatever is forbidden—from sadism to cannibalism. Study the face of the enemy and you will discover the political equivalent of Dante's circles of hell, the geography of evil...'[53] The 'out-group' is stereotyped as a foil to sharpen the identity, integrity and values of the 'in-group':

> The opponent is particularized and he is resymbolized to appear both implacable and menacing. He is menacing in that he is portrayed as representing a clear and dangerous threat to survival. And he is implacable in the he is held incapable of sharing in the fundamental value system of the protagonist... From a religious angle, the enemy becomes nothing less than evil incarnate, a 'fake person,' an imposter, a malefactor pretending to be human. In more general terms, the enemy may be characterized as racially, linguistically, ethnically, or physically different; *but the difference is invariably held to be both fundamental and noxious*.[54]

This reads like a commentary on Josephus' political demonology: by arousing and channelling antipathy against the θεομάχοι he implicitly deflects blame from the Jews as nation. In the latter connexion it is interesting to note that modern enmification too tends to drive a conceptual wedge between governments and their people. The rhetoric of hate typically targets the evil few in power, not the people at large: 'A striking aspect of the mirror image of the enemy is the perception that the leaders are the real villains—which assumes either that the rank and file

---

[52] They sink to the level of foreign desecrators. Respect for the sanctity of the Temple is the touchstone in Josephus' assessment of Jews and Romans. Pompey enters the sanctuary but refrains from touching the sacred objects or otherwise offending Jewish religious sensibilities (1.152-153)—this in contrast to Antiochus, Herodes, Crassus (1.179), Pilate (2.169ff.), Caligula (2.184ff.) and most especially John. Cf. Weber (1921) 66-67, 73-74.

[53] Keen (1986) 28.

[54] Rieber-Kelly (1991) 15 (emphasis mine); cf. Edelman (1988) 66-89; Benz (1996) 9-19.—Josephus represents the Zealots as being so noxious that if the Romans had not intervened, God himself would have destroyed them (5.566).

are well disposed to one's own nation or that if they are not, it is because their leaders have intentionally misled them'.[55] The Jews as the unwilling victims of Zealot tyranny—this is of course the familiar chorus-line in *BJ*.

But granted that Josephus' treatment of Zealot 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 στασιασταί are dramatized is itself calculated to engage Greco-Roman readers on a broad front. For a start, sacrilege in every form is a typical concomitant of *stasis*;[56] *bellorumque civilium insaniam, qua omne sanctum ac sacrum profanetur*, as Seneca puts it (*Ben.* 1.10.2). Thucydides notes the recurrent typology: trust and oaths perverted (3.82.6-7), religion disregarded (3.82.8), sacred space violated (3.70.4, 3.81.3-5). All this signals the dissolution of civilized norms; as one commentator has well remarked, 'Appeals of one kind or another to the sanctuaries of Corcyra mark most of the milestones that line Corcyra's descent into unrestrained *stasis*'.[57] Analogous clusters of *stasis* motifs appear in Xenophon (*Hell.* 4.4.2-3), Polybius (4.17-18, 4.35) and Tacitus (*Hist.* 3.33); Lucan's Laelius, elevating this nexus to political programme, itemizes the components of sacrilege as killing family, plundering and burning temples, and melting down images of the gods (1.372-386). In light of this well-established association between *stasis* and sacrilege, Josephus' dramatizations as discussed above could be seen as another specific application of the general pattern—and to that extent the ἀσέβεια motif is fully legitimated by the wider context of civic strife. Where specific polemical details converge with the generic pattern, their inherent plausibility is subtly enhanced and 'authenticated'. With this in mind, a final suggestion might be ventured. Josephus' persistent emphasis on temple desecration has been related by one commentator to the influence of Polybius in particular (above, chap. 1, n. 27). But while that Greek historian may indeed have played an intermediary role, the connexion should not, I think, be overstated. Temple desecration, in general terms, is an emblematic expression of *hybris* and impiety;[58] but

---

[55] Frank (1967) 119-120. Cf. Rieber-Kelly (1991) 26: 'It is always the government [which is guilty]..., not the people—they are deluded or misguided, perhaps, but not evil... The people are hapless victims... It is the government that is corrupt, illegitimate, and violent'. This corresponds exactly to the pattern in *BJ*.

[56] Cf. Gehrke (1985) 249-251.

[57] See Crane (1996) 187-208 for an illuminating discussion on religious space in Thucydides. (The quotation from 191).

[58] The motif is associated in particular with Xerxes, e.g. Hdt. 8.32.2, 33, 35, 53.2, 109.3, 143.2, with Crane (1996) 184-186; Aesch. *Pers.* 809-812; Isoc. 4.96, 155. Cf. also Tac. *Hist.* 1.2.2, 3.33.1; Stat. *Theb.* 5.683-685. *Sacrilega* and *sacrilegus* as terms of abuse are a popular expression of the same idea: cf. Opelt (1965) *s.vv.*

within the thematic structure of *BJ*, ἀσέβεια is only part of the wider pattern of sacrilege, itself predicted on Josephus' analysis of *stasis*. To insist therefore on Polybius as Josephus' principal source here would be to isolate one strand from the complex tapestry: the temple desecration in *BJ* should rather be seen within the whole configuration of *stasis*-related motifs.

3. *Diet and Design in BJ:* στάσις, σπαραγμός *and* ἀλληλοφαγία

In comparison with the works of other major ancient historians, the literary and structural aspects of *BJ* have attracted relatively little attention, a circumstance which reflects the traditional historical and theological emphasis in Josephan research. But there is no reason to treat *BJ* any differently, in these matters, from its predecessors in the genre, and here too there is a demonstrable correlation between the work's thematic structure and its ideological design. This section looks at one significant aspect of the question.

The Jerusalem narrative is shaped around a number of recurrent themes: internal *stasis* against external war, famine and eating as symptoms of progressive debasement, ἀσέβεια and divine retribution, pollution and purification. These themes, sometimes shading off into each other (as when eating becomes an expression of τὸν θεὸν ἀσεβεῖν), encompass both the religious and secular aspects of Josephus' interpretation; and at the intersection of two or more of these lines we can often observe how Josephus fuses classical and Jewish elements. Thematic nodes of this kind typically signal ideologically significant points in the narrative.

We noted above how suggestive references to temple desecration and divine retribution at the extremities of the work (1.32; 7.437-435) had the effect of articulating one of the axial ideas in *BJ*. In the same way the framing technique is used to give prominence to the equally important οἰκεία στάσις/ὁμόφυλος φόνος motif: this appears first in the preface (1.10), then in the opening sentence of the historical narrative (1.31), and becomes progressively more conspicuous as Josephus deals with the origins of the revolt. In the first major speech of the work Agrippa warns that an uprising would be doomed to certain failure, and that to proceed is nothing less than wilful self-destruction: 'Everyone who engages in war relies on either divine or human help; but when, as is probable, both are denied, the aggressor is bringing certain destruction on himself. What prevents you from killing your wives and children with your own hands and from consigning your ancestral home, the most beautiful in the world, to the

flames? By such madness you would at least avoid the shame of defeat!' (2.394-395). Prophetic words, duly vindicated much later in Eleazar's *anagnorisis* and the subsequent mass suicide at Masada: the revolt ends quite literally in an act of collective self-destruction.[59] The striking responsion brings out the ὁμόφυλος φόνος motif which runs like a red thread through the intervening narrative and creates a high degree of structural cohesion. As one commentator on the Masada episode has well remarked,

> ...[Josephus] so structures his narrative as to impress upon his audience that the suicide was both a penalty paid by the Sicarii for crimes against their own countrymen and an acknowledgment of their guilt. Indeed, he uses Eleazar's own speech to enforce that view of the suicide. In a way, their punishment exactly fits their crime. As they have habitually engaged in the murder of their own people, so in their final hours they are forced to kill those closest to themselves. Even without Eleazar's own explicit testimony, to a classical audience such an ending would have appeared retributive. This sort of 'proper ending' was a commonplace of the classical literary tradition, and not only in historiography. Josephus' contemporary Plutarch furnishes in his *Lives* numerous examples of an almost obsessive working out of this principle of divine retribution.[60]

In this way the literary structure consciously articulates the central and interrelated themes of self-destructive *stasis* and guilt and punishment.

Josephus' intervening treatment of *stasis* gives depth to the picture. The motif usually appears at structurally important points, frequently in combination with related strands; together these clusters give contour to the narrative, and analyse the process of self-evisceration in both secular

---

[59] Agrippa's argument at 2.394-395 has its exact thematic counterpart in Eleazar's speech, where the *sicarii* chief recognizes that God has abandoned the Jews (7.327, 329) and urges self-destruction in terms that ironically vindicate Agrippa's prediction: 'At such a time we must not disgrace ourselves' (7.324); '...let us at once choose death with honour and do the kindest thing we can for ourselves, our wives and children, while it is still possible to show ourselves any kindness' (7.380). This is precisely the course that Agrippa had considered an act of insanity (μανέντες γὰρ οὕτως.., 2.395). A further ironic responsion might also be noted. Agrippa as the wise warner, himself an embodiment of πρόνοια, brings out the notion of foresight in the image of the ship at 2.396 (which may owe something to Dem. 9.69): 'It is wise, my friends, it is wise, while the vessel is still in port, to foresee the approaching storm, and not to sail out into the midst of the hurricane to sure destruction. For those on whom disaster falls out of the blue are at least entitled to pity, but a man who plunges into destruction with his eyes open earns only contempt'. Such πρόνοια, as is well known, is not generally vouchsafed the Jews in *BJ*. The single exception (*mirabile dictu*) is none other than Eleazar himself, who in the suicide speech foresees the consequences of capture by the Romans and urges action on that premise: 'Who then can fail to foresee their wrath if they take us alive?' (7.384). This insight gives ironical point to his *anagnorisis*.

[60] Ladouceur (1987) 110. This final admission of guilt was anticipated in the 'inverse *aristeia*' of Simon (2.469-476), on which see section 1 of this chapter.

and moral-religious terms. The religious aspects of *stasis* in particular have been stressed:

> [Josephus'] most vehement condemnations [of *stasis*] have a religious tinge. It is the wickedness of shedding blood, and, above all, of polluting God's Temple, which is stressed: and indeed the precise character of the divisions involved is in this context irrelevant. The schema of incorrigible sin, followed by the withdrawal of God's favour, and then punishment, is that of the prophets of the First Temple and post-First Temple period. When Josephus talks of the Romans as God's agents through whom He will punish his people, he draws explicit comparisons with the Assyrians of old... What mainly stands out... is the way in which *stasis* is made to fulfil just the same role as sins of a different kind... [*S*]*tasis* is not just a sin, but the ultimate sin.[61]

But if these characteristic religious assumptions invariably shimmer through Josephus' account of *stasis*, the classical influences are no less significant, and indeed this double aspect is the hallmark of the historian between Jerusalem and Rome. Internal civic strife is set, refrain-like, against external war as the greater of two evils. Revolutionary excesses necessitate (i.e. legitimate) Roman intervention, the Jews have less to fear from the Romans than from their own oppressors, while the ἄκων motif in particular exonerates Titus and the Romans, transforming them into benefactors who deliver the Jews from their internal ills. As justificatory mechanism, this pattern invokes both religious and secular criteria, i.e. rebel atrocities and Roman intervention are interpreted simultaneously on two planes, the political and the theological-philosophical. A typical expression of this double aspect is the formulaic accusation that the rebels perpetrated every enormity against man and God (4.150, 382, 386; 7.260); on this pattern the Romans become the agents who punish both στασιασταί and θεομάχοι.

Josephus' description of the Jerusalem *stasis*, we have noted, has a consciously Thucydidean complexion. This background gives point to the recurrent metaphors of *disease* and *self-evisceration*, images which are too easily dismissed when taken in isolation.[62] Sickness as a metaphor for civic dissension is common in Greek literature from the fifth century onwards,[63] and is so used also in *BJ*. An isolated occurrence, to be sure, might be discounted as just a *topos*, but the metaphor appears frequently enough,

---

[61] Rajak (1983) 94-95.

[62] E.g. Krieger (1994) 307, who notes some occurrences of the νόσος motif, but implies that this is no more than a literary *topos*.

