Histos 14 (2020) 275–99

JOSEPHUS BETWEEN JERUSALEM AND ROME: CULTURAL BROKERAGE AND THE RHETORIC OF EMOTION IN THE *BELLUM JUDAICUM* (1.9–12)*

Abstract: This contribution aims to address the simple but far-reaching issue of the relationship between the Judaean and Graeco-Roman currents in Josephus' *Bellum Judaicum*. It offers a new perspective on Josephus' use of personal emotions in this work, in particular by looking at his outburst in *BJ* 1.9–12. It proposes to examine Josephus' motivations for fashioning this passage in the way he did by (1) placing his compositional choices in their literary context, i.e., the broader historiographical outlook of the *BJ*, and (2) comparing his practice to the Graeco-Roman literature supposedly familiar to his intended audience in Rome. What I aim to show in this article is that Josephus uses emotions in a rhetorically calculated way with the intention of investing Roman readers in his account of the Judaean revolt against Rome.

Keywords: Josephus, *Bellum Judaicum*, Roman audience, rhetoric of emotion, cultural brokerage, historiographical conventions

1. Introduction: Josephus between Jerusalem and Rome

The problem of determining the precise relationship between the Judaean and Graeco-Roman currents in the life and work of Josephus—a priest in Jerusalem and descendent of the Hasmonaean kings, but also a resident and citizen of Rome—has occupied scholars for a long time and remains central today.[1] In a recent contribution to this journal, for example, Jon Davies offers an illuminating take on Josephus' possible use of 'culturally-directed doublespeak'.[2] Asking where the centre of Flavius

* I am grateful to Steve Mason and Lautaro Roig Lanzillotta, for their extensive feedback on previous versions of my text, and to the editors and anonymous reviewers of *Histos*, whose suggestions greatly improved this article. I presented parts of my argument at the 12th International Symposium of the Spanish Society of Plutarchists (Lleida, October 2018) and the Hebrew Bible and Ancient Judaism Seminar (Groningen, April 2019). I thank both audiences for their helpful questions and suggestions. I also wish to thank Tom Britton, who saved me from many errors by his corrections of my English. Any that remain are entirely my responsibility. Translations of Josephus' works are my own. Except when stated otherwise, I have made use of the Loeb volumes for translations of other ancient works, sometimes with adaptations.

[1] I will use 'Judaean' instead of 'Jewish' throughout the article, except when citing other scholars, because Greek Ἰουδαῖος or Latin *Iudaeus* reflected primarily one's ἔθνος or *gens* in antiquity: see Mason (2007). For further bibliography, see Glas (2020) 2 n. 7.

[2] Davies (2019).

ISSN: 2046-5963 7 December 2020

Josephus' world was, he argues that Josephus fashions his narrative in such a manner that Judaean and non-Judaean audiences would understand it in radically different ways. Josephus—versed in Judaean and Graeco-Roman literary traditions—offers clues to Judaean readers that would allow them to unveil hidden meanings and understand their double value, thus creating an imbalance in interpretative power between Judaean and non-Judaean elements in his audience. According to Davies' analysis, Jerusalem always remained the centre of Josephus' world.[3]

The simple but far-reaching question asked by Davies requires a complex answer. To do justice to this complexity, this article aims to set up an alternative perspective, appreciating Josephus' position as a broker between Judaean and Roman worlds and foregrounding his specific attempt as a Judaean to communicate with local Roman audiences. It serves both to complement and to challenge the vision offered by Davies. My contribution takes Josephus' locality and basic outlook as a point of departure for interpreting the *BJ* as a whole. The work was produced in Rome and Josephus embedded it with classicising features. Correspondingly, I take it as fundamental that Josephus primarily aimed to reach an audience steeped in such learning—Romans, Greeks, and Hellenised Judaeans who could have appreciated the classicising style of the *BJ*, such as Agrippa II and his circle (e.g., *Vit.* 361–2; *Ap.* 1.50–2)—in and around his geographical location. Using this as a vantage point might help us to understand many of the structures, themes, and rhetorical features that shape the historiographical outlook of Josephus' works, specifically the centrality of Rome-tailored rhetoric.[4]

To accomplish this, I propose to examine Josephus' outspoken and at times emotional style of writing, which is one of the most characteristic features of his work. The passage I will consider in relation to this issue is *BJ* 1.9–12.[5] This passage is often interpreted as a slip of the pen, where Josephus supposedly reveals his personal emotions as a Judaean and in so doing departs from his main historiographical models, most notably Thucydides and Polybius.[6] Although it is impossible to determine the actual effects of Josephus'

[3] Davies (2019) 92.

[4] Following Mason (2005). Largely in support of Mason, see, e.g., Brighton (2009) 41–7 and den Hollander (2014) 279–93. This is opposed to the view of a broader and mixed audience, expressed in, e.g., Sterling (1992) 297–308; Bilde (1988) 77–8; or Feldman (1998) 668; Parente (2005); Cotton and Eck (2005); van Henten and Huitink (2009); Davies (2017) 107–9. For an analysis of some of the specifically Roman currents in the *BJ*, see recently Mason (2016a); Glas (forthcoming, 2021).

[5] Other relevant examples are *BJ* 5.20; 6.199–200; 7.274.

[6] E.g., Lindner (1972) 113, 132–41; Villalba I Varneda (1986) 208; Bilde (1988) 73, 205–6; Mader (2000) 3–4; Price (2005) 109–11 and (2010) 142; Hirschberger (2005) 149–50. This tension is also pointed out by van Henten (2018) 125–6; Friis (2018) 40, though they tend to emphasise that this tension might have been intended to strengthen the reader's impression

compositional choices on an educated audience situated in Rome, we might be able to get a grasp of Josephus' motivations for fashioning his narrative the way he did by (1) placing his compositional choices in their literary context, i.e., the broader historiographical outlook of the *BJ*, and (2) comparing his practice to the Graeco-Roman literature supposedly familiar to his intended audience in Rome.

2. Reading *BJ* 1.9–12 in its Literary Context

2.1 The Problem

The Graeco-Roman background of Josephus' historiographical programme is a subject that has received ample attention since the 1980s, with scholars showing, for example, that Josephus lends the *Bellum* a gloomy Thucydidean flavour.[7] This becomes evident in Josephus' focus on what he presents as the greatest conflict that has occurred in history to date (1.1–3). Among the main elements of this programme is that the temple in Jerusalem was destroyed not by the Romans but by tyrants and bandits that started a civil war, forcing the Romans to intervene (1.9–12). One regularly encounters virtuous Judaeans (among which Josephus numbers himself) struggling to uphold the honour of the Judaeans and to keep the hydra of civil unrest—one of the major themes of the *BJ*—in check to prevent the impending disaster.[8] In addition to this, Josephus also inserts various speeches revolving around this point (esp. 2.345–404 (Agrippa II); 5.362–419; 6.99–110(Josephus)).[9]

This gloomy outlook becomes especially evident in the famous obituary of Ananus and Jesus, a passage that strongly echoes Thucydides' characterisation of Pericles (Thuc. 2.65).[10] Here, Josephus laments the death of the last virtuous

of Josephus' personal involvement and authority on the subject matter. See, differently, Mason (1991) 64–9 and (2016b) 114. Mason argues that this statement probably has a variety of rhetorical functions, such as to create a sense of immediacy, to enhance Josephus' credibility as a historian, and to draw the audience into an emotional state similar to his own. I will carry this argument further by placing Josephus' rhetoric in the compositional context of the *Bellum* as a whole and in the Roman context of Josephus' historiography.

[7] On Josephus and Thucydides see, e.g., Rajak (2002) 91–4; Mader (2000) 55–103; Price (2010); and id. (2011b).

[8] Josephus seems to describe a pattern in which the removal of successful statesmen paves the way for increased revolutionary activity: see Glas (2020) 120–8 (with a specific focus on explaining the purposes and themes of the autobiographical sections in the *BJ*). On civil war as one of *BJ*'s major themes, see, in addition to the scholars cited in the previous note, Mason (2005) 97–9; Brighton (2009) *passim*.

[9] On speeches in Josephus see, e.g., Runnalls (1997); Mason (2011) and (2012).

[10] Cf. Mader (2000) 99–100; Price (2011a) 226–7. On the importance of political realism in the *BJ*, specifically in relation to *polis* leadership, and its strong resemblance to Plutarchan

Judaean leaders: 'it seems virtue herself groaned over the case of these men and lamented that she had been so greatly defeated by vice' (*αὐτὴν ἐπ' ἐκείνοις στενάξαι τοῖς ἀνδράσι δοκῶ τὴν ἀρετήν, ὀλοφυρομένην ὅτι τοσοῦτον ἥττητο τῆς κακίας*, *BJ* 4.318–25). This is further underlined by, for instance, Josephus' condemnation of the wicked generation of the Judaeans responsible for the destruction of Jerusalem and its temple (7.259–74). Ultimately, Josephus' narrative is a story of failure.

