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Each chapter of this thesis deals with specific problems. According to Josephus, he composed the *War* in his native tongue — Hebrew or Aramaic — soon after the end of the War in A.D. 70, and sent it to his coreligionists beyond the Euphrates.¹

Josephus composed the Greek version of *The Jewish War* several years after the War. The potential readers of this version were not coreligionists but Greek and the Romans who had not participated in the War.² This fact meant that Josephus had to rewrite the first version drastically so that this group would read his work. Josephus consulted both Greek and Hellenistic histories and thereby learned to compose his narrative in accordance with their historiography.

Thackeray has pointed out that some of the words and phrases employed in the Greek version could be ascribed to historians such as Herodotus, Thucydides, and Xenophon, or to Homer, Sophocles, and Virgil.³ Thackeray's study thus indicates that Josephus consulted the works of these historians and writers.

In this study — though not in every chapter — we give particular attention to the *Histories* of Polybius of Megalopolis (c. 200-118 B.C.) to see whether he too was one of the

¹ The *Jewish War* I:3.
historians Josephus read before he wrote the Greek version of The Jewish War.

Josephus refers to Polybius four times in Jewish Antiquities and once in Against Apion. He quotes Polybius' statements as authoritative in some places and refutes them in others. Judging from the content of the passages in which Josephus refers to Polybius, a convincing argument can be made that Josephus had studied the works of Polybius before he wrote Jewish Antiquities or Against Apion. However, in The Jewish War, Josephus does not refer to Polybius nor does he anywhere indicate that he had read Polybius. Yet, there are at least three reasons for examining whether Josephus had read Polybius' Histories before he wrote the Greek version of The Jewish War. At one period of his life Polybius believed that Roman supremacy over Greece must be accepted, and he ascribed the cause of Roman success in world dominion to the work of "Tyche." Josephus too expressed the view that Roman supremacy over Judaea must be accepted. Secondly, Polybius described in detail the Roman army — its discipline, organization, and camp. So did Josephus. Thirdly, the works of Polybius were widely consulted by those who wanted to learn how to write history. Polybius' Histories was one of the best introductions to the methodology in historical writing. These three factors suggest that there should be a comparative study of The Jewish War of Josephus and the Histories of Polybius.

1Jewish Antiquities XII:135;137;358;359.
2Against Apion II:84.
3After examining various works on Josephus published
This thesis is composed of six chapters.

In the first chapter, we discuss the relationship between the Greek version of *The Jewish War* and the lost first version. We shall suggest that the Greek version is not a translation but a rewriting of the first version. For this purpose, we shall examine in what sense Josephus employed the verb μεταβάλλω whose meaning has been rendered to "translate" and thus the Greek version has been assumed to be a translation of the first version. In terms of Greek and Hellenistic historiography, we shall also examine how Josephus composed the Greek version of *The Jewish War*.

In the second chapter, we shall examine how Josephus interpreted the history of the War. First, we shall describe Josephus' view of history and the Judaeans' justification for the War against the Romans. Secondly, we shall see how Josephus interpreted the causes of the War, the cause of the defeat, and the role of the Roman soldiers in the War. Our attention will be focused on Josephus' Pharisaic view of history.

As a result of the defeat, Jerusalem was captured and the Temple was destroyed. Josephus saw in these events the fulfilment of prophecies. He refers in three places to prophecies concerning the capture of the city and the destruction of the Temple, but he does not disclose the sources of these prophecies.

during the period from 1937 to 1962, Feldman says: "There is need for an extended study of J's (i.e., Josephus') relationship to his Greek predecessors with a view to ascertaining to what degree his ideals and practice of historiography, as well as his philosophy, are indebted to classical Greek historians, notably Herodotus and Thucydides, and to Hellenistic writers, especially Polybius..." See Louis H. Feldman, *Scholarship on Philo and Josephus (1937-1962)* (New York: Yeshiva University, 1963), p. 54.

1 *The Jewish War* I:3. - xi -
prophecies. In the third chapter, therefore, we shall attempt to locate the passages in the Scriptures which Josephus used. We shall also look at Josephus' account of the death of Ananus during the War and Josephus' narrative of Dan. 2:31-45 in Jewish Antiquities X:206-210. As for Josephus' account of the death of Ananus, many scholars have contended that Josephus saw in the death of Ananus the fulfilment of a prophecy in Dan. We shall examine whether this contention is well-founded or not. As for Josephus' narrative of Dan. 2:31-45, many scholars have ascribed Josephus' evasiveness as to the meaning of the stone to its reinterpretation as the Messiah in the first century A.D. We shall examine whether this contention is tenable or not.

Greek and Hellenistic historians inserted many speeches in their writings. Josephus, who learned from their historiography, inserted forty-six speeches in the Greek version. In the fourth chapter, therefore, we shall first see how Greek and Hellenistic historians used speeches in their histories. Why Josephus used so many speeches will be then examined. We shall also point out that some of the ideas and expressions in the speeches Josephus composed may be derived from Polybius.

In the fifth chapter, we shall compare the use Polybius made of the word "Tyche" in his Histories with the use Josephus made of it in the Greek version. The concept of "Tyche"—something like Providence—was one of the most important concepts for Polybius while he believed in the Roman supremacy over Greece and world. It was with this concept that Polybius justified his view that the Roman supremacy over Greece must
be accepted. Josephus used the concept of "Tyche" in the sense of Providence when he justified the Roman supremacy over Judaea. Like Polybius, Josephus employed the word "Tyche" in various senses. Our examination will indicate whether Polybius' Histories really exerted any influence upon Josephus or if Josephus employed the word "Tyche" because he knew that the various concepts which the word connotes would be helpful in conveying his ideas effectively to his readers.

In the sixth chapter, we shall compare Josephus' account of the Roman army with Polybius'. We shall try to see if Josephus did consult Polybius' Histories when he wrote his own account of the Roman army.

- Note -

Various sources have been used: Josephus works — The Jewish War, Jewish Antiquities, The Life, and Against Apion — have been used in the texts edited by B. Niese, i.e., Flavii Josephi Opera. English translations following the Greek text in the dissertation are all mine. Other translations where no Greek text is given are all from the Loeb Classical Library. In quoting the literature of the Greek, Hellenistic, and Roman periods, I have also employed the English translations in the Loeb Classical Library.
ABBREVIATIONS

B. = Bellum Judaicum.

A. = Antiquitatis Judaicae.

V. = Vita.


In this statement indicates relationship there may have been between the first version. This verb has been "translate" and therefore we have often taken that the Greek version is a "translation" of.

However, we argue against the meaning of the following reasons: (1) In the Greek and

...
CHAPTER I

ON THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE GREEK VERSION OF THE
JEWISH WAR AND THE FIRST VERSION

INTRODUCTION
In the beginning of the preface to the Greek version, Josephus says:

\[\text{προαθέμων ἐγὼ τοῖς κατὰ τὴν Ἑρωμαίων ἡμεῦνιαν}
\[\text{Ἐλλάδι γλώσσῃ μεταβαλλών & τοῖς ἄνω βαρβάροις}
\[\text{τῇ πατρίῳ συντάξας ἀνέπεμφα πρότερον ἀφηγήσασθαι}

...1

According to this, the first version was written in Josephus' native tongue and it was sent to his coreligionists beyond the Euphrates.2

The Greek verb \(μεταβάλλω\) in this statement indicates what sort of relationship there may have been between the Greek version and the first version. This verb has been assumed to mean "translate"3 and therefore we have often taken it for granted that the Greek version is a "translation" of the first version. However, we argue against the meaning of this verb for the following reasons: (1) In the Greek and Hellenistic literature, the use of the verb \(μεταβάλλω\) as

---

1 B. I:3.
meaning to "translate" is rare; (2) In some passages in A., Josephus used the verb \( \mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \beta \alpha \lambda \lambda \omega \) as meaning to "translate." However, the way he employed the verb in A. is different from the way he did in B.; (3) When Josephus referred to the Greek version in A., he never employed the expression which suggests that the Greek version is a translation of the first version; and (4) There is no Semitic phraseology in the Greek version.

As a result of the examination of these points, we shall maintain that Josephus used the verb \( \mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \beta \alpha \lambda \lambda \omega \) to indicate that the Greek version was a rewriting of the first version.

In this chapter, we also examine the way the Greek version was composed. We demonstrate that the Greek version was written in accordance with the traditional and conventional methods of Greek and Hellenistic historical writing. This examination may also conclude that Josephus rewrote the first version drastically.

I. On the Meaning of the Verb \( \mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \beta \alpha \lambda \lambda \omega \) in the Beginning of the Preface to the Greek Version

In the Greek and Hellenistic literature, the verb \( \mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \beta \alpha \lambda \lambda \omega \) in the active voice or \( \mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \beta \alpha \lambda \lambda \omega \alpha \tau \) in the middle or passive voice is frequently used in various senses. However, the use of the verb \( \mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \beta \alpha \lambda \lambda \omega \) as meaning to "translate" is rare. Liddell and Scott\(^1\) list only two instances they find

---

Neither Moulton and Milligan\(^1\) nor Bauer and others\(^2\) cite any instance. In the literature of the Roman period, Sophocles cites only two instances in which Eusebius of Caesarea (A.D. 260-340) and Socrates (A.D. 380-450) employed the verb μεταβάλλω in the sense of "translate."\(^3\) The verbs and idiomatic expressions to be rendered to "translate" in the Greek and Hellenistic literature are usually ἔρμηνευς, μετέρμηνευς, μεταγράφω, μεταφέρω, μεταφάζω, and ποιήσωσθαι τὴν ἔρμηνειαν.

In two passages in Α. cited by Liddell and Scott\(^4\) and in three other passages also in Α.,\(^5\) Josephus presumably used the verb μεταβάλλω to mean "translate." In three instances of the five,\(^6\) the verb takes the preposition εἰς with the accusative to indicate a language into which the translation is made. Similarly, other verbs in Α. meaning to "translate" take the same preposition with the accusative to indicate a language into which the translation is made.\(^7\) However, the verb μετα-

---


\(^{4}\)Liddell and Scott cite the passages in Α. I:10; XII:107.

\(^{5}\)Α. III:144; XII:14;15.

\(^{6}\)Α. I:10; III:144; XII:14.

\(^{7}\)See for instance the verb μεταφάζω in Α. VIII:144; IX:283; X:218 or the verb μεταφέρω in Α. XI:329.
βάλλω in the passage under discussion does not take a preposition with the accusative, and the language with which (not into which) Josephus μεταβάλλεται is placed in the so-called dative of means. These facts suggest that the verb μεταβάλλω in the passage under discussion is not employed in the same sense it is in A.

In another passage of the same preface, the verb μεταβάλλω is again used in an explanation as to why the narrative of the Jewish War does not begin with the ancient history of the Jews. Josephus says that doing so would be not only "out of place" but also "superfluous" because

τινες Ἐλλήνων ἐκεῖνα τῇ πατρίῳ φωνῇ μεταβαλόντες οὐ πολὺ τῆς ἀληθείας διήμαρτον.¹

The verb μεταβάλλω in this passage does not take the preposition εἰς with the accusative, and the language with which (not into which) "some Greeks" μεταβαλλουσίων is put in the dative of means.

Let us examine if "some Greeks" had actually translated the ancient history of the Jews.

In his footnote to the English translation of B., Thackeray says that Josephus' reference to "some Greeks" is found in Ap. I:218² in which he cites Demetrius of Phalerum, Philo the Elder, and Eupolemus as historians who correctly presented Jewish history. Did they correctly present Jewish history by

¹ B. I:17.
translating the Hebrew Scriptures into the Greek language?

According to a fictitious story in the Letter of Aristeas, Demetrius of Phalerum advised Ptolemy I to have the Hebrew Scriptures translated into Greek for his library. He was then commissioned to supervise the work of the priests who were brought to Alexandria from Jerusalem to do the translating.¹ Demetrius himself was not a translator. Josephus narrates this story in detail in A.,² and refers to it in Ap.³ Josephus too understands that Demetrius himself was not a translator. As for Philo the Elder, we don't have much information: Philo is a common name and Josephus refers to him only once in Ap. However, as Thackeray points out,⁴ Josephus may have had in mind Philo, author of a Greek epic entitled On Jerusalem. Similarly, Josephus refers to Eupolemus only once in Ap. This man may be identical with Eupolemus, a Greco-Jewish historian who wrote Περὶ τῶν ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ βασιλέων in a rhetorical style.⁵ None of these translated ancient Jewish history into Greek. What Philo, the epic writer, and Eupolemus, the Greco-Jewish historian, did was to refer to or rewrite Jewish history as they saw it in the Hebrew Scriptures. This suggests that the meaning of the verb μεταβάλλω in the passage under discussion is not "translate" but "freely use as a source" or

¹The Letter of Aristeas
²A. XII:12;16;34;36;103;107;108;110;111;114.
"rewrite."

Throughout B., the verb μεταβάλλω in the active voice is used four times — I:3;17; II:190; VII:318 — and μεταβάλλομαι in the middle or passive voice twelve times. The basic meaning in all these instances is to "change something fundamentally." This is especially true of the usage in B. II:190, where, as in B. I:3 or I:17, the verb is employed transitively. In view of this, therefore, Josephus seems to have employed the verb μεταβάλλω to indicate some radical change, that is, rewriting, and not merely translation.

That Josephus used the verb μεταβάλλω in the preface to B. as meaning to "rewrite" is further confirmed by two other examples. The first is in the way Josephus referred to the Greek version in A. In the preface to A., he recalls when he was contemplating the composition of A. for the Greek-speaking world. It was ὅτε τὸν πόλεμον συνέγραφον (when I was composing the War). The content of the preceding passage clearly indicates that this specific time refers not to the period during which Josephus was writing the first version of the Jewish War but to the period during which he was making the Greek version. It is therefore important to note that the verb συγγράψω in the above passage does not indicate that Josephus was translating the first version into Greek. Similarly, the expression

---

1 B. I:296;326; II:346;524;525; III:127; IV:282; V:354; 372;452; VI:219;248.
2 See GEL, pp. 1109-1110.
3 A. I:5-6.
4 A. I:6.
in the passage of A. XX:258, i.e., ταὶς ὕπ' ἐμοῦ περὶ τοῦ Ἰουνάκηκοῦ πολέμου βιβλίος γεγραμμένας (the books which have been written by me concerning the Jewish War) does not indicate that the Greek version is a translation of the first version. The verb γράφω in this Greek passage is again used in A. XX:259. In Ap. I:50, Josephus refers to the composition of the Greek version with the help of his Greek editors. He says: οὕτως ἐποίησόμεν τῶν πράξεων τὴν παράδοσιν (Thus I made the narrative of events) with the help of assistants. This statement does not indicate that Josephus translated the first version into Greek.

Another indication that the Greek version is not a translation is the complete lack of Semitic phraseology which has been pointed out by scholars. If the Greek version were a translation, no matter how skillfully the translation had been made, there would have been some vestige of Semitic phraseology in the use of the Greek language.

Thus, taking these into account, we can only say that the Greek version is a rewriting of the first version and that the verb μεταβάλλω is used to indicate a rewriting or a free rendering of a source.

II. On the Way Josephus Composed the Greek Version

While we cannot speculate as to which parts of the first version Josephus rewrote and how he did it, it is possible for us to demonstrate that the Greek version was made in

---

1For example, Thackeray, J., Vol. II, pp. ix-x.
accordance with traditional and conventional methods of Greek and Hellenistic historical writing. The following points indicate this:

1. Inclusion of Book I and Book II in B.

A series of Jewish revolts, which started the "Jewish War against the Romans" took place when Gessius Florus, the Roman procurator, was in Judaea. In the beginning of June, A.D. 65, G. Florus extracted seventeen talents from the temple treasury on the pretext that he would use the money for some imperial service. When he met severe protests from Judaeans, he marched on Jerusalem from Caesarea with an army of cavalry and infantry, plundered some quarters of the city, and massacred many citizens. According to Josephus' interpretation, it was this event that precipitated the Jewish War.

Josephus did not begin his narrative with the event precipitating the war, rather, he went back to c. 170 B.C. when Antiochus IV (Epiphanes) came to Jerusalem and captured it, and more than one-third of his entire narrative is spent in telling what happened to the Judaeans during the two hundred years before the start of the Jewish War. Why didn't Josephus begin his narrative with the arrival of G. Florus at Jerusalem? Was it because Josephus thought there were indirect or contributing causes of the Jewish War during the two hundred years before the arrival of G. Florus? Or was it because sources, such as 1 Maccabees, Herod's Memoirs, and

---

1 E. II:293.
3 From B. I:31 to B. II:277.
4 A. XV:174. See also A. XV:256.
Nicolaus of Damascus' *Universal History*, were available to him that he wrote a history of the two hundred years prior to the start of the Jewish War? The answer may be found in Josephus' statement in the preface to *B.* where he writes:

I shall therefore begin my work at the point where the historians of these events and our prophets conclude.¹

This statement clearly indicates Josephus' conscious effort to connect the beginning of his history with the end of histories of his Jewish predecessors. Why, if this was the case, didn't Josephus begin with the death of Herod the Great with which Nicolaus of Damascus' *Universal History* concludes? Nicolaus of Damascus was indeed not a "Jewish historian."² He was a Greek historian who served the court of Herod the Great — a semi-Jew! Therefore he was not a *bona fide* predecessor. Only "the historians of these events and our prophets" were Josephus' legitimate predecessors.

Josephus' concept of relating the beginning of his narrative to the end of his predecessors' histories is apparently derived from his understanding of Greek and Hellenistic historiography. For example, when Xenophon composed a history of Greek affairs from 411 B.C. to 362 B.C. in the seven books of his *Hellenica*, he spent the first two books covering the years 411 B.C. to 403 B.C. His predecessor Thucydides concluded his *Peloponnesian War* with the events in 411 B.C.

---

¹B. I:18.
²A. XIV:9.
When Polybius composed his *Histories* in forty books, he spent the first two books in covering the period from the First Punic War, following the *Histories* of his predecessor Timaeus.

2. Inclusion of digressions in B.

Josephus frequently departs from the main course of his narrative about the War. As we shall see, many digressions are included for a definite purpose and are of two kinds: (1) digressions for instruction or enlightenment; and (2) digressions for an effective elucidation of a main subject.

(1) Digressions for instruction or enlightenment

b. Digressions for geographical details

Throughout B., Josephus writes fourteen digressions\(^1\) to supply his readers with information on the geology, climate, population, history, economy, buildings, and legends of the lands in which certain important events relating to the main course of his narrative took place. In most cases, the digression precedes the narrative of the event\(^2\) so that the readers may understand the geographical setting in which the

\(^1\) B. I:138 (Jericho); II:188-191 (Ptolemais); III:35-58 (Galilee, Perea, Samaria, and Judaea); III:419-427 (Joppa); III:506-521 (Lake Genesareth and its district, the Jordan River, and its sources); IV:3-8 (Gamala); IV:452-485 (Jericho's neighbourhood, Great Plain, Elisha's spring, Dead Sea, and Sodom); IV:530-533 (Hebron); IV:607-615 (Alexandria of Egypt); V:142-247 (Jerusalem and its Temple, and Antonia); VII:96-99 (Sabbatical river between Arcea and Raphanea); VII:163-189 (Machaerus and its fortress); VII:280-303 (Masada and its fortress); and VII:421-436 (The so-called district of Onias in Egypt and its temple).

\(^2\) In digressions, Josephus does not indicate that he is departing from the main course of his narrative (except B. VII:274) nor does he signal when he returns. When he thinks the truth of a story may invite suspicion, he says in the beginning that what he is going to tell is unusual (B. VI:199-200:297-298). And when he thinks he has failed to tell a story in full, he promises his readers to tell the story in detail in the future (B. V:237;247).
event occurred.

b. Digression and explanations of Jewish religion and customs

In Book II, Josephus digresses at length to explain the religious beliefs and practices of the Essenes, the Pharisees, and the Sadducees. He also inserts brief explanations of Jewish religious customs.²

c. Digression to explain the etymology of the word "Zealot"

In Book VII, Josephus explains the etymology of the appellation of the "Zealot."³

d. Digression for military details

In Book III, Josephus digresses to discuss the Roman army, its organization, training method and camping.⁴

(2) Digressions for an effective elucidation of a main subject

In describing the famine in Jerusalem, Josephus tells of a woman who came to Jerusalem from Peraea and devoured her child during the famine.⁵ Elsewhere, Josephus collects a series of portents which appeared in Jerusalem toward the end of the War — the star and comet, midnight light around the

⁴B. II:119-166.
²B. I:146 (Sabbath); I:650 (Images, statues or any representation of a living creature); II:10 (Passover); II:42 (Pentecost); II:425 (Feast of wood-carrying); II:456 (Sabbath); II:517 (Sabbath); IV:100 (Sabbath); VI:423 (Passover).
³B. VII:268-274.
⁵B. III:70-109. See Chapter VI.
altar and sanctuary, a cow's birth of a lamb in the Temple, the spontaneous opening of the bronze gate in the inner court, celestial chariots, and a voice in the inner court of the Temple. To this collection, Josephus adds another episode of the ominous cries made by a certain Jesus against Jerusalem four years before the War.

The purpose of inserting an episode or a collection of episodes is to elucidate the main subject effectively. A story of a woman who devoured her child serves to explain how severe the famine in Jerusalem was during the time of Roman siege. Similarly, a collection of episodes about portents serve to explain that defeat was inevitable for the Judaeans.

Josephus' insertion of many digressions in the course of his narrative is presumably based on his understanding of Greek and Hellenistic historiography in which digressions were an important literary device. Concerning the effect of digressions, Polybius says that our "sense of hearing" cannot stand the same strain in a narrative but it is "touched by a diversified style and by everything that is disconnected and marked by abrupt and frequent transitions." In another place, Polybius refers to the traditional habit of inserting digressions. He says:

And this, I think, is why the most thoughtful of ancient writers were in the habit of giving their readers a rest in the way I say, some of

1 B. VI:288-299.
2 B. VI:300-309.
3 Histories XXXVIII.5.5-6.
them employing digressions dealing with myth or story and others digressions on matters of fact; so that not only do they shift the scene from one part of Greece to another, but include doings abroad.¹

As Polybius' expression — our "sense of hearing" — indicates, people in the Greek and Hellenistic periods heard a story recited by a professional storyteller who possessed a book. It was extremely rare for ordinary people to possess a book and enjoy it in their leisure time as we do today.² People sought entertainment and authors therefore developed digressions to please them. They were made not only for the sake of entertainment but also for the sake of instruction or enlightenment. Polybius who inserted many digressions giving geographical details says:

But lest owing to ignorance of the localities my narrative tend to become vague and meaningless, I must describe their natural features and relative positions, as indeed I attempt to do throughout my whole work, by bringing any places with which my readers are unacquainted into connexion and relation with those familiar to them from personal knowledge or reading...³

¹Histories XXXVIII.6.1.
³Histories V.21.3-5. Similar ideas are expressed in I.41.6; II.14.3; III.36.1-5; IV.38.11;40.1-3; V.21.4-10; X.9.8; XVI.29.1-14. See also III.58.1-9.
3. Inclusion of speeches in B.

Josephus inserted more than forty speeches — long or short — in B.