[63] E.g. Aesch. *Ag.* 848; Soph. *Ant.* 1015; Eur. *HF* 34, *IA* 411; Hdt. 5.28.1; Pl. *Resp.* 470c, 556e; Dem. 2.14; 9.12, 50; 18.45. Cf. also above, chap. 3, n. 5.

and with elegant variation, to attract closer attention: it is applied to the internal strife at Rome and Jerusalem, and to the activity of the revolutionaries in general. The individual instances are worth quoting in full to give an idea of the extent and consistency of the metaphorical system:

> For in kingdoms as in corpulent individuals, one member or another was always getting inflamed from the weight it carried [ἀεί τι μέρος φλεγμαίνειν ὑπὸ τοῦ βάρους]; yet this required not amputation but some milder method of cure.
>
> (1.507)

> No sooner were these disorders reduced than the inflammation, as in a sick man's body, broke out again in another quarter [ὥσπερ ἐν νοσοῦντι σώματι πάλιν ἕτερον μέρος ἐφλέγμαινεν].
>
> (2.264)

> The inhabitants [of Gischala] were anxious for peace...; but a powerful gang of bandits had infiltrated into their midst and some of the townsmen had been infected [ᾧ τινες... συνενόσουν].
>
> (4.84)

> [Vespasian advises against an immediate attack:] If then safety was to be the criterion, the Jews should be left to continue their own destruction; or if they considered what kind of success would win the most fame, they should not attack patients suffering from internal disorders [οὐ δεῖν τοῖς οἴκοι νοσοῦσιν ἐπιχειρεῖν]; for then it would be said with good reason that they owed their victory not to themselves but to Jewish sedition [τῆς στάσεως].
>
> (4.376)

> In the other parts of Judaea there was a similar upsurge in terrorism, hitherto quiescent [ἐκινεῖτο... τὸ τέως ἠρεμοῦν τὸ λῃστρικόν]; and as in the body when the chief member is inflamed [τοῦ κυριωτάτου φλεγμαίνοντος] all the members are infected [συνενόσει], so when strife and disorder broke out in the Capital [διὰ γοῦν τὴν... στάσιν καὶ ταραχὴν], the scoundrels in the country could plunder with impunity.
>
> (4.406)

> The Jews were suffering so severely in every engagement, as the war slowly but surely approached its climax and crept closer to the Sanctuary, that, as if dealing with a diseased body, they cut off the affected limbs to prevent the spread of the disease [καθάπερ σηπομένου σώματος ἀπέκοπτον τὰ προειλημμένα μέλη φθάνοντες τὴν εἰς τὸ πρόσω νομήν].
>
> (6.164)

> No doubt you despised Nero for his idleness, and, like fractures or ruptures, you remained quiescent but malignant for a time, only to show your true character when a more serious illness broke out... [καὶ καθάπερ ῥήγματα ἢ

> σπάσματα τὸν ἄλλον χρόνον κακοήθως ἠρεμοῦντες ἐν τῇ μείζονι νόσῳ διεφάνητε]. When Nero died you sank to the lowest level of depravity and took advantage of our difficulties at home...
>
> (6.337-341)

> So universal was the contagion [οὕτως... πάντες ἐνόσησαν], both in private and in public life, so determined were they to outdo each other in acts of impiety towards God and of injustice towards their neighbours...
>
> (7.260)

> Like a disease the madness of the Sicarii also attacked the towns around Cyrene [ἥψατο... ἡ τῶν σικαρίων ἀπόνοια καθάπερ νόσος].
>
> (7.437)

Taken together, these passages suggest both the irrepressible spread of *stasis* and its ravages on the body politic—aspects which fit in well with the work's Thucydidean orientation. Indeed the Thucydidean pathology, in which plague and *stasis* are treated as homologous phenomena, may have provided a decisive impulse to the νόσος imagery in Josephus. Amputation (1.507, 6.164) is a natural extension of this metaphorical system; here too there are good classical parallels.[64] And when Roman intervention is described as an act of purging (τὰ ἐμφύλια μύση καθαροῦντες, 5.19; κάθαρσιν, 6.110), this makes sense both in terms of the work's governing theological assumptions and of the medical metaphor: as God's agents the Romans punish Jewish transgressions, while on the other hand the κάθαρσις (a medical term) finally puts an end to the politically corrosive στάσις/νόσος.

Closely related to the στάσις/νόσος system is the imagery of self-evisceration, which again evokes a number of relevant associations:

> And the spot venerated by the whole world and honoured by foreigners from the ends of the earth who have heard its fame, is trampled on by monsters bred in our midst. And now in their desperation they are deliberately setting district against district, town against town, and enlisting the nation to tear out its own vitals [καὶ κατὰ τῶν σπλάγχνων τῶν ἰδίων τὸ ἔθνος στρατολογεῖν].
>
> (4.262-263)

> This [tripartite factionalism in Jerusalem] might not inaccurately be described as a faction within a faction, like a maddened beast driven by lack of other food to devour its own flesh [καὶ καθάπερ θηρίον λυσσῆσαν ἐνδείᾳ τῶν ἔξωθεν ἐπὶ τὰς ἰδίας ἤδη σάρκας ὁρμᾶν].
>
> (5.4)

---

64 Dem. 25.95; Cic. *Sest.* 135; *Phil.* 8.15; *Off.* 3.32; Ov. *Met.* 1.190-191; Sen. *Prov.* 3.2.

> The entire City was the battleground for these plotters and their disreputable followers, and between them the people were being torn to pieces like a great carcass. Old men and women, overwhelmed by the miseries within, prayed for the Romans to come, and looked forward to the external war to liberate them from their internal miseries.
>
> (5.27-28)

> When a man had been stripped by Simon he was passed on to John, and when someone had been plundered by John, Simon took him over. They drank to each other's health in the blood of their countrymen and divided the carcasses of the wretches between them.
>
> (5.440)

> For their souls were as insensitive to suffering as their bodies were to pain—they mauled the carcass of the nation like dogs [οἵ γε καὶ νεκρὸν τὸν δῆμον ὥσπερ κύνες ἐσπάραττον] and filled the prisons with the defenceless.
>
> (5.526)

Most obviously, self-evisceration is a graphic expression of ὁμόφυλος φόνος, and as such implies a contrast between internal and external war (thus 4.262-263; 5.27-28); we recall also Agrippa's warning on the revolt as a wilful act of self-destruction (2.395-396). The added detail of the dogs tearing at a carcass (5.27-28, 526, 440) effectively brings out the violent rage of the tyrants as they descend into bestiality.[65] And when, at 5.4, shortage of food (ἐνδεία τῶν ἔξωθεν) and self-evisceration are brought into a causal relationship, Josephus hints at the fatal link between *stasis* and famine which is worked out more fully in the later narrative. A further association may also be relevant. We noted earlier the polemical emphasis on dietary transgressions by John and others—a violation of the religious code to index the ἀσέβεια of the perpetrators. In the work's thematic design, this literal consumption of forbidden foodstuffs by the rebels is balanced by their metaphorical mutilation of the body politic, itself described as a perverse act of eating (self-devouring or mauling a carcass): thus the sacred and the profane, the literal and the figurative can be bracketed together in what I shall term the *non iusta alimenta* system.

This multi-layered system culminates in a spectacular act of cannibalism (6.193-219) which literally enacts the preceding metaphors of σπαραγμός and illicit eating. In addition the climactic atrocity demonstrates very clearly how Josephus integrates Jewish and classical frames. The decisive factor precipitating the Jerusalem famine is the destruction of the corn

---

[65] Similarly when Ananus is cast out to be literally devoured by dogs and beast of prey (4.324-325), the gesture fits into the wider pattern of the Zealots' savagery.

stocks by the rival factions, an action whose consequences are duly stressed:

> **24**To whatever part of the City John turned, he never failed to set fire to the houses that were stocked with corn and all kinds of supplies; and when he withdrew, Simon advanced and did the same. It was as if to oblige the Romans that they were destroying all that the City had laid up against a siege and severing the sinews of their own strength. **25**The result at any rate was that all the buildings round the Temple were reduced to ashes, the City became a desolate no-man's-land for their domestic warfare, and almost all the grain—enough to support them through many years of siege—went up in flames. **26**It was famine that defeated them, a thing that could never have happened if they had not brought it upon themselves.
>
> (5.24-26)

Where the preface to *BJ* had ascribed the ruin of Jerusalem to factional strife (αὐτὴν στάσις οἰκεία καθεῖλεν, 1.10), the focus here shifts to famine as a particularly disastrous consequence of that *stasis* (λιμῷ γοῦν ἑάλωσαν, 5.26). The aspect stressed is that the burning of the corn supplies is a gratuitous action which plays directly into Roman hands (ὥσπερ ἐπίτηδες Ῥωμαίοις, 24). Repeated references, from this point on, to the gradual intensification of the famine produce a rising thematic curve[66] that finally culminates in Mary's act of cannibalism. Structurally the τεκνοφαγία (6.193-219) marks the apex of both the famine and the *non iusta alimenta* motifs, but in the same way that the eating motif had earlier intersected with various other lines, so here the cannibalism itself becomes a focal point of all the major thematic strands.

The incident, insists Josephus, is singular, spectacular, superlative: 'But why speak of the inanimate things that hunger made them shameless enough to eat? I am now going to describe a deed unparalleled in the history of Greece or of any other country, a deed horrible to relate and incredible to hear' (6.199). But this is gross rhetorical exaggeration: teknophagy appears in biblical prophecy among the punishments for disobedience (*Lev.* 26.27-29; *Deut.* 28.52-53; *Jer.* 19.9; *Ezek.* 5.10) and is even reported as having actually taken place (2 *Kgs.* 6.24-30; *Lam.* 2.20, 4.10; cf. *Baruch* 2.2-3); and comparable acts are quite common in ancient siege narratives (e.g. Thuc. 2.70.1; Polyb. 1.84.9-85.1; Petr. 141.9-10).[67]

---

[66] Thus 5.343-344, 370-371, 424-438, 449, 499, 515, 520, 536, 548-549, 571; 6.1. And as the famine intensifies, the Roman earthworks also advance: 5.259, 268, 284, 356, 446, 457, 466, 469-472, 522, 536; 6.5, 149.

[67] Further examples in Biffi (1988).

We have no way of pronouncing on the veracity of Josephus' report,[68] but ultimately this is not the main issue: both the rhetorical overture and more especially the style of the episode itself call attention to its status *within the narrative*—and here we need to consider fully its symbolical and structural function.

As symbol, the τεκνοφαγία evokes a plurality of relevant associations, both religious and secular. To a mind steeped in the Old Testament and its scheme of transgression and punishment, our passage will have read like the fulfilment of ancient prophecy:[69] 'If in spite of this you do not listen to me and still defy me, I will defy you in anger, and I myself will punish you seven times over for your sins. Instead of meat you shall eat your sons and your daughters' (*Lev.* 26.27-29). Also relevant, on the theological plane, are the predictions reported at 4.388 and 6.109 that Jerusalem would be taken when it was torn apart by internal strife. The cannibalism simultaneously dramatizes the extremities to which the city is reduced by the *stasis* and serves as an indictment of the insurgents responsible for that *stasis*: as the pivotal enormity which causes Titus to order the final assault (6.217), it could therefore be linked directly to the fulfilment of the παλαιὸς λόγος.

Apart from these religious associations, the *ekphrasis* is also fully integrated into the work's secular and polemical-apologetic design: so much is clear from its literary structure. The teknophagy itself is prefaced by a graphic account of the general effects of the Jerusalem famine:

> **193**In the City the famine raged, its victims dropping dead in countless numbers and enduring unspeakable horrors. **194**In every home, if the shadow of food was anywhere detected, war broke out, and the closest of friends came to blows with each other, snatching away the most wretched means of support. **195**Not even the dying were believed to be in want; at their last breath they were searched by the bandits in case any had some food inside their clothes or were feigning death. **196**Gaping with hunger like mad dogs, the ruffians stumbled and staggered along, hammering at the doors like drunken men, and in their perplexity breaking into the same house two or three times in a single hour. **197**Necessity drove the victims to gnaw anything, and things which even the filthiest of brute animals

---

[68] The shrill hyperbole is apt to rouse suspicion: thus SMALLWOOD in the 1981 Penguin edition 452 n. 17, commenting on Josephus' alleged reticence in reporting the matter: 'He goes into quite unnecessary details, probably invented by himself'. SCHEIBER (1965) 271-272 is less sceptical: 'Man hat auch keinen Grund, das von ihm erzählte entsetzliche Ereignis zu bezweifeln. Damals mochten noch Zeitgenossen leben, die davon wußten, und es bestätigen oder widerlegen konnten [cf. 6.200]. Dennoch ist anzunehmen, daß er entweder auf Grund jüdisch-literarischer Reminiszenzen oder seiner klassischen Lektüren... oder auf Grund beider diese Szene so derb ausschmückte'.