This Thucydidean flavour is also evident in Josephus' emphasis on the truth, accuracy, and impartiality of his work (esp. 1.3, 6, 9, 13–16; 7.454–5; cf. *Vit.* 336–67; *Ap.* 1.47–56).[11] Here, however, we are confronted with the problem under discussion in this article, namely, the alleged tension between the visibility of Josephus' Judaean background in his narrative and his intention to communicate with an audience thoroughly familiar with classical literature. To this end, it is useful to quote the passage in question in full (*BJ* 1.9–12):

> *οὐ μὴν ἐγὼ τοῖς ἐπαίρουσι τὰ Ῥωμαίων ἀντιφιλονεικῶν αὔξειν τὰ τῶν ὁμοφύλων διέγνων, ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν ἔργα μετ' ἀκριβείας ἀμφοτέρων διέξειμι, τοὺς δ' ἐπὶ τοῖς πράγμασι λόγους ἀνατίθημι τῇ διαθέσει, καὶ τοῖς ἐμαυτοῦ πάθεσι διδοὺς ἐπολοφύρεσθαι ταῖς τῆς πατρίδος συμφοραῖς. ὅτι γὰρ αὐτὴν στάσις οἰκεία καθεῖλεν, καὶ τὰς Ῥωμαίων χεῖρας ἀκούσας καὶ τὸ πῦρ ἐπὶ τὸν [ἅγιον] ναὸν εἵλκυσαν οἱ Ἰουδαίων τύραννοι, μάρτυς αὐτὸς ὁ πορθήσας Καῖσαρ Τίτος, ἐν παντὶ τῷ πολέμῳ τὸν μὲν δῆμον ἐλεήσας ὑπὸ τῶν στασιαστῶν φρουρούμενον, πολλάκις δὲ ἑκὼν τὴν ἅλωσιν τῆς πόλεως ὑπερτιθέμενος καὶ διδοὺς τῇ πολιορκίᾳ χρόνον εἰς μετάνοιαν τῶν αἰτίων. 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· πόλιν [μὲν] γὰρ δὴ τῶν ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίοις πασῶν τὴν ἡμετέραν ἐπὶ πλεῖστόν τε εὐδαιμονίας συνέβη προελθεῖν καὶ πρὸς ἔσχατον συμφορῶν αὖθις καταπεσεῖν. τὰ γοῦν πάντων ἀπ' αἰῶνος ἀτυχήματα πρὸς τὰ Ἰουδαίων ἡττῆσθαι δοκῶ κατὰ σύγκρισιν, καὶ τούτων αἴτιος οὐδεὶς ἀλλόφυλος, ὥστε ἀμήχανον ἦν*

perspectives see especially Mason (2016b) 106–13. Adam Kemezis offers some useful observations on the context of 'the new rhetoric of an aristocracy in transition' as exemplified by both Plutarch and Dio Chrysostom and the necessity of their emphatic focus on civic rather than imperial politics: see Kemezis (2016) 460–3. Yet even though Kemezis briefly deals with Josephus in this chapter, he attributes such rhetoric exclusively to Dio and Plutarch (461): 'it is rhetoric unique to them within Second Sophistic literature, not because they were uniquely patriotic or politically engaged, or because the realities of politics were especially different any other time, but because their contemporary audience had a unique interest in the subject'.

[11] Cf. Price (2010).

ὀδυρμῶν ἐπικρατεῖν. εἰ δέ τις οἴκτου σκληρότερος εἴη δικαστής, τὰ μὲν πράγματα τῇ ἱστορίᾳ προσκρινέτω, τὰς δ' ὀλοφύρσεις τῷ γράφοντι.

> I will not attempt to make greater the actions of my countrymen, striving jealously against those who lift up those of the Romans. Rather, I will go through the actions of both sides with accuracy. However, I will suit my words to the subject and to my feelings, allowing myself to lament the disasters of my country. For civil war ruined its affairs, and the Judaean tyrants brought on the unwilling power of the Romans and the fire on the temple—Caesar Titus, who destroyed it, is himself a witness, having throughout the entire war shown pity to the people held in subjection by the insurgents, and having often deliberately put off the conquest of a city and drawn out a siege so that those responsible might repent. Now, if someone criticises us when we speak accusingly about the tyrants or their robbers, or in lamentation over my country's misfortunes, let him make allowance for a feeling contrary to the law of history. For it came to pass that our city, of all those under the Romans, advanced to the greatest prosperity and then dropped to the most extreme of disasters. Indeed, I think that all the misfortunes that happened of old are inferior in comparison to those of the Judaeans. Also, no foreigner is responsible for them, and so it is impossible to contain expressions of lamentation. But if someone is too bitter a judge for compassion, let him assign the events to history and the lamentations to him who wrote it down.

Josephus ostentatiously violates historiographical conventions immediately after his promise to uphold virtues of truth, accuracy, and objectivity. How to explain this? The most obvious and often used explanation is that Josephus is carried away by his emotions and 'cannot live up to his own ideals and those of his school', historians such as Thucydides and Polybius.[12] According to this interpretation, the passage shows the superficiality of Josephus' training in Graeco-Roman literature and rhetoric and so reveals a somewhat awkward 'tension … between Greek theory and Jewish practice'.[13]

An analysis of Josephus' use of emotions in characterising individuals throughout the *BJ* might, however, suggests alternative interpretations. Much revolves around how one understands Josephus' visible display of emotions in this passage. Are they heartfelt emotions and a slip of the pen, as some scholars tend to argue? Clearly, we can perceive Josephus' emotional expressions as sincere and—considering his background as a native from Jerusalem—should

[12] Bilde (1988) 205–6.

[13] Mader (2000) 4.

probably also perceive them as such. However, as I will show below, one must be alert to any sign of calculation on Josephus' part. Of all places, it is highly unlikely for any author to be careless in the preface of a work. The versatile way in which he uses emotion in representing individual character in the *BJ*, including (or especially) his own, provides various clues in this respect.

2.2 Josephus as Author and Actor in the *Bellum Judaicum*

Ancient theorists distinguish between the permanent characteristics (ἦθος) of an individual and his emotions (πάθος).[14] Emotions can be influenced more easily through external stimuli than the permanent characteristics of an individual. When it comes to classical historiography, emotions ascribed to characters by a historian may therefore provide the audience with information about their temporary mental disposition.[15]

When it comes to the representation of character in the *BJ*, Josephus uses emotions in a variety of manners. For instance, when attacking Gischala, Titus is aware that a direct assault of the city will end in a massacre. Thus, he shows pity (οἶκτος) towards the innocent majority inside the city and decides to offer terms first. Titus' decision points to his remarkably mild, humane, and compassionate character, something he displays consistently throughout the narrative.[16] In many cases he tends to emphasise the destructive workings of emotions, for instance, with John Hyrcanus I (1.57–60), who is manipulated by his enemies because 'he proved inferior to his justified emotion' (ἡττᾶτο δὲ δικαίου πάθους, 1.57). This scene demonstrates an important principle underpinning the historiographical programme of the *BJ*: a statesman should be governed by reason rather than emotions. Even if his emotions are justified, Hyrcanus' inability to master them exemplifies a lack of self-control. In the relevant scene, Hyrcanus' mother and brother are held hostage by his brother-in-law Ptolemy in the siege of the fortress Dagon. Hyrcanus has the upper hand, but every time Ptolemy is under pressure, he tortures Hyrcanus' mother and brother in full view on the walls. This view robs Hyrcanus of his rational capacities: 'he was unmanned and completely overcome by emotion' (ἐθηλύνετο καὶ τοῦ πάθους ὅλος ἦν, 1.59). When Hyrcanus lifts the siege temporarily because of the Sabbath Year, Ptolemy still decides to execute his

[14] On the application of emotions in Graeco-Roman history writing, see Marincola (2003) 293–4.

[15] For a discussion of this distinction in ancient literary criticism see Gill (1984). See also Pitcher (2007) 116; De Temmerman (2014) 36; De Temmerman and van Emde Boas (2018a) 22.

[16] *BJ* 4.117–20; 5.450, 522; 6.115–16, 182–4, 324, 345, 383. On the potential weakness of Titus' character see Mason (2016b) 129–30.

family. Hyrcanus' acting on his emotions merely resulted in a siege that dragged on for too long.

This is one example in the *BJ* that shows the destructive workings of passions—such as fear, hatred, envy, mistrust, and anger—when political leaders fail to control them.[17] One of Josephus' favourite themes is the disruptive nature of love for a woman.[18] Mark Antony and Herod are the most notable victims in the *BJ*. Both allow themselves to be corrupted by their love/desire (ἔρως, ἐπιθυμία, etc.) for a woman.[19] The case of Herod in particular is deeply ironic. Herod witnessed (and realised) the destructive power of women in the case of his Roman patron Mark Antony (1.389–90). In the end, however, he falls victim to that very same power himself (1.431–44), losing control over his emotions and by consequence his rational capacities.