Like the use of digressions, the insertion of speeches in the course of a narrative was an important literary device. Herodotus employed speeches. Thucydides inserted as many as forty speeches and wrote of his own technique of speech writing. In the extant books and fragments of Polybius, thirty-seven speeches can be found. He too described his concept of speeches as effective in the writing of history. Josephus and his use of orations or speeches will be discussed in detail in Chapter IV.

4. Elements of entertainment in Books I and II

We discern pure entertainment more in the first two books than in the rest. This may be due to Josephus' effort to maintain the interest of his readers as far as the end of Book II, after which the narrative of the Jewish War starts. The intrigues at the court of Herod the Great who executed his favorite wife Mariamme I, her two sons, and his eldest son are dramatically described.¹ Four predictions, which

¹The dramatic elements which mark the narrative are as follows: (1) In B. I:488;535, because of its magnitude, the intrigue, from which none is escaped, is likened to the "tempest"; (2) In B. I:531;582, the "Goddess of Vengeance" appears as if she were the agent of intrigues. She is depicted as arising out of the spirits of the people who were involved in the intrigues and killed in them; (3) In B. I:599;607;628, the image of "Ghosts" is used to depict the spirits of the murdered; (4) In B. I:596, "Avenging Spirit" appears in the confession of Pheroras' wife whose husband was murdered in an intrigue; and (5) In B. I:543, the progress of intrigue is likened to the progress of "drama" leading the major character, i.e., Herod the Great, to his final catastrophe.
turned out to be true are narrated without examining their
truthfulness.\footnote{The four predictions are: the prediction of John Hyrcanus about the future of his elder sons in \textit{B. I:68}; the prediction of a certain Judas the Essene about the future of Antigonus in \textit{B. I:78-80}; Archelaus' dream, and its interpretation by soothsayers, Chaldeans, and a certain Simon the Essene in \textit{B. II:112-113}; and Glaphyra's dream in \textit{B. II:116}.} Herod's narrow escape at Jericho is narrated
as if it were a miracle.\footnote{\textit{B. I:331; 340.}}

As far as the dramatic composition of the narrative of
intrigues which befell Herod and his family is concerned, it
seems possible to speculate that it was originally in Nicolaus
of Damascus' \textit{Universal History}. Nicolaus is known to us not
only as a historian of Herod's court but also as an author
of tragedies and comedies.

5. Inclusion of a lengthy pref ace in \textit{B}.

Josephus wrote a lengthy pref ace in \textit{B. I:1-30}. The pur-
pose of this pref ace is to capture the attention and interest
of his readers. First of all, he affirms that the War of the
Jews against the Romans was the "greatest" of all wars man
had experienced. He then gives: (1) the reasons for the
composition of the work; (2) his criticism of contemporary
historians who failed to write an objective history of the
Jewish War and the failure of contemporary Greek historians
who had little interest in these contemporary events; and (3)
the outline of his work.

Many historians had written pref aces before —Herodotus,
Thucydides, Polybius, Diodorus, Dionysius of Halicarnassus.
Concerning the inclusion of pref ace, Polybius says:
I indeed regard a prologue as a useful kind of thing, since it fixes the attention of those who wish to read the work and stimulates and encourages readers in their task, besides which by this means any matter that we are in search of can be easily found...¹

Concerning Josephus' emphasis on the greatness in size of the War he is about to describe, a similarity in diction between Thucydidest's preface and Josephus' has been pointed out by Thackeray.² Josephus' criticism of Greek historians for their lack of interest in contemporary events is very vague since he failed to specify the names of historians he had in mind nor did he actually assail them in B. His remarks about them are found in Ap.

Josephus criticized contemporary Greek historians possibly because he could thus arouse the interest and attention of his readers—particularly Greek readers. Dionysius of Halicarnassus states that both Anaximenes and Theopompus assailed their fellow historians in the prefaces to their histories.³ Dionysius himself criticized his fellow historians in a preface.⁴ Although Polybius did not criticize his fellow historians of his own and preceding generations in his preface, he did make sweeping criticisms of Timaeus, Phylarchus, Theopompus, and Ephorus in Book XII.

¹ Histories XI.1.1.
³ Roman Antiquities I.1.1.
In the first part of this chapter, we examined in what sense Josephus employed the verb μεταβάλλω in the beginning of the preface to the Greek version of Ε., and as a result we have suggested that Josephus used the verb to indicate that the Greek version is a rewriting of the first version. In the second part, the Greek version was examined in terms of the traditional and conventional methods of Greek and Hellenistic historical writing. What does the result of this examination mean for our discussion of the relationship between the Greek version and the first version?

In the preface to the Greek version of Ε., Josephus says that he wrote the first version for his coreligionists to acquaint them accurately with "the origin of the war, the various phases of calamity through which it passed and its conclusion."¹ This gives an impression that Josephus wrote the first version simply because he wanted to enlighten his coreligionists beyond the Euphrates about the War in which the Judaeans in Palestine had been involved. However, this conclusion is not tenable. On the basis of the epilogue to the lengthy account of the Roman army in Book III, Thackeray speculates that the first version was composed soon after the War as "a warning to the East of the futility of further opposition."² The danger of an uprising by the coreligionists

1 B. I:6.
2 Thackeray, J., Vol. II, pp. 608-609. Thackeray's contention is originally expressed in J., Vol. I, "Introduction," p. xi. However, in his later work on Josephus, Thackeray writes as if not only the first version but also the Greek version were intended as "a warning to the East of the futility
beyond the Euphrates to avenge upon the Romans the destruction of the city and especially the destruction of the Temple would have been strong after the War. They were united with the Judeans in Palestine not politically but religiously.¹

If this was indeed the case, writing the first version would have been a matter of great urgency, and it would be legitimate for us to suggest that the first version would not therefore have been written in accordance with the methods which we have styled the traditional and conventional methods of Greek and Hellenistic historical writing.

In fact, the accounts from B. I:31 to B. II:277 which we read in the Greek version would not have been included in the first version. Josephus would not have had time to create the dramatic narrative of the intrigues which befell Herod the Great and his court that he put in the Greek version. Unlike Roman and Greek readers, his coreligionists were naturally familiar with the beliefs and practices of the three Jewish religious groups in Palestine. The background material on this was thus unnecessary in the first version.


They also knew the meaning of the Sabbath, the Passover, the feast of wood-carrying and the like, for they faithfully observed the Jewish religious rites in accordance with instructions from the great Bet Din in Jerusalem. These descriptions were hence unnecessary in the first version. Geographical information is given not only in the first two books but also in the rest. Since the coreligionists were familiar with the lands of Palestine through their pilgrimages to Jerusalem, these geographical details were unnecessary in the first version. Thus, except for the digression on the Roman army, almost all the background information which is found in the Greek version would not need to have appeared in the first version. The same thing may be true of the speeches. As we shall see in Chapter IV, in reporting speeches in the Greek version of B., Josephus created elaborate works to convey his view of history to his readers. This kind of work would not have been possible in the first version which had to be done in haste.

In addition to the meaning of the verb μεταβάλλω, we have examined and observed certain factors which indicate that Josephus rewrote the first version drastically in making the Greek version so that it might become more interesting and informative for his new audience — Romans and Greeks.

CHAPTER II

JOSEPHUS' INTERPRETATION OF THE JEWISH WAR AGAINST THE ROMANS

INTRODUCTION

This chapter is in three parts. The first part deals with Josephus' view of history and the Judaeans' justification for the War against the Romans. We shall point out that Josephus, the Pharisee, recognized the work of God not only in the history of the Judaeans but also in that of the Romans. We shall also point out that Josephus' view of history would have clashed with the anti-Roman ideology of Judas of Galilee because the latter encouraged the Judaeans to refuse to acknowledge Caesar as head of the Roman empire. The second part deals with the beginning of the War and its causes. Josephus regarded the beginning of June, A.D. 65, as the period in which the War started. We shall discuss that the refusal to pay tribute to Caesar through Florus and the cessation of the imperial sacrifices in the Temple were the major causes for the beginning of the War. We shall also discuss that Josephus found the precipitating factors for the War in the events which took place under the administration of Roman procurators before Florus. The third part deals with the cause of the defeat and the role of Roman soldiers in the War. We shall point out that Josephus interpreted the cause of the defeat in terms of the Pharisaic belief in God's retribution for failure to observe the Law and
for defying the Law. We shall also point out that Josephus interpreted the role of the Roman soldiers in the War as agents of God.

I. Josephus' View of History and the Judaeans' Justification for the War against the Romans

Josephus saw history as a Pharisee.

In V., Josephus tells how at about sixteen years of age he compared the beliefs and practices of the Pharisees, the Sadducees, and the Essenes in order to find what was the "best" in them.¹ Not content, however, with what he learned from this comparative study, Josephus went into the wilderness to an ascetic named Bannus, and for three years led a life of purification with him.² At about nineteen, he returned to Jerusalem, and began to live in accordance with the rules of the Pharisees.³ This is the only reference Josephus makes to his relationship to Pharisaism. However, when we compare the passages in B. or in A. in which he refers to the views of these religious groups on the concept of "Providence"⁴ with the passages in A. in which he reveals his own view of "Providence,"⁵ or when we note in B. Josephus' repeated references

¹ V. 9-10.
² V. 11.
³ V. 12.
⁵ See p. 22, n.2.
to God's retribution (or punishment) of man, we are convinced that Josephus thought and interpreted the meaning of history as a Pharisee.

The Pharisees recognized the work of human free will as well as that of God's Providence in the causation of events. As long as human free will is converted into actions on the basis of the Law, the doer can expect rewards from God, but if what is done is in defiance of or contrary to the Law, he must expect God's retribution. Thus, the Pharisaic views of God's Providence and God's retribution create the concept that history is formed and guided by God.

Through His Providence and His retribution God works not only on the development of the history of the Judaeans but also on that of the Romans. God is universal.

Despite their belief in God's Providence and God's

1The idea that because of God's retribution one must pay the penalty for the wrongs which he has done is clearly expressed in the following passages: B. I:58;72;84;373;378;488; 531;593;595;630; II:455;472; IV:185;254;493; V:398;400;407; 537; VII:32;84;330;450;453.

2Josephus refers to the Pharisaic view on the cause of event in both B. and A. He says: "...the Pharisees... ascribe everything to Fate (= ροτησμενη) and God, and (they assert that) doing what is right or otherwise depends mostly upon men but (that) Fate (= ροτησμενη) aids in each (action)" (B. II:162-163); "Indeed, the Pharisees say that some events are the work of Fate (= ροτησμενη) and that other (events) depend upon ourselves whether they take place or not" (A. XIII:172); "Though they (= Pharisees) postulate that everything is brought about by Fate (= ροτησμενη), still they do not deprive the human will of the pursuit of what is in man's power..." (A. XVIII:13).

Fate (= ροτησμενη) in these passages is equivalent to "Providence." See George Foot Moore, "Fate and Free Will in the Jewish Philosophies according to Josephus," The Harvard Theological Review, No. 22 (1929), p. 379. See also R. Marcus, Jr., Vol. III, p. 311.
retribution and despite their belief in the universality of God, few Pharisees had carried these beliefs to their logical conclusion: that God was also working through the Roman empire. Josephus was one of these Pharisees. He knew Rome and the Roman world. In A.D. 61, when Josephus was twenty-six years of age, certain priests of his acquaintance were arrested by Marcus Antonius Felix, Roman procurator of Judaea, "on a slight and trifling charge," and sent to Rome to render an account to Nero. Josephus went to Rome to try to get them released. Although he does not say how long he was in Rome, he does say that it was on the eve of the War against the Romans that he returned. This means that Josephus was in Rome and saw the Roman world for a considerable period — perhaps from A.D. 61 to the spring of A.D. 65. Inevitably this experience exerted a great influence upon him when later he viewed the history of the Judeans in relation to that of the Roman world. Furthermore, an event occurred during the War which provided Josephus with a clear realization that through His Providence God participated in the formation of Roman history. Vespasian mounted an imperial throne in the midst of his War against the Judeans. Vespasian, ordered by Nero, began a series of campaigns in Galilee with three Roman legions and auxiliary forces and thus the War became serious. According

3Y. 17.
4E. III:409. See p. 44 for our discussion of Josephus' prediction of Vespasian's accession to the throne.
5E. III:3ff.
to Josephus' logical mind and because of his belief in God's retribution, if the Judaeans had been faithful to the observance of the Law, and if the Roman cause had been unjust, God would have punished Vespasian and his army during the campaign in Galilee. The fact is that far from being punished by God, Vespasian ascended the imperial throne from being a mere general of the army against the Judaeans. With his experiences in Rome and in the Roman world, this event added to Josephus' conviction that God must be working in the formation of the history of the Roman empire.

Josephus does not discuss the ideologies of the Jewish generals who waged the War against the Romans while engaging in civil strife against one another — the ideologies of John of Gischala, Eleazar, son of Simon, and Simon, son of Giora. However, Josephus does mention repeatedly the anti-Roman sentiment originated by Judas of Galilee in the beginning of the first century A.D.

After Augustus Caesar deposed Archelaus in A.D. 6, he made Judaea a Roman province, and dispatched P. Sulpicius Quirinius, the legate of Syria, to Judaea to take a census for the purpose of levying tribute from the Judaeans. At this time, Judas of Galilee urged the inhabitants not to pay tribute to the Romans. His rationale, which Josephus repeatedly

1 In B. V:407, Josephus emphasizes that when Sennacherib, King of Assyria, besieged Jerusalem, God swiftly punished him because injustice was clearly on the side of Sennacherib. See also B. V:388;404.
2 B. II:118;433; VII:253.
mentions, is that since the Judaeans have God as their Lord they should not acknowledge anyone as their Lord other than God.¹

Josephus does not say that Judas of Galilee refused to acknowledge Caesar as head of the Roman empire, but Judas' decision not to pay tribute to the Romans and his reason for so doing clearly indicate that he refused to acknowledge Caesar.² The anti-Roman activities resulting from Judas' propaganda were suppressed by Roman procurators, but the sentiment itself was not rooted out, and new anti-Roman activities came out of it later. When Marcus A. Felix was in Judaea as Roman procurator, the followers of Judas of Galilee killed other fellow Judaeans who were the ruling class of Jerusalem on the ground that they were pro-Roman. With sica (=dagger) they assassinated many including Jonathan the high priest.³ In the words of Josephus, these assassins, whom he styles "Sicarii," believed that such fellow Judaeans who acknowledged the Roman rule were "no other than aliens, who so ignobly sacrificed the hard-won liberty of the Jews and admitted their preference for the Roman yoke."⁴ Anti-Roman sentiment is also found among the so-called Apocalyptic Pharisees. They understood that the various hardships in their lives were due to the

¹B. II:118;433; VII:253; A. XVIII:23.
²We suggest that Josephus may have omitted reference to the refusal of Judas of Galilee to acknowledge Caesar as head of the Roman empire because the reference itself would have offended his Roman readers including Vespasian and Titus.
⁴B. VII:255.
oppresive rule of the Roman empire, and believed that God would someday rid them of the Roman yoke. The Apocalyptic Pharisees did not take part in the War, but their belief in the future deliverance by God exerted an influence upon the Judaeans, and often caused disturbances before and during the War. Josephus assails their leaders as false prophets. ¹

Soon after the beginning of the War, the Sicarii captured Masada ² and fortified it. Despite the radical activities before the beginning of the War, they did not participate in the War in Jerusalem. Because there is no significant contact between the Sicarii and the inhabitants of Jerusalem during the War, it is hard to gauge how much the anti-Roman ideology of the Sicarii, derived from the ideology of Judas, influenced the inhabitants of Jerusalem. However, the fact that the War against the Romans started in Jerusalem after the inhabitants had refused to pay tribute to Florus in the spring of A.D. 65³ indicates that the nationalistic ideas of Judas, if not that of the Sicarii, still influenced the inhabitants of Jerusalem.

It is noteworthy that whenever Josephus refers to the teaching of Judas —God alone is the Lord of the Judaeans—he never criticizes it. This may mean that Josephus as a Pharisee accepted his fellow Pharisee's ideology as partially true. However, when it resulted in the refusal of acknowledging Caesar as head of the Roman empire and when further anti-Roman

¹See p. 43.
²B. II:408.
³See pp. 28-30.
activities were justified by these beliefs, Josephus' view of history would have clashed with the ideology of Judas. To summarize, Josephus believed that God forms and guides not only the history of the Judaeans but also that of the Romans.

II. The Beginning of the War and Its Causes

Concerning the beginning of the War against the Romans, Josephus says:

... the war began, in the twelfth year of the principate of Nero, and the seventeenth of the reign of Agrippa, in the month of Artemisius.¹

In the same wording, Josephus refers to this period elsewhere in B.² and in A.³ Thus, it is clear that Josephus himself regards the month of Artemisius in the twelfth year of the principate of Nero, i.e., the beginning of June, A.D. 65, as the period in which the War started. Why does Josephus regard this period as marking the beginning of the War?

Immediately after the above, Josephus refers to the events which took place in the month of Artemisius. He first tells us of a serious disturbance which took place in Caesarea between the Judaeans and Hellenized Syrians. The Judaeans had a synagogue in the city and wanted to purchase a plot next to the synagogue from a Hellene. When he refused to sell it

¹B. II:284.
²B. I:20.
³A. XX:257.
to them, one of the Judaeans gave eight talents to Florus apparently asking his help in the settlement of the matter. However, Florus left Caesarea for Sebaste without solving the problem. On the following day, the Sabbath, when the Judaeans went to the synagogue they found a pot, turned bottom upward, upon which birds had been sacrificed. They regarded this as an insult to their religious practices and committed some acts of reprisal against the Hellenized Syrians. The leading Judaeans went to Sebaste to seek Florus' assistance but they were apprehended by him. Furthermore, Florus took action against the Judaeans of Jerusalem. He sent to the temple treasury and had seventeen talents taken out by force to "fulfil the requirements of the imperial services." When the inhabitants of Jerusalem protested, he resorted to military force. He arrested them and crucified many of them.

Josephus does not explain why he thinks these events started the War against the Romans. However, some portions of the speech of Agrippa II addressed to the Judaeans help us understand why Josephus regards these events as important. Josephus has him say at the end of the speech:

But your actions are already acts of war against Rome: you have not paid your tribute to Caesar, and you have cut down the porticoes communicating with Antonia.

3Josephus, B. II:293-306.
4Josephus, B. II:403.
In other places of this speech, through the mouth of Agrippa II, Josephus repeats the importance of paying tribute to Caesar as a duty of his subjects.¹

Many Judaeans had refused to pay tribute to Caesar through Florus before the events of the month of Artemisius. The teachings of Judas of Galilee provided a rationale for this.² Florus justified his taking the seventeen talents from the temple treasury for this. Josephus apparently observed the significance of this tax refusal, for it was tantamount to a declaration of independence from Roman dominion, i.e., a declaration of war against Caesar and the Roman empire.

Josephus also ascribes the refusal to accept a sacrifice from foreigners in the temple service as a cause of the War against the Romans.³ This event, which took place on the 19th of June, A.D. 65,⁴ was as significant in its effects as that of the refusal to pay tribute to Caesar. Thus, Josephus says:

This action laid the foundation for the war with the Romans; for the sacrifices offered on behalf that nation and the emperor were in consequence rejected.⁵

---

¹B. II:368;383;386. See also B. V:405.
²Florus, B. II:409.
³There were objective economic reasons why most of the Judaeans were not able to pay tribute to Florus. Josephus reports that Lucceius Albinus (A.D. 62-64), Florus' predecessor, burdened "the whole nation with extraordinary taxes" (B. II:273). Without doubt, Florus too followed the policy of Albinus. See Josephus' description of Florus' cupidity in E. II:277-279; A. XX:252-258.
⁴Zeitlin, RPJS, Vol. II, p. 239.
⁵B. II:409.
The refusal to pay tribute to Caesar and the cessation of the imperial sacrifices in the Temple were the major causes which precipitated the Roman War. But Josephus does not simply ascribe the causes of the War to these two events. He examines events which led up to them. Under the administration of Ventidius Cumanus (A.D. 48-52), an incident took place at Passover when a Roman soldier insulted the people. Owing to Cumanus' failure to handle the event properly, many disturbances ensued. A band of brigands and Sicarii then appeared in Jerusalem, together with people whom Josephus styled "false prophets" or "impostors," who promised Judaeans freedom from the Roman yoke. Josephus describes in detail the subsequent administrations of L. Albinus (A.D. 62-64) and assesses his responsibility for the conflict; of Gessius Florus (A.D. 64-65) whose cupidity disregarded the welfare of the Judaeans.

In A., Josephus goes back to the time of the administration of Porcius Festus (A.D. 60-62) when the leaders of the Hellenized Syrians in Caesarea obtained from Nero a rescript annuling the equal rights that had been guaranteed Jewish inhabitants. Josephus indicates that because of this rescript a series of incidents took place and culminated in the events of the month of Artemisius.

1 B. II:223-227.
2 B. II:228-246.
3 B. II:252-265.
5 B. II:277-279; 280; 333. See also A. XX:257.
It is clear that Josephus penetrated into the problem of the interaction of various occurrences before the month of Artemisius and of the cupidity of Roman procurators as making war against the Romans inevitable. As we shall see in the next section, despite this understanding, once Josephus begins to describe the progress of the War, he repeatedly maintains that God was on the side of the Romans, and places the onus for the capture of the city and for the destruction of the Temple upon some of the Judeans whom he styles "revolutionaries."

III. The Cause of the Defeat and the Role of Roman Soldiers in the War

For, that it owed its ruin to civil strife, and that it was the Jewish tyrants who drew upon the holy Temple the unwilling hands of the Romans and the conflagration, is attested by Titus Caesar himself, who sacked the city; throughout the war he commiserated with the populace who were at the mercy of the revolutionaries, and often of his own accord deferred the capture of the city and by protracting the siege gave the culprits time for repentance.¹

For I maintain that it was sedition that subdued the city, and the Romans the sedition, a foe far more stubborn than her walls; and

¹E. I:10.
that all the tragedy of it may properly be
ascribed to her own people, all the justice
to the Romans.1

As a result of this defeat, the Temple was destroyed and
the city of Jerusalem was taken. Josephus finds the cause of
the defeat in civil strife and places the responsibility firmly
on their leaders — John of Gischala, Eleazar, son of Simon, and
Simon, son of Giora.

Throughout B., Josephus depicts the progress of civil
strife, and his reference to it is attested by Tacitus who
says:

All the most obstinate rebels had escaped into
the place [i.e., the Temple], and perpetual
seditious were the consequence. There were
three generals, and as many armies. Simon held
the outer and larger circuit of walls. John,
also called Bargioras, occupied the middle
city. Eleazar had fortified the Temple. John
and Simon were strong in numbers and equipment,
Eleazar in position. There were continual
skirmishes, surprises, and incendiary fires,
and vast quantity of corn was burnt...2

As a result of these internal dissensions there was no
united military strength on the side of the Judaeans. Josephus
therefore ascribes the cause of the defeat to civil strife,

1B. V:257.
2History 5:12.
but does not merely refer to it as the cause. He analyzes the cause in terms of his own Pharisaic point of view and interprets the role of the Romans in the War.