[69] Cf. NIKIPROWETZKY (1971) 481; COHEN (1976) 192; RAJAK (1983) 96.

> would reject, they picked up and brought themselves to eat. In the end they did not abstain from belts and shoes, and stripped off the leather from their shields and chewed it. **198**Others devoured scraps of old hay; for there were some who collected the stalks and sold a tiny bunch for four Attic drachmas.
>
> (6.193-198)

'In every home, if the shadow of food was anywhere detected, war broke out'. First *stasis* had caused famine, now famine itself produces further strife—described here in familiar terms of friends turning against each other (cf. 4.132). Hunger and strife fuel each other in self-destructive symbiosis. The callous comportment of the rebels harks back to the erosion of αἰδώς ('Not even the dying were believed to be in want; at their last breath they were searched by the bandits...'), and beyond that we recall also Thucydides' comments on the effects of the plague. Tormentors and victims are equally dehumanized,[70] although Josephus differentiates between vicious and systematic plundering by the former and the overwhelming plight of the latter.[71] Debasement of the victims is then registered by the progressive deterioration in their diet, from food unfit for animals to leather (belts, shoes, shields) to withered grass, and finally to cannibalism. Calibrated sequences of this kind are a regular feature in Greco-Roman siege narratives,[72] but what stands out principally is the high concentration of detail, further intensified by the observation that even the basest food fetched exorbitant prices (cf. 2 *Kgs.* 6.25).[73] Doubtless this reflects to some extent the actual effects of the Jerusalem famine (more recent examples of famine-stricken populations provide supporting evidence),[74] but at the same time the elaborate attention to detail suggests also a conscious element of literary stylization.

At this point, and with the αἰδώς motif as connecting idea, Josephus turns from the general situation to a particular instance: 'But why speak of the inanimate things that hunger made them shameless enough to eat [τὴν

---

[70] Reference to animals is in either case suggestive: οἱ δ' ὑπ' ἐνδείας κεχηνότες ὥσπερ λυσσῶντες κύνες ἐσφάλλοντο (the brigands, 196)—καὶ τὰ μηδὲ τοῖς ῥυπαρωτάτοις τῶν ἀλόγων ζῴων πρόσφορα συλλέγοντες ἐσθίειν ὑπέφερον (their victims, 197).

[71] Ἀνάγκη (197) with the slightest nuance of exoneration, i.e. they were acting under external compulsion and in spite of themselves. This is a subtle variation of the well-known 'people as victims' motif.

[72] Cipriani (1986) 18-33; Biffi (1988). Josephus has an abbreviated sequence at 6.372-373.

[73] A comparable *fortissimo* is achieved by the preceding remark that the rebels in their desperate search for food enter the same house two or three times within a single hour (196). Notice Josephus' extraordinary realism in this section.

[74] Cf. Sorokin (1942) 66-68; Camporesi (1989) 40-55.

ἐπ᾽ ἀψύχοις ἀναίδειαν τοῦ λιμοῦ]? I am now going to describe a deed unparalleled in the history of Greece or of any other country...' (199). The rhetorical question and appearance of the first person heighten the pathos in the transitional segment (199-200) and lead into the account of the cannibalism itself:

> **201**There was a woman, Mary, daughter of Eleazar, who lived east of Jordan in the village of Bethezub..., distinguished in family and fortune, who had fled with the rest of the population to Jerusalem, where she shared in the horrors of the siege. **202**Most of her property, which she had packed up and brought with her from Peraea to the City, had been plundered by the party chiefs; the remnants of her treasures, and any food she had managed to obtain, were being carried off by their henchmen in their daily raids. **203**Uncontrollable fury filled the wretched woman, whose frequent abuses and curses at the looters enraged them against her. **204**But when neither resentment nor pity caused anyone to kill her she grew tired of finding food for others (which it was indeed impossible to find anywhere), and while hunger was eating her heart out and rage was consuming her still faster, she yielded to the suggestions of fury and necessity, **205**and in defiance of all natural feeling laid hands on her own child, a baby at her breast. 'Poor child!' she cried. 'In war, famine and civil strife why should I keep you alive? **207**With the Romans slavery awaits us, even if we are alive when they come; but famine is forestalling slavery, and the partisans are crueller than either. Come, you must be food for me, to the partisans an avenging spirit, and to the world a tale, the only thing left to complete the calamities of the Jews'.
>
> (6.201-208)

Shape and progression of the whole argument—from general exposition (193-198) via thematic transition (199-200) to the teknophagy itself (201-219)—say something about the function of the episode. Especially telling, as we shall see in a moment, is the fluctuation between general and specific. All the motifs identified in the preamble (193-200) come into sharp focus in the teknophagy (the reciprocity famine/*stasis*, erosion of αἰδώς, daily raids by the tyrants, ἀνάγκη, and eating): this anchors the specific case firmly in the wider picture, and indeed makes it another dramatic *Einzelszene*, a *synecdoche* for the general situation in Jerusalem. In consequence of *stasis* and famine, an individual once διὰ γένος καὶ πλοῦτον ἐπίσημος (201) is now debased and hideously dehumanized. Mary's tragic fate, to be sure, has an intrinsic pathos, but in addition the individual tragedy, as *pars pro toto*, replicates the fate of the whole nation: we recall the historian's poignant remark that 'of all the cities under Roman rule our own reached the highest summit of prosperity, and in turn fell to the lowest depths of misery' (1.12, cf. 6.6-8; 7.112-113). The parallel contours are suggestive.

Other details point in the same direction. On the one hand the teknophagy is dramatized as a highly personal exchange between Mary and her tormentors (209-212), while on the other hand both confrontation and gesture are such as to give the episode a significance that also transcends its immediate context. Having suffered materially at the hands of the rebels, Mary shows a correspondingly personal indignation (202-203). Her child-slaying is as much a consequence of external ἀνάγκη as an indictment of the tyrants who are themselves the ultimate cause of the famine. So much is clear from her own words: 'In war, famine and civil strife [ἐν πολέμῳ καὶ λιμῷ καὶ στάσει] why should I keep you alive? With the Romans slavery awaits us...; but famine is forestalling slavery, and the partisans are crueller than either. Come, you must be food for me, to the partisans an avenging spirit, and to the world a tale...' (206-207). For one nearly starved to death the rhetoric is, to say the least, noteworthy. First, her suggestion that the rebels are worse than the Romans chimes in with the well-known polemical refrain. Another point of reference is the configuration πόλεμος—λιμός—στάσις, here coupled with a curse (καὶ τοῖς στασιασταῖς ἐρινύς). Niger, an earlier victim of *stasis*, had denounced the Zealots in identical terms:

> As he died, Niger called down on their heads the vengeance of Rome, famine and pestilence to add to the horrors of war, and, to crown it all, internecine strife; all these curses on the scoundrels were ratified by God, including that most righteous fate, by which they were to taste before long in their party strife the frenzy of their fellow-citizens.
>
> (4.361-362)

Mary's teknophagy now *ratifies and enacts* Niger's curse, giving literal meaning to his metaphor γεύσασθαι τῆς ἀλλήλων ἀπονοίας (362). The configuration πόλεμος—λιμός—στάσις then re-appears in Titus' self-righteous speech immediately after the cannibalism: 'Caesar disclaimed all responsibility in the sight of God for this latest tragedy. He had offered the Jews peace, independence, and an amnesty for all past offences; but they had preferred *sedition* to concord, *war* to peace, *famine* to plenty and abundance... So this food was just what they deserved' (6.215-216). Thus the cannibalism, however spectacular in its own right, is conceived not as an isolated showpiece but is fully integrated into the pattern of sin and retribution, and becomes a focal point in Josephus' anti-Zealot polemic.

Mary herself shows a clear awareness of the paradigmatic significance of her action. 'Come, you must be food for me, to the partisans an avenging spirit, and to the world a tale, the only thing left to complete the calamities of the Jews' (207). When in the last member of an elegant triad

she designates teknophagy as the climactic atrocity, she is simultaneously an actor in the drama and a commentator upon it—another touch, like the hyperbolical preface (199-200), which alerts us to the importance of the episode within the philosophical structure of the work. Other effects consciously reinforce this supra-contextual dimension. The reaction of the rebels, when the deed is divulged, is presented as a cataclysmic ἀπροσδόκητον: 'Overcome with instant horror and amazement, they stood paralyzed by the sight... They went away trembling. They had never before shrunk at anything, and did not much like giving up even this food to the mother' (210, 212).[75] The living, in a grotesque inversion of the *makarismos* formula, pronounce the dead blessed in comparison with their own lot (213, cf. 4.385)—literary touches designed to enhance the enormity of the event. News spreads quickly, the teknophagy elicits wide response: 'From that moment the entire City could think of nothing else but this abomination; everyone saw the tragedy before his own eyes and shuddered as if the crime were his' (212). The hint of *collective contagion* is picked up by Titus, who generalizes the incident into a symbol of Jewish guilt, perversity and impiety: 'So this food was just what they deserved. Nevertheless, he would bury this abomination of infanticide and cannibalism under the ruins of their country, and would not leave on the face of the earth, for the sun to behold, a city in which mothers [plural μητέρες!] fed themselves thus. It was even more revolting for mothers to eat such food than for fathers...' (216-218). These remarks, like Mary's own comment on the incident (207), again emphasize its emblematic, symbolic status.

Apart from the thematic links noted above, the cannibalism itself has intrinsic nuances relevant to the narrative and moral structure. Anthropophagy in the Greco-Roman mind is regarded with particular horror as the ultimate violation of cultural norms, a symptom of ἀνομία, the omega point at which man becomes beast:[76] thus Lycaon is transformed by cannibalism into a wolf (Pl. *Resp.* 8.565d), and when Ovid's homonymous tyrant tempts Jupiter with a banquet of human flesh, this is the culminating act which motivates the god to destroy the entire human race (*Met.* 1.163-243). The teknophagy in Josephus is the same sort of pivotal atrocity, and activates a corresponding cathartic mechanism: first the emblematic

---

[75] For the literary effect—a paradoxical reaction to enhance a paradigmatic enormity—compare (e.g.) Verg. *Aen.* 2.6-8, *quis talia fando / Myrmidonum Dolopumve aut duri miles Vlixi / temperet a lacrimis*?; Sen. *Tr.* 1154, *novumque monstrum est Pyrrhus ad caedem piger.* At the same time the reaction of the tyrants is an effective comment on an atrocity for which they themselves bear ultimate responsibility—a species of the 'recours à la tierce personne'.

[76] See Segal (1974) 304-306; Rawson (1987); Versnel (1993) 81 n. 166 and 94 n. 12.

debasement, then the corrective reaction to restore equilibrium in the moral universe. One effect of this sequence of cause and effect is to give the Roman intervention an 'external' justification.

Cannibalism and Roman intervention are clearly linked in a structural relationship of pollution and purification. The vocabulary used of Mary's act is telling: 'At once the rebels appeared, and sniffing the unholy odour [καὶ τῆς ἀθεμίτου κνίσης σπάσαντες], threatened to kill her on the spot unless she produced what she had prepared' (209). When even the tyrants show revulsion, Mary's sarcastic parody of religious language again calls attention to the theme of pollution: 'But if you have pious scruples and shrink from my sacrifice [εἰ δ' ὑμεῖς εὐσεβεῖς καὶ τὴν ἐμὴν ἀποστρέφεσθε θυσίαν], then let what I have eaten be your portion and the remainder also be left for me' (211). The choreography is consistent, Mary stylizes herself as celebrant in a bizarrely inverted sacrifice. The action is termed μύσος, 'defilement' (212), and Titus promptly takes up this theme: 'Nevertheless, he would bury this abomination of infanticide and cannibalism [καλύψειν μέντοι τὸ τῆς τεκνοφαγίας μύσος] under the ruins of their country, and would not leave on the face of the earth, for the sun to behold,[77] a city in which mothers fed themselves thus' (217). Intervention by the Romans, therefore, amounts to an act of purification, with Titus duly proclaiming his own role in the work's moral geometry: 'Caesar disclaimed all responsibility in the sight of God for this latest tragedy...' (215). As the sequence of pollution and purification slides into apology, the Romans become the agents of divine punishment (cf. 5.566).