In contrast, Josephus portrays good statesmen as thinking and acting rationally, without capriciousness.[20] When Herod is still his rational self in Josephus' narrative of his public career (1.204–430), he displays exactly this capability. Illustrative is Herod's response to receiving the news of the death of his brother Phasael (1.277–85): he is hurled from anxiety to grief, but nonetheless takes the necessary action and travels to Rome. We find a similar response when Herod receives the news of the death of his brother Joseph (1.328). Herod briefly laments Joseph's death but puts aside his emotions. Proper mourning should wait for a more suitable occasion. He quickly turns to pursuing his enemies and forces his army to move at great speed. The question to what extent individuals possess control over their emotions is of great importance for understanding Josephus' evaluation of character in the *BJ*.

Having said this, we must note that visible displays of emotion do not always match the *real* feelings of a character in Josephus' narratives. In some cases the sincerity of the emotions displayed is questionable. In ancient rhetoric, emotions were thought to add significantly to the persuasive power of a speech. In the *Rhetoric*, Aristotle notes that there are cases where it is useful for a speaker to present himself as being in an emotional state to arouse emotions among the audience themselves (Arist. *Rh.* 2.2–11).[21] Horace, Cicero, and Quintilian elaborate on the importance of a speaker's ability to adapt his emotions to the words of his speech: to move the audience effectively, the speaker needs to be moved himself (Hor. *AP* 101–7; Cic. *De or.* 2.189; Quint.

[17] van Henten and Huitink (2018) 252–3 (discussing Josephus' corpus in general).

[18] van Henten and Huitink (2018) 253.

[19] E.g., *BJ* 1.243, 359, 436, 441, 442, 444.

[20] Mason (2016b) 112.

[21] On the latter see Russell (1981) 81–2. The idea is expressed somewhat less emphatically in Arist. *Rh.* 2.21.13 (1395a 23–4).

Inst. 6.2.26).[22] A good speaker can use strategic displays of emotion to accomplish his goals.

In the *BJ*, Josephus appears to portray speakers and their speeches in accordance with these rhetorical conventions. While he does not always comment on the rhetorical purpose of emotions, in many cases they seem to carry considerable persuasive force. For instance, Agrippa II and his sister burst into tears immediately after Agrippa has delivered an elaborate speech: 'Having thus spoken he wept along with his sister, and *he stopped much of their impulse with his tears*' (τοσαῦτα εἰπὼν ἐπεδάκρυσέν τε μετὰ τῆς ἀδελφῆς καὶ πολὺ τῆς ὁρμῆς αὐτῶν ἔπαυσεν τοῖς δακρύοις, 2.402).[23] Notably, Agrippa II's tears effectively have more persuasive power than his eloquent and memorable speech. Similarly, in the second part of his speech at Masada, Eleazar complains *angrily* (σχετλιάζω, 7.341) to his audience, perceiving that sentiments of pity and tears might overcome them. This softness might prevent them from committing suicide, as Eleazar plans for them to do (7.337–9). The angry tone clearly aids him in achieving his purpose: even before the end of Eleazar's speech, his audience is filled with an *impulse* (ὁρμή) to commit suicide (7.389). It appears that the statesmen staged in the *BJ* by Josephus put into practice the rhetorical principles and oratorical skills which statesmen were expected to have in real life.

This particularly applies to Josephus' self-characterisation. Josephus presents himself as a man of many virtues in the *BJ*, but his 'power of thought/inventiveness' (ἐπίνοια: 3.175, 271, 387) and his 'quick comprehension/sagacity' (σύνεσις: 2.623; 3.144, 358) are underlined most systematically. He possesses a mental quickness that enables him to be one step ahead of every situation, to anticipate problems, and to come up quickly with solutions when they occur. In Greek historiography this is one of the desirable qualities of a good general.[24]

[22] Cf. Russell (1981) 108–10. One of Longinus' main concerns in *On the Sublime* is to develop emotionally persuasive rhetoric. A means to achieve this is by using 'visualisations' (φαντασίαι), enabling a speaker to see and describe vividly—'through inspiration and emotions' (ὑπ' ἐνθουσιασμοῦ καὶ πάθους)—what he wants to convey to the eyes of the audience ([Longi.] *Subl.*, esp. 15.1ff). As Gill (1984) argues, in early Imperial literary criticism, especially in the works of Quintilian and Longinus, we regularly encounter the idea that *pathos* is associated with a distinctively emotional style of writing and speaking, in addition to the common idea that *pathos* can be used to effect a corresponding emotion in the audience. Earlier critics such as Aristotle recognise an emotional style but do not elaborate on it (e.g., *Rh.* 1408a10–b20). On the interconnectedness of author, audience, and text in *On the Sublime*, see more elaborately de Jonge (2020).

[23] Other notable examples are Josephus' speeches, esp. *BJ* 5.420 and 6.111–12, or Eleazar's second speech at Masada (note esp. 7.339–41).

[24] This is also noted in Davies (2017) 196–7 in relation to Josephus' characterisation of Vespasian.

Josephus shows his best self when under pressure, always coming up with speeches, tricks, and stratagems (e.g., 2.604, 611, 635; 3.171, 187, 190, 222, 227, 271). Even when his measures fail, he displays the ability to adapt his strategies on the spot. Josephus' bipartite speech before the walls of Jerusalem in Book 5 (5.362–74, 376–419) exemplifies this principle. The first part of the speech consists of *topoi* closely resembling the speech of Agrippa II in Book 2 (2.345–401).[25] However, Josephus' arguments only infuriate those listening on the walls: 'Many of those on the city-walls made fun of Josephus when he gave this advice, many cursed at him, and some tried to shoot him' (*ταῦτα τὸν Ἰώσηπον παραινοῦντα πολλοὶ μὲν ἔσκωπτον ἀπὸ τοῦ τείχους, πολλοὶ δ' ἐβλασφήμουν, ἔνιοι δ' ἔβαλλον*, 5.375). He thus changes his strategy: 'Seeing that he could not persuade them with plain advice, he switched to employing the history of his people' (*ὁ δ' ὡς ταῖς φανεραῖς οὐκ ἔπειθε συμβουλίαις, ἐπὶ τὰς ὁμοφύλους μετέβαινεν ἱστορίας*). This proves to be more effective: 'However, although Josephus called upon them in tears, the insurgents neither conceded nor judged it without risk to change their course. But the people were set in motion towards desertion' (*τοιαῦτα τοῦ Ἰωσήπου μετὰ δακρύων ἐμβοῶντος οἱ στασιασταὶ μὲν οὔτ' ἐνέδοσαν οὔτ' ἀσφαλῆ τὴν μεταβολὴν ἔκριναν, ὁ δὲ δῆμος ἐκινήθη πρὸς αὐτομολίαν*, 5.420). As happens often in the *BJ*, the insurgents are insensitive to reason. But the people respond to his emotional (but reasonable) appeal.[26]

Another illustration of Josephus' mental quickness is the narrative of his surrender after the siege of Jotapata. Motivated by a divinely inspired dream, Josephus decides to hand himself over to the Romans (3.351–4).[27] When his compatriots attempt to force him to commit suicide (3.355–60), Josephus first tries to philosophise (*φιλοσοφέω*) his way out of the situation (3.361) by means of an elaborate speech in which he appeals, as Maren Niehoff has pointed out most recently, to Stoic notions of Nature (3.362–82).[28] The Judaeans are only infuriated by this attempt and launch themselves at him. Yet Josephus miraculously escapes all their attacks (3.385): 'But he, summoning one by name,

[25] As is widely recognised among scholars: see, e.g., Lindner (1972) 40–8; Villalba I Varneda (1986) 99–100; Rajak (1991) 124–5; den Hollander (2014) 144.

[26] Likewise, in the scene of his speech to John of Gischala, where Josephus Hebraises Titus' instructions and in so doing spurs many of the Judaean aristocracy to action (*BJ* 6.93–116). Even the Romans admire Josephus' disposition (*προαίρεσις*, 6.111) amid his sufferings, although he converses in Hebrew or Aramaic (*ἑβραΐζων*, 6.96). Because the Romans do not speak his language, they could not have admired the speech itself.

[27] In addition to highlighting his own cleverness, Josephus foregrounds motifs of fortune and the divine throughout the episode narrating his surrender immediately following the siege of Jotapata (3.340–91). On the different functions of these motifs, see Glas (2020) 109–12, 249–72.