In his account of the death of Ananus, Josephus writes:

But it was, I suppose, because God had, for its pollutions, condemned the city to destruction and desired to purge the sanctuary by fire... ¹

In referring to the killing of sacrificing worshippers in the Temple by the seditious, Josephus says:

What misery to equal that, most wretched city, has thou suffered at the hands of the Romans, who entered to purge with fire thy internal pollutions?²

On the occasion of the cessation of daily sacrifices in the Temple, Josephus writes:

Who would not bewail and lament for the city at this amazing inversion, when aliens and enemies rectify your impiety, while you, a Jew, nurtured in her laws, treat them more harshly even than your foes?³

God it is then, God Himself, who with the Romans is bringing the fire to purge His Temple and is exterminating a city so laden with pollutions.⁴

¹ E. IV:323.
² E. V:19.
³ E. VI:102.
⁴ E. VI:110.
What is clear from these words is that Josephus, the Pharisee, interpreted the defeat caused by civil strife in terms of God's retribution, and that in doing so he assigned the Roman soldiers the role as an agent of God.

The Roman empire had allowed the Judaeans to practice Judaism as a *religio licita*, a lawful religion.¹ Because of the internal dissensions during the War, however, those who were involved in them failed to observe the Law and made it impossible for their fellow Judaeans also, and the daily sacrifices in the Temple ceased.² By his own words³ and as quotations from Ananus⁴ or Titus,⁵ Josephus repeatedly refers to the Roman policy toward the practice of Judaism, and often interprets the acts committed by Jewish soldiers as impious in terms of the Law.⁶

Josephus as a Pharisee seems to have thought seriously about failure to observe the Law or acts in defiance of and against the Law. The best proof of this is in the speech which he delivered to urge the Jewish soldiers to surrender when the Roman army captured the second wall.⁷ In the first half of the speech, Josephus draws lessons from the history of the deliverance and capture of the city. Concerning the

---

² E. VI:94.
³ E. V:363;402;406; VI:101.
⁴ E. IV:182;184.
⁵ E. VI:128;333-335.
⁶ E. IV:317; V:15;39;395;401;403;411; VI:102;240;260;365.
⁷ E. V:363-419. See also p. 78.
former deliverance, Josephus first cites an event in which Nachao, also called Pharaoh, robbed Abraham of his wife Sarah, and points out that because Abraham did not resort to arms to regain his wife, God returned Sarah to him. 1 Josephus also cites four other instances in which previous generations depended upon God, not upon arms, in a time of crisis, 2 and draws a lesson. He says:

In short, there is no instance of our forefathers having triumphed by arms or failed of success without them when they committed their cause to God: if they sat still they conquered, as it pleased their Judge, if they fought they were invariably defeated. 3

Concerning the previous captures of the city, Josephus first refers to the siege of the Babylonians. Because Zedekiah resorted to arms when the Babylonians came and besieged the city, the city was taken and the Temple was levelled to the ground. 4 Josephus cites three other instances 5 and points

---

1 E. V:380-381. In the footnote to his English translation, Thackeray points out that this story is derived from "some strange version" of Jewish legend based on Genesis xii:10-20. See Thackeray, J., Vol. III, pp. 318-319.

2 The four other events which Josephus cites are: the plague of Egypt and the Exodus (E. V:382-383); the recovery of the ark from the Philistines (E. V:384-386); overthrow of Sennacherib's army (E. V:387-388); and Cyrus and the restoration from exile (E. V:389).

3 E. V:390.

4 E. V:391-392.

5 The three other instances which Josephus cites are: capture by Antiochus Epiphanes (E. V:394); capture by Pompey (E. V:395-397); and capture by Sossius (E. V:398).
out that God delivered the city to foreigners when there was "impiety," or "party strife," or "offences against the Temple and against the Law" on the side of the forefathers or when they resorted to arms. He continues:

Thus invariably have arms been refused to our nation, and warfare has been the sure signal for defeat. For it is, I suppose, the duty of the occupants of holy ground to leave everything to the arbitrament of God and to scorn the aid of human hands, can they but conciliate the Arbiter above.¹

In short, what Josephus has learned from history is that the Judaeans who live in Jerusalem should obey the Law and act in accordance with the Law in any circumstance and it is only when they do so that God delivers them from crisis.²

As we shall see in the next chapter, Josephus also recognized the fulfilment of Scriptural prophecies in the failure to observe the Law and in acts which polluted the city and the Temple.³

Josephus' repeated references to the Roman policy toward the practice of Judaism as a religio licita, his interpretation

¹ B. V:399-400.
² Josephus expresses a similar idea in Agrippa's speech. He says: "If, on the contrary, you transgress the law of your ancestors, I fail to see what further object you will have for hostilities, since your one aim is to preserve inviolate all the institutions of your fathers. How could you invoke the aid of the Deity, after deliberately omitting to pay Him the service which you owe Him?" (B. II:393-394).
³ B. IV:388; VI:109-110;311.
of acts committed by Jewish soldiers as impious in terms of the Law, his serious reflection upon the history of his forefathers, and his repeated references to the fulfilment of the prophecies in the Scriptures indicate that failure to observe the Law and acts in defiance of and against the Law on the part of Jewish soldiers were the central issue for Josephus in his interpretation of the cause of the defeat. Thus, Josephus, the Pharisee, having seen God's retribution, placed the blame for the destruction of the city and the Temple upon those who were involved in internal strife, especially upon their leaders — John of Gischala, Eleazar, son of Simon, and Simon, son of Giora, and interpreted the role of the Roman soldiers in the War as the hand of God.

Mention must be also made of the way Josephus described the progress of the War.

As we have already seen, Josephus understood that there existed objective situations in Judaea which made the Jewish War against the Romans inevitable. Despite this understanding, once he has begun to describe the progress of the War, Josephus never again refers to this. It is as if he had no such idea. Even before he begins to describe the serious strife in Jerusalem,¹ he tells of the progress of War in Galilee with the implication that God was on the part of the Romans. It is true that we can sometimes recognize Josephus' editorial elaborations to please his Roman readers by saying that God

¹According to Josephus, internal dissensions became serious when John of Gischala came to Jerusalem. The narrative starts at B. IV:121.
was on the side of the Romans. However, we suggest that Josephus' belief that God elevated Vespasian to be Caesar of the Roman empire despite his involvement in the campaigns against the Judaeans in Galilee helped Josephus to understand that God was on the side of the Romans from the very beginning of the conflict and that because of this belief he never touched again upon the conditions in pre-war Judaea.

For example, in his description of the capture of a town called Japha, in Galilee, Josephus mentions that many of the inhabitants were killed by the Roman army because when they tried to rush out to the second wall from the first one to escape the pursuit of the Roman soldiers, their fellow inhabitants shut them out. The cause of this tragedy can be simply ascribed to the misjudgement or fear of the fellow inhabitants. Josephus, however, says: "God, and no other, it was who made a present to the Romans of the wretched Galileans; it was He who now caused the population of the town to be excluded by the hands of their own people and delivered them to their murderous foes, to be exterminated to a man" (E. III:293).
CHAPTER III

JOSEPHUS AND PROPHECIES IN B.

INTRODUCTION

In three passages in B. Josephus refers to the prophecies concerning the capture of the city and the destruction of the Temple, but he does not disclose to his readers the origin of the sources he used.

In the footnote to his English translation of B., Thackeray admits his failure to locate the sources, but suggests that two of the three prophecies may have been taken from the fourth book of Orac. Sibyll. Bruce disagrees with him and speculates that the three prophecies were taken from the Scriptures. Except Ezek. 9:6-7, the passages in the Scriptures Bruce has indicated seem to be acceptable. However, his arguments on the sources Josephus may have used are not completely convincing because he omits the important reference of Josephus in A. to the prophecies concerning the capture of the city and the destruction of the Temple.

In B. Josephus refers to the death of Ananus and mourns for him. In Josephus' words, "the Jews saw the high priest and protector of their own safety slain in the midst of the city." Bruce and other scholars see Josephus' allusion to

---

"anointed one" who was to "be cut off" in Dan. 9:26, and thus they speculate that Josephus saw the fulfilment of this prophecy in Dan. Although Bruce and other scholars are aware of Josephus' contradictory statements about Ananus in B. and in A., they do not go into a detailed analysis of them. As a result of this, they base their arguments on the information given in B. and draw an erroneous conclusion.

This chapter is in four parts. In the first part we shall discuss the Apocalyptic Pharisees and their prophecies, and Josephus' interest in prognostication. In the second part we shall deal with the three prophecies in B. concerning the capture of the city and the destruction of the Temple. We shall discuss why Bruce's speculation on the passages in the Scriptures — Jeremiah's oracles and Daniel's prophecies — are tenable but also why we feel his speculation on Ezekiel not acceptable. Unlike Bruce's argument, ours will be based on Josephus' references to the prophecies of the capture of the city and the destruction of the Temple in A. We shall argue, as did Bruce, that Thackeray's speculation concerning the sources of the prophecies is invalid. In the third part we shall deal with the death of Ananus. We take issue with Bruce and other scholars who have suggested that Josephus saw the fulfilment of a prophecy in Dan. in the death of Ananus. We explain that Ananus was not the type of person in whose death Josephus would have seen the fulfilment of a prophecy in Dan. For our argument, we shall go into details about Josephus'
contradictory statements about Ananus in B. and in A. We shall also attempt to explain why Josephus in B. painted the picture of Ananus as a national hero. In the fourth part we shall deal with Josephus' narrative of Dan. 2:31-45 in A. In his article, Swain has convincingly pointed out that the prophecy of the four great empires and a more glorious fifth empire had already been carried to Rome from Asia Minor before the book of Daniel was composed and that the fifth empire was later thought to mean the Roman empire.¹ On the basis of Swain's theory, we shall argue that Josephus knew not only the reinterpretation of the fourth kingdom of Dan. as the Roman empire but also the reinterpretation of the prophecy of the four great empires and a more glorious fifth empire. We will suggest that Josephus' evasiveness as to the meaning of the stone is because he had the prophecy of the four great empires and a more glorious fifth empire in mind and that there was no logical necessity for Josephus to go into detail about the meaning of the stone. The inclusion of this part in this chapter is justified, for it deals with the interpretation of the Roman empire in a prophecy.

I. Josephus and Prophecies in B.

The passages in Ps. 74:9, I Macc. 4:46 and 14:41 refer to a time when there are no more signs and when there are no

¹Swain mentions the name of Aemilius Sura who referred to the prophecy of the four great empires and a more glorious fifth empire. See J.W. Swain, "The Theory of the Four Monarchies Opposition History Under the Roman Empire," Classical Philology, No. 35 (1940), pp. 1-14.
more prophets in the land of the Judaeans. With the canoni-
ization of the Pentateuch in the time of Ezra, prophecy was
thought to have ceased in Israel. Haggai, Zechariah, and
Malachi were the last prophets. Despite this, some Judaeans
during the Second Commonwealth believed that they could still
read the "divine will" through dreams. According to Zeitlin,
those who believed in the revelation of the divine will
through dreams did not belong to the "normative Judaean spirit
of that period [i.e., the Second Commonwealth]" but that they
were the "product of the teachings of the Apocalyptic Pharisees."  

The Apocalyptic Pharisees emerged from the Pharisaic group
during the reign of Herod in response to his tyrannical rule
and the subjugation of Judaea to Rome. They later prophesied
the coming of a Messiah, and attempted to persuade the Judaeans
that the Messiah would not only end the tyrannical rule but
would also deliver them from the Roman yoke. Their message
was political as well as theological, and caused a great deal
of disturbance among the Judaeans, particularly later when
Roman procurators — e.g., Cuspius Fadus (A.D. 45-46) and
Marcus A. Felix (A.D. 52-59/60) — governed them.

Josephus did not believe in the cessation of signs nor

4 See Josephus' references to the signs which he thought
appeared during the War in B. I:28; II:650; IV:286-287; VI:
288-310. In relation to the signs mentioned in B. VI:288-
310, see also Tacitus, History V:13.
did he believe in the cessation of prophecy in the land of Israel. However, he was opposed to the prophecies of the Apocalyptic Pharisees insofar as they were related to the expectation of the deliverance of the Judeans from the Roman yoke through the coming Messiah. This can be proven by the fact that Josephus severely assailed the activities of some of the Apocalyptic Pharisees. Josephus calls them πλάνοι ἀνθρώποι (deceivers), ἀπατώνες (ανθρώποι) (seducers, demagogues), γόητες (ανθρώποι) (impostors, swindlers), ϕευδο-προφήται (false prophets), and καταφευδόμενοι τοῦ Θεοῦ (false witnesses against God).

1 In Ap. I:41, Josephus states that although the history has been written during the period from Artaxerxes to his own time, it has not been regarded as worthy of equal credit with the earlier history "because the exact succession of prophets did not take place." Josephus' reference to Artaxerxes (465-425 B.C.) in whose time the Pentateuch was canonized in Jerusalem may suggest that Josephus believed in the cessation of prophecy in Israel. However, in other accounts, Josephus states that John Hyrcanus (B. I:68-69 // A. XIII:299-300; cf. Testament of Levi 8:15), a certain Judas the Essene (B. I:78-80 // A. XIII:311-313), Pollio the Pharisee (A. XV:4), and Josephus himself (B. III:399-408) were blessed with the gift of prophecy.

2 For example, in reference to the activities of some of the Apocalyptic Pharisees at the time of the Roman procurator Felix, Josephus says in B. II:258: "And besides these (i.e., the Sicarii) there arose another band of villains, with purer hands but more impious designs, who destroyed the peaceful state of the city no less than did the assassins."


4 B. II:259 (// A. XX:167); VI:288.

5 B. II:261 (ἀνθρωπος γόης ); 264. See also B. IV:85 (γόης ἀνήρ ); V:317 (τις ἀνήρ γόης ); A. XX:97;160;167; 186; Ap. II:145;161.


7 B. VI:288.
Josephus believed in the possibility of predicting events. He speaks of himself: ἂν δὲ καὶ περὶ κρίσεως ἡμῶν ἤκανός συμβαλέσαι τὰ ἀμφιβόλως ὑπὸ τοῦ θείου λεγόμενα (And concerning the interpretation of dreams, he was competent to conjecture [the meaning] of what was said by the Deity). ¹

Josephus may have learned the skill of prognostication when he was studying the beliefs and practices of the Essenes about the age of sixteen ² or when he subjected himself to an ascetic life under a certain Bannus between the ages of sixteen or seventeen and nineteen.³ In his writings, Josephus inserts several instances of predictions which were fulfilled: the prediction of John Hyrcanus about the future of his elder sons;⁴ the prediction of a certain Judas the Essene about the future of Antigonus;⁵ Archelaus' dream, and its interpretation by soothsayers, Chaldeans, and a certain Simon the Essene;⁶ Gaphyra's dream;⁷ and the prediction Josephus himself made to Vespasian about his succession to the throne.⁸ Except for the prediction of John Hyrcanus,⁹ all these instances are related

¹B. III:352.
²V. 10-11.
³V. 11-12.
⁸B. III:399-402; IV:622-629. See also Suetonius, Vespasian ⁵; Dio Cassius, Roman History LXVI 1:4.
⁹The power of J. Hyrcanus' prognostication is ascribed to his close contact with τὸ δαιμόνιον (Deity) in B. I:69 and with τὸ θεῖον (Deity) in A. XIII:300.
to either divination\(^1\) or dreams, and, with the exception of
those of John Hyrcanus and Josephus, three other predictions
were fulfilled within a very short period of time.\(^2\)

In two other passages, Josephus refers to his nightly
dreams.\(^3\)

In B., Josephus valued some of the prophecies in the
scriptures not because they contain moral or ethical teachings
but because they foretold events, and furthermore he thought
they were fulfilled in a series of events during the War and
culminated in the capture of the city and the destruction of
the Temple. Likewise, he valued some of the oracles provided
they foretold events in the War. In the interpretation of some
phases of the events Josephus refers to both prophecies and
oracles in a cryptic manner. As we shall see, Josephus never
disclosed to his readers the origin of sources he used.

II. Prophecies in B. of the Capture of the City and the
Destruction of the Temple

---

\(^1\) The word τὸ μαντεύω in B. I:79 suggests that Judas the
Essene made the prediction through some kind of divination.
Likewise, the word τὰ μαντεύατα in B. IV:624 suggests that
Josephus made the prediction through some kind of divination.
It seems that Josephus practiced divination because he knew
that Vespasian was interested in divining his future through
omens, dreams, holoscopes, and oracles of gods. See Tacitus,
History II.1;78; IV.81-82; Suetonius, Vespasian 5.7; Dio
Cassius, Roman History LXVI 1.4.

\(^2\) Immediately after the references to the predictions,
their results are told. This may suggest that Josephus expec
ted his readers to react quickly to the stories of predictions.
Concerning the insertion of these predictions in B., Josephus
may have followed the editorial advice offered by his Greek
assistants.

\(^3\) B. III:351;353. See also V. 208-209.
In three places Josephus refers to the prophecy of the capture of the city and the destruction of the Temple.

The first reference is in the account in B. IV:386-388. The account of the acts committed by the Zealots in defiance of any kind of law precedes this. In the account, Josephus first mentions that the Zealots scoffed at both "human ordinance" and "the oracles of prophets," and then he says that when the Zealots transgressed the oracles of prophets which "foretold much concerning virtue and vice," they brought upon their country "the fulfilment of the prophecies." After this, he refers to one of the prophecies in the following words:

 hWnd ότι τις παλαιός λόγος ἀνδρῶν ἐνθέων
tοτε την πόλιν ἀλώσεσθαι και καταφλέξεσθαι
tο ἀγιωτάτον νόμῳ πολέμου, στάσις ἐὰν κατασκήψη
καὶ χεῖρες οἰκεῖαι προμιάνωσι τῷ τοῦ θεού
τέμνεις· οἷς οὐκ ἀπιστήσαντες οἱ ζηλωταὶ
dιακόνους αὕτους ἐπέδοσαν (For there was
a certain ancient oracle of inspired men that
the city would be taken and the sanctuary [lit.
the most sacred] burned to the ground, in
accordance with the law of war, at the time
when a sedition should raze it to the ground
and the native hands pollute the precincts of
God beforehand. Although the Zealots did not
disbelieve these oracles, they made themselves
the instruments of their fulfilment). 1

1B. IV:388.
The second prophecy is in the speech which Josephus made to John of Gischala and his party in an attempt to persuade them to submit to the Roman soldiers. He says:

τίς οὖν οἶδεν τὰς τῶν παλαιῶν προφητῶν ἀναγραφὰς καὶ τὸν ἐπιρρέοντα τῇ τλῆμονι πόλει χρησμὸν ἢ δὲ ἐνεστῶτα; τότε γὰρ ἐπέσαν αὐτῆς προεῖπον, ὅταν ὁμοφύλου τις ἄρξῃ φῶνον (Who does not know the writings of the ancient prophets and the oracle which is now about to be fulfilled upon this wretched city? For they foretold that it would be taken whenever one human being should start slaughtering his fellow countrymen).¹

The third prophecy is in B. VI:310-315, which precedes the account of a series of portents which appeared in Jerusalem during the War. Josephus first mentions that although God was the guardian of the people and showed them the way to safety, the Jews chose the way to destruction, and then he says:

ὅπου γε Ἰουδαῖοι καὶ τὸ ἱερὸν μετὰ τὴν καθαίρεσιν τῆς Ἀντωνίας τετράγωνον ἐποίησαν, ἀναγεγραμμένον ἐν τοῖς λογίοις ἔχοντες ἀλώσεσθαι τὴν πόλιν καὶ τὸν ναὸν, ἐπειδὰν τὸ ἱερὸν γένηται τετράγωνον

¹B. VI:109-110.
(For the Jews, after the destruction of Antonia, made the Temple a square [or four-square], although they had it recorded in their oracles that the city and the sanctuary would be taken when once the Temple should become a square [or four-square].)

One thing which makes it difficult for us to locate the exact source used in each of these three prophecies may be ascribed to the incorporation of Josephus' own vocabulary in them. In the footnote to his English translation of B., Thackeray admits his failure to find the sources of these three prophecies. However, he speculates that the first and the second prophecies belong to the same source and suggests that it may be the oracles in Orac. Sibyll. IV:115-118, which refers to the internal dissensions in Jerusalem during the siege in A.D. 69, and IV:125-126, which refers to the destruction of the Temple in A.D. 70. Thus, Thackeray says: "The

---

1B. VI:311.
2For example, the use of the phrase πολέμου νάμψ (in accordance with the law of war) in the first prophecy may be ascribed to the vocabulary of Josephus. See pp. 78-79, 87-90.
fourth book of Sibylline Oracles dates from c. A.D. 80, and is therefore contemporary with the Jewish War of Josephus.  

It is difficult to accept Thackeray's suggestion of Josephus' use of the fourth book of Orac. Sibyll because the date of its composition is a little late for Josephus to have used it. Another difficulty is in Josephus' failure to refer to the fourth book of Orac. Sibyll in A.  

Josephus' ambiguous statement in B. IV:388 concerning the provenance of the first prophecy and his statement in the same passage concerning the Zealots' attitude toward the prophecy are important. Josephus says that the prophecy is taken from

---


2 The oracles in Orac. Sibyll. IV:115-118 and 125-126 give us an impression that they were composed soon after the Jewish War when the memory of the events during the years A.D. 69-70 was still vivid in the mind of the author. However, other passages in IV:128-129;143-144, which refer to an earthquake in Cyprus in A.D. 76, suggest that the date of the composition of the fourth book be placed sometime after A.D. 76, probably at about A.D. 80. See Charles, APOT, Vol. II, p. 373. There is of course a possibility that some nucleus in the oracles of IV:115-118 and 125-126 was independently made soon after the War and that it was current at an earlier date. However, the unity of oracles in the fourth book is pointed out. See Charles, APOT, Vol. II, p. 373.

3 The Greek version of B. was composed after the dedication of the Temple of Pax in Rome (B. VII:158ff) in A.D. 75 (See Dio Cassius, Roman History LXVI 15) but before the death in A.D. 79 of Vespasian who received a copy of B. (V. 361; Ap. 1:50-51).

4 In A. Josephus discusses one of Daniel's prophecies as referring to the destruction of the city and the Temple. If the fourth book of Orac. Sibyll. had been known to Josephus, he would have used it at the end of his discussion and disclosed to his readers the name of the source, for it is Josephus' consistent policy in A. to use available sources, be they Jewish or non-Jewish, in paraphrasing the Scriptural accounts and to mention the names of the sources. See A. I:118 (Allusion to the source of Orac. Sibyll. III:97ff). See also Charles, APOT, Vol. II, p. 370.
"a certain oracle of inspired men" and that the "Zealots did not disbelieve" in it. If we accept these statements as true, it follows that the first prophecy was in the Scriptures. The Zealots did not believe in any prophecy not in the Scriptures. Likewise, Josephus' statement in B. VI:109a suggests that the second prophecy was actually taken from the Scriptures. Although Josephus says nothing of the provenance of the third prophecy, it too may be taken from the Scriptures.