In the thematic and moral design of *BJ*, therefore, the cannibalism episode clearly marks a significant nodal point where all the major strands in the work converge: *stasis*, famine, dietary violation, indictment of the Zealots, pollution and purification, divine retribution and justification of Roman intervention. Its function may be correspondingly differentiated, and here at least the following aspects are relevant. Dramatically (i.e. within the narrative sequence) the cannibalism is a pivotal event on a level with the earlier death of Ananus. From the historian's perspective, the murder of the high priest was interpreted as a decisive *peripeteia*, the defeat of virtue by vice (4.325); the teknophagy takes the process of degradation to its limits, and as the final motivation for Roman intervention marks a corresponding pivotal point in the narrative. In the thematic structure of the work, the cannibalism marks the apex of the antecedent *non iusta*

---

[77] The topical idea that the ἄγος should not be exposed to the light of the sun (e.g. Soph. *OT* 1424-1427; Eur. *Med.* 1327-1328, *HF* 1231, *Or.* 819-821; Dem. 19.267; Sen. *HF* 596-603, *Pha.* 677-679) again calls attention to the central theme of pollution.

alimenta system; all the polemical nuances inherent in that motif (whether the eating was literal or figurative) culminate in our episode: with Mary as his mouthpiece, Josephus explicitly assigns blame to the criminals who have reduced the city to this level. And since the teknophagy answers both Niger's curse (4.361-362) and recalls earlier biblical prophecy, the reader is clearly intended to recognize behind the specific atrocity the integrating scheme of sin and divine punishment. From all these angles, therefore, the scene with Mary is another luminous *Einzelszene* with a crucial role in the overall design of *BJ*.

Finally, it may have appeared somewhat anomalous to preface this chapter with a quotation from an Augustan poet, for *BJ* has traditionally been the province of historical and theological study—and not of literary analysis. Such literary examination may have been further discouraged by the theory of Josephus' reliance on Greek assistants, a hypothesis which inevitably tends to diminish the historian's status as conscious artist. But the foregoing discussion would at least suggest that literary and architectural elements, consciously applied to articulate the controlling ideas, are no less significant in *BJ* than in any other work by a major ancient historian.

CHAPTER FIVE

MODEL AND MIRROR: IMPRESSION MANAGEMENT BY INTERTEXTUAL STRATEGY

> Atque ita mentitur, sic veris falsa remiscet.
>
> HORACE, *Ars Poetica* 151.

> Virginis est verae facies, quam vivere credas
> et, si non obstet reverentia, velle moveri:
> ars adeo latet arte sua.
>
> OVID, *Metamorphoses* 10.250-252.

> Das als Abbild auftretende Bild hinterläßt immer den überragenden Eindruck von Authentizität, während noch der stärkste Beweis die Schwächen bloßer Behauptung nicht abstreifen kann.
>
> Thomas MEYER, *Die Inszenierung des Scheins* (1992), 45.

Flavius Josephus occupies a unique position at the intersection of the Jewish and Greco-Roman historical traditions, and the characteristic polemical-apologetic strategies in his *BJ* rely extensively for their effect on the purposeful interweaving of these diverse lines. As *historicus bifrons*, with personal experience of both camps, Josephus is well placed to conduct a two-way apologetic, addressing each group in an appropriate register. Ὁ ἔχων ὦτα ἀκούειν, ἀκουέτω. The form of *BJ*—Jewish narrative re-cast as classical historiography—cannot be explained apart from the work's apologetic and polemical motives: in this medium the historian 'between Jerusalem and Rome' engages his Greco-Roman readers in their own terms, gives plausibility to an interpretation designed to deflect animus and criticism from the Jews as nation, while at the same time explaining the Romans to the Jews. From this polemical-apologetic perspective the classical elements are integral to the intellectual design of the whole work and need to be analysed in other than just stylistic terms. *BJ*, in sum, is far more than just a prospecting ground for historians or theologians: it is an elaborate and multi-layered literary edifice in which the generic, structural and suasive aspects deserve greater attention.

The work's characteristic polemic and apologetic tendencies can be analysed in detail and over long stretches in relation to Josephus' treatment

of the Jewish war parties. To protect his co-religionists from an anticipated anti-Semitic backlash in the wake of the revolt, the apologist-historian artfully obscures the link between Jewish nationalism and traditional Jewish piety, and denies that the uprising had a broad base in popular support. The majority of Jews, on his version, were peace-loving and eager for an accommodation with Rome, the catastrophe is ascribed to a small and unrepresentative group of radicals who forced their will on a reluctant populace. By blaming a few misguided fanatics, presented as unscrupulous demagogues motivated principally by a tyrannical lust for power, Josephus exonerates the nation as a whole at the expense of the ringleaders.

That this interpretation however involves tendentious oversimplification is clear from a cluster of recurrent motifs which can be retrieved from Josephus' attempts to deny, distort or ridicule them, and which take us beyond the nationalist and political dimensions of the revolt to its sustaining religious substratum: the inviolability of Jerusalem, the divine symmachy, ἡ ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ βοήθεια, the purity of the Temple, revival of ancient religious tradition, trust in apocalyptic deliverance and not least the fervour and tenacity of the Jewish fighters themselves. These are the distinctive religious contours which give the revolt its broad ideological cohesion. The apologist-historian however, concerned to *dissociate* the rebels from the traditions of Jewish piety, plays down, refracts and filters out this religious dimension by applying the political and psychological categories of Greco-Roman historiography. When these classical elements become conspicuous in Josephus' scheme of explanation, close inspection of the context typically reveals a polemical tension between his emphasis on the 'rationalist' motifs and the (implicit) eschatological mystique against which they are deployed.

Polemic by substitution might be a useful label for this procedure, i.e. Greco-Roman motifs are introduced specifically as alternative 'rationalist' explanations for actions whose deeper motivation (as the context suggests) is to be sought in the prevailing religious mentality. And while the rationalist and religious explanations need not always be mutually exclusive, it is clear that Josephus privileges an internally consistent pattern of psychological analysis in order to obfuscate and marginalize the eschatological aspects. The diverse examples discussed in chapter 2 illustrate this strategy in its simplest and clearest form.

Extensions of these principles can be observed in Josephus' ample treatment of the Jerusalem *stasis*, which emerges as a major theme from book 4 on. In this, the most consistently Thucydidean section in *BJ*, Josephus analyses the factional strife in and around Jerusalem in terms that

presuppose a thorough acquaintance with his predecessor's model of political and social dissolution (Athenian plague and Corcyrean *stasis*); and once we recognize this orientation, a number of diverse strands come together in a coherent and penetrating analysis.

Thucydides, arguing from ἀνθρωπεία φύσις, abstracts from the specific instances the recurrent typology and enduring contours, and his classic pathology provides the conceptual framework for Josephus' analysis in *BJ*. In either case the external convulsions precipitate a corresponding dislocation in men's attitudes. This metamorphosis is indexed, in the Corcyrean excursus, by the collapse of three fundamental institutions—kinship, human law and divine ordinance—with the Athenian plague adding αἰδώς to the list of casualties. All these aspects resurface in Josephus, giving his analysis an unmistakable Thucydidean tinge. Erosion of αἰδώς, in consequence of the Jerusalem *stasis*, is evinced typically in contempt for the dead and disregard of burial customs (as in the Thucydidean plague) and additionally through the motif of progressive dietary debasement, culminating in the ultimate violation of alimentary tabu. As society is polarized through *stasis*, language itself becomes destabilized to reflect the alignments and priorities of the moment (...πρὸς τὰ παρόντα τὰς ὀργὰς τῶν πολλῶν ὁμοιοῖ, Thuc. 3.82.2). Josephus' re-working and application of this crucial system of semantic anarchy is arguably the subtlest and most intriguing aspect of his Thucydides-reception; it is also an aspect which has been consistently overlooked in the secondary literature.

Josephus' evident interest in the Thucydidean *stasis* model is related to the prominent role of factional strife in his own Jerusalem narrative. Civic conflict is consistently thematized in the second half of his work to excoriate the odious 'tyrants' and expose their atrocities in the most lurid colours; polemic is intensified to systematic enmification. Evocations of Thucydides, I have argued, serve Josephus in two ways by giving his hostile interpretation both intrinsic plausibility and 'external' or generic validity—for when specific atrocities are made to coalesce with the typical phenomenology of *stasis*, when polemic is thematically structured along the lines of Thucydides' account of social disintegration, when the *mundus inversus* system in Josephus broadly replicates the dynamics of the Corcyrean strife, this assimilation encourages the reader to see our historian's version through the classic analysis of his predecessor and to place it in the same tradition of 'scientific' historiography. *Color Thucydideus* in other words provides a frame of reference to support and 'objectify' Josephus' own partisan interpretation of the revolt. Assimilation of the Jerusalem *stasis* to the Thucydidean model, and in particular the emphasis on *stasis*-induced

reversals, provide Josephus with intrinsic justification for 'reclaiming' sense and reconstituting the picture. First norms and meaning are shown to be destabilized, then Josephus puts the dislocated *mundus inversus* back in order —his own order, that is. By predicating his account on the Thucydidean model, he creates the impression of rigorous analysis in the tradition of antiquity's greatest *Krisenhistoriker*. Josephus' proemial evocations of Thucydides (*BJ* 1.1 ≈ Thuc. 1.1.1-2; *BJ*1.16, 26 ≈ Thuc. 1.22.2-3) cannot therefore be dismissed as just topical posturing, but are important signals which alert the reader to an affiliation and an intellectual perspective which are systematically expanded in the narrative. The *generic expectations* raised by these introductory allusions are indeed fully met in the work itself. To that extent Tessa Rajak's metaphor of the 'Hellenizing glass' is amply justified.

Other recognizable generic features in *BJ* function in a similar way as conveyors of Josephus' loaded interpretation. Most notable among these is a group of stylized *aristeiai*, discussed in chapter 4, which pointedly reinforce some of the work's central propagandistic themes: the national τρόποι, idealization of Titus and the *concordia* between general and troops. The typical *form* of these engaging *Einzelszenen*, it was argued, is intended to encourage and facilitate acceptance of their ideological *content*. Topical associations can function in a similar way to sustain the interpretation urged by Josephus. Thus his lurid account of the rebels' acts of ἀσέβεια for all its overt hostility is tacitly justified by the well attested link between *stasis* and sacrilege: from this topical perspective the rebels' impieties are another particular manifestation of the typical dynamic. And when a climactic act of cannibalism is made a pivotal event in the work's moral and dramatic structure, a crystallization point for a number of other central motifs, we see how Josephus incorporates a *topos* from Greco-Roman siege narratives as a frame to support and enhance his own distinctive religious interpretation. In all these cases the cogency of the argument is predicated on the formal, presentational aspects.

Where form cannot be explained apart from the work's polemical-apologetic tendencies, genre and generic affiliation in *BJ* are plainly not just a matter of style or literary *ornatus*, but serve as a *system of communication* which can be described from the perspectives of both writer and recipient. If 'every convention the writer uses ultimately bears upon his meaning'[1] and helps articulate the message he wishes to convey, then the generic features identified above can be understood as an integral component in Josephus' strategy of persuasion and impression management: through this

[1] Fowler (1982) 22.

medium he subtly suggests inferences and points the reader in the desired direction. To that extent his tactical use of generic elements for their focussing, defining and suasive effects might be compared with the technique of 'framing' as understood in modern communications analysis:

> Framing essentially involves selection and salience. To frame is to select some aspects of a perceived reality and make them more salient in a communicating text, in such a way as to promote a particular problem definition, causal interpretation, moral evaluation... Frames, then, *define problems*—determine what a causal agent is doing with what costs and benefits, usually measured in terms of common cultural values; *diagnose causes*—identify the forces creating the problem; *make moral judgments*—evaluate causal agents and their effects...[2]

In the same way the 'Hellenizing glass' through selective emphasis and exclusion, through filtering, refraction, colouring and assimilation mediates a picture that carries its own implicit interpretation.

Conversely it is genre and generic expectations that engage the recipient as an active participant in this exchange, and here the Thucydidean connexion in particular is important. A basic mechanism posited in reception theory will have special relevance to a work that self-consciously proclaims its generic allegiance and its intellectual orientation:

> Auch das neu erscheinende Werk präsentiert sich nicht als absolute Neuheit im leeren Raum, sondern prädisponiert sein Publikum durch Ankündigungen, offene und versteckte Signale, vertraute Merkmale oder implizite Hinweise für eine ganz bestimmte Weise der Rezeption. Es weckt Erinnerungen an schon Gelesenes, stiftet schon mit seinem Anfang Erwartungen für 'Mitte und Ende', bringt den Leser in eine bestimmte emotionale Einstellung und gibt mit alledem einen allgemeinen Horizont des Verstehens vor...[3]

BJ's genre-bound prefatory statements and more especially the subsequent Thucydidean allusions function as signals of this kind to activate *and*

---

[2] Entman (1993) 52. Taylor (1992) 16 makes the same point very effectively, noting that 'television cameras "see" only what they are pointed at... The angle of vision is in turn determined by either what the operator can point at or which he decrees or hopes will be of interest to his editors. The result is to amplify what is before the camera lens and to minimise the significance of what is behind it'. This is exactly the effect of the 'Hellenizing glass' in *BJ*.