[28] Niehoff (2018) 100.

looking another in the face with his commander's glare, seizing the hand of a third, shaming the next by entreaty, and dividing them by using all kinds of emotions in this moment of need, turned the blades of all away from his throat, like the surrounded wild animals ever turning towards the next attacker.' In the scene that follows, Josephus is said to be 'not without his usual inventiveness in his hardships' (ὁ δ' ἐν ταῖς ἀμηχανίαις οὐκ ἠπόρησεν ἐπινοίας, 3.387).[29] He takes a gamble and proposes to draw lots to determine the order of the killing so that no one must die by committing suicide. They agree with his proposal. Josephus remains with one other man and 'also persuaded the other in a pledge of good faith to stay alive' (πείθει κἀκεῖνον ἐπὶ πίστει ζῆν, 3.391). Josephus maintains his willpower even when his compatriots threaten to kill him. He displays the ability to switch between all kinds of tools from his vast arsenal—philosophy, rhetoric, tricks, personal authority, physical strength, and *emotions*—to obtain the goals he believes to be worthy of pursuit.[30]

Notably, the narrator explicitly brings some of these stratagems to the attention of the audience.[31] A representative example is the episode describing civil unrest in Tarichea (2.595–613). Josephus is accused of being a traitor on account of his intention to send stolen goods back to Agrippa II, who at an earlier point in the narrative has attempted to convince the people of Jerusalem to see reason. Although momentarily successful, he is driven out of the city because of his efforts (2.405–7). In defence of his actions, Josephus decides to face the mob and strikes a humble pose by putting on ragged clothing, sprinkling ashes over his head, clasping his hands behind his back, and hanging his sword around his neck (2.601). The Taricheans are moved to compassion (οἶκτος) and the people from the countryside step forward and demand a share in the spoils. This is explained as follows: 'they had assumed

[29] Josephus often foregrounds this and related characters traits (esp. σύνεσις, 'sagacity') in relation to his own character in the *BJ* (most explicitly: 2.623; 3.144, 175, 271, 358), which is why I translate 'usual'. Cf. Glas (2020) 114–16.

[30] Mason (2018) 224–5 has compared this scene to Vespasian's response to threats in *BJ* 4, arguing that Josephus portrays himself much more positively than he portrays Vespasian.

[31] Josephus uses similar tricks elsewhere, e.g., *BJ* 2.611: Josephus' second trick (ἀπάτη) following the stratagem described above; 3.197: Josephus decides not to mention his personal safety when discussing his intentional departure from Jotapata; see also 2.630: Josephus' use of στρατήγηματα to defeat the armed embassy from Jerusalem; 2.635: Josephus uses a δόλος to capture the Tarichean elite and conquer the city back; 3.176: Vespasian's indignation about Josephus' στρατήγημα; 3.181–92: Josephus employing two στρατήγηματα to keep the Romans at bay (see esp. 3.190); 3.361: Josephus talking philosophy (φιλοσοφέω) to persuade his compatriots not to commit suicide; 3.387: Josephus uses his inventiveness (ἐπίνοια) to come up with the trick of drawing lots to prevent himself being killed, resulting in his miraculous escape; 5.175: Josephus, perceiving that his appeals to common sense have no significant impact, decides to 'depart to' (μεταβαίνω) examples from the Judaean past.

in advance from his outward appearance that he would not deny the things of which he was suspected, and that he attempted to earn a pardon by striking a pose to arouse pity' (*προειλήφεσαν γὰρ ἐκ τοῦ σχήματος οὐδὲν αὐτὸν ἀρνήσεσθαι τῶν ὑπονοηθέντων ἀλλ' ἐπὶ συγγνώμης πορισμῷ πάντα πεποιηκέναι τὰ πρὸς τὸν ἔλεον*, 2.603). The narrator immediately reveals the truth of the matter, showing that these deductions are incorrect: 'But the humble pose was a preparation for a stratagem, and he employed an artifice to set up those angry at him in strife against each other [while he promised] to confess everything about which they were angry' (*τῷ δ' ἦν ἡ ταπείνωσις προπαρασκευὴ στρατηγήματος καὶ τεχνιτεύων τοὺς ἀγανακτοῦντας κατ' αὐτοῦ κατ' ἀλλήλων στασιάσαι ἐφ' οἷς ὠργίζοντο πάνθ' ὁμολογήσων*, 2.604). The comment of the narrator clarifies that Josephus acted strategically, and that the resulting discord among the people from the city and those from the countryside was intentional. Without overt narrative commentary, this point might otherwise have been lost on the audience.

I have tried to show that the strategic use of emotions is a practice thoroughly anchored in Graeco-Roman rhetorical discourse. The characters depicted in the *BJ* also display such calculated use of emotions. Moreover, Josephus shows himself to be a master of manipulation as a *character* in the *BJ*, especially by playing with the emotions of others. If we apply this insight to *BJ* 1.9–12, it is unlikely that the *author* Josephus would allow himself to be carried away by similar emotions.

3. Reading *BJ* 1.9–12 in its Roman Context

3.1 Roman Historiography: Writing History 'from Within'

As discussed in the previous sections, Thucydides is clearly one of Josephus' major historiographical models. However, we cannot simply compare Josephus' practice with that of Thucydides and then draw conclusions as to how Josephus' readers in Rome—readers that lived five centuries after Thucydides—would have judged his work. It is beyond doubt that Josephus follows Thucydidean practices in many ways, but some of his practices more closely reflect the literary tastes of his own days.

Although we should attribute some of the variation from author to author, we can observe subtle differences between the Greek histories produced in the fifth century BC and those written under Rome. About five decades ago, Brooks Otis wrote a seminal article in which he emphasises the difference between Greek and Latin literature. He argues that the tone assumed by Roman authors, including historians, is much more personal and engaging than that of 'observers' like Herodotus and Thucydides. Romans tended to

'subjectivise' their writings, as Otis phrases it.[32] Roman historians usually claim to be impartial, but that does not stop them from studying their subject 'from within'.[33] Charles Fornara makes similar observations but attempts to explain them in a chronological framework. He argues that the style of Greek historians before the first century BC is characterised by 'a certain intellectual distance', whereas the works of Greek and Roman historians writing about one century after Polybius 'throb with passion'.[34]

Recent scholarship—most notably the book-length study by Lisa Hau[35]—shows that the contrast between Classical/Hellenistic historiography and the emotional authors in Roman times is not quite as stark as sometimes implied in older scholarship. Authors like Thucydides and Xenophon display a strong inclination towards more explicit and moralising commentary in their reflections on individual characters and groups.[36] Simultaneously, Hau also acknowledges that the moralising in the histories produced by Herodotus and Thucydides is often much more subtle than the practices of Polybius and Diodorus of Sicily, who may have been influenced by their encounter with Roman culture.[37] Hence, it seems reasonably clear that Greek historiography written under the Roman era witnessed a subtle shift in emphasis towards more explicit praise and blame under Roman cultural influence.

If anything can be determined with certainty about Josephus' style as a historian, it is that he displays great passion and engagement with his subject. In the prologue of the *BJ* Josephus repeatedly emphasises his Judaean background. He is a priest from Jerusalem (*BJ* 1.3) and a foreigner in Rome (1.16). His style might be inferior to native Greek speakers, but his Judaean background offers him the advantage of writing about the destruction of Jerusalem *as an insider*, as historians like Sallust and Tacitus do in relation to Roman society. Greeks and Romans could write about the subject, but they

[32] Otis (1967).

[33] Otis (1967) 197–8.

[34] For an overview of this development, see Fornara (1983) 105–20 (quotation from p. 115). See also Marincola (1997) 158–9. At some points, however, Polybius engages with his subject in a very Roman manner: see further below.

[35] Hau (2016). One of Hau's merits is that she provides an elaborate discussion of the (often ignored) fragmentary fourth-century historians, such as Ephorus and Theopompus.

[36] See, e.g., Thucydides on the virtue of Nicias (Thuc. 7.86) or Xenophon's extensive moralising reflections on the Greek generals executed by Tissapherness in *An.* 2.6.1–30.

[37] Cf. Fornara (1983) 114–15. Hau (2016) 6–7 identifies Diodorus of Sicily as the last true Greek historian: 'because he stands on the threshold between the Greek and Roman historiographical traditions, which *then* start to conflate' (p. 7; italics mine). In my view, it is difficult to maintain such a late date for the start of such conflation. This fails to explain, for example, the impact of Polybius' stay in Rome from 167–150 BC. I offer a more elaborate discussion of this point, specifically in relation to the moralising tendencies in Greek and Roman historiography, in Glas (2020) 48–55.

could not hope to offer a perspective similar to that of Josephus, who wrote about the destruction of his native city and its glorious temple. In this regard, Josephus' emotions add to the persuasiveness of his account.[38]

3.2 The Uniqueness of Josephus' Confession

If we approach Josephus' statements in the prologue of the *BJ* with a certain open-mindedness and as produced in a recognisable historical and cultural context, we might become more aware of the relevance and explanatory power of different sorts of comparative material derived from Graeco-Roman cultural backgrounds. As Steve Mason notes, historians in Josephus' days tend to mention laws of history when they are about to break them.[39] This is comparable to other expressions contrary to type that serve rhetorically to highlight the author's virtues. One can think of Sallust's unusual statement about his lack of political engagement in the prologue of the *Catiline* (3.3–4.2). The oddity is that most Roman historians would make the opposite claim. Yet while unusual, Sallust's statement naturally fits the gloomy outlook of Roman Republican politics outlined in his history.[40] Similarly, in the prologue of his *Histories* Tacitus criticises the tendency of historians of the Flavian period to write from a desire to flatter. Immediately afterwards he admits that his own political career was sponsored by the Flavians (1.1), which might make him susceptible to accusations of flattery. Yet presumably Tacitus' openness about his past is intended to convince his audience of his honesty.[41]

Plutarch makes a sport of pointing out unusual aspects of his investigation in the prologues of his *Parallel Lives*.[42] Thus, in the *Alexander–Caesar*—a biographical pair focusing on arguably the greatest Greek and Roman generals of all time—one would expect an emphasis on great battles and military strategies. Yet Plutarch claims that he will refrain from this, apparently because he is writing biography, not full-scale history (*Alex.* 1.2).[43] In the *Demosthenes–Cicero* he refrains from analysing speeches, even though Demosthenes and Cicero are especially famous for their speeches (*Dem.* 2.1–

[38] With Mason (1991) 67–8.