Josephus' references in B. to the oracle of Jeremiah\(^1\) and to the oracle of the coming disaster foretold by Jesus b. Ananias in A.D. 61\(^2\) indicate that he was interested in Jeremiah and his oracles. There are also Josephus' remarks in A. which indicate his interest in Jeremiah's oracles. After referring to the death of Josiah in battle with Necho and to the great

\(^1\)When the second wall was taken by the Roman soldiers and the earthworks opposite Antonia were raised by them, Josephus was commissioned by Titus to make a speech to his fellow countrymen to persuade them to submit to the Romans. In the speech, Josephus recalls the former captures of the city by the Babylonians, Antiochus Epiphanes, Pompey, Herod and Sossius (B. VI:391-398). In recalling the capture of the city by the Babylonians, Josephus makes a reference to the oracle of Jeremiah. He says: τούτο μὲν, ἡνίκα βασιλεὺς Βαβυλωνίων ἐπολιορκεῖ ταύτην τὴν πόλιν, συμβαλὼν Σεδεκίας ὁ ἡμέτερος βασιλεὺς παρὰ τὰς Ἰερεμίου προφητείας αὐτῶς τὸ ἐάλω καὶ τὸ ἄστον μετὰ τοῦ ναοῦ κατασκαπτόμενον εἶδος... βοώντα γοῦν τὸν Ἰερεμίαν, ὥς ἀπέχθιοντο μὲν τῷ θεῷ διὰ τὰς εἰς αὐτὸν πλημμελείας, ἀλλόφοιντο δὲ εἶ, μὴ παραθιέν τὴν πόλιν,... (Thus, at that time when the King of Babylon was besieging this country, our king Zedekiah fought against him in defiance of the prophecies of Jeremiah, [and] was himself taken captive and saw the city, together with the Temple, razed to the ground...For, though Jeremiah cried out loudly that they were hostile to God because of their sins against Him and that they would be taken captive unless they would hand over the city...) (B. V:391-392).

\(^2\)B. VI:300-309. See Jer. VII:34.
mourned for him, Josephus says:

Ἰερεμίας δὲ προφήτης ἐπικήδειον αὐτοῦ
συνέταξε μέλος θρηνητικῶν, ὃ καὶ μέχρι
νῦν διαμένει. οὗτος δὲ προφήτης καὶ τὰ
μέλλοντα τῇ πόλει δεινὰ προεκήρυξεν ἐν
γράμμαι καταληπτῶν καὶ τὴν νῦν ἐφ’ ἡμῶν
γενομένην ἀλώσιν τὴν τε Βαβυλῶνος αἰρέσιν

(And the prophet Jeremiah composed a dirge
for his funeral, which also remains until
now. This prophet also announced beforehand
the terrible things which were to befall the
city, and left behind in [his] writings [the
oracles concerning] the capture which recently
befell our [city] as well as the capture of
Babylon).¹

These things lead us to think it possible that the pro-
pheties under discussion were taken from Jeremiah's oracles,
although they were recorded some seven hundred years before
and were directed against the city and the first Temple, not
the second Temple.

In B. Josephus does not make any reference to Daniel and
his prophecies, but references in A. X:186-281 indicate that
he was also interested in Daniel and his prophecies. He

¹ A. X:78-79.
regards Daniel as "one of the greatest prophets." Toward the end of his narrative of the life of Daniel and his prophecies, Josephus summarizes the account of Daniel's vision in Dan. IX-XI, and says:

τὸν αὐτὸν δὲ τρόπον Δανίηλος καὶ περὶ τῆς ἡγεμονίας ἀνέγγαψε καὶ ὅτι ὑπ' αὐτῶν ἀφεθήσεται τὰ Ἰεροσόλυμα καὶ δὲ ναὸς ἐρμηνευθῆσεται (In the same manner, Daniel also wrote about the empire of the Romans and (predicted) that Jerusalem would be taken and the Temple would be laid waste).²

The above passage may indicate another possibility that the prophecies under discussion were taken from Dan.

---

¹ A. X:266. Besides Josephus and Matthew, Ginzberg enumerates Palestinian sources which regard Daniel as one of the prophets. See L. Ginzberg, The Legends of the Jews, Vol. VI (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1939), p. 413. See also S. Zeitlin, "The Cryptic Number in Daniel," The Jewish Quarterly Review, No. 39 (January, 1949), p. 321. Josephus also says in A. X:267: τὰ γὰρ βιβλία, ὡς ἐν συγγραφεῖοι καταλέλειπεν, ἀναγινώζεται παρ' ἡμῖν ἢτι καὶ νῦν καὶ πεπιστευκαμεν εἰς αὐτῶν ὅτι Δανίηλος ὠμέλει τῷθεν οὗ γὰρ τὰ μέλλοντα μόνον προφητεύων διητέλει, καθάπερ καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι προφῆται, ἀλλὰ καὶ καὶρὸν ὑφικεν, εἰς ὅν ταύτα ἐπιθέσομαι (For the books, which he wrote and left behind, are still read by us even now, and we believe from them that Daniel used to converse with God. For he kept prophesying not only of the things to come, as did other prophets also, but he also set (the time) at which these things would come to pass).

² A. X:276. Our reading in this passage is based on R. Marcus' text after a study of the expository works of St. John Chrysostom, 4th century Patriarch of Constantinople. See R. Marcus, J., Vol. VI, p. 311. Niese's text reads: τὸν αὐτὸν δὲ τρόπον δὲ Δανίηλος καὶ περὶ τῆς ἡγεμονίας ἀνέγγαψε, καὶ ὅτι ὑπ' αὐτῶν ἐρμηνευθῆσεται (In the same manner, Daniel also wrote about the empire of the Romans and (predicted) that it (impersonal) would be laid waste).
In his speculation on the sources of these prophecies, Bruce specified their locations. The first and second prophecies are suggested to be Jeremiah's oracles in Jer. 7:14 and 26:6 or the vision of Lord's judgment in Ezek. 9:6-7 or Dan. 11 and 12, which refer to the struggle between those who "forsake the holy covenant" (11:30) and those who "know their God" (11:32), the profanation of the Temple as a result of internal dissension (11:31) and the "breaking into pieces of the holy people" (12:7). As to the source of the third prophecy, he suggests Dan. 9:26, which refers to the coming destruction of the city and the sanctuary by the "people of the prince to come."  

Concerning Josephus' reference to the Temple being made "τετραγώνων (a square or four-square), he thinks that Josephus may have misinterpreted Dan. 9:25, which refers to the future reconstruction of Jerusalem with "a square" and moat.  

Except for the vision of the Lord's judgment in Ezek. 9:6-7, Bruce's location of the sources seems to be acceptable. According to A., Josephus was interested in Ezekiel and his prophecies, but he does not specifically say that Ezekiel predicted the capture of the city and the destruction of the (second) Temple.

III. Concerning the Death of Ananus during the War

In B. Josephus talks of Ananus' death in the following words:

---

1 Bruce, op. cit., pp. 155-156.
2 Bruce, ibid.
3 A. X:79;98;106;141.
In this passage where we read "the Jews saw the high priest and protector of their own safety slain in the midst of the city," Bruce and others see Josephus' allusion to "an anointed one" who was to "be cut off" in Dan. 9:26, and they suggest that Josephus thought that the prophecy of Daniel was thus fulfilled.

As is clear from the passage cited above, Josephus regards the death of Ananus as one of the most important events of the War.

According to B., soon after the War against the Romans started, Ananus, with Josephus, son of Gorion, was elected by the provisional government of Jerusalem to take care of the

---

1 B. IV:318.
2 Bruce, op. cit., p. 194.
safety of the city. He was in charge of raising the height of the walls and accumulation of arms, but he hoped to pacify the seditious and the so-called Zealots by "gradually abandoning these warlike preparations." He delivered a speech against the Zealots and assailed them. When the Idumean soldiers came to Jerusalem to assist the Zealots in the Temple, he shut the gates to prevent them from entering. After his death at the hands of some Idumean soldiers, Josephus delivers an encomium about him.

Throughout B., however, Josephus does not touch upon the following points which are covered in A. or in V.: (1) Ananus was a Sadducee; (2) Ananus was appointed high priest by Agrippa II in A.D. 62, but he was dismissed by the same Agrippa II three months later because he summoned a synedrion of judges without the consent of the Roman procurator Albinus, who was on the way to Judaea from Alexandria; (3) Ananus was a man of harsh character in judging offenders; and (4) Ananus once attempted to remove Josephus from Galilee when Josephus was

---

1. B. II:563.
2. II:563;648.
3. II:651.
4. B. IV:162-192. This speech will be examined in Chapter IV.
6. B. IV:236-238.
7. B. IV:319-322. See also B. IV:151.
8. A. XX:199.
there as a general to execute the missions assigned to him by the provisional government of Jerusalem.¹

The first point suggests that Ananus the Sadducee stood in opposition to Josephus the Pharisee. The second point indicates that Ananus was not a high priest during the War. After he was stripped of his high priesthood, Ananus had no right to wear the high priestly vestment which the Judaeans believed had atoning power.² Thus, Ananus had no authority whatsoever during the War to make atonement for the sins of his people. The third point suggests the recurrence of a struggle between the Sadducees and the Pharisees over political matters.³ And the fourth point indicates that Ananus and Josephus were opposed to each other over the handling of the situations in Galilee.

The four points which Josephus does not touch upon in B. and the things inferred from them lead us to a conclusion that Ananus was not necessarily the type of person in whose death — no matter how tragic it may have been — Josephus would have seen the fulfilment of Daniel's prophecy.

There remains the question as to why Josephus did not refer in B. to the above-cited four points but painted a picture of Ananus as if he were a national hero. Although there are many possible explanations for this, we believe that Josephus was influenced by his Greek editorial assistants who,

---

¹W. 193-204; 216.
perhaps unconsciously, suggested that to balance the two Roman heroes, Vespasian and Titus, a Jewish national hero was desirable and even necessary. Stripped of certain damaging detail, Ananias emerged as just that.

IV. Josephus' Narrative of Dan. 2:31-45 in A. X:206-210

Dan. 2:31-45 speaks of a dream King Nebuchadnezzar had and of its interpretation by Daniel. In his dream, Nebuchadnezzar saw an image, of which the head was of fine gold, the breast and arms of silver, the belly and thighs of brass, the legs of iron, the feet part of iron and part of clay. The King also saw a stone being quarried without human hands. After breaking the image into pieces, this stone "became a great mountain and filled the whole earth."

According to Daniel, the head of gold signifies Nebuchadnezzar; after Nebuchadnezzar there arises another king inferior to him; then there occurs another third kingdom of brass, which rules over all the earth; and the fourth kingdom is strong as iron and just as iron breaks all things into pieces, this kingdom crushes all things into pieces.

The names of these four kingdoms are not specified by

---

1 Dan. 2:32-33.
2 Dan. 2:34.
3 Dan. 2:34-35a.
4 Dan. 2:35b.
5 Dan. 2:38b.
6 Dan. 2:39a.
7 Dan. 2:39b.
8 Dan. 2:40.
With few exceptions, modern scholars agree that the Babylonian, Median, Persian, and Greek empires are indicated respectively by the first, second, third, and fourth kingdoms. 

In retelling the story in Dan. 2:31-45, Josephus omits some Scriptural details and adds some unscriptural ones. Thus, he says:

τὸ μὲν οὖν ὃναρ, ὅπερ εἶδες, τοῦτ' ἔστιν,
ἡ δὲ κρίσις αὐτοῦ τούτου ἔχει τὸν τρόπον
ἡ μὲν χρυσὴ κεφαλὴ σὲ τε ἐδήλου καὶ τοὺς
πρὸ σοῦ βασιλέας Βαβυλωνίους ὠντας· αἱ δὲ
χεῖρες καὶ οἱ ὄμοι σημαίνουσιν ὑπὸ δύο
καταλυθήσεσθαι βασιλέως τὴν ἡγεμονίαν ὑμῶν·
tὴν δὲ ἑκείνων ἔτερος τις ἀπὸ τῆς δύσεως
καθαιρήσει χαλκὸν ἡμφιεσμένος, καὶ ταύτην
ἀλλή παύσει τὴν ἴσχυν ὑμῶν σιδήρῳ καὶ
κρατήσει δὲ εἰς ἄπαντα διὰ τὴν τοῦ σιδήρου
φύσιν (This, then, is the dream which you saw, that is, its interpretation goes as follows: The golden head indicates you and

\[1\] Eerdmans, for instance, thinks that the four kingdoms indicate the last four Babylonian kings. See Bernardus D. Eerdmans, The Religion of Israel (Leiden: Universitaire Pers Leiden, 1947), pp. 222-227.

the Babylonian kings who were before you.
The hands and the shoulders signify that your kingdom will be destroyed by two kings.
But another king (lit. some other) from the West, clad in bronze, will take down their kingdom, and another (power), like iron, will bring this power to an end and rule with regards to everything on account of its iron nature).¹

As the passages cited above show, Josephus mentioned two kings when he referred to the second kingdom in Dan. whereas Daniel mentions "another kingdom inferior to him" indicating only one kingdom or one king. This enables his Roman readers to shift the fourth kingdom in Dan. to the fifth kingdom. It is important to note here that although Josephus mentioned two kings, he referred to their kingdom not in the plural but in the singular. This may be his deliberate intention to show that he is not adding one more kingdom to the four kingdoms in Dan. It is also important to note that Josephus identified the third kingdom in Dan. with Alexander's empire by inserting the phrase ἀπὸ τῆς δυσευς (from the West).² This identification reveals that Josephus reinterpreted the fourth kingdom in Dan. as the Roman empire and at the same time it enables his Roman readers to understand that their empire is now the

¹Α. Χ:208-209.
²As is suggested by Bruce, the phrase ἀπὸ τῆς δυσευς may be taken from Daniel's vision of the he-goat in Dan. 8:5. See Bruce, op. cit., p. 149.
After interpreting the "fourth kingdom of iron," Daniel interprets the meaning of the stone which was quarried without human hands. According to him this stone will "consume these kingdoms," and be established as an everlasting kingdom.¹ This interpretation of Daniel is very important. However, Josephus refuses to go into details about Daniel's interpretation. He says:

*(Greek text)*

Daniel also revealed to the king (the meaning of) the stone, but I have not thought it good to relate this, since I am under an obligation to write of the things which have passed by and the things which have happened and not of the things which are to come. But if anyone is so desirous for precise information as not to wave such points of curiosity and wishes to learn what will happen concerning the unknown.

¹Dan. 2:44.
thing, let him take the trouble to read the
Book of Daniel. He will find it in the sacred
writings ).

Concerning Josephus' evasiveness in his reference to the
meaning of the stone in Dan., Marcus says in the footnote to
his English translation of Jewish Antiquities: "The Jewish
interpretation of it current in his day took it as a symbol
of the Messiah or messianic kingdom which would make an end
of the Roman empire." 2

In Palestine of the first century A.D., some portions of
Dan. were being reinterpreted. In 2 Bar., for instance, the
fourth kingdom in the vision of Baruch is apparently made
identical with the Roman empire, and the coming "principe"3
of the Messiah is referred to. 4 The date of this book is
generally placed between A.D. 50 and A.D. 100. 5 In 4 Ez.,
the fourth kingdom is made identical with the "eagle" sym-
bolizing the Roman empire, 6 and the appearance of the Messiah
is referred to. 7 This book is dated after the destruction of

---

2 Marcus, J., Vol. VI, p. 275. For general discussion on
the history of the interpretation of the meaning of the stone,
see Montgomery, op. cit., pp. 185-192, esp. pp. 190-192.
3 Concerning this translation, see Charles, APOT, Vol. II,
p. 501.
4 2 Bar. 39:3-7.
5 Charles, APOT, vol. II, p. 477. Zeitlin, however, dates
its composition within the reign of Hadrian (A.D. 117-138).
See S. Zeitlin, "The Apocrypha," The Jewish Quarterly Review,
6 4 Ez. 12:11.
7 4 Ez. 12:32-36.
We cannot tell exactly when the reinterpretation of some portions of Dan. started in Palestine. However, it may well be that it was encouraged by the Apocalyptic Pharisees who believed that the Messiah would free the Judaeans from the yoke of the Roman empire, and Josephus probably came to learn at an early time about the reinterpretation of the fourth kingdom through his contacts with some of the Apocalyptic Pharisees.

In his important articles, Swain points out that the idea that the four great empires would be followed by a more glorious fifth empire had been known to Rome before Dan. was composed and that when that idea reappeared later in Rome some historians used it to hail the Roman rule or to refer to the Roman rule. One of the historians whom Swain cites is Dionysius of Halicarnassus who lived and taught in Rome for many years from 30 B.C. In his Roman Antiquities, Dionysius lists the names of the Assyrian, Median, Persian, and Macedonian empires as the four great empires and extols the Roman empire as the more glorious fifth empire.

---


2In his contention, Swain stands on the assumption that Dan. was composed after the persecution of Antiochus IV in 168 B.C. See Swain, op. cit., pp. 1-5.


4Roman Antiquities i.2.2-4.
Josephus was without doubt familiar with the reinterpretation of the fourth kingdom in Palestine by the time the War against the Romans started in A.D. 65. However, the fact that Josephus placed two kings in his reference to the second kingdom in Dan. in order to make it easy for his Roman readers to shift the fourth kingdom in Dan. to the fifth one suggests that Josephus was also familiar with the interpretation of the four great empires and a more glorious fifth empire. Our speculation on Josephus' familiarity with this idea is strengthened by the following two facts: (1) Although we don't know exactly how long Josephus had been in Rome at the time he was writing the tenth book of A., it may well be that by then he had been in Rome more than ten years.\(^1\) This means that Josephus had had a chance to get acquainted with this idea and its current interpretation; and (2) Although Josephus does not mention in any place his dependence on Dionysius of Halicarnassus, some scholars have pointed out his indebtedness to Dionysius' *Roman Antiquities* in writing A.\(^2\) Therefore, if this be accepted, Josephus could have known about this interpretation at least through the works of Dionysius.

As we have already seen in Chapter II, Josephus, the Pharisee, recognized the work of God not only in the history of the Judaeans but also in that of the Romans, and especially

---

\(^1\) According to *A. XX:267*, Josephus completed *A.* in the thirteenth year of the reign of Domitian and in the fiftysixth year of his own life, i.e., A.D. 93-94.

perceived His work in the event in which Vespasian became 
Caesar of the Roman empire from being a mere general in the 
War against the Judaeans. In the first section of this 
chapter, we have also seen that Josephus assailed the activi-
ties of the Apocalyptic Pharisees because they caused dis-
turbances among the Judaeans with their promise of deliverance 
from the Roman yoke through the coming Messiah. Thus, it 
seems possible to speculate that as long as the reinterp­
tation of the meaning of the stone as the Messiah refused to 
recognize the divine role of the Roman empire (represented by 
Caesar) in world history, it was embarrassing to Josephus 
and that because of this embarrassment he did not go into 
detail about the meaning of the stone. Yet, as our argument 
proposes, it also seems possible to posit that if Josephus 
had been narrating the four kingdoms in Dan. with the idea 
of the four great empires and a more glorious fifth empire 
in mind, there would not have been any room to go into detail 
about the meaning of the stone.
CHAPTER IV

JOSEPHUS AND SPEECHES

INTRODUCTION

Josephus presumably learned the use of direct quotations of historical figures from his Greek and Roman predecessors. The lesson was well learned and thus we find forty-six direct quotations in the Greek version of *The Jewish War*.¹

Thirteen are found in I:31-II:277 where events of the years from c. 170 B.C. to A.D. 65 are sketched, and thirty-three occur in the body of the narrative of the progress of the War. The inclusion of the thirty-three speeches in the account of the War serves a different purpose from that of the thirteen speeches in the pre-war accounts.

This chapter is in three parts. The first deals with "Speeches and Historical Writings." The use earlier historians made of direct quotations and their concept of the proper use of speeches as demonstrated in their historical writings will be examined. We then deal with the "Speeches in the Narrative

¹Speeches, orations, conversations - long and short - are found in E. I:373-379; 388-390; 391-392; 458-465; 500-501+503; 545-546; 571-556-558; 595-597; 622-628; 630-635; 637; II:84-92; 302-304; 345-401+403-405; 412-416; 605-607; III:354; 356-359; 362-382; 388-389; 400-402; 405; 406; 494-496; IV:40-48; 93-96; 99-102; 163-192; 216-223; 238-269; 272-282; 366-367; 368-376; 592-600; 637-638; V:121-125; 362-419; 535-537; VI:34-53; 56-57; 95-110; 124-128; 205-207+210-211; 301+304+ 308-309; 328-350; VII:323-336+341-388.
of the Progress of the War." We shall try to clarify Josephus' purpose in inserting speeches in the mouths of major characters. To elucidate this we shall compare the contents of Josephus' speeches with those of others. The third part concerns "Josephus' Speeches and Polybius." Here certain specific ideas and phrases which Josephus may have borrowed from Polybius will be examined.

I. Speeches and Historical Writings

The insertion of speeches was one of the most important literary devices used by historians in the Greek and Hellenistic periods. Roman writers also used this device.

In The Persian Wars, Herodotus makes his narrative vivid and realistic by the use of short conversations and even long speeches.

In The Peloponnesian War, Thucydides reports about forty direct quotations, some long and others short. Thucydides inserted speeches in his narrative not because he was blindly following a traditional method of historical writing but because he had definite purposes. He used them both to express his own opinions through the mouths of historical characters and to describe the "workings of men's mind." While most of the speeches Thucydides reports as spoken by historical figures were his own invention, this does not mean that they were purely imaginative. If we take his words at their face value as to his method of inventing speeches, we can say that among other things Thucydides thought the speech must be appropriate both
to the speaker and to the occasion.  

In the Hellenistic period, some historians believed that they were to provide their readers with entertaining stories rather than with material based on documentary evidence or what had been seen or heard. Thus, speeches offered them an opportunity to display their rhetorical and literary abilities. The quality of their works would be judged by the quality of the rhetorical style in the orations, addresses, or encomiums. As a result, the reporting of facts and the interpretation thereof were no longer vital. The importance of a speech's appropriateness in both place and person to which Thucydides attached so much importance was disregarded. This literary tendency, which lasted for centuries, was especially strong among historians who had no military or political experience. Accordingly, when later writers discussed historiography, some questioned the inclusion of speeches.

Polybius (c. 200-118 B.C.), who inserted many speeches and orations in his Histories, repeatedly pointed out the attention the historian should pay to their use. Phylarchus, Athenian historian of the third century B.C., wrote the account

---

1Thucydides says: "As to the speeches that were made by different men, either when they were about to begin war or when they were already engaged therein, it has been difficult to recall with strict accuracy the words actually spoken, both for me as regards that which I myself heard, and for those who from various other sources have brought me reports. Therefore the speeches are given in the language in which, as it seemed to me, the several speakers would express, on the subjects under consideration, the sentiments most befitting the occasion, though at the same time I have adhered as closely as possible to the general sense of what was actually said" (1.22.1).