[3] Jauss (1969) 33. Also relevant in this context is the schemata theory of perception psychology, on which see (e.g.) Harris (1989) 33, 71-72. Conversely the effective propagandist, as sender, makes it his business to tap into the same system. Thus the German advertising pioneer Hans Domizlaff, as quoted in Gries-Ilgen-Schindelbeck (1995) 45: 'Jedenfalls muß der Propagandist... der großen Masse gegenüber Opportunist sein und auf die Möglichkeiten aufbauen, die das jeweilige Weltbild seiner Aufgabe bietet'. This applies exactly, *mutatis mutandis*, to Josephus' tactical use of genre.

instrumentalize prior knowledge and assumptions on the part of the reader, implicitly inviting him to see the new in terms of the old, the unfamiliar through the classic account. And once the generic horizon is established, what is familiar and expected increasingly guides and modifies what is noticed,[4] the narrated events are read from the perspective of the well-known generic frames.

Apart from engaging the reader in this way and influencing his judgement, evocations of a literary archetype also have the effect of conferring an implicit authority and so enhancing the credibility of the 'imitation'. Ἀμάρτυρον οὐδὲν ἀείδω: like the epic poet who invokes the higher sanction of the muses, Josephus by aligning himself with an authoritative figure in the genre tacitly emphasizes his own status as historian. In that sense the historian's μίμησις works in a very un-Platonic way to undergird and authenticate his own interpretation. The immediate relevance of this 'celebrity endorsement' is best understood in light of Josephus' proemial criticisms of rival (Greek) accounts of the war circulating in Rome, tendentiously misleading versions he wants to explode (1.1-2, 6, 16; cf. *Ap.* 1.46). In this polemical context any emphasis on his own (Thucydidean-type) ἀλήθεια and ἀκρίβεια looks less like a statement of principle than a simple matter of point-scoring, a way of enhancing Josephus' own truth claims against those of the competing accounts.

Implicit throughout the foregoing is the assumption that the intertextual strategies were directed at a sector of Josephus' readers *who would indeed have recognized and appreciated them*, and so also been susceptible to their suasive effect. This takes us to the wider issue of *BJ*'s target audience, which is in turn linked to the question of the work's ultimate intentions. The one-dimensional emphasis on Josephus' Greek and (Greek-speaking) Jewish readership found in some recent studies[5] is an oversimplification that needs to be qualified in light of additional hints supplied by the historian himself. A good starting point is a remark in *Contra Apionem* which alerts us to a more variegated audience for *BJ*:

> So confident was I of its veracity that I presumed to take as my witnesses, before all others, the commanders-in-chief in the war, Vespasian and Titus. They were the first to whom I presented my volumes, copies being

[4] Detailed exposition in Edelman (1995), whose arguments have much relevance for literary genre and reception aesthetics.

[5] Schäublin (1982) 316: 'Josephus bedient sich... der griechischen Sprache: er schreibt also im wesentlichen *für* den hellenistischen Osten'; Krieger (1984) 304: '*BJ* wäre also an das griechisch sprechende Diasporajudentum gerichtet und damit das echte Pendant zur aramäischen Kriegsgeschichte des Josephus (*BJ* 1.3)'; *ibid.* 328: '*BJ* zielt besonders auf ein jüdisches Publikum'.

> afterwards given to many Romans who had taken part in the campaign. Others I sold to a large number of my compatriots, persons well versed in Greek learning, among whom were Julius Archelaus, the most venerable Herod, and the most admirable King Agrippa himself.
>
> (*Ap.* 1.51)

Granted that Josephus is here explicitly defending his credibility as historian by citing diverse groups who might testify to his veracity, the passage offers a useful perspective which can be further nuanced by allusions in *BJ*.

There too particular reader-groups appear in particular contexts. In the work's opening paragraphs Josephus takes issue with earlier accounts of the war which pay more attention to style than accuracy, and which distort the facts through flattery of the Romans or hatred of the Jews (1.2). 'In these circumstances', he continues, 'I... propose to provide *the subjects of the Roman empire* [τοῖς κατὰ τὴν Ῥωμαίων ἡγεμονίαν] with a narrative of the facts, translating into Greek the account which I previously composed in my vernacular tongue and sent to the barbarians in the interior' (1.3). Set against the Aramaic-speaking recipients (cf. 1.6, quoted below) of the original version, the subjects here mentioned will comprise on the one hand non-Semitic readers in general, on the other the Jews of the Hellenistic east.[6] With the former group, we might conjecture, the intention of *BJ* is to neutralize potential anti-Jewish sentiment in the post-war years; addressed to the latter audience, the work would attempt to promote the Jewish-Roman symbiosis by counteracting the negative image of Titus current among the Jews, perhaps also by implicitly cautioning restive elements against contemplating a repetition of the disastrous uprising.[7]

---

[6] The correlation between the Greek version of *BJ* and its lost Aramaic precursor should not be overstated, for while the earlier work was plainly intended for an exclusively Semitic readership, the Greek elaboration alone in virtue of its language made it accessible to wider and more heterogeneous readership. On the Aramaic version Rajak (1983) 176 plausibly conjectures: '...There is no reason to think that the first work bore much similarity to the second in scope or literary form. The fact that the Aramaic version was not preserved in the eastern Christian tradition points to its having been a slight production. Speeches and digressions, characteristic formal features of Graeco-Roman historiography, are likely to have been absent. If there were any prefatory remarks, they would have had to have been different'.

[7] On Titus' negative image in Rabbinic literature, see Yavetz (1975) 412-414; Smallwood (1976) 324 n. 138; Stemberger (1979) 351-356 and (1983) 69-74; Krieger (1994) 302, 304, 328-329. The work's apotreptic intent (cf. 1.5, 3.108): Thackeray (1929) 27-29; Michel-Bauernfeind in their introduction, I xx-xxii; Krieger (1994) 304; but note also the reservations of Rajak (1983) 179-184.

Greek readers too are explicitly named in the preface: 'For myself, at great expenditure of money and pains, I, a foreigner, present to Greeks and Romans this memorial of great achievements' (1.16). The Greeks here mentioned are probably distinct from the Hellenized Jews; and since the statement occurs in a context where Josephus contrasts his own quest for accuracy (τὸ τῆς ἱστορίας ἀληθές) with the careless indifference of contemporary Greek accounts of the war (cf. *Ap.* 1.46), he seems to have in mind specifically those Greek writers whose deficiencies he denounces, i.e. he is making a literary-polemical point.

Greek and Roman readers then appear again in a remark with clear implications about the intentions of *BJ*:

> I thought it monstrous, therefore, to allow the truth in affairs of such importance to go astray, and that, while Parthians and Babylonians and the most remote tribes of Arabia with our countrymen beyond the Euphrates and the inhabitants of Adiabene were, through my assiduity, accurately acquainted with the origin of the war, the various phases of calamity through which it passed and its conclusion, the Greeks and such Romans as were not engaged in the contest [Ἕλληνας... καὶ Ῥωμαίων τοὺς μὴ ἐπιστρατευσαμένους] should remain in ignorance of these matters, with flattering or fictitious narratives as their only guide [ἐντυγχάνοντας ἢ κολακείαις ἢ πλάσμασι].
>
> (1.6)

The slanted accounts named here will correspond to the tendentious narratives censured elsewhere in the preface and subsequently also at *Ap.* 1.46, while the context suggests that Josephus is concerned especially with their potentially damaging effect upon the readers. Nor is this concern hard to understand—for if κολακείαι and πλάσματα are glossed by reference to the earlier distortions 'from flattery of the Romans *or from hatred of the Jews*' (1.2), then such partisan accounts circulating among literate Greeks and Romans could easily fuel existing prejudice and μῖσος πρὸς Ἰουδαίους.[8] The apologist-historian, at pains to counteract the anti-Jewish bias of these rival accounts available in Rome, finds it expedient to propagate among literate Greco-Romans an interpretation of the war that would take the heat off the Jews, and this reader-group (Ἕλληνας... καὶ Ῥωμαίων τοὺς μὴ ἐπιστρατευσαμένους) is evidently identified as a significant constituency in the opinion-shaping process. They will certainly be among those whom Josephus seeks to sway by his strategy of genre-bound impression management.

---

[8] Schäfer (1997) 180-195 has a useful sketch of Roman prejudice towards the Jews; a number of the issues thematized in Noethlichs (1996) 44-67 are also relevant here. For Roman anti-Jewish sentiment after the war, see Goodman (1987) 237-239.

The Roman readership explicitly identified above is also assumed consistently throughout *BJ*. Here for example the distinctive geographical and military excursuses (3.35-58, 70-107, 506-521; 4.476-458; 5.184-247 etc.), arguably of greater interest to a Roman than a Jewish audience, may have been intended especially for the former.[9] And if the work's favourable presentation of the soldier-emperors, and of Titus in particular, aims at one level to counter hostile Jewish propaganda, the Roman focus of this panegyric is even more apparent. Flavian interest in Josephus' history, as evidenced in the official imprimatur (*Vita* 361-363; *Ap.* 1.50-51), must be explained in terms of *BJ*'s propaganda potential.[10] Mindful of *auctoritas* and *maiestas*, and of securing legitimacy for the *novus principatus*, the image-conscious new men will have been especially sensitive to the role of public opinion on the home front.[11] To compensate for deficiency in lineage, pragmatic competence becomes a central theme in the propaganda of the soldier-emperors: hence their massive emphasis on the *Judaea capta* motif[12]—with its literary counterpart in the historian's epic μνήμη τῶν κατορθωμάτων (1.16). The marked Flavian slant in *BJ* presupposes

---

[9] Cf. Weber (1921) 79-80.

[10] For a balanced view, see Rajak (1983) 203-206, 211-213. Yavetz (1975) is more sceptical. Krieger (1994) 298-304 in my view rather overstates the case that the firing of the Temple reflects badly on Titus as impotent commander, and that a Roman reader would therefore have found this portrait 'anstößig' (304).

[11] Suet. *Vesp.* 7.2 is telling, its significance not restricted to the anecdote it introduces (set in Alexandria): *auctoritas et quasi maiestas quaedam ut scilicet inopinato et adhuc novo principi deerat*... Without the advantages of ancestry on their side (*ibid.* 1, *gens Flavia, obscura illa quidem ac sine ullis maiorum imaginibus*; cf. 4.5), the new dynasty had to rely heavily on an effective 'public relations' effort; cf. Weber (1921) 229-231; Bengtson (1979) 86-87.

[12] For the Flavian coinage celebrating *Iudaea capta*, *Iudaea devicta*, *Iudaea devicta imp. T. Caes.*, as well as the *victoria* and *triumphus* types, see Mattingly (1930) *passim* (cf. his index). Simon (1952) 90-116, 214: 'Niemals zuvor ist ein erfolgreicher Feldzug eines römischen Kaisers in diesem Maße auf Münzen gefeiert worden und niemals—mit Ausnahme des augusteischen Zeitalters—tritt in der gesamtem Propaganda der Friedensgedanke so stark hervor' (90). 'Jedenfalls verschweigen die Münzen, daß Judäa bereits zuvor Provinz gewesen ist (Ivdaea Recepta wäre danach der adäquate Terminus gewesen), und erwecken den Anschein, als habe Vespasian als erster dieses Land unterworfen. Ziehen wir in Betracht, daß der Civilis-Aufstand, wie auch die Kämpfe auf den anderen Kriegsschauplätzen keine Erwähnung auf den Münzen finden, so wird die Tendenz deutlich, die Bedeutung des jüdischen Aufstandes zu übersteigern, in dem Wunsch, in der Durchführung dieses Krieges den Aufstieg der neuen Dynastie zu legitimieren' (92). A parallel emphasis in the (now lost) dedication to Titus (*CIL* VI 944) preserved in the *anonymus Einsiedlensis*: *...quod... gentem Iudaeorum domuit et urbem Hierosolymam omnibus ante se ducibus regibus gentibus aut frustra petitam aut omnino intemptatam delevit*. Cf. Schwier (1989) 283-293, who concludes: '...Der Krieg gegen die Juden [gewinnt] nicht nur den Stellenwert eines die neue Dynastie prüfenden Ereignisses, sondern kann—nach dem Erfolg—als Bestätigung der römischen Hegemonie propagiert werden, die von den Flaviern neu errungen... wurde' (292-293). Further Weber (1921) 80-85; Garzetti (1974) 233; Jones (1984) 77-79.

precisely a significant *Roman* target audience susceptible to this kind of persuasion. And these are the same circles among whom Josephus aims also to temper prejudice and μῖσος πρὸς Ἰουδαίους.