[39] See Mason (1991) 64–9; id. (2016b) 78. In relation to Graeco-Roman historiography more generally: Marincola (1997) 63–86 (on autopsy); 128–74 (on the character of the historian). As to the preface of *BJ* and Josephus' appeal to emotion, Price (2010) 142–3 also notes a certain amount of calculation but still regards Josephus' remarks as special pleading.

[40] Cf. Marincola (1997) 138–9.

[41] Cf. Pelling (2009).

[42] It is therefore difficult to pinpoint generic principles of his biographical programme: in agreement with Duff (1999) 17–19.

[43] On the prologue of the *Alexander–Caesar* see esp. Duff (1999) 14–22; Chrysanthou (2017) 133–8. In the narrative itself Plutarch actually does the opposite, quite often focusing on the great achievements of Alexander and Caesar: see Pelling (2006) 266–7.

3.2).[44] In the *Theseus–Romulus* Plutarch proposes to subject mythological stories—notorious for their unreliability and thus running counter to the foundational principles of *ἱστορία*—to the methods of *ἱστορία* (*Thes.* 1–2).[45] What connects these examples is that Plutarch plays with the expectations of his audience, asking his readers to trust him in spite of his unexpected and unconventional approaches.

If we allow ourselves to look beyond the proems of histories or biographies, we might be able to identify more immediate points of comparison to Josephus' statement in *BJ* 1.9–12. Thus, as has been pointed out by Eckstein, Josephus may here echo Polybius' description of the misfortunes of Greece in 146 BC in the opening of Book 38 of the *Histories*.[46] Evidently, there are fundamental differences in outlook and purpose between Polybius' *Histories* and Josephus' *BJ*. Polybius attempts to explain how Rome came to dominate the entire inhabited world and deals with the extensive period of 264–146 BC in forty Books. Josephus mainly focuses on the Judaean war against the Romans from AD 66–74. Hence, we find Josephus' statement about the fall of Jerusalem right at the beginning of his work, whereas Polybius' statement about Corinth and the Greeks comes at the end of his history, as its climax.

Polybius is usually viewed as a relatively sober historian, reserved in his use of rhetoric and emotional language. It is therefore even more striking that he too violates historiographical conventions occasionally. Some events—such as his narrative of 'the completion of the misfortune of the Greeks' (*τὴν συντέλειαν τῆς τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἀτυχίας*, 38.1.1)—force even him to use a different stylistic register.[47] He compares this misfortune with the fall of Carthage in the same year, which is usually considered to be 'the greatest of calamities' (*μεγίστου πάθους*). In Polybius' view, the Greeks' disaster is greater than that of the Carthaginians because the Greeks had no pretext to fight the Romans (38.1.4–9). He blames his compatriots for bringing this disaster upon themselves (38.3.8–13). These events prompt him to adopt an approach that might run counter to the expectations of his audience: 'It should not surprise anyone that I abandon the style proper to historical narrative here and express myself in a more declamatory and distinct manner' (*ὑπὲρ ὧν οὐ δεήσει θαυμάζειν ἐὰν παρεκβαίνοντες τὸ τῆς ἱστορικῆς διηγήσεως ἦθος ἐπιδεικτικω-*

[44] On the prologue of the *Demosthenes–Cicero* see, e.g., Hägg (2012) 244–7.

[45] For a discussion of the *Theseus–Romulus* prologue see, e.g., Pelling (1999); Chrysanthou (2017) 138–45. On the structure, themes, and narrative perspectives in Plutarch's prologues see, e.g., Stadter (1988); Duff (1999) 13–51; id. (2011); and id. (2014); Chrysanthou (2018) 26–65. For a brief investigation of Plutarch's aims and methods in the *Parallel Lives*, including a survey of the prologues, see Hägg (2012) 268–77.

[46] The parallels discussed below are also briefly touched upon in Marincola (1997) 168–9. Cf. Landau (2006) 11 n. 31; Chapman (2005) 290–1.

[47] Cf. Eckstein (1990) 182–3.

τέραν καὶ φιλοτιμοτέραν φαινώμεθα ποιούμενοι περὶ αὐτῶν τὴν ἀπαγγελίαν, 38.4.1). Polybius is aware that some may criticise him for doing so (38.4.2). Such people would have preferred Polybius to defend the Greeks out of solidarity. Yet Polybius considers it more important to uphold the value of truth (ἀλήθεια) and implies that his listeners (οἱ ἀκούοντες) ought to share this opinion (38.4.7). Polybius thus explains his departure from a sober historical style as the result of his more important task to uphold the virtue of truth. Truth requires that the Greeks should be blamed for their considerable mistakes.

Polybius spells out his methodological principles and compositional choices in detail, providing us with an interesting vantage point regarding Josephus' practice.[48] Both Polybius and Josephus write about what they claim are the greatest misfortunes that occurred in history. Polybius notes that he will express himself in a more distinct and declamatory manner and abandon the traditional style of historical narrative in the process. In similar fashion, Josephus notes that he will limit the play of emotions in his history, accepting that it is not proper to history to indulge in them, but that at times he simply must. Both Polybius and Josephus refer to potentially critical responses from the audience on account of their choices and explain why their choices are nonetheless justified.

Polybius also blames his countrymen for the disaster that befell the Greeks and claims that this adds to the credibility of his narrative.[49] Josephus might have envisaged something similar in the prologue of the *BJ*. He starts his investigation by attacking historians who flatter the Romans and write out of hatred against the Judaeans (1.2–3, 6–8). A natural response on Josephus' part would be to give disproportionate support to the *Judaean* case. Yet he promises that he will do no such a thing but rather will treat the actions of both sides with accuracy (1.9). Immediately afterwards, he ferociously blames a small group of *Judaean* tyrants and bandits for the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple (1.10). He exculpates the *Romans* from any guilt for this catastrophe: *no foreigner is to blame* (1.12: καὶ τούτων αἴτιος οὐδεὶς ἀλλόφυλος) for the disaster that struck the Judaeans. As has also been pointed out by Mason, this criticism of his fellow-Judaeans might have been intended to validate his authority as a critical and impartial historian.[50]

As to the function of the passage in the *Histories*, Polybius implies that his violation of stylistic conventions of historical narrative—to depart from the sober tone usually employed by historians, including himself—is warranted because the subject matter requires such a choice. The fact that he abandons

[48] For a systematic discussion on the discrepancy between Polybius' methodological remarks on history writing and his actual procedures, see Grethlein (2013) 224–67.

[49] Eckstein (1990) 182–3; Chapman (2005) 290–1.

[50] Mason (1991) 66–7, although without reference to Polybius' description of the fall of Corinth in the *Histories* to support the observation.

a proper style does not undermine its truthfulness but rather underscores it. Polybius' procedures correspond to the commonly expressed rhetorical idea that the literary style of a composition should be fitting to its subject matter (*πρέπον* or *decorum*; e.g., Arist. *Rh.* 3.2ff.; D.H. *Comp.* 20.1–2 (88.11–15 U–R); Cic. *Orat.* 70–4).[51] On this basis, he clearly expects his audience to understand this choice. It appears that similar rhetoric underpins Josephus' text.[52] Josephus explains that he will describe the narrated actions (*ἔργα*) with accuracy (*ἀκρίβεια*), but that he will set up (*ἀνατίθημι*) his words (*λόγοι*) in accordance with the events (*ἐπὶ τοῖς πράγμασι*) he describes: the unparalleled disasters of the Judaean people, which require the language of emotion (*πάθος*).[53] While Price interprets the latter to undermine the former as an explicit statement of bias and partisanship,[54] it is also possible—and well-supported by ancient rhetoric—that the truthfulness of the events described is underscored rather than undermined by the words or style (= *λόγοι*, 1.9) in which they are described.

Josephus articulates his preference for truth over style elsewhere in the prologue of the *BJ*. He ends his 'confession' by pointing out that some judges (*δικαστής*) too cold-hearted for pity might censure him for his practice. He appears to build on the distinction between truth and style in the next section, using it to his own advantage (1.13–16): Josephus himself can *justly* (*δικαίως*) criticise *those learned Greeks* (*τοῖς Ἑλλήνων λογίοις*) with their *advantage in style* (1.13: *τῷ λόγῳ πλεονεκτοῦσι*). This stylistic advantage is insignificant because these Greeks lack the proper disposition (*προαίρεσις*). On the other hand, Josephus will *honour historical truth* (1.16: *τιμάσθω δὴ παρ' ἡμῖν τὸ τῆς ἱστορίας ἀληθές*), precisely as the Greeks have failed to do. Likewise, at the end of the prologue Josephus claims to have left no opening for criticism regarding the accuracy of his work (1.30). The conclusion of the *BJ* contains a similar statement: adherence to truth (*ἀλήθεια*) has been the sole aim throughout the narrative, whereas his literary expression (*ἡρμήνευται*) is left to be variously judged (7.455). Josephus (like Polybius) might occasionally be violating stylistic conventions, but adherence to truth is more important for the serious historian.[55]

While the parallels with Polybius are important, the differences in tone are just as telling. Polybius' account is primarily intended to convey his ruthless

[51] Ooms (2019) discusses the rhetorical principle of appropriateness extensively and on multiple occasions.

[52] The 'law' referred to by Josephus is probably the one mentioned by Cicero and Lucian: cf. Mason (1991) 65. Cic. *De or.* 1.62; *Leg.* 1.5; Lucian, *Hist. conscr.* 41. On Cicero and the 'laws of history', see Woodman (1988) 70–116; on Lucian's work see Avenarius (1956).

[53] For the possible inscriptional inheritance of *ἀνατίθημι* in Greek historiography, see Moles (1999).

[54] Price (2005) 110.

[55] With Mason (1991) 65ff.

criticism of the Greeks, whereas *BJ* 1.9–12 is designed to invoke pity among the audience and to highlight Josephus' deliberate emotional accommodation because of the unique stakes of his work. Polybius leaves no room for tears and maintains a certain intellectual distance,[56] whereas Josephus intends to produce tears and uses his Judaean background as a warrant for his own lamentations. While we might not find such methods in the histories of Thucydides or Polybius, or at least not in this explicit fashion,[57] Diodorus' presentation of the fall of Greece in the *Library* (32.26.1–2) offers a compelling point of comparison. The account draws heavily on Polybius' *Histories* but adds a distinctively tragic colour to the narrative.[58] Diodorus embarks on a comparison between Greece and Carthage, yet puts his subject in an entirely different perspective through his narrative commentary (32.26.1):

> ὅτι οὐδέποτε συμφοραὶ τηλικαῦται τὴν Ἑλλάδα κατέσχον ἀφ' ὅτου μνήμης ἱστορικῆς αἱ πράξεις τετεύχασι. διὰ γὰρ τὴν ὑπερβολὴν τῶν ἀκληρημάτων οὔτε γράφων τις οὔτ' ἀναγινώσκων ἄδακρυς ἂν γένοιτο.
>
> Never since men's deeds have been recorded in history had Greece been a prey to such disasters. Indeed, so extreme were her misfortunes that no one could either write or read of them without weeping.

Diodorus is aware that rehearsing these events may be painful to Greeks, but their didactic potential urges Diodorus to describe them nonetheless. Note the similarity to Josephus' claim in the Judaean case (*BJ* 1.12) that it is impossible for him to suppress expressions of lamentation.

Diodorus' justification (32.26.1) also provides a parallel with Josephus:

> ὥστ' οὐ χρὴ τοῖς ἱστοροῦσι τὰς μέμψεις ἀναφέρειν, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον τοῖς κεχειρικόσι τὰς πράξεις ἀφρόνως· οὐ γὰρ δι' ἀνανδρίαν στρατιωτικὴν ἀλλὰ δι' ἀπειρίαν στρατηγῶν τὸ ἔθνος τῶν Ἀχαιῶν περιέπεσε τοῖς ἀκληρήμασι.
>
> Accordingly, criticism should be directed not at the historians, but rather at those whose conduct of affairs has been so unwise. It was not, for example, the cowardice of the soldiers, but the inexperience of their commanders that brought the Achaean League crashing to its fall.

[56] Cf. Fornara, cited above, n. 34.

[57] Simultaneously, ancient critics regarded Thucydides as a master of *pathos*: see Lateiner (1977). On the reception of Thucydides in Roman times more generally, see Canfora (2006).

[58] For the relation between Polybius and Diodorus in this specific instance cf. Sacks (1990) 140–2; Hau (2006). For a more integral discussion on Diodorus' use of sources, see Hau (2009), and the various contributions in Hau–Meeus–Sheridan (2018).

Diodorus narrows the scope of Polybius' accusations from the entire Greek population to the leadership of the Achaean League, whose inexperience caused its fall. Likewise, Josephus blames tyrants and bandits for the civil war that caused the collective fall of Judaea, Jerusalem, and its temple. More generally Diodorus implies that not he, but the characters staged in his narrative are to be held responsible for the emotional tone of this episode. Diodorus thus absolves himself from potential criticism. While Josephus takes responsibility for his lamentations and knows that some might criticise him for including them, he calls the judges too bitter (*σκληρότερος*) for pity. The intended message seems to be rather similar: criticism of the author is entirely unwarranted.

Further, Diodorus explains his display of emotions as arising from the unparalleled reversal of Greek fortune: the Greeks 'exchanged the greatest prosperity for the most terrible misfortune. Having so heedlessly allowed themselves to get into war with Rome, they now experienced the greatest disasters' (*μεγίστων ἀγαθῶν ἠλλάξαντο τὰς ἐσχάτας συμφοράς. ἀφρονέστατα γὰρ εἰς τὸν πρὸς Ῥωμαίους πόλεμον ἐμπεσόντες τῶν μεγίστων ἀκληρημάτων ἐπειράθησαν*, 32.26.2). Compare this statement with Josephus' claim in the prologue of the *BJ*: 'For it came to pass that our city—of all those under the Romans—advanced to the greatest prosperity and then dropped to the most extreme of disasters' (*πόλιν [μὲν] γὰρ δὴ τῶν ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίοις πασῶν τὴν ἡμετέραν ἐπὶ πλεῖστόν τε εὐδαιμονίας συνέβη προελθεῖν καὶ πρὸς ἔσχατον συμφορῶν αὖθις καταπεσεῖν*, 1.11). Like Diodorus, Josephus connects the extremity of the disaster to the fact that 'no foreigner is responsible for them' (1.12). Both Diodorus and Josephus use the motif of the greatest possible reversal of fortune to enhance the tragic tone of the narrative and draw the reader into their presentation of the events.

Roman historiography of the first century occasionally takes on a strongly passionate tone. The reception of Cicero's death provides fascinating parallels to Josephus' practice, especially in Velleius Paterculus' history (cf. Flor. 2.16.4; Val. Max. 5.3.4).[59] In Book 2 Velleius describes the proscriptions undertaken by Mark Antony under the Second Triumvirate. The spokesperson of the Republic, Marcus Tullius Cicero, is one of the most notable victims, and Velleius holds Mark Antony directly accountable for his death (2.66.2–3):

> abscisaque scelere Antonii uox publica est, cum eius salutem nemo defendisset, qui per tot annos et publicam ciuitatis et priuatam ciuium defenderat. nihil tamen egisti, M. Antoni (cogit enim excedere propositi formam operis erumpens animo ac pectore indignatio) nihil, inquam,

[59] On this reception see esp. Keeline (2018). Gowing (2005) 44–8 focusses on Velleius' potential use of Cicero's *Phillipicae* to voice his critiques about Mark Antony.

> egisti mercedem caelestissimi oris et clarissimi capitis abscisi numerando auctoramentoque funebri ad conseruatoris quondam rei publicae tantique consulis inritando necem.
>
> Through the criminal act of Antony, the people's voice was cut off, with no one defending the life of a man who for so many years had, in the public sphere, defended the life of the state and, in the private, the lives of the citizens. But you achieved nothing, Mark Antony—the indignation that bursts forth in my mind and heart forces me to go beyond the plan of the work I had set out—you have accomplished nothing, I say, in counting out the payment for cutting off that heavenly voice and celebrated head, and with a deadly fee inciting people to murder a man who had earlier been the saviour of the state and such a great consul!

Velleius claims to be carried away by his emotions. He explains that Mark Antony's acts of indignation force him into an emotional outburst that is beyond the original plan of his investigation. He knows that condemning Mark Antony with such emotional language does not fit the general outlook of historical narrative, but the catastrophic nature of Cicero's death leaves him without choice. Velleius transitions from this to the next episode with the following statement: 'No one has been able to deplore in an adequate manner the fortunes of this whole period with the weeping it deserves, and certainly one cannot properly describe them in words' (2.67.1: *huius totius temporis fortunam ne deflere quidem quisquam satis digne potuit, adeo nemo exprimere uerbis potest*, 2.67.1). Velleius thus combines strong invective against Mark Antony with lamentations about the fate of the Republic. Velleius claims that he is forced into indignation by Mark Antony and that it is impossible not to weep about the proscriptions and the civil war that followed them. The use of these emotional registers is clearly carefully considered. Instead of adhering to the conventions of style that might be expected of his genre, he chooses to vocalise his emotions and enhance the drama and the vividness of the entire episode.[60]

Ronald Syme once famously marked Velleius' work as 'fulsome in praise of the government and bitter in rebuke of lost causes and political scapegoats'.[61] This statement could apply equally well to Josephus and his style.

[60] Cf. Keeline (2018) 118–25.

[61] Syme (1939) 384. Velleius is also called (488) a 'typical government writer … unswervingly loyal to Tiberius and to L. Aelius Seianus, the chief minister of state'. Elsewhere he claims that Velleius is 'voluble and unscrupulous' and that his 'loyal fervour insists everywhere on rendering praise where praise is safe and profitable, with manifold convolutions of deceit and flattery': Syme (1958) I.367. Syme even devoted an entire paper to 'Mendacity in Velleius' (Syme (1978). The commentaries of Woodman (1977) and (1983) challenge this approach and are the first systematic attempt to find some literary value in

Perhaps *BJ* 1.9–12 corresponds more closely to the historiographical conventions of first-century Rome than some scholars have thought.

As a final note, it is perhaps useful to move beyond Josephus' use of emotions briefly and to consider the object of his emotions. Josephus does not write about the death of Cicero or the destruction of Corinth, which happened more than two centuries before he put his pen to paper. Josephus shaped the theme of his narrative in such a fashion that it would have matched the contemporary concerns of his Roman audience. Here and elsewhere in the *BJ*, he puts specific emphasis on the tragedy of the burning of the temple in Jerusalem as the result of a Judaean civil war (e.g., *BJ* 1.10, 28; 5.444; 6.97, 165–67, 216, 249–66, 274, 280, 347).[62] We must consider that Josephus finished his account of the Judaean revolt against Rome roughly ten years after the year of the four emperors, when memory of civil war in Rome was still an open wound.[63] He describes these events extensively in *BJ* 4 (545–9, 585–663), explicitly referring to the burning of the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus as a consequence of Roman civil war (4.645–9), and reminds the Romans of their own sufferings in the closing book on multiple occasions (7.65–6, 157). In sum, Josephus' foregrounding of his personal emotions in reference to the burning of the temple in Jerusalem in *BJ* 1.9–12 may very well have been intended to invoke the memory of sufferings in Rome and draw a Roman audience into his account of the Judaean revolt against Rome.

4. Implications and Conclusions

Anyone familiar with Latin and Greek literature will observe some apparent points of contrast between the works of Flavius Josephus and the literature produced by Roman and Greek elites in the early imperial period. The world Josephus describes in the *BJ*—its geography, people, history, customs, traditions—would have been largely unfamiliar to most of his Greek and Roman readers. Josephus presents himself as a Judaean—an outsider to the city of Rome but an insider to his subject matter—and writes from this perspective throughout his entire corpus. However, it is precisely this Judaean background which makes Josephus suitable for the task set in the prologue of the *BJ*. Who other than Josephus could have served as a broker to present this Judaean world to an audience situated in and around Rome, largely unfamiliar with the world so important for Rome, the world where Vespasian prepared his claim to become emperor?

Velleius' work. Both positions have been discussed more recently in Gowing (2007) and Yakobson (2019).

[62] I have described this subject in more detail elsewhere: cf. Glas (forthcoming, 2021).

[63] For discussions of the dating of the *BJ* see, e.g., Brighton (2009) 33–41; Siggelkow-Berner (2011) 25–33.

Thus, the apparent points of contrast seem to have an important rhetorical function in a work produced in Rome and addressed to an audience in and around that city. Based on my analysis, I propose a new interpretation of what Josephus aims to accomplish in *BJ* 1.9–12. In the first part of this paper I addressed the alleged tension between Josephus' promise of a truthful, accurate, and impartial account and his statement that he will employ language in accordance with his personal emotions. I tried to show that the strategic use of emotions is a practice thoroughly anchored in Graeco-Roman rhetorical discourses. The characters presented in the *BJ*, and especially Josephus himself, also display such calculated use of emotions. Applying this to *BJ* 1.9–12, it is reasonable to expect a certain degree of calculation on Josephus' part instead of a slip of the pen betraying his Judaean background to his audience.

This proposition was elaborated and substantiated in the second part of this article. First, it appears that Josephus' blunt confession is in fact a rhetorical device used to claim that what he is about to write is so important and tragic that he must violate historiographical conventions. He appeals to the expectations of his audience, and asks them to trust him in spite of this. This is done in a fashion that resembles the practice of Greek and Roman historians writing in Josephus' day, or at least closer than Thucydides. Second, the use of tragic vocabulary and motifs is presumably meant to draw his readers into his history of the Judaean war against the Romans. It prepares them for the tragic vision which Josephus hopes to develop. Third, Josephus distinguishes between the style and the truth of his account. The law of history he proposes to violate is a stylistic law. This means that Josephus' practice is fundamentally different from what Cicero asks the historian Lucceius to do, namely to 'ignore the laws of history' (*leges historiae neglegas*), not to lay aside friendship, and to 'permit just a little more personal affection than truth would allow' (*Fam.* 5.12.2–3: *ne aspernere amorique nostro plusculum etiam quam concedet ueritas largiare*). Whereas Cicero's request implies bias and a violation of truth, Josephus violates stylistic conventions to honour the truth.

The implication of my argument is that the emotional outburst in *BJ* 1.9–12 is not necessarily at odds with his intention to write history in accordance with Roman tastes. Josephus' compositional choices may not have resulted in the alienation of his Roman readers, as some scholars have proposed. On the contrary, writing as a Judaean insider emotionally engaged with his subject matter, Josephus' subversion of his audience's expectations and the stylistic conventions of his genre resemble the practice of contemporary Graeco-Roman historians and seem to be tailored to an audience versed in Greek and Latin literature.

J. E. GLAS
University of Groningen j.e.glas@rug.nl

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Avenarius, G. (1956) *Lukians Schrift zur Geschichtsschreibung* (Meisenheim am Glan).
Becker, E. M. and J. Rüpke, edd. (2018) *Autoren in religiösen literarischen Texten der späthellenistischen und der frühkaiserzeitlichen Welt: zwölf Fallstudien* (Tübingen)
Bilde, P. (1988) *Flavius Josephus between Jerusalem and Rome: His Life, his Works, and Their Importance* (Sheffield).
Brighton, M. A. (2009) *The Sicarii in Josephus's Judean War: Rhetorical Analysis and Historical Observations* (Atlanta).
Canfora, L. (2006) 'Thucydides in Rome and Late Antiquity', in A. Rengakos and A. Tsakmakis, edd., *Brill's Companion to Thucydides* (Leiden) 721–54.
Chapman, H. H. (2005) 'Spectacle in Josephus' *Jewish War*', in Edmondson–Mason–Rives (2005) 289–314.
Chrysanthou, C. S. (2017) 'The Proems of Plutarch's Lives and Historiography', *Histos* 11: 128–53.
—— (2018) *Plutarch's* Parallel Lives*: Narrative Technique and Moral Judgement* (Berlin).
Cotton, H. and W. Eck (2005) 'Josephus' Roman Audience: Josephus and the Roman Elites', in Edmondson–Mason–Rives (2005) 37–52.
Davies, J. (2017) *Representing the Dynasty in Flavian Rome: The Case of Josephus'* Jewish War (diss., Oxford).
—— (2019) 'Covenant and Pax Deorum: Polyvalent Prodigies in Josephus' *Jewish War*', *Histos* 13: 78–96.
De Temmerman, K. (2014) *Crafting Characters: Heroes and Heroines in the Ancient Greek Novel* (Oxford).
De Temmerman, K. and E. van Emde Boas, edd. (2018a) 'Character and Characterization in Ancient Greek Literature: An Introduction', in De Temmerman and van Emde Boas (2018b) 1–23.
——, edd. (2018b) *Characterization in Ancient Greek Literature* (Leiden).
Den Hollander, W. (2014) *Josephus, The Emperor, and the City of Rome: From Hostage to Historian* (Leiden).
Duff, T. H. (1999) *Plutarch's 'Lives': Exploring Virtue and Vice* (Oxford).
—— (2011) 'The Structure of the Plutarchan Book', *ClAnt* 30: 213–78.
—— (2014) 'The Prologues', in M. Beck, ed., *A Companion to Plutarch* (Malden, Mass.) 333–49.
Eckstein, A. M. (1990) 'Josephus and Polybius: A Reconsideration', *ClAnt* 9: 175–208.
Edmondson, J., S. Mason, and J. Rives, edd. (2005) *Flavius Josephus and Flavian Rome* (Oxford).
Feldman, L. H. (1998) *Josephus's Interpretation of the Bible* (Berkeley and Los Angeles).

Fornara, C. W. (1983) *The Nature of History in Ancient Greece and Rome* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London).

Friis, M. (2018) *Image and Imitation: Josephus'* Antiquities *1–11 and Greco-Roman Historiography* (Tübingen).

Gill, C. (1984) 'The Ethos/Pathos Distinction in Rhetorical and Literary Criticism', *CQ* 34: 149–66.

Glas, J. E. (2020) *Flavius Josephus' Self-Characterization in First-Century Rome: A Literary Analysis of the Autobiographical Passages in the* Bellum Judaicum (diss., Groningen).

—— (forthcoming, 2021) 'Overcoming Otherness in Flavian Rome: Flavius Josephus and the Rhetoric of Identity in the *Bellum Judaicum*', in C. Teixeira, J. L. Brandao, and F. L. Roig Lanzillotta, edd., *Representations of Roman Identity: Between Self-Perception and Performance* (Paris).

Gowing, A. M. (2005) *Empire and Memory: The Representation of the Roman Republic in Imperial Culture* (Cambridge).

—— (2007) 'The Imperial Republic of Velleius Paterculus', in Marincola (2007) 411–8.

Grethlein, J. (2013) *Experience and Teleology in Ancient Historiography: 'Futures Past' from Herodotus to Augustine* (Cambridge).

Hägg, T. (2012) *The Art of Biography in Antiquity* (Cambridge).

Hau, L. I. (2006) 'Diodorus Siculus (32.2 and 4) and Polybius', *C&M* 57: 67–102.

—— (2009) 'The Burden of Good Fortune in Diodorus Siculus: A Case for Originality?', *Historia* 58: 171–97.

—— (2016) *Moral History from Herodotus to Diodorus Siculus* (Edingburgh).

——, A. Meeus, and B. Sheridan, edd. (2018) *Diodorus of Sicily: Historiographical Theory and Practice in the Bibliotheke* (Leuven).

van Henten, J. W. (2018) 'Josephus as Narrator', in Becker–Rüpke (2018) 121–50.

van Henten, J. W. and L. Huitink (2009) 'The Publication of Flavius Josephus' Works and their Audiences', *Perspectives on Jewish Culture* 6: 49–60.

—— (2018) 'Josephus', in De Temmerman–van Emde Boas (2018b) 251–70.

Hirschberger, M. (2005) 'Historiograph im Zwiespalt—Iosephos' Darstellung seiner selbst im Ioudaikos Polemos', in M. Reichel, ed., *Antike Autobiographien: Werke–Epochen–Gattungen* (Cologne) 143–84.

de Jonge, C. C. (2020) 'Ps.-Longinus on Ecstasy: Author, Audience, and Text', in J. Grethlein, L. Huitink, and A. Tagliabue, edd., *Experience, Narrative, and Criticism in Ancient Greece* (Oxford) 148–71.

Keeline, T. J. (2018) *The Reception of Cicero in the Early Roman Empire: The Rhetorical Schoolroom and the Creation of a Cultural Legend* (Cambridge).

Kemezis, A. (2016) 'Flavian Greek Literature', in A. Zissos, ed., *A Companion to the Flavian Age of Imperial Rome* (Malden, Mass.) 450–68.

Landau, T. (2006) *Out-Heroding Herod: Josephus, Rhetoric, and the Herod Narratives* (Leiden).
Lateiner, D. (1977) 'Pathos in Thucydides', *Antichthon* 11: 42–51.
Lindner, H. (1972) *Die Geschichtsauffassung des Flavius Josephus im Bellum Judaicum* (Leiden).
Mader, G. (2000) *Josephus and the Politics of Historiography: Apologetic and Impression Management in the Bellum Judaicum* (Leiden).
Marincola, J. (1997) *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography* (Cambridge).
—— (2003) 'Beyond Pity and Fear: The Emotions in History', *AncSoc* 33: 285–315.
——, ed. (2007) *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography* (Malden, Mass.).
Mason, S. (1991) *Josephus on the Pharisees: A Composition-Critical Study* (Leiden).
—— (2005) 'Of Audience and Meaning: Reading Josephus's Judean War in the Context of a Flavian Audience', in Sievers–Lembi (2005) 71–100.
—— (2007) 'Jews, Judaeans, Judaizing, Judaism: Problems of Categorization in Ancient Judaism', *JSJ* 38: 457–512.
—— (2011) 'Speech-Making in Ancient Rhetoric, Josephus, and Acts: Messages and Playfulness, Part I', *Early Christianity* 2: 445–67.
—— (2012) 'Speech-Making in Ancient Rhetoric, Josephus, and Acts: Messages and Playfulness, Part II', *Early Christianity* 3: 147–71.
—— (2016a) 'Josephus as a Roman Historian', in H. H. Chapman and Z. Rodgers, edd., *A Companion to Josephus* (Malden, Mass.) 89–107.
—— (2016b) *A History of the Jewish War: AD 66–74* (Cambridge).
—— (2018) 'Vespasian's Rise from Civil War in Josephus's *Bellum Judaicum*', in L. D. Ginsberg and D. A. Krasne, edd., *After 69 CE: Writing Civil War in Flavian Rome* (Berlin) 199–226.
Moles, J. L. (1999) 'Ἀνάθημα καὶ κτῆμα: the Inscriptional Inheritance of Ancient Historiography', *Histos* 3: 27–69
Niehoff, M. R. (2018) 'Philo and Josephus Fashion Themselves as Religious Authors in Rome', in Becker–Rüpke (2018) 83–104
Ooms, S. (2019) *How to Compose Great Prose: Cicero, Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Stylistic Theory in Late-Republican and Augustan Rome* (diss., Leiden).
Otis, B. (1967) 'The Uniqueness of Latin Literature', *Arion* 6: 185–206.
Parente, F. (2005) 'The Impotence of Titus, or Josephus' *Bellum Judaicum* as an Example of "Pathetic" Historiography", in Sievers–Lembi (2005) 45–70.
Pelling, C. B. R. (1999) '"Making Myth Look Like History": Plato in Plutarch's *Theseus–Romulus*', in A. Pérez Jiménez, J. García López, and R. M. Aguilar, edd., *Plutarco, Platón y Aristóteles* (Madrid) 431–43; repr. with add. in id., *Plutarch and History: Eighteen Studies* (Swansea and London, 2002) 171–95.
—— (2006) 'Breaking the Bounds: Writing about Julius Caesar', in B. McGing and J. Mossman, edd., *The Limits of Ancient Biography* (Swansea and London) 255–80.

—— (2009) 'Tacitus' Personal Voice', in A. J. Woodman, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Tacitus* (Cambridge) 147–67.
Pitcher, L. V. (2007) 'Characterization in Ancient Historiography', in Marincola (2007) 102–17.
Price, J. J. (2005) 'The Provincial Historian in Rome', in Sievers–Lembi (2005) 101–18.
—— (2010) 'Josephus' First Sentence and the Preface to *Bellum Judaicum*', in M. Mor, et al., edd., *For Uriel: Studies in the History of Israel in Antiquity Presented to Professor Uriel Rappaport* (Jerusalem) 131–44.
—— (2011a) 'Josephus', in A. Feldherr and G. Hardy, edd., *The Oxford History of Historical Writing: Beginnings to AD 600* (Oxford) 219–43.
—— (2011b) 'Josephus' Reading of Thucydides: A Test Case in the *Bellum Judaicum*', in G. Rechenauer and V. Pothou, edd., *Thucydides–A Violent Teacher? History and its Representations* (Göttingen) 79–98.
Rajak, T. (1991) 'Friends, Romans, Subjects: Agrippa II's Speech in Josephus's *Jewish War*', in L. Alexander, ed., *Images of Empire* (Sheffield) 122–34.
—— (2002) *Josephus: The Historian and His Society*[2] (London).
Runnalls, D. R. (1997) 'The Rhetoric of Josephus', in S. E. Porter, ed., *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period (330 B.C.–A.D. 400)* (Leiden) 737–53.
Russell, D. A. (1981) *Criticism in Antiquity* (London and New York).
Sacks, K. (1990) *Diodorus Siculus and the First Century* (Princeton).
Sievers, J. and G. Lembi, edd. (2005) *Josephus and Jewish History in Flavian History and Beyond* (Leiden)
Siggelkow-Berner, B. (2011) *Die judischen Feste im Bellum Judaicum des Flavius Josephus* (Tübingen).
Stadter, P. A. (1988) 'The Proems of Plutarch's Lives', *ICS* 13: 275–95.
Sterling, G. E. (1992) *Historiography and Self-Definition: Josephos, Luke-Acts and Apologetic Historiography* (Leiden).
Syme, R. (1939) *The Roman Revolution* (Oxford).
—— (1958) *Tacitus*, 2 vols (Oxford).
—— (1978) 'Mendacity in Velleius', *AJPh* 99: 45–63; repr. in id., *Roman Papers* III, ed. A. R. Birley (Oxford, 1984) 1090–1104.
Villalba I Varneda, P. (1986) *The Historical Method of Flavius Josephus* (Leiden).
Woodman, A. J. (1988) *Rhetoric and Classical Historiography: Four Studies* (London).
——, ed. (1977) *Velleius Paterculus: The Tiberian Narrative (2.94–131)* (Cambridge).
—— (1983) *Velleius Paterculus: The Caesarian and Augustan Narrative (2.41–93)* (Cambridge).
Yakobson, A. (2019) 'Velleius Paterculus, Imperial Ideology and the Old Republic', in C. Rosillo-López, ed., *Communicating Public Opinion in the Roman Republic* (Stuttgart) 273–94.