2See the article on "Greek Historiography" in OCD, p. 522.
of the Cleomenic War. Polybius accused him of having described events and invented speeches in the fashion of Duris of Samos (c. 340-c. 260 B.C.), the tragic poet. Polybius emphasized the essential difference between the purpose of the historian and that of the tragic poet. The tragic poet entertains his readers and is therefore allowed to exaggerate when he describes events and is also allowed to put imagined speeches in the mouths of characters. The historian, however, is bound to report the "facts." Just as when describing events he should not distort the facts, so also in reporting discourse he must simply record "what was really said." Similarly, Polybius considered that Timaeus of Tauromenium (c. 356-c. 260 B.C.) used his oratorical gift instead of setting down the "words spoken" when he reported public speeches, harangues to soldiers, or the discourses of ambassadors. Polybius says:

The peculiar function of history is to discover, in the first place, the words actually spoken, whatever they were, and next to ascertain the reason why what was done or spoken led to failure or success...

What is clear from his criticisms of Phylarchus and Timaeus is that although Polybius acknowledges the importance of the traditional method of inserting speeches he thinks that the

1 *Histories* II.56.1-63.6.
2 *Histories* II.56.10-11.
3 *Histories* XII.25a.1-28a.10.
4 *Histories* XII.25b.1.
historian should faithfully reproduce what was actually said.¹ Since it is impossible for the historian to witness all the events he reports nor is it possible for him to recall precisely what he actually heard even if he happened to be on the scene, Thucydides attempted to construct speeches in a manner appropriate to the speaker and the occasion, that is, psychologically 'true.' Although Polybius acknowledges this Thucydidian invention as a last resort, he believes that because the task of the historian is to be accurate and precise, the "most diligent inquiry" into what was actually said is required of him.²

The proper use of speeches by historians is also considered by Diodorus Siculus of Agyrium, contemporary of Dionysius of Halicarnassus. He criticized his contemporaries who, to display their literary abilities, inserted long speeches and orations irrelevant to the main theme. He says:

One might justly censure those who in their histories insert over-long orations or employ frequent speeches; for not only do they rend asunder the continuity of the narrative by the ill-timed insertion of speeches, but also they interrupt the interest of those who are eagerly pressing on toward a full knowledge of the events.³

---

¹See Histories XII.251.8-9; XXIX.12.9.
²Histories XXXVI.1-7. See also Histories III.20.1-5.
³Bibliotheca XX.1.1.
Polybius emphasized the importance of accurate reporting for the historian and thus deprecated any rhetorical display. Pindarus, however, affirmed the use of rhetorical style if the speeches or orations were relevant to the main theme. He says:

Accordingly, whenever the situation requires either a public address from an ambassador or a statesman, or some such thing from the other characters, whoever does not boldly enter the contest of words would himself be blameworthy.¹

Many Roman historians employed speeches, and some used them effectively in depicting the speaker's personality and psychology. Livy (59 B.C.-A.D. 17), who wrote the history of Rome in one hundred and forty-two books, is said to have inserted more than two thousand speeches in them,² and there are many speeches in the thirty-five books and some fragments still extant. Livy portrayed the personalities and minds of speakers "with the sharpness of a good etching."³ Tacitus (c. A.D. 56-c. 120) is also said to have made powerful psychological analysis of the speakers.⁴

Finally, let us note the words of Lucian (c. A.D. 120-c. 180) from his brief treatise "How to Write History." After

---

¹Bibliotheca XX.2.1.
⁴Ibid., p. 128.
reviewing the methods of writing history as practiced by Herodotus, Thucydides, and Polybius, Lucian writes:

If a person has to be induced to make a speech, above all let his language suit his person and his subject, and next let these also be as clear as possible. It is only then, however, that you can play the orator and show your eloquence.¹

II. Speeches in the Narrative of the Progress of the War

The first thirteen speeches inserted in B. I:31-II:277 are all related to accounts of the life of Herod, and most are found in the dramatic accounts of intrigues against him in his later years. As earlier historians employed direct quotations to depict the personalities and psychologes of those speaking, Josephus used them to portray vividly the major and the minor characters in the drama at the court of Herod the Great. When the speeches as delivered by Herod are read,² one sees what sort of man Herod was. His personality and his character are clearly depicted — though perhaps distorted by Josephus' lens. One can also learn how Herod's mind worked at the time he spoke. Similarly, when we read Antipater's speech,³ we can learn what type of person he was. In some of these speeches the powers which helped the progress of the drama in the court of Herod — evil genius and avenging

¹ How to Write History 58.
³ B. I:630-635.
spirits — are referred to.\(^1\)

Most of the thirteen speeches are presumably based on those in the *Universal History* of Nicolaus of Damascus.\(^2\)

Josephus' major purpose in the use of direct discourse in the narrative of the progress of the War is distinctively different from that of the thirteen speeches in the preliminary background. This will become clear when we compare the ideas and expressions in Josephus' own speeches with the direct quotations from the mouths of some important historical figures.

In eight different places, Josephus puts in his own mouth speeches, orations, harangues — long and short.\(^3\) The most important of all these are the oration he made at the command of Titus urging his fellow Judaeans to surrender to the Roman army after the Romans had captured the second wall (B. V:362-419; hereafter this speech will be cited as J-1) and the speech he made to John and his party to convince them to surrender to the Roman army when Antonia was razed to the ground (B. VI:95-110; hereafter cited as J-2). These two are compared with the oration Agrippa II made in an attempt to dissuade the Judaeans from waging war against the Romans at the beginning of the War (B. II:345-401+403-405), the oration Ananus made to his fellow Judaeans in the General Assembly in Jerusalem when the so-called Zealots occupied the Temple (B. IV:163-192), the speech Titus made to the inhabitants of

---

\(^{1}\) See p. 14.

\(^{2}\) See p. 15.

\(^{3}\) B. II:605-607; III:354;362-382;388-389;400-402;406; V:362-419; VI:95-110.
gischala (B. IV:93-96; hereafter cited as T-1), the speech Titus made to John and his party about the Romans' concern for the preservation of the Temple (B. VI:124-128; hereafter cited as T-2), and the speech Titus made to the so-called Jewish tyrants toward the end of the War (B. VI:328-350; hereafter cited as T-3).

A. Similarities in ideas and expressions between the speeches Josephus put in his own mouth and the speeches purported to come from the mouths of some historical figures

1. Concerning Roman policy toward the practice of Judaism

In J-1, Josephus emphasizes that:

(1) the Romans revere the "holy things" of the Judaeans;¹
(2) the Romans used to worship (προσεχύνουν) the divine precinct from afar (πόρρωθεν);² and
(3) the Romans gave up many of their own customs in deference to the Law of the Judaeans.³

In J-2, Josephus emphasizes that:

(1) the Romans are concerned for the laws of the Judaeans;⁴
(2) the Romans are trying to restore the sacrifices to God which the Judaeans have themselves interrupted.⁵

In his speech, Ananus emphasizes that:

(1) the Romans have not at any time (μηδέποτε) overstepped the limit fixed for the profane, i.e., the stone

¹B. V:363.
²B. V:402.
³B. V:402.
⁴B. VI:101.
⁵B. VI:101.
balustrade separating the outer court from the inner temple;¹ 
(2) the Romans have not violated any of the Jewish sacred
usages;² 
(3) the Romans behold from afar (πὸρρωθεὶν) the walls
that enclose the sanctuary;³ and 
(4) the Romans have been the upholders (βεβαιῶτας) of
the laws.⁴ 

In T-2, Titus emphasizes that:
(1) if the Judaeans surrender to the Roman army, the
Romans will not approach the holy places nor will they des­
ecrate them;⁵ and
(2) if the Judaeans surrender to the Roman army, he will
preserve the Temple even against the will of the Judaeans.⁶ 

In T-3, Titus emphasizes that:
(1) the Romans have permitted the Judaeans to live in
Jerusalem;⁷ 
(2) the Romans have permitted the Judaeans to have their
own kings;⁸ 
(3) the Romans have kept the traditional Jewish laws;⁹ and
(4) the Romans have permitted the Judaeans to exact tri­
bute for God.¹⁰ 

¹ B. IV:182.  
² B. IV:182.  
³ B. IV:182.  
⁴ B. IV:184.  
⁵ B. VI:128.  
⁶ B. VI:128.  
⁷ B. VI:333.  
⁸ B. VI:333.  
⁹ B. VI:333.  
¹⁰ B. VI:335.
In these speeches, with the exception of T-3, when emphasis is laid upon the general Roman policy toward the practice of Judaism, the attitude of the Judaeans is referred to as impious, and in J-1, J-2, and in the speech of Ananus, it is understood that the Judaeans have been brought up near the holy places, under the influence of the Law, and in the traditions of their forefathers. Thus, in each of these three speeches we find:

1. The very men who had been brought up (ἐν ταφίνοις) in them (i.e., the holy places) ... were bent on their destruction;

2. You, a Jew, nurtured (ἐν φασις) in her laws, treat your fellows more harshly even than your foes do; and

3. Persons born in this very country, nurtured (τραφαν-τας) under our institutions and calling themselves Jews, freely move about in our holy places, with hands still hot with the blood of their countrymen.

2. Concerning the timing of the War against the Romans

In J-1, Josephus emphasizes that the timing of the War against the Romans is not propitious. In doing this, he does not deny the justification of the war for independence, but he says that the proper time was in the past and that "after having once (ἀποτελέσθη) succumbed and submitted for so long, to

1 B. V:403 for J-1; VI:102 for J-2; IV:183 for Ananus' speech; VI:126 for T-2.
2 B. V:363.
3 B. VI:102.
4 B. IV:183.
5 B. V:365.
putably the masters...).\textsuperscript{1}

When we compare the passage in J-1 with the above passage we can immediately recognize the similarities between them. The idea of the rule of the stronger is found in them and a similar expression — in souls and in bodies (J-1) // in bodily strength and in courage (Polybius) — is found.

In his commentary on the passage of Polybius, Walbank points out that Polybius' comparison with animals to justify the rule by the stronger is found in the works of Plato.\textsuperscript{2} For example, the following is in \textit{Gorgias}:

It is obvious in many cases that this is so, not only in the animal world, but in the states and races, collectively, of men — that right has been decided to consist in the sway and advantage of the stronger over the weaker.\textsuperscript{3}

In addition to sources in the works of Plato, the idea of the rule of the stronger was later used by Dionysius of Halicarnassus,\textsuperscript{4} though he did not make a comparison with animals.

Polybius employed the expression "in bodily strength and in courage" not only in the passage under discussion but also in another place.\textsuperscript{5} Walbank points out that Cicero employed

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{1}Histories VI.5.7-8.
\item \textsuperscript{3}Gorgias 483D-E.
\item \textsuperscript{4}Roman Antiquities I.5.2.
\item \textsuperscript{5}Histories VI.52.10.
\end{itemize}
speech of Ananus, mention is made that Fortune is on the side of the Romans. In his speech, Agrippa emphasizes that the Roman empire was built with God's aid.  

4. Concerning the nature of the Romans

It is emphasized that the Romans are humane and generous but that they can be vindictive once they undertake war against their enemies.

In J-1, Josephus emphasizes that:

(1) the Romans will not bear malice (οὐδὲ μητσικαιχήṣειν) for their past behavior if the Judaeans are not obstinate (μὴ ...ἀπαυθαδισάντο); and

(2) the Romans are by nature generous in victory.

In J-2, Josephus emphasizes that the Romans will not sack the city nor will they touch the holy things if the Judaeans pay the customary tribute to them.

In his speech, Agrippa assumes that the Romans are humane (φιλάνθρωποι), but he emphasizes that once they undertake the conflict they will burn the holy city and exterminate the Jewish race.

In T-1, Titus emphasizes that the Romans are humane (φιλάνθρωποι) because he has made a proposal for surrender by bearing no malice (μηδὲν μητσικαχῶν) for the obstinacy

---

2. II:390.
6. II:399.
7. II:397-399.
of the Judaeans. However, in the same speech, Titus says that if the Judaeans do not accept the proposal, the Romans will become relentless.

5. Concerning the lessons of history

In J-1, Josephus emphasizes that the War against the Romans is not right, and in so doing he discusses the history of his forefathers and points out a unifying concept. Concerning previous deliverances, Josephus discusses the instances of Pharaoh Necho and Sarah, the plagues of Egypt and the Exodus, the recovery of the ark from the Philistines, the overthrow of Sennacherib's army, and Cyrus and the restoration from exile, and finds common features in them. Concerning the earlier captures of the city, he mentions the captures by the Babylonians, Antiochus Epiphanes, Pompey, Herod and Sossius, and concludes the common elements in them.

In his speech, Agrippa emphasizes that many nations have surrendered to Roman rule, and he describes historical episodes in some detail. He refers to Athens, Gaul, Spain, Germany, Britain, Parthia, Carthage, Cyrene, and Egypt, and points out that despite each group's passion for liberty each surrendered to the Romans.

6. Concerning the "law of war"

In J-3, Josephus refers to the "law of war." References

1 B. IV:94-96.
2 B. IV:96.
3 B. V:376-400. See also pp. 34-36.
4 B. II:358-361+365-387.
5 B. III:363.
to this are also found in the speech of the Jewish deputies before Caesar after the death of Herod the Great,¹ the speech of Jesus,² and the speech of Titus.³

7. Concerning the reference to the beauty of the Temple and to the families of the soldiers

In J-1, Josephus makes a reference to the beauty of the Temple which his fellow Judaeans are "betraying",⁴ and urges them to have pity at least for their families — children, wives, and parents.⁵ In his speech, Agrippa refers to the beautiful Temple which is destined to be burned in case of war and refers also to the lot the wives and children of Jewish soldiers may suffer.⁶

B. Similarities in ideas between the speeches Josephus put in the mouths of some (historical) figures

1. Agrippa's speech and Titus' speech (T-3)

As we have already seen, in his speech, Agrippa referred to many nations which have surrendered to the Roman rule, four of whom were Germany, Britain, Parthia, and Carthage.⁷ In T-3, Titus emphasizes that Germans, Britons, and Carthaginians have surrendered to the Roman rule.⁸ Between these two speeches, similarities are found not only in the order of reference —

¹B. II:90.
²B. IV:260.
³B. VI:346.
⁴B. V:417.
⁵B. V:419.
⁶B. II:395.
⁷B. II:376-380.
⁸B. VI:331.
Germany // Germans, Britain // Britons, Parthia // (Parthians?), Carthage // Carthaginians — but also in the content. In the speech of Agrippa, mention is made that the Germans are serving (δουλεύοντις) the Romans.¹ In the speech of Titus, mention is also made of the Germans serving (δουλεύοντας) the Romans.² In the speech of Agrippa, the wall which encompasses Britain, i.e., the sea, is compared with the wall which encompasses the city of Jerusalem, and the emphasis is made that the Romans broke even the wall surrounding Britain.³ In the speech of Titus, when he refers to the strength of the wall in Jerusalem, he emphasizes that nothing is stronger than the wall of Britain encompassed by the Ocean and that even the Britons who have such a wall do homage to the Roman army.⁴

2. Titus' speech (T-2) and the speech which Josephus' companions made to him at Jotapata when he was about to surrender to the Roman army

In T-2, Titus mourns with his troops after their defeat due to a Jewish ruse. One of the passages goes as follows:

Deeply indeed (Ἡ μεγάλα) may the laws (νόμους) of the service mourn (στενάξειν), deeply too my father when he hears of this rebuff;...⁵

---

¹B. II:377.
²B. VI:331.
³B. II:378.
⁴B. VI:331.
⁵B. V:123.
When Josephus was to surrender to the Romans at Jotapata, his companions threatened to kill him, shouting:

**deeply indeed (ἡ μεγάλα) might the laws (νόμοι) of our fathers groan (στενάξειον) aloud and God Himself hide His face for grief...**¹

3. **Agrippa's speech and Ananus' speech**

In his speech, Agrippa compares the might of the Judaeans with that of the Romans. Agrippa asks: "Do you really suppose that you are going to war with Egyptians or Arabs?"² What is implied in this question is that although the Jews could win a victory over the Egyptians or the Arabs, the might of the Romans is beyond comparison. On the other hand, in the speech Ananus made to encourage the inhabitants of Jerusalem to resist the so-called Zealots who occupied the Temple, the victory over Egypt and the victory over Media are remembered.³

The existence of similarities in ideas and expressions between the speeches which Josephus put in his own mouth and the speeches which he put in the mouths of Agrippa, Ananus, Titus, and others reveals the major purpose of Josephus in his use of speeches in the narrative of the progress of the War. Josephus used the speeches to express his own view repeatedly and thoroughly. As we have seen, Josephus, among other things, emphasized that the Roman policy toward the practice of Judaism

---

¹ B. III:356.
² B. II:362.
³ B. IV:176.
was generous. The Roman rulers acknowledged Judaism as a *religio licita* before the War and thus the Judaeans could openly practice Judaism. Some of the Roman procurators were hard on the Judaeans in Palestine economically as well as politically. Yet, the Judaeans could theoretically practice Judaism. The Roman rulers also guaranteed the Judaeans this religious right even after the destruction of the Temple. Johanan ben Zaccai thus could establish his religious community at Jabneh and study and practice Judaism.\(^1\) Josephus, the Pharisee, apparently recognized the significance of this Roman policy for the survival of Judaism, that is, the survival of his people, and despite his personal involvement in the War in its beginning he judged that the War against the Romans was wrong. The Roman policy of continued acknowledgement of Judaism as a *religio licita* even after the War may have strongly influenced the opinion of Josephus at the time he was writing the Greek version. Anyway, it is because of this point of view that Josephus repeatedly emphasized his opposition to the War through speeches reported as from his own mouth and from the mouths of the important characters in his narrative.

The existence of similar ideas and expressions also betrays the manner in which Josephus was writing these speeches. Some of the speeches which he had already finished were before him as if they were now a source and he constantly checked them. The best proof of this is in the speech of Agrippa and

\(^1\) Zeitlin, *SJH*, p. 208.
in the speech of Titus (T-3). Agrippa referred to Germany, Britain, Parthia, and Carthage as great nations surrendered to the Roman rule. In the speech of Titus, however, Josephus replaced the names of these nations by their people, i.e., Germans, Britons, and Carthaginians in the same order — though he did not refer to Parthians. This replacement clearly indicates that when Josephus was writing the speech of Titus, he was consulting the speech of Agrippa which he had already finished writing. Likewise, when he was writing a speech for his own mouth (especially J-1), the speeches of Agrippa, Ananus, and Titus were before him.

Mention must be made that Josephus dared to contradict himself for the sake of emphasis. For example, in the speech of Ananus, Josephus has him say that the Romans have never at any time overstepped the limit fixed for the profane. This is contrary to his own report, for in another place Josephus says that Pompey penetrated into the sanctuary, together with his staff, when he captured the Temple.  

III. Josephus' Speeches and Polybius

Some of the ideas and expressions Josephus employed in writing these speeches seem to be derived from Polybius.

1. On the idea of the "rule of the stronger" and the

---

1Concerning the way Josephus handled I Maccabees in A., Cadbury says: "His process... is usually to substitute for each word a synonym, as though his main object was to avoid using the words of his source." Cadbury's statement seems borne out by our study. See Cadbury, op. cit., p. 171.

2B. I:152. See also B. VI:260; Ap. II:82.
In J-1, Josephus attempts to urge his fellow Judaeans to surrender to the Roman army. He first mentions that both Fortune and God are on the side of the Romans, and then he says:

νόμον γε μὴν ἐφίσοι μιαί παρὰ Θερσίν Ισχυρᾶται καὶ παρὰ ἀνθρώποις, εἶναι τοῖς δυνατωτέροις καὶ τὸ κρατεῖν παρ' οἷς ἀκμὴ τῶν ὑπλῶν εἶναι. διὰ τούτο καὶ τούς προγόνους αὐτῶν καὶ ταῖς φυλαίς καὶ τοῖς σώμασιν ἕτε δὲ καὶ ταῖς ἀλλαίς ἀφορμαῖς ἀμείνους δὴν εἰξαὶ Ὀρωμάιοις (The most powerful law existing both among animal (s) and among men is: "Yield to the stronger ones" and "The Mastery is for those pre-eminent in arms." For this reason, their forefathers also who were superior to (them) in souls and in bodies and furthermore in other resources, surrendered to the Romans),...²

In the preceding part, we have already shown that the overall tone of this speech is similar to that of the speech Agrippa made in dissuading his people from waging war against the Romans, and we have also suggested that Agrippa too made

---

¹I owe the translation of this line to Thackeray, J., Vol. III, p. 315.
²B. V:367-368.
a reference to the Jewish forefathers who were superior to the present Judaeans "in wealth, and in bodies and in souls."

In one part of Book VI, which has survived only in fragmentary form, Polybius mentions his own opinions on the forms of state, and therein he explains the theory of the natural transformation of the constitutional form. In this explanation, Polybius first refers to the origin of monarcy. He says that men herded together because they were weak against natural disasters such as floods, famines, failure of crops.

Then, Polybius makes the following remarks:

Δνάγη τὸν τῇ σωματικῇ ρώμῃ καὶ τῇ ψυχικῇ τόλμῃ διαφέροντα, τούτον ἡγεῖσθαι καὶ κρατεῖν, καθάπερ καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἄλλων γενόν

άδοξοποιήτων ζῷων θεωρούμενον τούτο χρῆ

φύσεως ἔργον ἀληθινότατον νομίζειν, παρ' οἷς δυσλογούμενως τοὺς ἰσχυροτάτους δρᾶμεν

ἡγομένους,... (It is a necessary consequence that the man who excels in bodily strength and in courage will lead and rule over the rest. We observe and should regard as a most genuine work of nature this very phenomenon in the case of the other animals which act purely by instinct and among whom the strongest are always indis-

1 Histories VI.3.1.-10.14.
2 i.e., the idea that the constitutional form undergoes a process of monarchy, kingship, tyranny, aristocracy, democracy, and ochlocracy (=mob-rule).
3 Histories VI.5.5-6.
putably the masters...).¹

When we compare the passage in J-1 with the above passage we can immediately recognize the similarities between them. The idea of the rule of the stronger is found in them and a similar expression — in souls and in bodies (J-1) // in bodily strength and in courage (Polybius) — is found.

In his commentary on the passage of Polybius, Walbank points out that Polybius' comparison with animals to justify the rule by the stronger is found in the works of Plato.² For example, the following is in Gorgias:

It is obvious in many cases that this is so, not only in the animal world, but in the states and races, collectively, of men — that right has been decided to consist in the sway and advantage of the stronger over the weaker.³

In addition to sources in the works of Plato, the idea of the rule of the stronger was later used by Dionysius of Halicarnassus,⁴ though he did not make a comparison with animals.

Polybius employed the expression "in bodily strength and in courage" not only in the passage under discussion but also in another place.⁵ Walbank points out that Cicero employed

¹Histories VI.5.7-8.
³Gorgias 483D-E.
⁴Roman Antiquities I.5.2.
⁵Histories VI.52.10.
the expression when he referred to the power of Romulus and that Livy too used it.¹

Concerning Josephus' use of the idea of the rule of the stronger, besides the possibility that Josephus borrowed it from Polybius, what we have observed suggests that Josephus got it from Plato or from Dionysius. Similarly, concerning Josephus' use of the expression "in souls and in bodies," besides the possibility that Josephus had in mind Polybius' use of the expression "in bodily strength and in courage," we may speculate that Josephus learned it from Cicero or from Livy. However, since the idea and the expression are employed together by Josephus and they are also used together by Polybius, it seems possible that Josephus borrowed them from Polybius.

2. On the expression the "law of war"

We have already pointed out in the preceding section that Josephus employed the expression πολέμου νόμος (in accordance with the law of war) in some of his speeches.² Josephus used this expression four times in explanatory sentences.³ He also employed it five times in A.⁴ Except the usage in the speech of Titus,⁵ the "law" in the expression always appears in the singular throughout B. and A.

¹Cicero, De Re Publica ii.4 and Livy, Roman History I.4.9. See Walbank, op. cit., p. 652.
²B. II:90; III:363; IV:260; VI:346. See pp. 78-79.
³B. IV:388; V:332; VI:239; 353.
⁴A. I:315; VI:69; IX:58; XII:273; XIV:304.
⁵B. VI:346.
Neither in B. nor in A., does Josephus explain the substance of this "law of war." However, when we examine the meaning of the expression in the context, we learn that Josephus implies a law by which one is justified to do anything harmful to an enemy in war.\(^1\) Josephus uses this expression in B. when he refers to the general attitude of the Romans to the Judaeans or when he justifies the actions of the Roman army against the Judaeans. For instance, in one account, Josephus ascribes the cause of the failure of the Roman army to capture the third wall after the second wall to Titus' desire to preserve the city for himself and the Temple for the city.\(^2\) Josephus says:

Now, had he (Titus) either at once broken down more of the wall, or in accordance with the law of war, followed up his entry by sacking what he captured, no loss, I imagine, would have attended his triumph.\(^3\)

In another speech which Josephus ascribes to Titus, he has him say:

On approaching the Temple, again in deliberate forgetfulness of the laws of war I besought you to spare your own shrines and to preserve the Temple for yourselves.\(^4\)

---

\(^1\) See especially B. IV:260; V:332; VI:346,353; A. VI:69; IX:58.

\(^2\) B. V:334.

\(^3\) B. V:332.

\(^4\) B. VI:346.
On the other hand, when Josephus refers to the Jewish refusal to accept Titus' proposal for surrender, he says that all the actions Titus takes will be made "in accordance with the law of war," and then he says that Titus has given his army permission to burn and sack the city.

Another good example is in Josephus' reference to the council Titus convened to discuss the fate of the Temple with his staff. According to Josephus, some staff officers were of the opinion that the "law of war" should be enforced, i.e., the Temple should be burned down.

In an account in Book V, where he tells of the Social War between the Aetolians, their allies, and Philip V of Macedon and his Hellenic League, Polybius employs the expression the "laws of war" and explains what they are in the following words:

For it is one thing to lay siege on and to destroy the enemy's forts, harbors, cities, men, ships, crops, and other things of that nature, by depriving him of which we weaken him, while strengthening our own resources and furthering our plans: all these indeed are measures forced on us by the usages and the laws of war.

1 B. VI:353.
2 B. VI:353.
3 B. VI:239.
4 Histories V.11.3.
In the passage following this, Polybius mentions that doing wanton damage to temples and statues should be regarded as the work of a frenzied mind at the height of its fury.\(^1\)

In addition to this, Polybius employs the expression the "laws of war" in two other places.\(^2\) What Polybius means by the "laws of war" is the same as what Josephus implies by the "law of war." This fact may indicate that Josephus borrowed the expression from Polybius and that he changed it from the plural to the singular. It is important to note that Polybius refuses to acknowledge wanton acts in the name of the "laws of war,"\(^3\) especially wanton acts against the inviolability of the temples.\(^4\) On the other hand, as we have seen, in some cases Josephus used the "law of war" to justify the acts of the Romans against the inviolability of the city and the Temple.

---

\(^1\) Histories V.11.4.
\(^2\) Histories V.9.1; VII.14.3.
\(^3\) See Histories XXIII.15.1-3 for specific cases.
\(^4\) See Histories IV.67.3-4; V.11.1ff.; VII.14.3; IX.33.4; 34.8; XI.7.2; XXXII.15.7.
CHAPTER V

SOME OBSERVATIONS ON THE USE OF THE WORD "TYCHE" IN B.

INTRODUCTION

In the Greek version of The Jewish War, Josephus used certain specific Greek words whose basic concepts are essentially non-Jewish, for example, "Tyche," "Heimarmene," "Chreōn," "Anankē," and "Daimōn." Did Josephus use these words because he believed in what they connote? Or, did he employ them because they were convenient means of conveying his ideas to Greeks and Romans? When we examine how Josephus used these words in the narrative of the War, we may find answers.

The word "Tyche" signifying something akin to Providence or Fate was an important concept for Polybius when he urged acceptance of Roman supremacy over Greece. It was to "Tyche" that Polybius ascribed the cause of Rome's spectacular success in world dominion. Polybius also used the word "Tyche" in other senses. Like Polybius, Josephus used the word "Tyche" in a sense akin to Providence and Fate, and it was to this "Tyche" that Josephus attributed the cause of Roman military supremacy over the Judaeans. Like Polybius, Josephus used the word "Tyche" in several senses.

In this chapter, we shall compare the way Polybius used "Tyche" in his Histories with the way Josephus used it in the Greek version of his Jewish War. This comparison may help us understand any influence Polybius may have exerted upon Josep-
phus. Our study may also help us understand why Josephus employed words whose basic concepts are not Jewish.

I. Some Observations on the Use of the Word "Tyche" in Polybius' Histories

In the preface to his Histories, Polybius says that the history of Roman dominion from the Second Punic War in 220 B.C. to the Roman conquest of Macedonia in 168 B.C. is the most striking and greatest spectacle the history of empires has ever seen.¹ Within the passage of only fifty-three years, Rome came to possess nearly the whole of the then-known world, and her future looked stable and auspicious. In this Roman success, Polybius recognizes the work of "Tyche," and says: "Fortune (=Tyche) has guided almost all affairs of the world in one direction and has forced them to incline towards one and the same end."² He says further that the historian's task is to explain to his readers "the operations by which she (=Tyche) has accomplished her general purpose,"³ and for this reason the historian must write "a universal history." "Tyche" is here conceived as something like Providence or Fate. Its determining power has enabled the Romans to achieve world dominion. However, Polybius' later attempt to find the rational cause of an event affected his belief in the role of "Tyche" in Rome's success. He does not see any longer the action of "Tyche" in this success and maintains that the

¹Histories I.1.5-2.1.
²Histories I.4.1. See also Histories II.37.6; VIII.2.3-4.
³Histories I.4.2. See also Histories II.35.5; VIII.2.1-11.
Romans were successful only because of their rigorous training and discipline. As a result, in Book VI, Polybius analyzes in detail the roles which the Roman constitution, the Roman army, and the early development of Rome played in later Roman affairs.

Polybius believed in "Tyche" as Fortune endowed with a capricious power. He ascribes the cause of the downfall of Macedon and that of the sudden fall of Eumenes, King of Pergamum to the work of "Tyche." In his description of the first, Polybius inserts the words of Demetrius of Phalerum (b. 350 B.C.) who foretold the downfall of Macedon:

..., Fortune [=Tyche], who never compacts with life, who always defeats our reckoning by some novel stroke; she who ever demonstrates her power by foiling our expectations, now also, as it seems to me, makes it clear to all men, by endowing the Macedonians with the whole wealth of Persia, that she has but lent them these blessings until she decides to deal differently with them.

1 Histories I.63.9 reads: "This confirms the assertion I ventured to make at the outset that the progress of the Romans was not due to chance [=Tyche] and was not involuntary, as some among the Greeks choose to think, but that by schooling themselves in such vast and perilous enterprises it was perfectly natural that they not only gained the courage to aim at universal dominion, but executed their purpose."


3 Histories XXIX.22.1-4.

4 Histories XXIX.22.2 reads: "For Fortune [=Tyche] is quite capable of dashing reasonable expectations by unexpected blows; and, if she ever helps anyone and throws her weight into the balance, she will again, as if she repented of it, turn the scale against him, and in a moment mar all he has achieved."
In the description of the second instance, we can discern Polybius' concept of the nature of this capricious "Tyche."¹ Polybius also ascribes the cause of an event to the work of "Tyche" when its nature seems to him sensational or coincidental. For example, the crucifixion of Hannibal on the very cross on which Spendius was put is attributed to the work of "Tyche."² A coincidental happening in which the portraits of Callicrates were carried in darkness while the portraits of Lycortas were brought out into the light to occupy their original position is ascribed to "the peculiar function of Tyche."³ In some passages, Polybius censures "Tyche" because of the results of what she has done. The deterioration of the Lacedaemonians' government,⁴ the destruction of the Abydenes,⁵ and the life of Lyciscus⁶ are examples. The Lacedaemonians' government went from the best to the worst because "Tyche" turned against them. The Abydenes were destroyed in spite of their righteousness. Lyciscus could enjoy his life in spite of his being a bad man.

Polybius also believed in "Tyche" as Fortune endowed with a punitive power. When he describes the murder of the Spartan ephors by Cheilon, he sees "Tyche" exacting a "fitting penalty" on them because they had selected Lycurgus as king

¹ Histories XXIX.21.5-6.
² Histories I.86.6-7.
³ Histories XXXVI.13.2.
⁵ Histories XVI.32.1-6.
⁶ Histories XXXII.4.3.
in return for a bribe,\(^1\) while, in his opinion, Cheilon was the lawful heir to the throne.

Polybius also tells of the attempt of Philip and Antiochus to possess the kingdom of the infant Ptolemy by some plot against him. Their plot failed because of the intervention of the Romans.\(^2\) In this connection, "Tyche" is depicted as having worked to inflict a penalty on them through the agency of the Romans. This same "Tyche" is later referred to as re-establishing the kingdom of Ptolemy.\(^3\) Similarly, the cause of the misfortunes which befell King Philip and Macedon is ascribed to the work of "Tyche."

Polybius' belief in "Tyche" undergoes a gradual change as he grows old. In one passage, he discusses in detail when the historian should ascribe an event to "Tyche." He says:

Now indeed as regards things the causes of which it is impossible or difficult for a mere man to understand, we may perhaps be justified in getting out of the difficulty by setting them down to the action of a god or of chance (=Tyche).\(^5\)

Such things are: exceptionally heavy and continuous rain or snow, severe drought or frost destroying crops, plague, and

\(^1\)Histories IV.81.1-5.
\(^2\)Histories XV.20.5-7.
\(^3\)Histories XV.20.8.
\(^4\)Histories XXIII.10.2-3. The cause of death Antiochus Epiphanes met is ascribed to "divine displeasure" (Histories XXXI.9.4) and the disease Prusias suffered to "the vengeance of heaven" (Histories XXXII.15.14).
\(^5\)Histories XXXVI.17.2.
other natural disasters.\(^1\) A little later, he further dwells on this. The cause of the contemporary depopulation in Greece should not be attributed to the work of "Tyche" because it can be found in the low birth-rate of Greeks.\(^2\) On the other hand, the rise of the Macedonians under the false Philip can be ascribed to the work of "Tyche" because rational analysis fails to detect its cause.\(^3\) In another passage, Polybius refers again to the rational analysis of the cause of an event and says: "Every event whether probable or improbable must have some cause."\(^4\) Thus, he criticizes those who have ascribed the rise of the Achaean League to the favor of "Tyche." According to his analysis, its success can be ascribed to its democratic institutions, that is, freedom of speech and equality.\(^5\) The use of "Tyche" in this instance is therefore "a poor explanation." When Polybius refers to Roman successes on the battlefield, he emphasizes that we should search for the "true cause," for only "foolish men" ascribe them to the work of "Tyche."\(^6\)

Polybius' attempt to find the cause of an event rationally is also recognizable in his evaluation of the achievements of some historical figures. Most people attribute the cause of the elder Scipio's success to the favor of the gods and to

\(^{1}\)Histories XXXVI.17.2.
\(^{2}\)Histories XXXVI.17.5-11.
\(^{3}\)Histories XXXVI.17.13-15.
\(^{4}\)Histories II.38.5.
\(^{5}\)Histories II.38.6 and 9.
\(^{6}\)Histories XVIII.28.5.
"Tyche,"¹ but Polybius maintains that it should be ascribed to his "shrewdness, calculation, and foresight."² Similarly, the success of King Eumenes in enlarging his territories should be attributed not to the favor of "Tyche" but to his "acuteness, industry, and energy."³

In his preface, Polybius states that one of the purposes in writing history is to teach the readers "how to bear bravely the vicissitudes of fortune (=Tyche)" by reminding them of the calamities which befell others.⁴ Despite the change of his belief in the role of "Tyche," Polybius constantly refers to the instability of "Tyche"⁵ in human affairs—be they in war or in an individual's life. After victory comes defeat and after prosperity the reverse.⁶ Advice is given "not to discuss the future as if it were the present,"⁷ and the need for

---

¹ Histories X.5.8.
² Histories X.5.8. See also Histories X.7.3; 9.2; 37.4.
³ Histories XXXII.8.4. See also Polybius on Hiero in Histories VII.8.1.
⁴ Histories I.1.2. Histories I.35.7-8 read: "...there are two ways by which all men can reform themselves, the one through their own mishances, the other through those of others, and of these the former is the more impressive, but the latter the less hurtful. Therefore we should never choose the first method if we can help it, but ever pursue the other, since by it we can discern what is best without suffering hurt."
⁵ Histories II.4.3; VI.2.6; 43.3; IX.21; XI.19.5; XV.6.8; 8.3; XXX.10.1; XXXV.2.14.
⁶ In Histories XXXIX.8, Polybius says that "Tyche" envies us especially when "our life has been most blessed and most successful." On Philopoemen's death, Polybius expresses his opinion using a proverb: "It is possible for a human being to be fortunate, but impossible for him to be constantly so" (Histories XXIII.12.4-7).
⁷ Histories II.4.5.
moderation is repeatedly emphasized, sometimes through the mouth of Polybius\(^1\) and sometimes through the mouths of historical figures.\(^2\) A man who has behaved with moderation in the time of prosperity or success and behaved high-mindedly in the time of the reversal is considered "a perfect man"\(^3\) and depicted as such.\(^4\) On the other hand, the Lacedaemonians after the Peloponnesian War are depicted as failing to be modest.\(^5\) They lost the hegemony of Greece because they made an oppressive use of the power that "Tyche" had placed in their hands.

II. Some Observations on the Use of the Word "Tyche" in Josephus' B.

Throughout B., the word "Tyche" is employed repeatedly.\(^6\)

\(^1\)Histories I.35.2; VI.43.3; IX.21; XVIII.33.4.

\(^2\)Histories XXI.16.8; XXIX.20.3-4; 21.3-6.

\(^3\)Histories VI.2.5-6. Histories XXXVIII.21.3 reads: "For at the moment of our great triumph and of disaster to our enemies to reflect on our own situation and on the possible reversal of circumstances, and generally to bear in mind at the season of success the mutability of Fortune (=Tyche), is like a great and perfect man, a man in short worthy to be remembered."

\(^4\)See for instance Scipio in Histories X.40.6; Hannibal in XV.8.3,15.5-6,16.6; King Philip in XVI.28.1-9 and XXV.3.9.

\(^5\)Histories XXXVIII.2.7.

In three passages in which Josephus refers to the reality of Roman power during the War, "Tyche" is employed to denote something akin to Providence or Fate.

In Agrippa's speech attempting to dissuade his people from waging war against the Romans, Josephus has him refer to the Romans πρὸς οὓς μεταβέβηκεν ἡ τύχη (to whom Tyche has passed over). ¹ Similar expressions are found in the prayer which Josephus made when he was going to surrender to Vespasian at Jotapata, ² and in the speech made by Josephus when sent by Titus to his fellow countrymen to encourage them to surrender to the Roman army. ³ In these instances, Josephus gives the nature of mutability or mobility to this "Tyche," ⁴ and consciously attempts to substantiate its work in the name of God or Deity. ⁵ Two more examples are found. The first occurs in the description of the manner in which Vespasian accepted

---

¹ B. II:360.
² B. III:354 reads: μετέβη δὲ πρὸς 'Ρωμαίους ἡ τύχη πᾶσα (... Tyche has wholly passed over to Romans).
³ B. V:367 reads: μεταβὴναί γὰρ πρὸς αὐτούς πάντοθεν τὴν τύχην (Tyche has wholly passed over to Romans).
⁴ See also the usage of the verb μεταβαλλω in B. I:488; 582; V:300. Although the verb in these three passages suggests the mutability or mobility of "Tyche," the Latin word "Fortuna" (ferre), also suggests this nature. See the article on "Fortuna" in OCD, p. 445.
⁵ Thus, in Agrippa's speech, Josephus has him say: "For, without God, it is impossible to build up such a vast empire" (B. II:390). Josephus' prayer starts with: "Since you, the Creator, seem to break the Jewish nation,..."(B. III:354). And in the speech of Josephus, he says that: "And God, who brings round his rule from nation to nation, now rests over Italy" (B. V:367. See also B. IV:622); "... had they (i.e., the Jewish forefathers) not known that God was with them (i.e., Romans) (B. V:368); "As a result I think that the Deity has fled from the holy places and that He stands on the side of those against whom you are now fighting"(B. V:412).
the nomination by his army's men as emperor. According to
Josephus, Vespasian accepted the nomination because Προσωποῦ-
σης δὲ πανταχοῦ κατὰ νοῦν τῆς τύχης (Tyche was everywhere
proceeding to his satisfaction)..., he was led to think that
both δαιμόνιος πρόνοια (divine providence) and δικαία των
εἰμαρμένη (just destiny) had assisted him.¹ The second
example is in the account Josephus gives of Claudius when he
was nominated to be emperor by the praetorian guard in Rome.²
The use of "Tyche" in the account of Vespasian's nomination,
together with "divine providence" and "just destiny," may be
ascribed to Josephus' editorial elaboration to please Vespasian
and his Roman readers.³ Mention must also be made of the use
of the words εἰμαρμένη and χρεών in B. In some instances in
which references to the unfavorable situations of the Jewish
army are made, these words too are employed as having a
determining power in the development of the war situation.⁴

¹B. IV:622.
²B. II:207.
³In B. V:2, Josephus says that it was God who committed
the empire to Vespasian. In B. VI:311-315, he refers to the
oracle that one from Jewish soil will become ruler of the
world, and says that it was not possible for Vespasian to
escape the decree of his Fate (=χρεών).
⁴In referring to the very day when the Temple was set on
fire, Josephus employs the expression η εἰμαρμένη...Ημέρα
(the fated...day)(B. VI:250). In preceding account, Josephus
says that Nebuchadrezzar, King of Babylon, set fire to the
First Temple on the same day and on the very same month.
No one can escape from the force of Fate (=εἰμαρμένη) who
causes things to happen at her appointed time. The connotation
of this Fate (=εἰμαρμένη) is found in the word εἰμαρμένη used
as an attributive participle qualifying the noun Ημέρα. Again
Josephus refers to this very day a little later and refers to
the work of this Fate (B. VI:268). In one account, Josephus
Unlike "Tyche," however, the force of εἰμαρμένη or that of χριστού could determine the outcome of an event before it took place, and its connotation was that because the Jewish army could not escape the outcome thus determined they were destined to be defeated by the Roman army. These words are used also to impress upon his readers the idea that the victory of the Roman army over the Jewish soldiers was inevitable.

In some passages, we find "Tyche" conceived as Fortune endowed with a capricious, jealous, or punitive nature. Because this "Tyche" presides over every affair — be it in war or in an individual's life — it is subject to a perpetual change. In the description of his own surrender to the Roman army at Jotapata, Josephus has Titus refer to this very "Tyche." When Titus saw the change in Josephus from the fighter of yesterday to a prisoner in his army, he was led to think of the force of "Tyche," which can quickly turn the tide of war. On the basis of the understanding of the nature of this "Tyche," for example, the happy life John Hyrcanus led is ascribed to says that the Jewish soldiers kept fighting despite the large number of casualties, and adds that the Jewish soldiers had been blinded by Fate (=χριστοῦ) (B. V:572). Similarly, in the account of Jewish soldiers' failure to stop fighting despite a great loss in battles or from starvation and despite a temporary lull in the Romans' assaults, Josephus states that Fate (=χριστοῦ) was prevailing that the innocent perish together with the guilty and the city together with the seditious (B. V:355).

1See Josephus' understanding of the relationship between Fate (=εἰμαρμένη, χριστοῦ) and man in B. VI:84, 314; A. VIII: 419.

2B. III:396.
the favor of "Tyche" who did not censurate his own activities.¹

The rare stumbling of Herod in battle² and his rise from being a mere commoner to being King³ are attributed to δεξιά τύχη
(good luck), but the cause of the tragedies which befell Herod and his family is ascribed to the revenge of "Tyche" for his public prosperity.⁴ Mariamme whom Herod loved and who caused troubles one after another in the court of Herod is thus depicted as an agent of Tyche's revenge.⁵ The same "Tyche" is employed purposefully in some editorial elaboration as to the causes of some accidents which happened to some Roman heroes. The cause of Sabinus' death in his attempt to attack the Jewish soldiers within the wall⁶ and the cause of Pudens' death in his response to the duel proposed by a Jewish soldier are ascribed to the work of "Tyche." In the first, "Tyche" is depicted as φθεονεράν ἐπὶ ταῖς ἀρεταῖς τὴν τύχην καὶ κωλύον-σαν ἀλὰ τὰ παράδοξα τῶν κατορθωμάτων (envious of virtuous acts and always hindering the performance of wonderful acts),⁷ and Sabinus as ἄνθρωπος μὲν ἀμείνοντες χρήσθαι δι' ἀνδρείας καὶ τύχη (a man worthy of having a better Tyche on his side because of his courageous act).⁸ In the second, the death

¹B. I:68.
²B. I:430. See also A. XVII:191.
³B. I:665.
⁴B. I:431.
⁵B. I:431ff.
⁶B. VI:63.
⁷B. VI:173.
⁸B. VI:66.
the Jewish soldier met after his victory over the Roman soldier is also mentioned and its cause is ascribed to the work of νέμεσις (goddess of revenge). In place of the word "Tyche" εἰμαρμένη as signifying "destiny" is also used to explain the death of a heroic Roman soldier. Even a heroic Roman fighter cannot escape the pursuit of εἰμαρμένη. On the other hand, the cause of the death of certain heroic Jewish soldiers is not ascribed to the work of "Tyche" or of εἰμαρμένη. These things indicate that Josephus had an editorial premise that the cause of Roman military accidents had to be explained in such a way that his Roman readers would be convinced. The cause of the Jewish elation after their victory over Cestius is referred to in terms of the capricious force of "Tyche" with a modifier ὡσπερ (as though). Similarly, in the speech delivered by Jesus against the Idumean soldiers who came to Jerusalem to assist the Zealots, their motive in wishing to help the Zealots is ridiculed as having been derived from the capricious work of "Tyche." In these two instances we may see some editorial elaboration in the use of the word "Tyche."

In describing the state of someone who has failed to behave moderately during prosperity or success, Josephus uses the expression ἐξυβρίζειν εἰς τὴν τύχην (to become insolent

---

1 In B. VI:176, Josephus says: "The victim, writhing in agony, fell upon the body of his foe, illustrating how swift in war is the nemesis that overtakes irrational success."
2 See the account of death one Julianus in B. VI:84.
3 For instance, see the account in B. III:229-233.
4 B. III:9.
5 B. IV:238;243.
in defiance of Tyche). For example, when Josephus describes how Gaius Caligula began to consider himself a god and even wished to be called one, he says that the emperor "became insolent in defiance of Tyche."\(^1\) Two other examples are found in the brief account of the atrocities Nero committed\(^2\) and in the passage condemning the excessive joy of the Jewish soldiers who, having caught some of Titus' soldiers by a ruse, caused the Roman army to retreat as far as Helena.\(^3\) Behind the expression "to become insolent in defiance of Tyche" lies Josephus' understanding of the Greek attitude toward "Tyche" which we have already discussed in relation to Polybius' use of "Tyche." Only once, in the speech delivered by Vespasian to his soldiers, does Josephus have him point out how a man should behave in success and in failure.\(^4\)

"Tyche" can manifest itself in the (simultaneous) occurrence of two events of a similar nature. Josephus, however, attempts to explain the nexus of the two events by ascribing them to the work not of "Tyche" but of δαιμόνιος πρόνοια (heavenly Providence), sometimes with a modifier ὡσπερ (as if)

---

\(^1\) B. II:184.
\(^2\) B. II:250.
\(^3\) B. V:120.
\(^4\) B. IV:42 reads: "As it is a mark of vulgarity to be over-elated by success, so is it unmanly to be downcast in adversity; for the transition (of Tyche) from one to the other is rapid, and the best soldier is he who meets good fortune with sobriety, to the end that he may still remain cheerful when contending with reverses."
sometimes without it. There is no essential difference between "Tyche" and this "heavenly Providence."

When the outcome of the war became uncertain, the feeling for "Tyche" — Fortune endowed with a power which brings about victory — became strong. The soldiers believed in the favor of this "Tyche," and their general knew when he should invoke her special favor. In one passage, Josephus refers to this "Tyche" as δαίμον (Deity) to whom Vespasian urged his soldiers to make a generous contribution since they had failed to win over the Jewish soldiers at Gamala. Some of Josephus' references to this "Tyche" echo the usual thought in the Hellenistic world. In the speech of Agrippa, Josephus has him refer to τὴν τύχην... ἃτις αὐτοῖς κατορθοὶ πλείονα τῶν ὀπλῶν (Tyche who brings them (i.e., Romans) more victories than their arms), and in the speech of Ananus, Josephus has him refer to τὴν ἠττήσασαν τύχην (Tyche who has once for all overcome (us)).

---

1 In his account of the massacre of the Jewish inhabitants at Caesarea by the Syrians which took place on the same day when the massacre of the Romans by Eleazar's party occurred in Jerusalem, Josephus refers to the simultaneous occurrence of these two events in terms of the work of "heavenly Providence" with a modifier "as if" (B. II:457). According to Josephus, when a large number of Germans conspired to revolt, Vespasian sent letters to Petilius Cerealius with instructions of how to govern Britain. Because of these letters, received on his way to Britain, P. Cerealius heard of the German revolt and thus could crush it. The timing of Vespasian's dispatch of these letters is referred to in terms of the work of "heavenly Providence" with a modifier "as if" (B. VII:82). One day, according to Josephus, Aristobulus vomited blood. One of the attendants who was removing the blood slipped on the very place where the bloodstains of Antigonus whom Aristobulus had murdered were still visible. Josephus ascribes this accident to the work of "heavenly Providence" without a modifier (B. I:82).

2 B. IV:41.
3 B. II:373.
4 B. IV:179.
as long as this "Tyche" is regarded as a power which brings about victory in war, she is taken to be an ally in time of war. νάν εἶς πολλά τινες τήν τύχην εὑρωνται συναγωνιζομένην (however often some of their foes might have found an ally in Tyche) is an example.¹ Two more examples are found in the speech of Herod² and that of Vespasian.³

When the strength of the Roman army is mentioned, however, there are some editorial qualifications. In his lengthy account of the Roman army,⁴ Josephus says repeatedly that the strength of the Roman army comes from the rigorous training and discipline and not from the favor of "Tyche."⁵ The same editorial elaborations are made in the speeches of Titus. In one speech in which Titus reprimands his soldiers who had been defeated by a Jewish ruse, Josephus reports him as referring to the Jewish soldiers whom ἔπετα, δ' αὐτῶν ταῖς ἱνέδραῖς καὶ τύχην διὰ τὸ πειθήνιον καὶ τὴν πρὸς ἀλλήλους εὔνοιαν τε καὶ πίστιν (even Tyche favors because of their obedience and their mutual loyalty and confidence),⁶ and the Roman soldiers whom δὶ' ἐνταξίαν καὶ τὸ πρὸ; τούς ἡγεμόνας εὐπέλεθες ἀεὶ δουλεύει καὶ τύχη (even Tyche always serves

¹ B. VII:7. The use of the verb συναγωνιζομαι (contend along with, share in contest) may be a reminiscent of "Tyche" invoked in athletic contests. See the article on "Tyche" in OCD, p. 1100.
² B. I:374.
³ B. IV:40.
⁴ B. III:70-109. See also our discussion on this account in Chapter VI.
⁵ B. III:71;100;106.
⁶ B. V:121.
because of their good discipline and obedience to command).\(^1\)

The use of the verb δουλεύω (serve) suggests that any victory due to the favor of "Tyche" is regarded as secondary by the Roman army. In another speech of Titus, Josephus has him say that any victory by the favor of "Tyche" is secondary to the Roman army.\(^2\)

The expression δεξιὰ τυχῆ is employed as signifying good luck or good fortune. Behind this expression stands "Tyche" which we have seen. This expression is first used in reference to the Syrian King's army which was victorious over Judah's army.\(^3\) It also is found in the account of a series of victories which Placidus won over the Jewish army.\(^4\) Placidus' success is ascribed to δεξιὰ τυχῆ which was on his side.

Similarly, in describing the difficulty of Roman soldiers' attack upon Jewish soldiers,\(^5\) or in the narrative of the successful attack of Jewish soldiers upon Titus and his legions at Mt. Scopus and at Mt. Olive,\(^6\) Josephus says that the Jewish soldiers had δεξιὰ τυχη on their side. In these two instances, we see some editorial inclinations to ascribe subtly the strength of the Jewish soldiers to something accidental.

The word "Tyche" can also signify the vicissitudes one meets in the course of everyday life or the unpredictable changes one experiences in the course of war. The first usage

\(^1\) B. V:122.
\(^2\) B. VI:44.
\(^3\) B. I:45.
\(^4\) B. IV:438.
\(^5\) B. VI:14.
\(^6\) B. V:78.
is found in the account of Antipater, who came to Rome to get some scribes to forge letters in his plot against his father, Herod. Josephus used the word "Tyche" when he refers to the changes occurring in Judaea while he was in Rome. Another example is found in the description of how the Jewish citizens buried their most valuable possessions during the War. Here the expression αἱ αὕτης οἱ πολέμου τυχαὶ (the uncertain odds of war) is used. In these two instances, the word "Tyche" is employed in the plural.

The word "Tyche" is also used to denote fate—a specific situation which is decreed for one by "Tyche." The expressions "my Tyche" and "his Tyche" are found. Phrases such as "Tyche of a captured man," "Tyche of a prisoner," "Tyche of those who are besieged," and "Tyche of captured men" also occur. Another usage of the word "Tyche," close to the meaning in these examples, but slightly different, is found in the preface to B. There Josephus gives us an outline of the topics to be covered. One of them is: εἰς ἡν ἔκαστοι τὺχην διενεμήθησαν (Tyche to which all and each severally were allotted). This subject is treated in B. VI:414-419, in which he summarizes

---

1 B. I:606.  
2 B. VII:115.  
3 B. I:622.  
4 B. VII:231.  
5 B. III:438.  
6 B. IV:626.  
7 B. V:486.  
8 B. VI:352.  
9 B. I:29.
the different ways Jewish soldiers, the seditious, brigands, and noncombatants were treated by Titus after his victorious entry into Jerusalem. Here the expression ἡ ἀξία ἐκαστος τος Τύχη (Tyche appropriate to each) is found.

The word "Tyche" is employed to denote ill fortune which is decreed for one by "Tyche." Three examples are found: in the description of the people of Jotapata who were to be forsaken by Josephus; in the description of Meius, son of Belgas, and Josephus, son of Dalaeus, who plunged into the fire when the Temple was burned; and in the description of a certain Adiabenite, who had a physical defect.

The word "Tyche" is used to denote fortune which the ruler enjoys (or used to enjoy). The "Tyche" of rulers was thought to be special. We find phrases such as "his Tyche," i.e., Antony's fortune, "Tyche concerning him," i.e., Titus' special fortune, "Tyche of Alexander," "your Tyche," i.e., Titus' fortune, "his Tyche," i.e., Titus' fortune. The ruler's Tyche was worshipped or invoked by his subjects, sometimes out of flattery and sometimes seriously. Some of Josephus' references to this "Tyche" echo this dichotomy. In

---

1B. VI:416.
2B. III:201.
3B. VI:280.
4B. V:474.
5B. I:390.
6B. V:88.
7B. V:465.
8B. VI:57.
9B. VI:413.
connection with the confusion regarding the confirmation of Claudius' accession to the imperial throne in Rome after the assassination of Gaius in A.D. 41, Josephus describes the soldiers supporting Claudius as "the most hot-headed flatterers of his Tyche." A bodyguard calling themselves "Macedonians" worshipped Alexander's "Tyche" and Sabinus invoked Titus' "Tyche" before he assailed the Jewish soldiers. In one account, Josephus reports that when Titus destroyed the city of Jerusalem, he left the two towers as "a memorial of his Tyche." Similarly, the word "Tyche" is used to denote the good fortune which the Romans were enjoying. The phrase η 'Ρωμαίων τυχή (Tyche of Romans) is found four times. In two instances of the four, the phrase η τοῦ θεοῦ δύναμις (the power of God) or the phrase η 'Ρωμαίων ἰσχύς (the might of Romans) precedes the phrase "Tyche of Romans." This connection is apparently made to strengthen the meaning of "Tyche."

People in the Hellenistic world attributed the change in natural phenomena and the disasters caused by them to the force of "Tyche" or to some other metaphysical forces. In referring to the uncertainties of the sea voyage between

1 B. II:213.
2 B. V:465.
3 B. VI:57.
4 B. VI:413.
5 B. II:387; III:359; VI:399; VII:204.
6 B. VI:399.
7 B. VII:203.
Caesarea and Rome\(^1\) and in referring to the difficulty of access to the Alexandrian harbor when the sea is rough,\(^2\) the word "Tyche" is employed to denote this power. In referring to the calamity caused by an earthquake during the reign of Herod, Josephus talks of it as συμφορὰ δαμάσω (heaven-sent disaster)\(^3\) and has Herod refer to it in his speech to his soldiers as ἀλ δαμάσων πληγαί (heaven-sent visitations)\(^4\) in contradistinction to ἀνθρωπινή (human), or δαμάσως (heaven-sent)\(^5\) in contradistinction to ἀνθρωπειός (human). In referring to the pestilence and famine the Judaeans suffered during the war, Josephus talks of them as δαμάσων (divine) calamities\(^6\) in contradistinction to ἀνθρωπειό (human) ones.

The word "Tyche" is employed to denote Fortune – the goddess of chance. In a long speech Josephus delivered at Jotapata in response to the arguments of his comrades who threatened him with the sword to prevent his surrender to Vespasian and also proposed to destroy themselves rather than surrender,\(^7\) we find that the order in which they were to kill themselves was to be decided by lot because thus "Tyche" would work impartially. This same "Tyche" is used again when Josephus refers to the result of casting lots.\(^8\) He wonders if

\(^1\) B. IV:591.
\(^2\) B. IV:607.
\(^3\) B. I:370.
\(^4\) B. I:373.
\(^5\) B. I:376.
\(^6\) B. VI:429. See also B. IV:362.
\(^7\) B. III:389.
\(^8\) B. III:391.
should ascribe his survival to "Tyche" or to the Providence of God.

The word "Tyche," with a preposition, forms various idiomatic expressions. The expression ἀνά τὸχης (by chance) is used in reference to the result of the casting of lots with which the so-called Zealots themselves selected the high priest.¹ The expression ματὰ τὸχης (by chance) is employed three times.² Another idiomatic expression διὰ τὸχην (by chance) is found once.³

III. Polybius and Josephus: Similarities and Differences
As we have seen, both Polybius and Josephus employed the concepts of "Tyche" repeatedly in their writings.

Let us first compare the way Polybius employed the word "Tyche" in his interpretation of the success of Roman dominion with the way Josephus used it in his statement that "Tyche" has moved to the side of Romans.

When Polybius disclosed that within only fifty-three years a city on the Tiber became the center of most powerful empire in history having supremacy over nearly the whole of the lands and seas of the then-known world, Roman success looked like a miracle. In terms of the size of the territories Rome came to possess and in terms of the time Rome spent for the acquisition of these territories, there was no precedent in history comparable to this Roman success. Only the force

¹B. IV:155.
²B. I:341; II:494; III:327.
³B. IV:365.
of "Tyche" could work such a miracle. It was because of this belief that Polybius introduced the concept of "Tyche" in his interpretation of Roman success. In his belief, the force of "Tyche" was an objectively working force in history.

Through the mouth of Agrippa and through his own, Josephus referred to the action of "Tyche" to express his own opinion that the military situation was decisively favorable to the Roman army, and not to the Jewish army. This judgment of Josephus came from his objective observation of the strength of the Roman army and that of the Jewish army during the War, and not from a belief in the force of "Tyche." Why then did Josephus employ the word "Tyche"? Why then did he use it as if it were something akin to Providence or Fate? Various speculations are possible. Zeitlin thinks that Josephus used the concept of Providence "to demonstrate the power of the Roman Empire and Rome was destined by Providence to rule the world, thus to deter any nation or group from revolt against Rome."¹ Josephus may have had such a serious motive, for his coreligionists were still rebelling against the Romans at the time he was rewriting the first version in Greek.² However, we suggest that the primary motive behind the use of the word "Tyche" is to please his Roman readers including Vespasian and Titus and to justify his own actions during the War. By his references to the movement of "Tyche" to the side of Romans, Josephus could assure his Roman readers of the

¹ Zeitlin, SJH, p. 182. See also p. 181.
² See pp. 130-131.
strength of the Roman empire and at the same time he could explain implicitly why he left his own army, surrendered to Vespasian and his army at Jotapata, and worked for the Roman army later. Throughout B. and V., Josephus always refers to the assistance of some higher power for his benefit whenever he justifies his own actions or events in which he was involved. The use of "Tyche" is therefore in line with his policy—an editorial justification.

Both Polybius and Josephus referred to "Tyche" as Fortune endowed with a capricious, jealous, and punitive nature. In the early period of his writing, Polybius believed in the work of this Fortune and in explaining the cause of some events he employed it. As we have already seen, in some instances, Josephus too ascribed the cause of an event to the work of this Fortune. Unlike Polybius, however, Josephus did so not because he believed in the force of Fortune but because he had some editorial motive. For example, when Josephus described the death heroic Roman soldiers met in their fighting against Jewish soldiers, he ascribed it to the work of a

---

1 Josephus' successful escape to a cave when Jotapata was to be taken by the Roman soldiers is ascribed to "some divine cooperation" (B. III:341); Josephus' escape from death at Jotapata is ascribed to either to Tyche (=Fortune) or to the "Providence of God" (B. III:391); the cause of the death of Catullus, Roman governor in Libya, is attributed to "God's punishment" on behalf of Josephus. Catullus was accusing Josephus and other Jews in Alexandria and in Rome of past seditions (B. VII:453); the safety Josephus had when his ship foundered in the middle of the Adriatic Sea on his way to Rome is ascribed to "God's Providence" (V. 15); Josephus' successful escape from Jonathan is attributed to the work of "God's Providence" with a modifier "perhaps" (V. 301); and Josephus' survival of many accusations by his fellow countrymen when he was in Rome after the War is ascribed to the work of "God's Providence" (V. 425).
capricious "Tyche" or to the work of εἰμαρμένης of χρεών. In this way, Josephus could with subtlety indicate to his Roman readers that some of their heroes met death in the War not because of their inferiority to the Jewish soldiers but because of some irrational force which worked against them. In one instance already referred to, the death of a Jewish soldier is attributed to the work of νέμεσις (goddess of vengeance). He was in turn killed by Roman soldiers because he had killed a heroic Roman! The cause of the Jewish elation after their victory over Cestius, the cause of the difficulty of Roman soldiers' attack upon Jewish soldiers in one phase of the War, and the cause of the successful attack of Jewish soldiers upon Titus and his legions at Mt. Scopus and at Mt. Olive are attributed to the work of Fortune or of δεξιά τύχη (good luck). Josephus thus could reassure his Roman readers that the strength of the Jewish army or Jewish soldiers showed in some phases of the War was something accidental. On the other hand, in his own account of Roman military organization and discipline or in his reports of the speeches of Titus, Josephus emphasized that the strength of the Roman army had nothing to do with the work of Fortune. Thus, he could infer to his Roman readers that the strength of their army was not accidental.

As he grew older, Polybius came to have a different viewpoint as to the applicability of "Tyche" in historical writings. Despite the apparent change in his idea of the role of "Tyche," Polybius pointed out the instability of "Tyche" in human affairs to draw lessons for his readers.
repeatedly emphasized the necessity for moderation in time of success and assessed the merit of some historical figures as to their moderation in their prosperity or success and their courage in adversity. Josephus too referred to some historical figures who failed to behave with modesty during prosperity and used the expression "to become insolent in defiance of Tyche." However, except in the speech of Vespasian to his soldiers, Josephus does not draw a positive lesson on the basis of the nature of "Tyche."¹

The difference between the way Polybius used the concepts of "Tyche" and the way Josephus did may be due to the fact that Polybius was a product of Grecian soil and Josephus a product of Palestinian soil. Although he became a disbeliever of the force of "Tyche" toward the end of his life and rewrote some of the earlier parts of his Histories, Polybius first accepted the force of "Tyche" — be it Providence, Fate, or Fortune —, and then, to some degree, rejected it. However, Josephus would not have believed in "Tyche" as Polybius did. The basic concepts which the word "Tyche" can connote were Greek and Hellenistic, and not Jewish. Despite his disbelief in the force of "Tyche," Josephus employed the word repeatedly. This is probably because he was familiar with the effective use of this word in Greek and Hellenistic historical writings.

It is difficult to assay how much Polybius' Histories influenced the use of "Tyche" in Josephus' Jewish War.

¹ In A., however, the necessity of moderation is often emphasized. See the articles in A. IV:49; 264; XVII:15-16; 155-156; 292-296.
As we have seen, in many instances Josephus' use of the concepts which the word "Tyche" connotes reflects nothing more than the current colloquial usage of the word in the Hellenistic world and the differences between Polybius' use and Josephus' are very significant. Thus, we may justifiably conclude that Polybius' *Histories* exerted no discernible influence upon Josephus in rewriting the first version in the Greek language. On the other hand, the fact that, like Polybius, Josephus used the concepts of "Tyche" profusely in his writing may indicate that the latter has learned from the former the use of "Tyche" in historical writing. As for Josephus' use of "Tyche" in his references to war situations favorable to the Roman army, despite a great difference between the way Polybius used the concept of "Tyche" as signifying Providence or Fate and the way Josephus did, we may point out that Josephus learned from Polybius the use of "Tyche" so that he could expand the working area of "Tyche" onto the spacious stage of the Roman world.
Excursus I: On the Use of the Word "Tyche" in Josephus'

Throughout A., the word "Tyche" is employed fifty-eight
times. In several passages, "Tyche" is used to denote some-
thing akin to "Providence" or "Fate." In one passage, Josephus
compares "Tyche" in Hellenistic usage with that "Fate" in
Jewish fatalism. After an account of the execution of Alexan-
der and Aristobulus by Herod, Josephus ponders upon the cause
of this tragedy. Should the blame be laid upon his sons or
upon Herod himself or upon:

Tyche (=Fortune) who has a power greater than
all prudent reflection. For which reason we
are persuaded that human actions are dedicated
by her beforehand to the necessity of taking
place inevitably, and we call her Fate (= εἰμαρ-μενη) on the ground that there is nothing
that is not brought about by her.

According to this, the course of man's actions is always
predetermined by Tyche (or Fate). This idea reflects the
Pharisaic notion on Divine Providence. The expressions
"to be subject to Tyche,"¹ "to yield to Tyche,"² "to ascribe something to Tyche,"³ "to make way for Tyche"⁴ and "Tyche's overruling"⁵ are found.

The word "Tyche" is employed to denote Fortune endowed with a capricious nature. In one passage, Josephus has Petronius speak of a Hellenistic understanding of this capricious "Tyche." He says:

..., in human affairs Tyche, moreover, is wont to veer now toward one side, now toward the other.⁶

In other passages, "Tyche" is employed to explain a hypothetical cause of what has happened or a cause of a sudden change in human life. Ten examples are found.⁷ In two instances, "Tyche" is also used to explain a hypothetical cause of what will happen.⁸ The phrase "the caprice of Tyche" is found once.⁹

In one passage, "Tyche" is used to denote good luck or success as a result of happening.¹⁰ The same "Tyche" is used to denote ill fortune. The expression "the frowns of Tyche"

---

¹ A. XIV:381.
² A. XV:165.
³ A. XV:246.
⁴ A. XVIII:46.
⁵ A. XIX:77.
⁶ A. XVIII:267.
⁷ A. XVIII:54; XIV:9; XV:17;191;374; XVI:188;300; XVII:122;191; XVIII:239.
⁸ A. XI:56;341.
⁹ A. XX:57.
¹⁰ A. XVIII:178.
is found once, and the expression "a reminder of one's Tyche" is also found. Besides these, the expressions "to meet such Tyche," "to pity them because of their Tyche," "to inform him of his brother's Tyche," "to put up magnanimously with their Tyche with a spirit of disdain," and "Tyche which has occurred to him" are found. In these instances, the cause of the ill fortune—capture, flight, death, and the like—is specified. The plural form of the word "Tyche" is also used to denote ill fortunes. The causes of the ill fortunes are less specific in the seven examples.

The word "Tyche" is also employed as signifying the vicissitudes one meets in life or the unpredictable changes one experiences in war. With two exceptions, an interrogative pronoun, an adjective or adjectives, or a pronominal adjective is/are attached to the plural form of "Tyche." Thus, we find the expressions "what sort of Tychai," "varying Tychai,"

---

1. A. XIX:318.
2. A. XIX:294.
7. A. XX:60.
"many Tychai of war,"¹ "diverse and varying Tychai in one's life,"² "whatever Tychai,"³ and "better Tychai."⁴ To these may be added the expression "every Tyche."⁵

The word "Tyche" is used to denote fate—a specific situation which is decreed for one by "Tyche." The expressions are "Tyche of his father,"⁶ and "Tyche of his sons."⁷ "Tyche" in the expression "Tyche of a slave"⁸ is also of this same "Tyche." The word "Tyche" is also used to denote a less specific situation in life. Three examples are found.⁹

The word "Tyche" is employed twice to denote the good fortune the Romans are enjoying: "Tyche of Romans"¹⁰ and "the might and Tyche of Romans."¹¹

The word "Tyche" used to denote a faculty for good fortune is found three times: "as they were adorned with the greatness of their Tyche,"¹² "my body and my Tyche,"¹³ and "And both hope and Tyche were their large asset."¹⁴ In one instance,

¹ A. I:8.
² A. XV:179.
³ A. XVIII:142.
⁴ A. XIX:293.
⁵ A. XIX:317.
⁶ A. XIV:140.
⁸ A. II:39.
⁹ A. XIV:481; XVIII:197; XX:61.
¹¹ A. XX:70.
¹² A. XVI:7.
¹³ A. XVIII:282.
¹⁴ A. XIX:233.
Caesar's "Tyche" is invoked by people.¹

As for the usage of "Tyche" as chance — impersonal cause — there is one example in the idiomatic expression "by chance."²


The word "Tyche" is used once to denote an agent or cause beyond human control. This is in the expression "Changes of Tyche" in Ap.³

The word "Tyche" is used to denote the vicissitudes met in the course of life or the unpredictable changes experienced in the course of war. The expression "Tychai of war"⁴ is found once in V. and the expressions "neither Tychai of Athenians nor (Tychai) of Lacedaemonians"⁵ and "countless Tychai"⁶ are found in Ap. In two instances, "Tyche" is used to denote fate — a specific situation which is decreed for one by "Tyche."⁷

¹ A. XVI:344.
² A. XVII:24.
⁴ V. 417.
⁵ Ap. II:130.
⁷ V. 142;149.
CHAPTER VI

JOSEPHUS' DESCRIPTION OF THE ROMAN ARMY, IN CAMP
AND IN ACTION IN B. III:70-109

INTRODUCTION

Polybius described in detail the Roman army in his Histories VI.19.1-42.6. Josephus too described the Roman army in the Greek version of his Jewish War III:70-109. Some scholars have assumed that Josephus had consulted Polybius' description before he wrote his own.¹

In this chapter, we compare Josephus' description of the Roman army with Polybius' to determine whether or not Josephus did read Polybius. We also examine whether or not Josephus employed some written records and speculate on the intention Josephus may have had when he inserted the description of the Roman army.

I. Similarities and Differences Between Josephus' Description of the Roman Army and Polybius'

When Josephus' description of the Roman army is compared with Polybius', some similarities and differences can be easily detected.

Two points are similar:

(1) Josephus and Polybius insert the description of the Roman army as intentional digressions in their accounts; and

(2) Josephus and Polybius use practically identical outlines in their descriptions. After brief introductions (B. III:70-76, Histories VI.26.10-12), they give descriptions of the way in which the Roman soldiers form their camp (B. III:76-84, Histories VI.27.1-32.8 + 41.1-42.5), life in camp (B. III:85-88 + 102-104, Histories VI.33.1-39.15), the way in which camp is broken up (B. III.88-92, Histories VI.40.3-14) and, of course, both accounts draw to a close (B. III:105-109, Histories VI.42.1-6).

Four points appear to differ:

(1) The length of Josephus' description is about one-fifth Polybius';

(2) Josephus lacks completely the description of the organization of Roman legions and allies, which constitutes one-third of the entire description in Polybius; ¹

(3) Polybius' description is well-organized and detailed while Josephus' is rambling and less systematic; and

(4) In some respects, the information Josephus gives is different from what Polybius gives.²

¹ Histories VI.19.1-26.9.
² The following discrepancies between the information in Polybius and that in Josephus may be pointed out: (1) According to Polybius, a unit of four legions had two consuls as their leaders and the following words are used to designate them: the plural form of ὑπάτως (Histories VI.19.1; 26.6; 28.4; 31.3; 32.6, 8; 37.8); the plural form of στρατηγὸς (Histories VI.35.2, 4; 39.2, 6, 9; 40.3; 41.2); and ὁ τάς ὑπάτως ἔχοντες ἡγας (Histories VI.19.5; 21.4). According to Josephus, a unit of legions had one leader. The plural form of ὑπάτως is not used at all. Except πολέμαρχος (B. III. 92; 350) and κύριος τῶν δῶν (B. IV.366; V.248), either ἡγεμὼν or στρατηγὸς is used not only in the description of the Roman camp but also throughout B.; (2) According to Polybius, when the camp was to be
Upon examination, the similarities turn out to be insignificant, but the differences are substantial. Therefore, the reason for such differences between the two must be explored here.

made, the soldiers were mobilized for its building (Histories VI.26.10). According to Josephus, a number of artisans, mechanics and carpenters, who accompanied the Roman army, became its builders (B. III:78. See also B. II:544; III:505). A quarter in the camp was offered to them (B. III:83); (3) Concerning the circulation of orders in the camp, Polybius reports that "every day at dawn, the cavalry officers and centurions go to the tents of their tribunes, and there they wait for the orders of the day from the tribunes who alone receive them from the consul" (Histories VI.34.5-6). However, the passage in B. III:87 ὑπὸ δὲ τὴν ἑω τὸ στρατιωτικὸν μὲν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἐκατοντάρχας ἐκατοστοὶ πρὸς δὲ τοὺς χιλιάρχους οὐτοὶ συνίσταν ἀσσαπομένοι, μεθ' ὧν πρὸς τὸν Ἱγμιόνα τῶν οἱ ταξιάρχοι πάντες seems to report that not only the tribunes but also the centurions could go to the tent of the consul; (4) Every Roman camp had its own military court. According to Polybius, the tribunes were the major members of the court, though the centurions could participate in it (Histories VI.24.2;37.1), but the passage in B. III:83 θώκοι τε λοχαγοὶ καὶ ταξιάρχοι, ἀπὸ διπλάζονται, εἶ τινες διαφέροντο suggests that both tribunes and centurions were given the seats in it; (5) Concerning the way in which they break their camp, Polybius reports that when they decided to break up their camp, they gave signals three times in the camp. At the first signal, the soldiers broke up the tent of the consul and tribunes, and at the second signal they put their baggage upon mules, and at the third signal they immediately started marching (Histories VI.40.1-3). According to Josephus, at the first sound of trumpet they broke up their tents, and at the second sound they put their baggage upon mules and other beasts of burden and they set fire to the site of the camp "to prevent the enemy from making use of the place of the encampment," and at the third sound the herald who stood at the right side of the consul asked the soldiers three times whether they were ready for march, and if by that time they were ready they had to answer to that effect in a loud voice, and after that they started marching (B. III:89-92); (6) Concerning the way in which they marched, Polybius reports that each of the two legions and wings took the front or rear position in the column on alternate days (Histories VI.40.9), but Josephus reports that the legions which preceded the column were always determined by lots (B. III:97).
The information Polybius gives concerns the Roman army during the period from the First Punic War (264-241 B.C.) to the Third Macedonian War (171-168 B.C.). That army played major roles in acquiring Sicily (241 B.C.), Sardinia (238 B.C.), Spain (201 B.C.), and Africa (141 B.C.) as Rome's overseas provinces. On the other hand, the information Josephus gives is about conditions in the latter part of the first century A.D. Between the writing of Polybius and that of Josephus there is a passage of about two hundred years. During this time, the Roman political system changed from a Republic to a Principate, important social and economic changes took place and, as just mentioned, territories greatly expanded. As a result of these and other factors, various changes were introduced in the Roman army itself. For example, under Gaius Marius and C. Octavius Augustus several major alterations were introduced and under L. Cornelius Sulla and G. Pompeius several minor ones. When G. Marius came to power, he changed drastically the method of recruiting soldiers described by Polybius in the first part of the section where the Roman

legions and their allies are the subject.\textsuperscript{1} The recruitment was based on property ownership as determined by an annual census. The minimum amount of property had been four hundred drachmae, but Marius lowered this amount. Thus, almost the entire citizen body became eligible for service and volunteers were also accepted from all classes. Furthermore, in the days of Polybius, the Roman legions had three lines, that is "hastati, princeps, and triarii,"\textsuperscript{2} but Marius simplified them. Under Pompeius, the art of the campaign saw a great progress. Under Augustus, soldiers had to take oaths of service for sixteen years but the application for service in the legions became voluntary.

The Roman army, with these and other reforms, had become a thoroughly professional army by the time of Josephus and was totally different from the days of Polybius. Thus, even if Josephus had read Polybius' description of the Roman legions and their allies, he would have found it incomprehensible, and there would have been two ways for Josephus to deal with this: he could rewrite it or he could discard it. Josephus seems to have chosen the latter since information about Roman legions and their allies was well known to his Roman readers.

Similarly, Polybius' description of the Roman camp itself was anachronistic to Josephus. The way the Roman soldiers built their camp had changed in many respects during the two hundred years intervening. Thus, Josephus could not have used

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Histories VI.19.1-9.
\item Histories VI.21.6ff.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
polybius' description as it was, even in his favorite method of simply exchanging words and phrases in the original with synonyms.¹ That there are quite a few discrepancies between polybius and Josephus suggests the way the Roman camp changed, and the paucity of similarities suggests that Josephus had difficulty in using Polybius' description. Therefore, judging from the nature of the similarities and differences, the most we can say about the relationship between Josephus' description of the Roman camp and Polybius' is that although Josephus may have taken from Polybius the outline of the description of the Roman camp, he had difficulty in using Polybius' description without change.

II. Purpose of Josephus' Insertion of the Description of the Roman Army in B.

We have already stated that both Josephus and Polybius inserted the description of the Roman army as intentional digressions in their accounts.

As a literary device, the Greek writers invented the insertion of digressions in the course of the development of their narrative. The purpose of this digression was to give contrast and variety. They could thus hope to maintain the interest and attention of their readers who expected entertainment. The digressions are sometimes indirectly related to the subject and sometimes have apparently nothing to do with the subject. Many Hellenistic writers used this

¹Cadbury, op. cit., p. 171.
literary device. Polybius learned it and used it, and so did Josephus. However, it must be noted here that Polybius inserted the account of the Roman army (camp) not because he wanted to give some change or variation in the flow of his narrative but rather because he wanted to explain to his readers that Roman successes during the period from the Second Punic War in 220 B.C. to the Roman conquest of Macedonia in 168 B.C. were partly due to her army. Like Polybius, Josephus seems to have some purpose other than simply giving some change or variation to his narrative. For our speculation, the words which conclude the description of the Roman army are highly important. Josephus says:

Ταύτα μὲν οὖν διεξήλθον οὐ 'Ρωμαίοις ἐπαίνεσαι προσαρθομένος τοσούτον, ὥσον εἰς τε παραμυθήσαι τῶν κεχειρωμένων καὶ εἰς ἀποτροπὴν τῶν νεωτεριζόντων (I went through these things in detail not so much with the intention of eulogizing the Romans as of consoling those who have been subdued (by them) and of deterring those who are making revolutionary movements). 2

The motive here stated is significant for our speculation. Josephus does not specify who are οἱ νεωτεριζόντες. In the footnote to this in his English translation of B., Thackeray says:

The danger of a rising of the Parthians or of

---

1 See pp. 12-13.
2 B. III:108.
the Jews of Babylon (ii.388f.) was a constant menace.¹

Thackeray seems to have inferred this from a portion of a speech Josephus reports as given by Agrippa II in B. II:345-401 (+ 403-404).² That Josephus had in mind a possible rising of the Parthians against the Romans is unlikely,³ but it is possible for us to infer from the same speech of Agrippa⁴ and other references⁵ that Josephus had in mind some coreligionists beyond the Euphrates. They might have been Jews in Parthia or in Babylon⁶ or former Gentiles in Adiabene who had become converts to Judaism during the reign of Claudius.⁷

The use of the present participle in the expression of ⁶στεριζόντες suggests that these coreligionists were still

²Concerning the nature of this speech, see Zeitlin, RFJS, Vol. II, pp. 236-237. See also Chapter IV.
³B. II:389 reads: πρόσωπα γὰρ αὐτῶ τῆς πρὸς Ἡρωαίους ἐκεχερίσας, καὶ παραβάνειν οίσθεται τὰς σπονδὰς, ἀν τῶν ὑπ' αὐτῶν ἐπὶ Ἡρωαίους ἵππας (For it is his, i.e., the Parthian's, concern to maintain the truce with the Romans, and if any of his tributaries were to march against the Romans he will regard it as a violation of the treaty). See also B. II:379 and Tacitus, Annals XV.29f.
⁴According to B. II:388, in the beginning of the War, some Judaeans were expecting assistance from beyond the Euphrates and from coreligionists in Adiabene. See also B. I:5-6.
⁵Dio Cassius states that during the War Judaeans were assisted "by many who professed the same religion, not only from the Roman empire but also from beyond the Euphrates." See Dio Cassius, Roman History LXVI 4.3.
⁶B. II:520 and III:11 refer to the participation of Silas the Babylonian in the War.
⁷Concerning the conversion of some members of the royal family in Adiabene, see A. XX:17ff. Concerning the participation in the War of the family of King Monobazu and his subjects, see B. II:520; V:474; VI:356. See also B. IV:567; V:147;252.
rebelling against the Romans at the time Josephus was rewriting the first version of his *Jewish War* in Greek, probably about A.D. 75.

Josephus would naturally have considered what he could do to prevent his coreligionists from colliding with the Roman legions stationed in Syria or in Judaea after the War. He presumably would have wanted to let them know the strength of the Roman army. For this purpose, he seems to have inserted the account of the Roman army in the Greek version of his *Jewish War*, which may have had a chance to be read by his coreligionists beyond the Euphrates. Throughout the description of the Roman army, he repeatedly emphasized that the strength of the Roman army was not accidental but due to daily rigorous training.¹ Thus, we may safely say that the true purpose of Josephus' insertion of the description of the Roman army was propaganda for the Romans, not to supply information about the Roman army per se.²

III. Sources

When Polybius described the organization of the Roman

¹B. III:70-72;100-101;105;107. See also pp. 106-107.

²That Josephus did not intend to offer detailed information about the Roman army may be substantiated by the following: (1) In this specific description Josephus did not refer to the ensign of the Roman army. It was a symbol of the Roman empire and indispensable to the Roman army. He referred to it in another place (B. III:123); (2) In this particular description Josephus did not refer in detail to the march of the Roman soldiers after they break up their camp. He does mention it in other places (B. III:116-126; V. 47-50;130); and (3) In another place Josephus states that the strength of the Roman army is due to its discipline and training and that they in turn are due to the number of officers (B. II:577), but in this particular description Josephus does not mention it.
army, he used not only his personal experiences in it and information he had gained during his sixteen-year stay in Rome, but he also used official and historical records from Roman archives.\(^1\) Like Polybius, Josephus had access to the library of the Flavians and the Roman archives, which had a number of military records.\(^2\) This suggests that Josephus used some records when he wrote the account of the Roman army. Indeed, when he was writing the account of the advance of Vespasian and his army from Ptolemais to Galilee, in which the description of the Roman army is inserted, the "memoirs" of Vespasian\(^3\) and probably some other official records concerning the daily movements of the Fifth, Tenth, and Fifteenth Legions and their auxiliary contingents were employed. However, when we speculate on Josephus' purpose, it seems plausible for us to assume that Josephus used only his personal knowledge of the Roman army he had gained before and during the War.

According to Josephus, after the Judaeans defeated the army of Cestius in A.D. 65, he was dispatched to Galilee as a general by the provisional government of Jerusalem.\(^4\) He there employed Roman military discipline in training the indigenous population who had the "habitual malpractices: theft, 

\(^1\) Concerning the sources Polybius used in writing his Histories, see Walbank, op. cit., pp. 26-34.  
\(^2\) Zeitlin, SJH, p. 194.  
\(^4\) B. II: 566-568.
robbery, and rapine."¹ If this is true, it may well be that Josephus gained some knowledge as to the organization of the Roman army when he went to Rome to obtain the release of the certain priests of his acquaintance in A.D. 61.² However, even if we doubt the veracity of these reports, we learn that after the fall of the town of Jotapata to Vespasian and his army, Josephus was with the Roman army. He was a prisoner for a while and then was given his freedom thanks to the fulfilment of his prophecy as to the accession of Vespasian. While he was a prisoner of Vespasian, it would have been difficult for him to observe the Roman army and its camp because of his lack of mobility, but when he was given his freedom he could observe activities of the Roman army and its procedures. In Ap., Josephus says:

During that time (i.e., during the period between his liberation by Vespasian and until the siege of Jerusalem) there were no incidents which escaped my knowledge. For I wrote down carefully when I watched the things in the Roman camp and I myself was the only person to understand the information brought by deserters.³

Although there is some exaggeration about his position in the Roman camp,⁴ it would not be a mistake to think that

---

¹B. II:577-582.
²V. 13.
⁴Tiberius Alexander, who accompanied Titus from Alexandria, could certainly have understood the information brought by deserters. See B. V:45;205;510; VI:237;242.
Once he was given his freedom he could observe everything in the Roman camp. This fact alone would suggest that Josephus had sufficient knowledge to describe the Roman army in the way he did.

In the first chapter, we attempted to determine whether the Greek version was a translation or a rewriting of the first version. The meaning of the verb ἀναγάλλω in the preface to the Greek version (2. 1.) has been assumed to mean "translate" and therefore the Greek version has been thought to be a translation of that first version which Josephus said he had written and sent to his coreligionists beyond the Euphrates soon after the end of the War in A.D. 70. The use of the verb ἀναγάλλω to mean "translate" in the Greek and Hellenistic literature is extremely rare and unlike the usage in ἀ., the verb ἀναγάλλω in the preface does not take the preposition κύριῳ with the accusative. Furthermore, the Greek version is composed in accordance with the traditional and conventional methods of Greek and Hellenistic historical writing. As a result of our examination, it is suggested that the Greek version was in fact a rewriting, and not a translation of the first version.

In the second chapter, Josephus' interpretation of the Progress of the War was scrutinized. First, we saw that Josephus believed that God carries out His will not only in the history of the Judæans but also in that of the Roman empire. This concept of history was formed by: (1) his
In the preceding, we have dealt with various problems whose solution seems indispensable for the better understanding of the Greek version of Josephus' *Jewish War*.

In the first chapter, we attempted to determine whether the Greek version was a translation or a rewriting of the first version. The meaning of the verb μεταβάλλω in the preface to the Greek version (B. I:3) has been assumed to mean "translate" and therefore the Greek version has been thought to be a translation of that first version which Josephus said he had written and sent to his coreligionists beyond the Euphrates soon after the end of the War in A.D. 70. The use of the verb μεταβάλλω to mean "translate" in the Greek and Hellenistic literature is extremely rare and unlike the usage in A., the verb μεταβάλλω in the preface does not take the preposition εἰς with the accusative. Furthermore, the Greek version is composed in accordance with the traditional and conventional methods of Greek and Hellenistic historical writing. As a result of our examination, it is suggested that the Greek version was in fact a rewriting, and not a translation of the first version.

In the second chapter, Josephus' interpretation of the progress of the War was scrutinized. First, we saw that Josephus believed that God carries out His will not only in the history of the Judaeans but also in that of the Roman empire. This concept of history was formed by: (1) his
pharisaic view; (2) his experiences in Rome and in the Roman world before the outbreak of the War; and (3) his presence at the Roman legions' proclamation of Vespasian as Caesar of the Roman empire despite Vespasian's personal involvement in the initial stage of the War in Galilee. The hopes which supported the Judaeans during the War were derived from Judas of Galilee who claimed that the Judaeans should not acknowledge any Lord other than God. This view, which encouraged Judaeans to refuse to acknowledge Caesar as head of the Roman empire and to engage in anti-Roman actions, would surely have clashed with Josephus' view. Secondly, Josephus' interpretation of the causes of the War, the cause of the defeat, and the role of the Roman soldiers in the War were summarized. His analysis of the cause of the defeat was the failure to observe the Law and defiant acts during the War.

In the third chapter, entitled "Josephus and Prophecies," it was first pointed out that although Josephus did not believe in the cessation of prophecy in the land of Israel, he denied the validity of the prophecies made by the Apocalyptic Pharisees as to the deliverance of the Judaeans from the Roman yoke through the coming Messiah. The sources of the prophecies concerning the capture of the city and the destruction of the Temple, which Josephus referred to in B. IV:388, VI:109-110, and VI:311ff, were examined. Although Thackeray failed to find the sources of these prophecies, he suggested that those Josephus referred to in B. IV:388 and VI:109-110 may have their source in the Fourth Book of Orac.
This derivation is unlikely because the date of the composition of the Fourth Book of Orac. Sibyll. is too late for Josephus to have used it. On the basis of Josephus' references in A. to prophecies concerning the capture of the city and the destruction of the Temple, it was suggested that the sources of the prophecies could be found in the Scriptures.

In Josephus' account of the death of Ananus during the War in B. IV:318, many scholars have seen an allusion to the fulfilment of a prophecy in Dan. Because of the differences between the descriptions of Ananus in B. and in A., it was suggested that Ananus was not the type of person in whose death Josephus would have seen the fulfilment of Daniel's prophecy. Josephus' narrative based on Dan. 2:31-45 in A. X:206-210 was then analyzed. Many scholars have ascribed Josephus' evasiveness as to the meaning of the stone in this passage to its reinterpretation as the Messiah. On the basis of Swain's theory that the prophecy of the four great empires and a more glorious fifth empire was known to the Romans in the first century A.D., we suggested that Josephus knew not only the interpretation of the stone in Palestine but also other interpretations current in Rome. Had Josephus retold the history of the four kingdoms in Dan. with the interpretation of the prophecy of the four great empires and a more glorious fifth empire in mind, there would not have been any room to go into detail about the meaning of the stone.

In "Josephus and Speeches," we dealt with three facets: the use his predecessors — historians in the Greek, Hellenistic,
and Roman periods—made of direct quotations in their works; the extensive use Josephus made of speeches in *The Jewish War*; and the possibility that some of the ideas and expressions employed may have been taken from Polybius.

In the fifth chapter, we examined the way Polybius used the word "Tyche" in his *Histories* and the way Josephus employed it in the Greek version. At one period of his life, when he maintained a view that the Roman supremacy over Greece must be accepted, Polybius believed in the force of "Tyche"—an objectively working force in history, and ascribed the cause of the Roman success in world dominion to the work of "Tyche." In some passages, Josephus ascribed the cause of the Roman supremacy over Judaea to the work of "Tyche." The result of our study shows that although there is a similarity between Polybius' use of "Tyche" and Josephus', there is a great difference in motive between Polybius and Josephus. Polybius employed the concept of "Tyche" because he believed in its force. On the other hand, Josephus used it because he wanted to please his Roman readers including Vespasian and Titus and to justify his own actions during the War. Polybius used the word "Tyche" in various senses. So did Josephus. The result of our comparative study shows that Josephus employed the word "Tyche" in many senses not necessarily because he was influenced by Polybius but rather because he knew that the concepts which the word "Tyche" connotes would be helpful in conveying his ideas effectively to his readers.

In the sixth chapter, we compared Josephus' description
of the Roman army in B. III:70-109 with Polybius' in his 
*Histories* VI.19.1-42.6. We explained the nature of the 
similarities and differences between the two and in so doing 
we drew a conclusion that the most we can say about the 
relationship between Josephus' description and Polybius' is 
that although Josephus may have consulted Polybius' account, 
he had difficulty in using it directly because its contents 
were too anachronistic.

As the results of our examinations show, despite our 
initial anticipation that Polybius may have exerted some 
serious influence upon Josephus, our conclusion is that 
Polybius' influence upon Josephus was not really so substantial.
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