This essay has tried to make coherent sense of some significant Thucydidean impulses and other generic conventions in *BJ*, and it was argued that these elements together are part of a strategy of impression management by which Josephus, for reasons outlined above, seeks to convey a particular interpretation of events to a heterogeneous spectrum of readers. By incorporating recognizable classical frames, Josephus formats his own tendentious interpretation in a way that makes it accessible and acceptable to a readership familiar with the νόμοι of the genre. Clearly his hostile treatment of the insurgents will *not* stand up to the prefatory claims of ἀλήθεια, ἀκρίβεια and impartial reporting; but equally clearly the historiographical issues raised by Josephus' polemic involve more than just the simple dichotomy 'true/false'. With reference to his treatment of the rebels and their motives, the alternative to the historical *verum* proclaimed in the preface is not indeed *falsum* or flagrant untruth, but rather *verisimile*. In Polybian terms, this is the distinction between τὸ πιθανόν, κἂν ᾖ ψεῦδος on the one hand, on the other τἀληθές (2.56.11-12)—with the difference that the *verisimile* Josephus presents as *verum* has nothing to do with poetic fictions but is recognizably based on a Thucydidean-type analysis of ἀνθρωπεία φύσις. In that sense the aggregate of classical elements that make up his *verisimile* might be termed an ἀληθὲς ψεῦδος—a system of truth *out of context*, to be sure, yet a consistent and compelling scheme of 'syntactical' truth or truth by coherence,[13] with a distinguished literary genealogy to boot. Of Josephus' war narrative it might well be said, as has been claimed of a more recent conflict, 'es war ein Krieg, in dem Fakten zu Fiktionen wurden. Und Fiktionen zu Fakten'.[14] The point is that fact and fiction only become interchangeable when the fictions themselves are presented so persuasively.

Finally, we noted earlier a wide divergence in modern attempts to define Josephus' relationship to the tradition of classical historiography. At

---

[13] I.e. truth relative to the syntactical or ordering system employed. For the notion, see CHERRY (1966) 225: '"Syntactical truth" should be distinguished from experiential, factual, "plain truth." A logician may set up formal rules for combining words, or other signs, into sentences and rules by which deductions, consequences, or implications may be drawn. The "truth" of any such conclusions can then be stated only with reference to this particular syntactical system ("true" in such-and-such a system)'. Cf. RUTHVEN (1979) 171-173; BAILEY (1991) 15-19.

[14] Thus Dietmar OSSENBERG (à propos the 1991 Gulf War), as quoted in LÖFFELHOLZ (1993) 54.

one end of the scale we encountered the view that 'in the end, Josephus' Hellenization is of a rather formal and superficial nature' (BILDE), at the other the verdict that he is 'the Jewish Thucydides' (SHUTT).[15] I would argue that after some qualification of either position, there is even a partial convergence of opposites. BILDE in bracketing 'formal' and 'superficial' articulates a common prejudice that has not been conducive to critical analysis of the Hellenization in *BJ*: the correlation will stand only if 'formal' is narrowly understood as referring to discrete details such as lexical or stylistic features—the kind of data that can be tabulated in inventories but that leave unanswered the crucial question 'So what?' Formal allegiance however also entails more than just this. Josephus' relationship to Thucydides and the Greco-Roman tradition is indeed of a strictly *formal* nature in the sense that he incorporates not only identifiable motifs and allusions, but also characteristic *formal-analytical frames, methods and categories*. To the extent therefore that these formal features together amount to material evidence of a literary-intellectual affiliation, SHUTT comes closer the mark than BILDE. But on the other hand, as I have tried to show throughout, the notion of *Josephus Thucydideus* needs to be treated with the greatest caution, for the author of *BJ* is not the austere and disinterested scientist whose guiding principle is historical ἀκρίβεια. A distinguished analyst of propaganda reminds us that 'we must make a radical distinction between fact on the one hand and intentions or interpretations on the other; in brief, between the material and the moral elements'.[16] So it is with Josephus' use of his predecessors and of the generic conventions.

[15] BILDE (1988) 205 and SHUTT (1961) 125 respectively.
[16] ELLUL (1965) 53.

This page intentionally left blank

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. *Text and Translations of Josephus*

Michel, O., Bauernfeind, O. (1982): Flavius Josephus, *De Bello Judaico—Der jüdische Krieg*. Herausgegeben und mit einer Einleitung sowie mit Anmerkungen versehen von O. Michel und O. Bauernfeind (Darmstadt 1959, ^{3}1982).

Thackeray, H.St.J. (1927/1928): Josephus, *The Jewish War*. With an English translation by H.St.J. Thackeray (Cambridge, Mass. = volumes II [1927 repr. 1989] and III [1928 repr. 1990] of the Loeb Josephus).

Clementz, H. (1994): Flavius Josephus, *Geschichte des Judäischen Krieges*. Aus dem Griechischen von H. Clementz, mit einer Einleitung von K.-D. Eichler (Leipzig 1978, ^{6}1994).

Endrös, H. (1993): Flavius Josephus, *Der jüdische Krieg*. Aus dem Griechischen von H. Endrös, mit einem Anhang von G. Wirth (München).

Williamson, G.A. (1959): Josephus, *The Jewish War*. Translated with an introduction by G.A. Williamson (Harmondsworth, Penguin Classics).

Williamson, G.A. (1981): Josephus, *The Jewish War*. Translated by G.A. Williamson, revised with a new introduction, notes and appendixes by E. Mary Smallwoood (Harmondsworth, Penguin Classics).

B. *Secondary Literature*

Allison, J.W. (1997): *Word and Concept in Thucydides* (Atlanta).

Applebaum, S. (1971): 'The Zealots: The Case for Revaluation', *Journal of Roman Studies* 61: 155-170.

——(1989): 'Josephus and the Economic Causes of the Jewish War', in Feldman-Hata (1989) 237-264.

Attridge, H.W. (1976): *The Interpretation of Biblical History in the Antiquitates of Flavius Josephus* (Missoula).

——(1984): 'Josephus and his Works', in Stone (1984) 185-232.

——(1986): 'Jewish Historiography', in R.A. Kraft, G.E. Nickelsburg edd., *Early Judaism and its Modern Interpreters* (Atlanta) 311-343.

Avi-Yonah, M., Baras, Z. edd. (1977): *Society and Religion in the Second Temple Period* (= *The World History of the Jewish People* 1.8) (London).

Baer, Y. (1971): 'Jerusalem in the Times of the Great Revolt', *Zion* 36: 127-190 (Hebrew, with English summary).

Bailey, F.G. (1991): *The Prevalence of Deceit* (Ithaca/London).

Barnard, M.A. (1980): *Stasis in Thucydides: Narrative and Analysis of Factionalism in the Polis* (Diss. Univ. of North Carolina at Chapel Hill).

Barnett, P.W. (1981): 'The Jewish Sign Prophets A.D. 40-70. Their Intentions and Origin', *New Testament Studies* 27: 679-697.

Baumbach, G. (1965): 'Zeloten und Sikarier', *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 90: 727-740.

——(1967): 'Das Freiheitsverständnis in der zelotischen Bewegung', in F. Maass ed., *Das ferne und nahe Wort*. Festschrift Leonhard Rost (Berlin) 11-18.

——(1968): 'Die Zeloten—ihre geschichtliche und religionspolitische Bedeutung', *Bibel und Liturgie* 41: 2-25.

——(1973): 'Die antirömischen Aufstandsgruppen', in J. Maier, J. Schreiner edd., *Literatur und Religion des Frühjudentums* (Würzburg/Gütersloh) 273-283.
——(1985): 'Einheit und Vielfalt der jüdischen Freiheitsbewegungen im 1. Jh. n. Chr.', *Evangelische Theologie* 45: 93-107.
Bender, G.F. (1938): *Der Begriff des Staatsmannes bei Thukydides* (Diss. Würzburg).
Bengtson, H. (1979): *Die Flavier* (München).
Benz, W. (1996): *Feindbild und Vorurteil* (München).
Bertman, S. ed. (1976): *The Conflict of Generations in Ancient Greece and Rome* (Amsterdam).
Betz, O. (1987): 'Stadt und Gegenstadt—Ein Kapitel zelotischer Theologie', in *id.*, *Jesus. Der Messias Israels* (Tübingen) 25-38.
Betz, O., Haacker. K., Hengel, M. edd. (1974): *Josephus-Studien* (Göttingen).
Biffi, N. (1988): '*Sueta insuetaque vesci*. Verifica di un *topos*', *Invigilata lucernis* 10: 35-57.
Bilde, P. (1979): 'The Causes of the Jewish War according to Josephus', *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 10: 179-202.
——(1988): *Flavius Josephus between Jerusalem and Rome* (Sheffield).
Bohrmann, M. (1989): *Flavius Josèphe les Zélotes et Yavné* (Berne).
Bomstad, R.G. (1979): *Governing Ideas of the Jewish War of Flavius Josephus* (Diss. Yale).
Borzsák, I. (1973): 'Spectaculum. Ein Motiv der "tragischen Geschichtsschreibung" bei Livius und Tacitus', *Acta Classica Universitatis Scientiarum Debreceniensis* 9:57-67.
Brandon, S.G.F. (1951): *The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church* (London).
——(1965): 'The Zealots: The Jewish Resistance against Rome A.D. 6-73', *History Today* 15: 632-641.
——(1970): 'The Defeat of Cestius Gallus A.D. 66', *History Today* 20: 38-46.
Broshi, M. (1982): 'The Credibility of Josephus', *Journal of Jewish Studies* 33: 379-384.
Bruce, F.F. (1969): *New Testament History* (repr. New York 1980).
Brüne, B. (1913): *Flavius Josephus und seine Schriften in ihrem Verhältnis zum Judentum, zur griechisch-römischen Welt und zum Christentum* (repr. Gütersloh 1969).
Brunt, P.A. (1976): 'The Romanization of the Local Ruling Classes in the Roman Empire', in D.M. Pippidi ed., *Assimilation et résistance à la culture gréco-romaine dans le monde ancien* (Paris/Bucarest) 161-173.
——(1977): 'Josephus on Social Conflicts in Roman Judaea', *Klio* 59: 149-153.
Camporesi, P. (1989): *Bread of Dreams* (Cambridge).
Cancik, H. (1986): 'Disziplin und Rationalität. Zur Analyse militärischer Intelligenz am Beispiel von Caesars "Gallischem Krieg"', *Saeculum* 37: 166-171.
——(1987): 'Rationalität und Militär. Caesars Kriege gegen Mensch und Natur', in H.-J. Glücklich ed., *Lateinische Literatur, heute wirkend* II (Göttingen) 7-29.
Cherry, C. (1966): *On Human Communication* (Cambridge, Mass. 1957, ^{2}1966).
Cipriani, G. (1986): *Cesare e la retorica dell'assedio* (Amsterdam).
Cohen, N.G. (1976): 'The Theological Stratum of the Martha b. Boethus Tradition', *Harvard Theological Review* 69: 187-195.
Cohen, S.J.D. (1979): *Josephus in Galilee and Rome* (Leiden).
——(1982): 'Josephus, Jeremiah, and Polybius', *History and Theory* 21: 366-381.
Collomp, P. (1947): 'Der Platz des Josephus in der Technik der hellenistischen Geschichtsschreibung', in A. Schalit ed., *Zur Josephus-Forschung* (Darmstadt 1973) 278-293.
Colombo, G. (1983): 'Sul discorso di Tito in Giuseppe Flavio VI,1,34 ss.', in *Atti del Congresso Internazionale di Studi Flaviani* (Rieti) II 251-257.
Connor, W.R. (1984): *Thucydides* (Princeton).
Cornford, F.M. (1907): *Thucydides Mythistoricus* (repr. New York 1969).
Crane, C. (1996): *The Blinded Eye. Thucydides and the New Written Word* (Lanham).
Daniel, J.L. (1981): *Apologetics in Josephus* (Diss. Rutgers, New Brunswick).
Dauge, Y.A. (1981): *Le Barbare. Recherches sur la conception romaine de la barbarie et de la civilisation* (Bruxelles).
Dihle, A. (1989): *Die griechische und lateinische Literatur der Kaiserzeit* (München).

DOVER, K.J. (1973): *Thucydides* (= *Greece & Rome: New Surveys in the Classics* 7) (repr. Oxford 1979).
DRÜNER, H. (1896): *Untersuchungen über Josephus* (Diss. Marburg).
DYSON, S.L. (1971): 'Native Revolts in the Roman Empire', *Historia* 20: 239-274.
ECKSTEIN, A.M. (1989): 'Hannibal at New Carthage: Polybius 3.15 and the Power of Irrationality', *Classical Philology* 84: 1-15.
——(1990): 'Josephus and Polybius: A Reconsideration', *Classical Antiquity* 9: 175-208.
——(1995): *Moral Vision in the Histories of Polybius* (Berkeley/Los Angeles).
EDELMAN, M.J. (1988): *Constructing the Political Spectacle* (Chicago/London).
——(1995): *From Art to Politics* (Chicago/London).
EDMUNDS, L. (1975 *a*): *Chance and Intelligence in Thucydides* (Cambridge, Mass.).
——(1975 *b*): 'Thucydides' Ethics as Reflected in the Description of Stasis', *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 79: 73-92.
EICHLER, K.-D. (1994): 'Geschichtsschreibung zwischen Autobiographie und Rechtfertigung', introduction to CLEMENTZ (1994) 7-20.
ELLUL, J. (1965): *Propaganda. The Formation of Men's Attitudes* (repr. New York 1973).
ENTMAN, R.M. (1993): 'Framing: Toward Clarification of a Fractured Paradigm', *Journal of Communication* 43.4: 51-58.
EUBEN, J.P. (1990): *The Tragedy of Political Theory* (Princeton).
FARMER, W.R. (1956): *Maccabees, Zealots, and Josephus* (repr. New York 1958).
FELDMAN, L.H. (1984): *Josephus and Modern Scholarship (1937-1980)* (Berlin/New York).
——(1989): 'A Selective Critical Bibliography of Josephus', in FELDMAN-HATA (1989) 330-448.
——(1994): 'Josephus' Portrayal of the Hasmonaeans compared with 1 Maccabees', in PARENTE-SIEVERS (1994) 41-68.
FELDMAN, L.H., HATA, G. edd. (1987): *Josephus, Judaism and Christianity* (Leiden).
——(1989): *Josephus, the Bible and History* (Leiden).
FISH, S. (1994): *There's No Such Thing as Free Speech* (New York/Oxford).
FORNARA, C.W. (1983): *The Nature of History in Ancient Greece and Rome* (Berkeley/Los Angeles).
FOWLER, A. (1982): *Kinds of Literature* (repr. Oxford 1987).
FRANK, J.D. (1967): *Sanity and Survival. Psychological Aspects of War and Peace* (New York).
FRIES, J. (1985): *Der Zweikampf. Historische und literarische Aspekte seiner Darstellung bei T. Livius* (Meisenheim).
GABBA, E. (1976/1977): 'L'impero romano nel discorso di Agrippa II', *Rivista storica dell'antichità* 6/7: 189-194.
GANFI, I. (1984): 'The Historical Background', in STONE (1984) 1-32.
GÄRTNER, H.A. (1975): *Beobachtungen zu Bauelementen in der antiken Historiographie besonders bei Livius und Caesar* (Wiesbaden).
GARZETTI, A. (1974): *From Tiberius to the Antonines* (London).
GEHRKE, H.-J. (1985): *Stasis. Untersuchungen zu den inneren Kriegen in den griechischen Staaten des 5. und 4. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.* (München).
GICHON, M. (1981): 'Cestius Gallus's Campaign in Judaea', *Palestinian Exploration Quarterly* 113: 39-62.
GLÜCK, J.J. (1964): 'Reviling and Monomachy as Battle-Preludes in Ancient Warfare', *Acta Classica* 7: 25-31.
GOODMAN, M. (1982): 'The First Jewish Revolt: Social Conflict and the Problem of Debt', *Journal of Jewish Studies* 33: 417-427.
——(1987): *The Ruling Class of Judaea* (repr. Cambridge 1993).
——(1990): 'The Origins of the Great Revolt: A Conflict of Status Criteria', in KASHER-RAPPAPORT-FUKS (1990) 39-53.
GOMMEL, J. (1966): *Rhetorisches Argumentieren bei Thukydides* (Hildesheim).
GRABER, D.A. (1976): *Verbal Behaviour and Politics* (Urbana/Chicago).
GRIES, R., ILGEN, V., SCHINDELBECK, D. (1995): *Ins Gehirn der Masse kriechen!* (Darmstadt).

GRIFFIN, J. (1980): *Homer on Life and Death* (Oxford).
GRIMM, J. (1965): *Die literarische Darstellung der Pest in der Antike und in der Romania* (München).
HADAS-LEBEL, M. (1987): ' Ἄνοια et ἀπόνοια des ennemis de Rome selon Flavius Josèphe', *Associazione italiana per lo studio del Giudaismo* 4: 197-212.
——(1989): *Flavius Josèphe* (Paris).
——(1990): *Jérusalem contre Rome* (Paris).
——(1994): 'Flavius Josephus, Historian of Rome', in PARENTE-SIEVERS (1994) 99-106
HARRIS, R.J. (1989): *A Cognitive Psychology of Mass Communication* (New Jersey).
HARTER, W.H. (1982): *The Causes and the Course of the Jewish Revolt against Rome, 66-74 C.E. in Recent Scholarship*. (Diss. Union Theological Seminary, New York).
HENGEL, M. (1974): 'Zeloten und Sikarier', in BETZ-HAACKER-HENGEL (1974) 175-196.
——(1976): *Die Zeloten* (Leiden 1961, ^{2}1976).
HERKOMMER, E. (1968): *Die Topoi in den Proömien der römischen Geschichtswerke* (Diss. Tübingen).
HEUBNER, F. (1974): 'Das Feindbild in Caesars *Bellum Gallicum*', *Klio* 56: 103-182.
HÖLSCHER, G. (1916): 'Josephus', *RE* IX, coll. 1934-2000.
HORNBLOWER, S. (1991): *A Commentary on Thucydides. Volume I: Books I-III* (Oxford).
HORSLEY, R.A. (1979 *a*): 'Josephus and the Bandits', *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 10: 37-63.
——(1979 *b*): 'The Sicarii: Ancient Jewish "Terrorists"', *Journal of Religion* 59: 435-458.
——(1981): 'Ancient Jewish Banditry and the Revolt against Rome, A.D. 66-70', *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 43: 409-432.
——(1986 *a*): 'The Zealots. Their Origin, Relationships and Importance in the Jewish Revolt', *Novum Testamentum* 28: 159-192.
——(1986 *b*): 'High Priests and the Politics of Roman Palestine. A Contextual Analysis of the Evidence in Josephus', *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 17: 23-55.
——(1988): 'Bandits, Messiahs, and Longshoremen: Popular Unrest in Galilee around the Time of Jesus, in D.J. LULL ed., *Society of Biblical Literature 1988 Seminar Papers* (Atlanta) 183-199.
——(1995): *Galilee: History, Politics, People* (Valley Forge, Penn.).
HORSLEY, R.A., HANSON, J.S. (1985): *Bandits, Prophets and Messiahs* (Minneapolis).
HORSTMANSHOFF, H.F.J. (1989): *De Pijlen van de Pest* (Amsterdam).
HUART, P. (1968): *Le vocabulaire de l'analyse psychologique dans l'oeuvre de Thucydide* (Paris).
——(1973): ΓΝΩΜΗ *chez Thucydide et ses contemporains* (Paris).
HUNGER, H. (1939): 'Die Krise des athenischen Staates im Geschichtswerk des Thukydides', *Wiener Studien* 62: 23-38.
HUNTER, V. (1973): *Thucydides the Artful Reporter* (Toronto).
JAL, P. (1963): *La guerre civile à Rome* (Paris).
JAUBERT, A. (1963): *La notion d'alliance dans le Judaïsme aux abords de l'ère chrétienne* (Paris).
JAUSS, H.R. (1969): *Literaturgeschichte als Provokation der Literaturwissenschaft* (Konstanz 1967, ^{2}1969).
JEREMIAS, J. (1969): *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus* (London).
JONES, B.W. (1984): *The Emperor Titus* (London/New York).
DE JONGE, M. (1974): 'Josephus und die Zukunftserwartungen seines Volkes', in BETZ-HAACKER-HENGEL (1974) 205-219.
KASHER, A., RAPPAPORT, U., FUKS, G. edd. (1990): *Greece and Rome in Eretz Israel* (Jerusalem).
KEEN, S. (1986): *Faces of the Enemy* (San Francisco).
KLAUSNER, J. (1977): 'The Messianic Idea in the Apocryphal Literature', in AVI-YONAH-BARAS (1977) 153-186.
KOEP, L. (1954): 'Bestattung', *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum* 2: coll. 194-219.
KÖTTING, B. (1966): 'Euergetes', *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum* 6: coll. 848-860.
KOHL, W. (1977): *Die Redetrias vor der sizilischen Expedition (Thukydides 6,9-23)* (Meisenheim).

KOSTER, S. (1980): *Die Invektive in der griechischen und römischen Literatur* (Meisenheim).
KOTTEK, S.S. (1994): *Medicine and Hygiene in the Works of Flavius Josephus* (Leiden).
KRAUS, M. (1987): *Name und Sache* (Amsterdam).
KRAUS, W. (1978): *Macht und Kultur* (München).
KREISSIG, H. (1989): 'A Marxist View of Josephus' Account of the Jewish War', in FELDMAN-HATA (1989) 265-277.
KRIEGER, K.-S. (1994): *Geschichtsschreibung als Apologetik bei Flavius Josephus* (Tübingen/Basel).
LADOUCEUR, D.J. (1981): 'The Death of Herod the Great', *Classical Philology* 76: 25-34.
——(1987): 'Josephus and Masada', in FELDMAN-HATA (1987) 95-113.
LANDMANN, G.P. (1930): *Interpretation einer Rede des Thukydides* (Diss. Basel; Tübingen 1932).
LANTERNARI, V. (1963): *The Religions of the Oppressed. A Study of Modern Messianic Cults* (London).
LENDLE, O. (1992): *Einführung in die griechische Geschichtsschreibung* (Darmstadt).
LETOUBLON, F. (1983): 'Défi et combat dans l'*Iliade*', *Revue des études grecques* 96: 27-48.
LEVI, M.A. (1938): 'I principi dell'impero di Vespasiano', *Rivista di filologia e di istruzione classica* 17: 1-12.
LINDNER, H. (1972): *Die Geschichtsauffassung des Flavius Josephus im Bellum Judaicum* (Leiden).
LÖFFELHOLZ, M. ed. (1993): *Krieg als Medienereignis* (Opladen).
LORAUX, N. (1986): 'Thucydide et la sedition dans les mots', *Quaderni di storia* 23: 95-134.
LUND, A.A. (1990): *Zum Germanenbild der Römer. Eine Einführung in die antike Ethnographie* (Heidelberg).
LUSCHNAT, O. (1942): *Die Feldherrnreden im Geschichtswerk des Thukydides* (Leipzig).
——(1971): *Thukydides der Historiker* (= *RE* Suppl. XII, coll. 1085-1354) (Stuttgart).
MACMULLEN, R. (1966): *Enemies of the Roman Order* (repr. London 1992).
MADER, G. (1993): ' Ἀννίβας ὑβριστής: Traces of a "Tragic" Pattern in Livy's Hannibal Portrait in Book XXI?', *Ancient Society* 24: 205-224.
MANTOVANI, M. (1990): *Bellum iustum. Die Idee des gerechten Krieges in der römischen Kaiserzeit* (Bern/Frankfurt).
MATTINGLY, H. (1930): *Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum II: Vespasian to Domitian* (repr. London 1966).
MEISTER, C. (1953): *Die Gnomik im Geschichtswerk des Thukydides* (Diss. Zürich; Winterthur 1955).
MENDELS, D. (1992): *The Rise and Fall of Jewish Nationalism* (New York).
MICHEL, O. (1984): 'Die Rettung Israels und die Rolle Roms nach den Reden im "Bellum Iudaicum". Analysen und Perspektiven', *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* II.21.2: 945-976.
MITTELSTADT, M.C. (1968): 'The Plague in Thucydides: An Extended Metaphor?', *Rivista di studi classici* 16: 145-154.
MORGAN, T.E. (1994): 'Plague or Poetry? Thucydides on the Epidemic at Athens', *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 124: 197-209.
MOSÈS, A. (1986): 'Enjeux personnels, enjeux collectifs dans la *Guerre des Juifs*', *Bulletin de l'Association Guillaume Budé*: 186-201.
MÜLLER, K.E. (1972/1980): *Geschichte der antiken Ethnographie und ethnologischen Theoriebildung* I (1972), II (1980) (Wiesbaden).
MÜRI, W. (1947): 'Beitrag zum Verständnis des Thukydides', *Museum Helveticum* 4: 251-275.
——(1969): 'Politische Metonomasie (zu Thukydides 3.82.4-5)', *Museum Helveticum* 26: 65-79.
MUTSCHLER, F.-H. (1975): *Erzählstil und Propaganda in Caesars Kommentarien* (Heidelberg).
NADEL, B. (1966): 'Quid Flavius Iosephus sermoni atque colori dicendi invectivarum Romanarum debuerit', *Eos* 66: 256-272 (Polish, with Latin summary).
NIENS, C. (1987): *Struktur und Dynamik in den Kampfszenen der Ilias* (Heidelberg).

Nikiprowetzky, V. (1971): 'La mort d'Éléazar fils de Jaïre et les courants apologétiques dans le *De Bello Judaico* de Flavius Josèphe', in A. Caquot, M. Philoneko edd., *Hommages à André Dupont-Sommer* (Paris) 461-490.
——(1989): 'Josephus and the Revolutionary Parties', in Feldman-Hata (1989) 216-236.
Noethlichs, K.L. (1996): *Das Judentum und der römische Staat* (Darmstadt).
Opelt, I. (1965): *Die lateinischen Schimpfwörter und verwandte sprachliche Erscheinungen* (Heidelberg).
Orwin, C. (1988): 'Stasis and Plague: Thucydides on the Dissolution of Society', *Journal of Politics* 50: 831-847.
——(1994): *The Humanity of Thucydides* (Princeton).
Parente, F., Sievers, J. edd. (1994): *Josephus and the History of the Greco-Roman Period* (Leiden).
Parry, A.M. (1957): *Logos and ergon in Thucydides* (Diss. Harvard; Salem 1988).
Paul, G.M. (1993 *a*): 'Josephus *Bellum Judaicum* 4.559-63: Invective as History', in F. Cairns ed., *Papers of the Leeds International Latin Seminar* 7 (Liverpool) 141-154.
——(1993 *b*): 'The Presentation of Titus in the Jewish War of Josephus: Two Aspects', *Phoenix* 47: 56-66.
Pédech, P. (1964): *La méthode historique de Polybe* (Paris).
Plöger, H. (1975): *Studien zum literarischen Feldherrnporträt römischer Autoren des 1. Jahrhunderts v. Chr*. (Diss. Kiel).
Plümacher, E. (1972): *Lukas als hellenistischer Schriftsteller* (Göttingen).
Pouncey, P.R. (1980): *The Necessities of War* (New York).
Raabe, H. (1974): *Plurima mortis imago* (München).
Raaflaub, K. (1981): 'Zum Freiheitsbegriff der Griechen', in E.C. Welskopf ed., *Soziale Typenbegriffe* 4 (Berlin) 180-405.
——(1985): *Die Entdeckung der Freiheit* (München).
——(1988): 'Politisches Denken im Zeitalter Athens', in I. Fetscher, H. Münkler edd., *Pipers Handbuch der politischen Ideen 1: Frühe Hochkulturen und europäische Antike* (München/Zürich) 273-368.
Rajak, T. (1983): *Josephus. The Historian and his Society* (London).
Rambaud, M. (1953): *L'art de la déformation historique dans les commentaires de César* (Paris).
Rasmussen, D. (1963): *Caesars Commentarii. Stil und Stilwandel am Beispiel der direkten Rede* (Göttingen).
Rawson, C. (1987): 'Narrative and the Proscribed Act: Homer, Euripides and the Literature of Cannibalism', in K.W. Thompson ed., *The History and Philosophy of Rhetoric and Political Discourse* II (Lanham/New York/London) 73-103.
Rechenauer, G. (1991): *Thukydides und die hippokratische Medizin* (Hildesheim).
Reinhold, M. (1976): 'The Generation Gap in Antiquity', in Bertman (1976) 15-54.
——(1985): 'Human Nature as Cause in Ancient Historiography', in J.W. Eadie, J. Ober edd., *The Craft of the Ancient Historian* (Lanham) 21-40.
Rhoads, D.M. (1976): *Israel in Revolution: 6-74 C.E.* (Philadelphia).
Rieber, R.W., Kelly, R.J. (1991): 'Substance and Shadow: Images of the Enemy', in R.W. Rieber ed., *The Psychology of War and Peace* (New York/London) 3-39.
De Romilly, J. (1963): *Thucydides and Athenian Imperialism* (repr. New York 1979).
——(1990): *La construction de la vérité chez Thucydide* (Paris).
Roth, C. (1959 *a*): 'The Jewish Revolt against Rome', *Commentary* 27: 513-522.
——(1959 *b*): 'The Zealots in the War of 66-73', *Journal of Semitic Studies* 4: 332-355.
——(1959 *c*): 'The Zealots—A Jewish Religious Sect', *Judaism* 8: 33-40.
Ruthven, K.K. (1979): *Critical Assumptions* (Cambridge).
Saulnier, C. (1989): 'Flavius Josèphe et la propaganda flavienne', *Revue biblique* 96: 545-562.
——(1990): 'Flavius Josèphe: apologiste de Rome pour servir l'histoire juive', in Kasher-Rappaport-Fuks (1990) 84-91.

Schäfer, P. (1983): *Geschichte der Juden in der Antike* (Stuttgart/Neukirchen).
——(1997): *Judaeophobia. Attitudes toward the Jews in the Ancient World* (Cambridge, Mass./London).
Schäublin, C. (1982): 'Josephus und die Griechen', *Hermes* 110: 316-341.
Scheiber, A. (1965): 'Zu den antiken Zusammenhängen der Aggada', *Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 13: 267-272.
Schmid, W., Stählin, O. (1948): *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur* 1.5 (München).
Schneider, C. (1974): *Information und Absicht bei Thukydides* (Göttingen).
Schneider, W. (1978): *Wörter machen Leute* (München 1976, ^{2}1978).
Schönlein, P.W. (1965): *Sittliches Bewußtsein als Handlungsmotiv bei römischen Historikern* (Diss. Erlangen).
——(1969): 'Zur Entstehung eines Gewissensbegriffes bei Griechen und Römern', *Rheinisches Museum* 112: 289-315.
Schrijen, J.J.A. (1965): *Elpis. De voorstelling van de hoop in de griekse literatuur tot Aristoteles* (Groningen).
Schubart, W. (1937): 'Das hellenistische Königsideal nach Inschriften und Papyri', in H. Kloft ed., *Ideologie und Herrschaft in der Antike* (Darmstadt 1979) 90-122.
Schubert, C. (1993): *Die Macht des Volkes und die Ohnmacht des Denkens*. Stuttgart.
Schunck, P. (1955): *Römisches Sterben* (Diss. Heidelberg).
Schwartz, S. (1990): *Josephus and Judaean Politics* (Leiden).
Schwier, H. (1989): *Tempel und Tempelzerstörung* (Freiburg/Göttingen).
Segal, C. (1974): 'The Raw and the Cooked in Greek Literature: Structure, Values, Metaphor', *Classical Journal* 69: 289-308.
Shutt, R.J.H. (1961): *Studies in Josephus* (London).
Simon, H.-G. (1952): *Historische Interpretationen zur Reichsprägung der Kaiser Vespasian und Titus* (Diss. Marburg).
Smallwood, E.M. (1976): *The Jews under Roman Rule* (repr. Leiden 1981).
Sorokin, P.A. (1942): *Man and Society in Calamity* (repr. New York 1946).
Stahl, H.-P. (1966): *Thukydides. Die Stellung des Menschen im geschichtlichen Prozeß* (München).
Stein, E. (1937): *De Woordenkeuzen in het Bellum Judaïcum van Flavius Josephus* (Diss. Amsterdam).
Stemberger, G. (1979): 'Die Beurteilung Roms in der rabbinischen Literatur', *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* II.19.2: 338-396.
——(1983): *Die römische Herrschaft im Urteil der Juden* (Darmstadt).
Sterling, G.E. (1992): *Historiography and Self-Definition. Josephos, Luke-Acts and Apologetic Historiography* (Leiden).
Stern, M. (1977): 'Sicarii and Zealots', in Avi-Yonah-Baras (1977) 263-301.
——(1987): 'Josephus and the Roman Empire', in Feldman-Hata (1987) 71-80.
Stone, M.E. ed. (1984): *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (Assen/Philadelphia).
Strasburger, H. (1975): *Die Wesensbestimmung der Geschichte durch die antike Geschichtsschreibung* (Wiesbaden 1966, ^{3}1975).
Taylor, P.M. (1992): *War and the Media* (Manchester/New York).
Thackeray, H.St.J. (1929): *Josephus the Man and the Historian* (repr. New York 1967).
Thérond, B. (1979): *Le discours de l'historien dans la Guerre des Juifs de Flavius Josèphe* (Diss. Paris X Nanterre).
——(1981): 'Les Flaviens dans la Guerre des Juifs de Flavius Josèphe', *Dialogues d'histoire ancienne* 7: 235-245.
Thoma, C. (1966): *Die Zerstörung des Jerusalemischen Tempels im Jahre 70 n. Chr.* (Diss. Wien).
——(1969): 'Die Weltanschauung des Josephus Flavius', *Kairos* 11: 39-52.
Thomas, R.F. (1988): 'Tree Violation and Ambivalence in Virgil', *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 118: 261-273.
Thome, G. (1991): *Vorstellungen vom Bösen in der lateinischen Literatur* (Stuttgart).
——(1992): 'Crime and Punishment, Guilt and Expiation: Roman Thought and Vocabulary', *Acta Classica* 35: 73-98.

Trzaska-Richter, C. (1993): 'Das römische Germanenbild und wie man es benutzte', *Der altsprachliche Unterricht* 36.6: 37-51.
Van Unnik, W.C. (1978): *Flavius Josephus als historischer Schriftsteller* (Heidelberg).
Versnel, H.S. (1993): *Inconsistencies in Greek and Roman Religion* II (Leiden).
Vidal-Naquet, P. (1978): 'Flavius Josèphe et Masada', *Revue historique* 260: 3-21.
——(1992): *Il buon uso del tradimento* (Rome).
Villalba I Varneda, P. (1986): *The Historical Method of Flavius Josephus* (Leiden).
Vogt, J. (1940): 'Caesar und seine Soldaten', in *id.*, *Orbis* (Freiburg 1960) 89-109.
Walsh, P.G. (1961): *Livy. His Historical Aims and Methods* (Cambridge).
Wasserman, F. (1976): 'The Conflict of Generations in Thucydides', in Bertman (1976) 119-121.
Weber, H.-O. (1967): *Die Bedeutung und Bewertung der Pleonexie von Homer bis Isokrates* (Diss. Bonn).
Weber, W. (1921): *Josephus und Vespasian* (repr. Hildesheim 1973).
Wirth, G. (1993): Afterword to Endrös (1993) 571-600.
Wössner, W. (1937): *Die synonymische Unterscheidung bei Thukydides und den politischen Rednern der Griechen* (Diss. Berlin).
Yavetz, Z. (1975): 'Reflections on Titus and Josephus', *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 16: 411-432.
Zahn, R. (1934): *Die erste Periklesrede (Thukydides I 140-144)* (Borna-Leipzig).
Zeitlin, S. (1968/1969): 'A Survey of Jewish Historiography: From the Biblical Books to the *Sefer Ha-Kabbalah* with Special Emphasis on Josephus', *Jewish Quarterly Review* 49: 171-214.
——(1978): *The Rise and Fall of the Judaean State* III (Philadelphia).

INDEX OF PASSAGES

A. Josephus

B. Classical Literature

GENERAL INDEX

SUPPLEMENTS TO MNEMOSYNE

Recent volumes in the series: