

## JUSTUS OF TIBERIAS\*

JUSTUS of Tiberias played a part in the first Jewish revolt against the Romans. He was also the author of an historical work, or works, now lost. Various distinctions have been attributed to his writings; the loss of *Jewish Antiquities* comparable to those of Josephus,<sup>1</sup> and of an account of the Jewish War far more reliable than Josephus',<sup>2</sup> have at different times been regretted. Certainly, the writings would have been of great value to us, and it will be seen that it is not easy to make sense of the rather baffling evidence for their nature and contents. But perhaps it was not simply accident which preserved Josephus instead of Justus.<sup>3</sup>

An understanding of Justus' social and political position is easier to attain; and it is worth relating this to our scanty knowledge of his literary output. What we can discover about the man or his work will contribute to an estimation of the Greek culture of Palestine in the first century A.D., for Justus, as well as being a Jew, was a product and an exponent of that culture. And Justus did not, like Josephus, end his life in the imperial court of Rome. He was appointed, after he had fled from Tiberias, to Agrippa II's *τάξις ἐπιστολῶν*; but this move would not have taken him far from his original milieu.

Justus wrote in Greek, and there can be no doubt of his competence in the language. In fact, Josephus says that Justus was something of a Greek orator in 66: *ἦν γὰρ ἱκανὸς δημαγωγεῖν*, and that this facility in Greek was subsequently exploited in his book: *οὐδ' ἄπειρος ἦν παιδείας τῆς παρ' Ἑλλήσιν, ἣ θαρρῶν ἐπεχείρησεν καὶ τὴν ἱστορίαν τῶν πραγμάτων τούτων ἀναγράφειν*. (V. 40). The main qualification for being Agrippa's secretary was no doubt good Greek.

How Justus became an historian we do not know. He could have written for Agrippa II while still in his employ, a sort of Nicolaus of Damascus to Agrippa's Herod.<sup>4</sup> What we do know from Josephus is that Justus' work on the war, against which Josephus' *Vita* was a polemic, was published some twenty years after it was first composed, so more than twenty years after the events. Perhaps, then, Justus turned to putting his experiences into finished literary form after his retirement from active life, like many a Greek or Roman historian.<sup>5</sup> It has even been suggested<sup>6</sup> that the work was published out of spite against Agrippa, after the king's death; for Justus' relationship with him had not always been smooth, and Josephus asserts that Justus was twice imprisoned, twice exiled, once sentenced to death by Agrippa, and finally banished (V. 355). But we need not take these quarrels too seriously.<sup>7</sup> Apart from this work, there is also

\* I am very grateful to Dr. F. G. B. Millar for guidance at all stages in the writing of this article; to Professor A. Momigliano for much valuable advice; and to Dr. O. Murray for his scepticism, which made me think again.

<sup>1</sup> On such assumptions see section V.

<sup>2</sup> So Rühl, 'Justus von Tiberias', *Rhein. Mus.* lxxi (1916), 300.

<sup>3</sup> Wachsmuth, *Einleitung in das Studium der Alten Geschichte* (1889), 437, writes, 'das Schicksal hat gegen den ersteren entschieden

(i.e. Justus)'.

<sup>4</sup> On Nicolaus' relationship with Herod, see Schürer, *G.J.V.*<sup>5</sup> i. 1. 50-1; Wacholder, *Nicolaus of Damascus* (1962), ch. ii.

<sup>5</sup> As suggested by Jacoby, *R.E.* x (1919), 1342.

<sup>6</sup> S. Krauss, *Jewish Encyclopedia* vii (1903), 398.

<sup>7</sup> Some have found the story altogether incredible and treated it as an invention of Josephus. Thus Rühl, *op. cit.* 304; Jacoby, *loc. cit.*

evidence that Justus had something to say about other aspects of Jewish history.

The background, the man himself, and the evidence for his writings must all be investigated.

### I. TIBERIAS IN THE FIRST CENTURY A.D.

Josephus' *Vita* tells us much about the home town of his antagonist. Indeed, it is a valuable source of information about public life in a Palestinian city in the first century A.D., for it shows us the organism in operation.<sup>1</sup> Indirectly, we owe this to Justus! Of the archaeological evidence, only coins contribute to our knowledge of this phase of the city's development. Of the Gospels, John alone mentions Tiberias in passing. The abundant Talmudic information refers almost exclusively to a later period. I shall not give a history of the city here,<sup>2</sup> but only attempt to provide a sketch of its character.

Tiberias was founded by Herod Antipas in the middle period of his reign, and named after his friend, the Emperor Tiberius. After Antipas, it was in the territory of Agrippa I. The latter died in 44 and the area came under direct Roman rule, but Nero later presented Tiberias to Agrippa II (*B.ḡ.* 2. 252; *A.ḡ.* 20. 159; 5. 38). There is no doubt that the place was primarily Jewish, in spite of the unholiness of the site mentioned by Josephus at *A.ḡ.* 18. 38. Orthodox Jews could certainly settle at Ḥammath (*Ἀμματοῦς*), the district around the famous warm baths, which was contiguous with Tiberias, and, in due course, joined to it.<sup>3</sup> There it was presumably quite acceptable to build a Synagogue: a notable one, whose lowest stratum may go back to the first century, has been found.<sup>4</sup> Furthermore, it is probable that in many cases the ban was simply ignored. It might, as Avi-Yonah maintains, have been less likely to influence those prosperous, 'Herodian' Jews who would have been attracted to Tiberias when it was the administrative capital and the seat of the royal bank (*V.* 38).<sup>5</sup> And the poor, who are a type of settler singled out by Josephus (*A.ḡ.* 18. 36) would have been pleased with what benefits they received, free houses and land. That the population was a heterogeneous one is clear from Josephus' description of the situation at the outbreak of the revolt (*V.* 33 ff.). This to some extent explains the way it swung backwards and forwards from a pro-Roman to an anti-Roman position in the early stages. In 66 there were also some Greeks in Tiberias, and the Jews assaulted them (*V.* 67). We do not know whether the Greek community dated back to the city's foundation.

Tiberias had the political organs of a Greek city. We can reconstruct its political organization in 66. There was a *βουλή* of 600 (*B.ḡ.* 2. 641; *V.* 64, 284), but we do not know on what principles it was selected. The *ἀρχων* may have been chosen by popular election; this would explain the existence in 66 of a

<sup>1</sup> At some points the evidence of the *Vita* is supplemented by Josephus' other works.

<sup>2</sup> For the best accounts, see Schürer, *G.ḡ.V.* 4 ii. 216-17 (1907); Hölischer in *R.E.* vi (1936), 779-81; Jones, *The Herods of Judaea* (1938), 178-9; Jones, *Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces*<sup>2</sup> (1971), 275 ff. Hoehner, *Herod Antipas* (1972), 91-102, is the most recent discussion.

<sup>3</sup> See the evidence about the baths in

Schürer, op. cit. 216 n. 522. They were famous enough to attract the attention of Pliny, *N.H.* 5. 15. See also the vivid description of George Adam Smith, *Historical Geography of the Holy Land*<sup>25</sup> (1931), 291-2.

<sup>4</sup> Dothan, *I.E.ḡ.* xii (1962), 153-4; Lifschitz, *Ḳ.D.P.V.* lxxviii (1962), 180-4; Dothan, *R.B.* lxx (1963), 588-90.

<sup>5</sup> 'The foundation of Tiberias', *I.E.ḡ.* i (1950-1), 160-9.

‘revolutionary’ archon, Jesus son of Sapphias, who was leader τῆς τῶν ναυτῶν καὶ τῶν ἀπόρων στάσεως (V. 66), and who was πονηρὸς ἄνθρωπος καὶ ταραξάι μεγάλα πράγματα φύσιν ἔχων, στασιοποιός τε καὶ νεωτεριστὴς ὥς οὐχ ἕτερος (V. 134). Ten *πρώτοι* had both representative and, it seems, some decision-making functions (V. 64–5; 69; 296; B. J. 2. 639). The title *πρώτοι* implies that these were the most influential citizens: such boards of ten leading citizens become a regular feature in Greek cities, and this seems to constitute their earliest appearance.<sup>1</sup> In this case their activities have no connection with finance. There may have been rotation on the board, but in the course of the *Vita* the same names recur—Julius Capellus (or -a) and Justus himself. That they were also rich is clear from Josephus’ analysis of the three parties in the city. It is interesting that these ten men have the final say as to whether the palace of the tetrarch is to be destroyed, a course of action ordered by the Jerusalem war-command (V. 66); but, in spite of their reluctance, they are forced to concede to pressure.

There were assemblies of all the citizens. It is clear that they could only meet when convened, and could be adjourned if, for example, there was violence (or, no doubt, an undesirable decision was imminent). The day after Josephus arrives in Tiberias for the second time, an assembly is held at which the ambassadors from Jerusalem (outsiders, therefore) urge the people to reject Josephus, and are supported by Jesus and by Justus (V. 277). Josephus talks about a meeting of the council on the following day, as well as a gathering of the people (284). He maintains that the people *forced* his opponents to agree to the taking up of arms; if this was so, it was probably the threat of violence which succeeded. Again, he is questioned in public about the royal monies (295 ff.), but when, according to his account, he is winning popular support, Jesus dismisses the people and keeps only the council. Perhaps summoning and dismissing the assembly was the prerogative of the archon. But there is no indication of a clear-cut distribution of functions, or an orderly working of the different constitutional elements: this may be due to the crisis of 66; it may always have been the case. During the Jewish revolt, Josephus as commander of the Galilee tried to control the city, but was not very successful. He claims that when he took over the administration of the Galilee he made special arrangements for jurisdiction, appointing seven judges for each city, who were to be subordinate to his Galilean council of 70 (B. J. 2. 571); there is no trace of their activity in Tiberias.

The physical aspect of the city must have exhibited strong Greek influence. Antipas had erected a palace, whose decorations included pictures of animals (V. 65). The stadium was the place for gatherings (B. J. 2. 618; 3. 539). Josephus once addressed a crowd there (V. 92), and once entered with an army of 10,000 and met the *πρώτοι* of the city there (331). But the regular place for assemblies appears to have been, interestingly, the Synagogue, *προσευχή* (277, 293). It is described as μέγιστον οἶκημα καὶ πολλὸν ὄχλον ἐπιδέξασθαι δυνάμενον. This is unusual for a Synagogue, and it could not have been a Synagogue like the later Galilean Synagogues known to us.<sup>2</sup> What is even more interesting is that prayer could be converted on the instant into a political meeting: ‘We were proceeding with the ordinary service and engaged in prayer, when Jesus rose

<sup>1</sup> So I learn from Professor P. A. Brunt. Hoehner, op. cit. 97 n. 8, misstates the position.

<sup>2</sup> See Sukenik, *Ancient Synagogues in Palestine and Greece* (1930).

and began to question us about the furniture and uncoined silver . . .' (295; Thackeray's translation).

The Jewish religion was an important part of public life in Tiberias, in spite of Greek forms. That the Synagogue was a political arena is significant. Meetings of the Assembly were broken off at the sixth hour on the Sabbath (279). The Jewish community of Tiberias itself must have constituted a large proportion of the Galilean Jews met by Petronius when he went there to sound out Jewish reactions to the Emperor Gaius' plan of putting his own statue in the Temple (*A.J.* 18. 269 ff.; *B.J.* 2. 193–202). Josephus reports the attitude of the Jews as being a combination of religious militancy and political docility. Hellenization had not eroded Judaism. It is not surprising that passions rose so high in Tiberias in 66, when the citizens were torn in different directions.

At this time the city was by no means committed to loyalty to Agrippa II. Tiberias did not like being part of his kingdom. This was not because it had acquired a taste for independence but, as Jones rightly stressed, because it had ceased to be the capital of the Galilee.<sup>1</sup> As we shall see (p. 352), from this arose a feud with Sepphoris, in which Justus was involved. Thus we learn what kind of a city Tiberias was: it had flourished in the days when it had been an administrative centre and a royal one at the same time. On one occasion Agrippa I had invited five client Kings there (*A.J.* 19. 338). Its early development was closely bound up with the interest of the Herods.

A story which seems to reflect the rivalry of Tiberias and Sepphoris for royal attention occurs in the Babylonian Talmud (*Sukkah* 27a). The context is a discussion about how properly to observe the requirement that during the Feast of Tabernacles all meals be taken in the *Sukkah* (temporary structure with a roof of branches or the like): 'The *Epitropos* of King Agrippa asked Rabbi Eliezer: "(a man) such as I am, who eat but one meal a day, may I eat one meal (in the *Sukkah*) and be free (of my obligation)?" . . . He also asked him: "(a man) such as I, who have two wives, one in Tiberias and one in Sepphoris, and two *Sukkahs*, one in Tiberias and one in Sepphoris, may I go from one *Sukkah* to the other, and thus be free (of my obligation)?" He answered him "No! For I say that he who goes from one *Sukkah* to the other annuls the *Mizwah* [i.e. the virtuous act] of the first"'. (Soncino translation). It is interesting to see a royal official represented as punctilious enough about his religious observance to consult a Rabbi. What is noteworthy for our purposes is the implication that the Herodian court had a base in both cities and that the administrators appeared in both.<sup>2</sup>

And we may suspect that the court with its personnel dominated the city's life, just as the palace on its hill dominated it physically. This would have been the focus of whatever Greek culture existed in the city; the influence of visitors to the baths would have been peripheral. It seems significant that Justus and some of his family (p. 352) were in the employ of Agrippa II.

<sup>1</sup> *C.E.R.P.* 2, 276.

<sup>2</sup> Graetz, in *M.G.W.J.* xxx (1881), 483–5, drew this inference from the story. He took it to describe the situation after A.D. 70, since that was when R. Eliezer (ben Hyrcanus) was at the height of his authority; this may be correct, but such stories often become incorrectly anchored. Graetz identified the

conscientious prefect with the *Epitropos* of *Tosefta*, *Shabbat* 121a, who is criticized for his excessive religious punctiliousness. There (though not in the parallel texts) the man is named Joseph ben Simai: cf. Klein, *Beiträge zur Geographie und Geschichte Galiläas* (1909), 66 n. 1.

Tiberias has been described as the first Greek city founded for Jews.<sup>1</sup> It does, indeed, represent an important development: the political institutions of a Greek city were now established for the benefit of a Jewish population, in the heart of Palestine. At the same time, the limitations of Tiberias as a Greek city are evident. That many of the colonizers had been brought under compulsion, and an undertaking extracted from them not to leave (*A. J.* 18. 37–8), suggests that they would not have taken readily to this new form of life. Josephus' notice of the foundation is in fact an entirely hostile one, and would seem to reflect the hostility displayed to the new city by the Jews. The city is described as the centre of a toparchy, and thus cannot have possessed her own territory.<sup>2</sup> She remained part of the Herodian kingdom. Antipas was able to appoint the future Agrippa I to the position of ἀγορανόμος in the city (*A. J.* 18. 149). Later, when Nero made a present of Tiberias to Agrippa II, she was no more mistress of her own destiny. In the restricted nature of her autonomy, Tiberias was comparable to the other cities in the kingdoms of the Herods.<sup>3</sup> But she laboured under the additional disadvantage of being a totally new foundation, not based on a previous settlement: pride and an identity took time to emerge.

The history of the coinage of Tiberias reflects the city's development. The first bronze coins issued there are the coins not of the city but of the Tetrarch, Antipas; this was apparently his first coinage.<sup>4</sup> These coins are dated by the year of Antipas' rule. On the obverse, they have 'HPΩΔΟΥ ΤΕΤΡΑΡΧΟΥ and a palm branch; on the reverse ΤΙΒΕΡΙΑΣ and a wreath. The later coinage of Antipas replaces the word ΤΙΒΕΡΙΑΣ with the name of Gaius (Caligula), and is assumed also to have been produced at Tiberias. Between Antipas and Trajan, we have so far one single coin, the 13th year of Claudius (A.D. 53).<sup>5</sup> It is the same in design as the earlier Antipas coins, but the name of Claudius replaces that of Antipas. There is still no era of the city. After this, nothing: there is no coin of Agrippa II, who clearly did not set much store by the city, nor anything else from the Neronian period. We may contrast Caesarea, which issued a 'semi-autonomous' bronze coinage early on.<sup>6</sup> In Tiberias it is the Trajanic and post-Trajanic coinage, inscribed ΤΙΒΕΡΙΕΩΝ ΚΛΑΥΔΙΟΠΟΛΙΤΩΝ (or variations of this), and dated by the city's era,<sup>7</sup> which is profuse.<sup>8</sup> It would

<sup>1</sup> Jones, *Herods*, loc. cit.; Avi-Yonah, op. cit. (p. 346 n. 5).

<sup>2</sup> *B. J.* 2. 252; Jones, *C.E.R.P.*<sup>2</sup> 276.

<sup>3</sup> Jones, *C.E.R.P.*<sup>2</sup> 274–5; 'The Urbanization of Palestine', *J.R.S.* xxi (1931), 79–81.

<sup>4</sup> Hill, *Catalogue of Greek Coins in the British Museum, Palestine* (1914), xiii–xiv and 229–30; Meshorer, *Jewish Coins of the Second Temple Period* (1967), 74–5.

<sup>5</sup> Kindler, *The Coins of Tiberias* (1961), no. 2. In addition, Madden cites from Vaillant a Claudian coin of Agrippa I; it has not been seen since: see *A History of Jewish Coinage* (1864), 110 no. 3.

<sup>6</sup> See *Corpus Nummorum Palaestinensium*, vol. ii (1957), Caesarea Maritima, 30 and 83–5. But Sebaste (a city founded by Herod the Great for pagans) seems to have no coins until Domitian: *B.M.C. Pal.* xxxvii–xxxviii.

<sup>7</sup> Avi-Yonah discusses the question of the

foundation date in *I.E.J.* i, loc. cit. He establishes the limits of A.D. 17 and A.D. 22. Hoehner, op. cit. 94, claims greater exactitude, setting limits of A.D. 18 and A.D. 23. He forgets that the city's year need not have started on 1st January. Year 1 of the city lies between A.D. 17/18 and A.D. 23/4. Therefore the foundation date falls between A.D. 17 and A.D. 23 (or even 24, if the city were founded in the second half of the year, and year 1 reckoned from the beginning of the same year). The discussion should not have been necessary since George Hill calculated correctly, of course (*B.M.C. Pal.* loc. cit.). The actual dates for the foundation ceremony proposed by Hill, by Avi-Yonah, and by Hoehner are speculative.

<sup>8</sup> For these coins see any of the collections mentioned. Sepphoris was thought to have no coins before Trajan (*B.M.C. Pal.* xi and 1–4); but in *Num. Chron.* sixth series—x

seem that Trajan's reign saw a notable increase in Tiberias' civic pride—and also, presumably, in the financial resources at her disposal.

The name 'Claudiopolis' for the city is not attested earlier than Trajan.<sup>1</sup> When and why this honorific title was acquired is obscure: but it probably occurred after the reign of Claudius, since the Claudian coin of 53 does not bear the title. The most likely explanation is that it was adopted retrospectively,<sup>2</sup> in recognition of the fact that it had been in Claudius' reign, during the period of procuratorial rule in Galilee, that the city, left in her day-to-day affairs to her own devices, had begun to function as a real city. Perhaps there had even been special concessions from Claudius. Nero had reversed this, restoring the city to a Herod. Little is gained by Avi-Yonah's suggestion<sup>3</sup> that it was when the title was conferred (in his view, at the beginning of Nero's reign) that Tiberias first acquired the organs of a πόλις. For it is not likely that Antipas founded Tiberias as anything less than a πόλις, since the place was so clearly meant to be a showpiece. It was, however, some time after the foundation that the Tiberians learnt to use—and abuse—those institutions. At any rate, by 66 they were making—and changing—their own decisions about how to react to the revolt. When Herodian rule eventually ended, and the city stood on her own feet, at any rate to the extent that most other Greek cities in the Roman Empire did, the Claudian period would understandably have seemed the most important phase of her history.

Thus Tiberias slowly grew into a Greek city. To what extent these changes were associated with an increase in affection for the Greek language and Greek culture among the Jewish citizens we cannot tell. Did the βουλευταί call themselves βουλευταί? Were they aware of the Greek traditions which lay behind their office? It is at any rate clear that they did retain their consciousness of being Jews.

The Tiberias of later days cannot be discussed here. But it is noteworthy that the city continued to display a combination of evident Hellenism with strong Judaism. Almost all the known inscriptions (the total is small) are Greek.<sup>4</sup> The third or fourth century Synagogue mosaic has representations of the four seasons in human form.<sup>5</sup> Under Hadrian, a Hadrianeum was built, and coins bore pagan deities: this, however, may have been enforced, as Jones suggested.<sup>6</sup> At the same time, Tiberias was a centre of Jewish learning, residence and burial place of famous Rabbis, and the last home of the Sanhedrin.<sup>7</sup> The city had developed much; but perhaps in the same direction in which its early history

(1950), 284–9, Seyrig attributed to Sepphoris a Neronian bronze coin of 67–8 with a fragmentary inscription.

<sup>1</sup> In addition to the coins, see perhaps the inscription in *G.Γ.V.*<sup>4</sup> ii. 221 n. 544 = *I.G.R.* i. 132; it may be right, with Schürer, to supplement *Τιβ[ε]ρίων*.

<sup>2</sup> For possible parallels for the retrospective adoption of such titles, see Jones, *C.E.R.P.*<sup>2</sup> 159–60. Creteia in Pontus started coining under Antoninus Pius, entitling itself Creteia Flaviopolis. The coins of Bithynian Claudiopolis started appearing under Trajan; it is not likely that Claudius had freed her, for she had already coined in the Republic.

<sup>3</sup> Avi-Yonah, 'Tiberias in the Roman Period', in *All the Land of Naphtali* (Israel Exploration Society, Jerusalem, 1967; Hebrew).

<sup>4</sup> See Schwabe, 'What do we learn about Tiberias from the inscriptions?' in *All the Land of Naphtali* (Hebrew).

<sup>5</sup> For a summary of the results of excavation, see Finegan, *The Archaeology of the New Testament* (1969), no. 53; or, in Hebrew, *The Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in Israel* (1970).

<sup>6</sup> *C.E.R.P.*<sup>2</sup> 277–8.

<sup>7</sup> See the *testimonia* in Klein, *Sefer ha-Yishuv* (*The Book of Jewish Settlement*; 1939; Hebrew), and *Jewish Encyclopedia*, loc. cit.

had pointed. Its development could be continuous, because it had survived the Jewish War relatively unscathed, owing to Agrippa's intercession with Vespasian (V. 352; B. J. 3. 456-7).

It may be appropriate to mention here that the name Justus had, in this later period, a certain popularity in the area. We find it in two out of the small number of known inscriptions concerning men from Tiberias. (1) a sarcophagus with third to fourth century lettering (superimposed, according to Vincent, over earlier incisions): ΣΥΜΑΧΟΣ ΙΟΥΣΤΟΥ ΖΗΣΑΣ ΕΤΗ ΜΕ. (2) an inscription found in Rome concerning three Tiberian Jews: ΑΛΥΠΙΣ ΤΙΒΕΡΠΙΕΥΣ ΚΑΙ ΥΙΟΙ ΑΥΤΟΥ ΙΟΥΣΤΟΣ ΚΑΙ ΑΛΥΠΙΣ ΕΒΡΕΟΙ ΜΕΤΑ ΤΟΥ ΠΑΤΡΟΣ ΑΩΤΩΝ ΩΔΕ ΚΙΝΤΕ. It would be pleasing to think that these Justuses were named after a well-known figure in the city's past. But it must be admitted that the name was not unknown in Sepphoris, where, according to a Midrashic story, a tailor named Justa was made 'governor' of the city by the 'King'.<sup>1</sup>

## II. JUSTUS OF TIBERIAS AND THE REVOLT OF 66

For our knowledge of Justus' activities we depend on Josephus' *Vita*. Naturally, not every word of the polemic is to be believed, but discrimination is in general not difficult. Scholars have championed either the *Bellum's* account or the *Vita's*: Laqueur and Thackeray chose the latter. But the inconsistencies between the two have been over-stressed, and the search for a consistent criterion for selecting the better story has perhaps obscured the fact that it is often not necessary to select at all.<sup>2</sup>

In 66, after the defeat of Cestius, Josephus found, as we have said, conflicting attitudes in Tiberias. He describes three parties. The war party was ἐξ ἀση-μοτάτων; the pro-Roman party consisted of ἀνδρῶν εὐσχημόνων; in other words, a class division, as at Jerusalem itself, and in other places. Josephus' language is prejudiced, but the facts plausible.<sup>3</sup> The leaders of the wealthy were Julius Capellus (sometimes called Capella by Josephus), Herod son of Gamalus, Herod son of Miarus, and Compsus son of Compsus; the names themselves are telling.<sup>4</sup> There was also, says Josephus, a third party: τῇ γνώμῃ δ' οὐ συνηρέσκετο

<sup>1</sup> (1) Vincent, *R.B.* xxx (1922), 121. (2) Frey, *C.I.J.* i. 502. For Justa the tailor, see *Midrash Rabbah* to *Song of Songs* 6. 12. 1 (Soncino translation ix. 274). It is not clear from the story what exactly the position of Justa was. The word used for 'governor' is an Aramaic derivative of the Latin 'dux', and a ἀπαξ λεγόμενον.

<sup>2</sup> The remarks of Luther, *Josephus und Justus von Tiberias* (Halle, 1910), are sensible: 'Es ist . . . in jedem einzelnen Falle zu untersuchen, welcher von beiden Berichten der glaubwürdiger ist' (p. 8).

<sup>3</sup> Luther, op. cit. 39, disputes Josephus' analysis: he assumes, what I cannot accept, that all important Sadducees and Pharisees in the nation were whole-heartedly for revolt. He is certainly wrong in ascribing the presence of a strong peace party in Tiberias to Greeks.

<sup>4</sup> Julius Capellus sounds like a Roman citizen. The Herodian names have obvious

implications. Compsus son of Compsus was brother of Crispus, Agrippa I's former Prefect (V. 33). He may be the man who lies at the heart of the story of Kamza and Bar Kamza at *T. Bab. Gittin*. 56b. See Dérenbourg, *Essai sur l'Histoire et la Géographie de la Palestine* (1867), 267. The Aramaic name means 'an avaricious man'. The story is that an invitation was sent to Kamza, but Bar Kamza appeared. When the host would not receive him, Bar Kamza went to Caesar, told him that the Jews had revolted, and recommended the sending to their sacrifice of a blemished offering, which the Jews would refuse to sacrifice. The story's implications are evidently that civil dissension caused the destruction of the Jews. Josephus has the same message. But there is more to it: the rich were anxious for the Romans to come in and punish their fellow countrymen who had got out of control. Bar Kamza is the betrayer of his country.

Πιστὸς παραγόμενος ὑπὸ Ἰούστου τοῦ παιδός. καὶ γὰρ ἦν φύσει πως ἐπιμάνης. (V. 34). It is evident that in social terms, Pistus and his son Justus fitted in with the εὐσχήμονες. This is suggested by Josephus' wording; it is confirmed by Justus' being one of the πρώτοι; and it is borne out by the activities in other places of members of Justus' family. A brother had his hands cut off by the Galileans, that is to say the Zealots (V. 177); a sister was married to Jesus, a relative of Philip son of Jakimos, Agrippa's ἐπαρχος and the man who tried to keep Gamala loyal to Agrippa and Rome (V. 59 ff.). Both Jesus and his brother Chares were killed by the people of Gamala.<sup>1</sup> Pistus and Justus, however, were politically more ambiguously placed: ὑπεκρίνετο (sc. Justus) μὲν ἐνδοιάζειν πρὸς τὸν πόλεμον, νεωτέρων δ' ἐπεθύμει πραγμάτων, ἐκ τῆς μεταβολῆς οἰόμενος δύναμιν ἑαυτῷ περιποιήσιν. The hesitation must be genuine even if the reason given by Josephus is not.<sup>2</sup> What happened was that they found themselves playing a double game not unlike that of Josephus himself.<sup>3</sup>

Josephus accuses Justus of putting Tiberias on the road to revolt (V. 37, 41; 341-4), in retaliation to Justus' accusations of exactly the same thing (V. 340). He points to Justus' attacks in 66 on the pro-Roman city of Sepphoris, which had recently ousted Tiberias as capital of the Galilee, and to the raids he led against the Decapolis cities, Gadara, Hippos, and Scythopolis. While accepting Josephus' sequence of events, we can certainly see through the interpretation, for the attacks must be viewed in the context of the bitter animosity between Jews and Greeks in those cities, which at that time reached a climax. The picture is clear from the *Bellum* (2. 457 ff.). The whole Jewish population of Caesarea had been massacred (there may be some exaggeration here), and the Syrians of the Decapolis cities had taken up the cue, while Jews from the outside had raided the territories of the cities. The massacre had been greatest in Scythopolis (V. 26), where the native Jews had tried to adhere to the Syrians. There can be no doubt of the importance of these events in forcing the hand of Jews. To be a Hellenizer must have become embarrassing, to say the least. Loyalty would compel anti-Greek activity: πρὸς δὲ τὴν ἐκ τῆς Καισαρείας πληγὴν ὅλον τὸ ἔθνος ἐξαγριοῦται (B. J. 2. 458). But how far would it be possible to avenge oneself on Syrians and Greeks without fighting Romans?<sup>4</sup>

The situation was an explosive one. Internal feuds too were exacerbated everywhere, and often assumed more importance than any external enemy. Naturally, therefore, the feud against Sepphoris must be prosecuted (we might think of Catanzaro and Reggio di Calabria fighting over the same issue).

Justus was among the πρώτοι whom Josephus met after he had been given the task πρόνοιαν ποιήσασθαι τῆς Γαλιλαίας. They opposed the destruction of the palace of Herod Antipas, with its pictures of animals, ordered, according to

<sup>1</sup> Schalit disbelieves Josephus' statement about Chares: 'Josephus und Justus', *Klio* (1933), 81. He identifies this Chares with the Chares who is described as leading the revolt of Gamala, and therefore distrusts Josephus' statements both about the position Chares adopted, and about the time and manner of his death. But these would be very curious—and useless—falsifications.

<sup>2</sup> Schalit, op. cit., doubts this too, believing that there were only two parties in Tiberias and that Josephus invented the third. But subsequent events show that Justus was by

no means as committed to peace as the real pro-Roman party. See the discussion below of his later activities.

<sup>3</sup> Schürer, *G.J.V.*<sup>4</sup> i. I. 60, saw this clearly. Failure to recognize it has led to much unnecessary debate about Justus' position. The debate is well summarized at the beginning of Schalit's article (op. cit.).

<sup>4</sup> On this see Luther, op. cit. 43 f. But Luther holds that the war could not yet have been predicted. See, however, Josephus' remarks at V. 17.



Josephus, by the Jerusalem Central Command. Justus was thus working with the 'pacifists'—Julius Capella (? -us), of whom we have already heard, is mentioned—protecting the interests of Agrippa, to whom the palace must have belonged. It seems, then, that the raid on the Decapolis and on Sepphoris had not marked Justus as a war-monger. Subsequently, Justus was among those leading Tiberians imprisoned by Josephus, after Josephus had, by pretending to have a fleet, foiled their attempt to seek Agrippa's protection (and eliminate Josephus). The incident is told at length in both *Bellum* and *Vita* (*B. J.* 2. 632 ff., 5. 155), with only trivial differences in the order of events, surely just the tricks which memory can play.<sup>1</sup>

One new thing is told us in the *Vita*—how Josephus entertained his prisoners to dinner. It shows him behaving with magnanimity, which was no doubt what he wanted. But the point of the story was in what Josephus said to Justus and Pistus: καὶ παρὰ τὴν ἐστίασιν ἔλεγον ὅτι τὴν Ῥωμαίων δύναμιν οὐδ' αὐτὸς ἀγνοῶ πασῶν διαφέρουσιν, σιγήν μέντοι περὶ αὐτῆς διὰ τοὺς ληστές. καὶ αὐτοῖς δὲ ταῦτα συνεβούλευον ποιεῖν . . . (*V.* 175–6). In other words, the best hope for pro-Romans lay in taking over the revolt; it was too dangerous now to exhibit one's views openly. This is a point central to Josephus' defence of himself in the *Vita*: he was a man trapped into fighting a war he did not want to fight, and if it had to be fought he did not want to fight it in the style of those enthusiasts with whom it had to be fought. This emerges in the account of the outbreak of the war (29); of the stolen imperial corn which Josephus says he was hoarding for the Romans (72–3); of the charges of the Galilean villagers that Josephus contemplated betrayal (129). But this does not mean either that Josephus did not say it to Justus at the time, or that it is not true. It is presented as the kind of 'Didn't I tell you . . . ?' remark which has an authentic ring. As for the truth of the picture, in general lines it is verified not only by the *Vita* but by the *Bellum*; not only for Josephus, but for most of the rest of the High-Priestly aristocracy, the group which constituted the Central Command.<sup>2</sup> What is interesting is the *rapport*, in terms of attitude and pre-conception, which Josephus sees himself as having had with Justus. The exchange, as he draws it, is between two realists, two men who knew the war to be foolish and whose purposes must basically be the same. The presentation is surely accurate. The reason why Josephus and Justus clashed was that each was playing his own double game, and they were not synchronized.

Throughout the six months of Josephus' command with which the *Vita* is concerned, attempts both devious and violent were made to strip him of his position. The zealot John of Gischala was at the bottom of them, and an embassy from the Jerusalem authorities was soon working to the same purpose. Personal animosities were involved—Josephus maintained that John was jealous of him (85). But the basic cause was clearly Josephus' failure to be seen to be enthusiastic enough for war (see e.g. 132). The mood of the country was becoming more militant. Revolts against Josephus' authority were fomented in

<sup>1</sup> Although Thackeray maintains that the account in the *Vita* is 'confused and ridiculous' (see his note on *V.* 173).

<sup>2</sup> In the *Bellum* Josephus writes that, after the cessation of the sacrifices for Rome, when οἱ δυνατοὶ saw that war was inevitable, they begged Florus and Agrippa to come and crush the insurgents (*B. J.* 2. 418).

When Cestius reached the city, they offered to open the gates for him. But, after he had retreated, those of the Ῥωμαϊζόντων who had not fled the city had to join the revolt (2. 562). This group included those members of High-Priestly families who took over the organization of the revolt, and to whom Josephus' appointment was due (2. 568).

the towns. In Tiberias, Jesus son of Sapphias, ἄρχων and leader of the revolutionary faction (66; 134), who was at that time in the ascendant, spearheaded the attack, and he was supported by Justus (279). So Justus was now working with men who were actively prosecuting the war.

Thus, while Justus in his writings accused Josephus of behaving like a Zealot, he had at one stage associated himself with accusations to precisely the opposite effect. In other words, the bitterness and recriminations were the sequel to duplicity on both sides. And it was a sequel which lasted over twenty years. No doubt, Justus and Josephus were not the only two men to be affected thus.

Duplicity had finally led both Josephus and Justus the same way. For when Vespasian was nearing Tiberias, Justus fled to the protection of Agrippa, and he remained with him at Berytus. But he had not endeared himself to the Greeks, and men from the Decapolis made accusations. However, through Agrippa's intervention, Justus evaded Vespasian's death sentence. That was when he became Agrippa's private secretary (351 ff.).

Thus, both Josephus and Justus used their culture to extricate themselves from the grim conclusion of the Jewish revolt. Not surprisingly, in their writing they could not keep off the subject which must have haunted their minds—the events of the revolt.

### III. POLEMIC AND COUNTER-POLEMIC

Can we determine from the *Vita* what Justus had written in his book?

It is not possible certainly to say what proportion of it was devoted to general account of the war, what proportion to detailed accusations of Josephus. Josephus seems to describe it as a general narrative: *τολμᾷς λέγειν πάντων τῶν τὴν πραγματείαν ταύτην γεγραφότων αὐτὸς ἄμεινον ἐξηγγελκέναι, μήτε τὰ πραχθέντα κατὰ τὴν Γαλιλαίαν ἐπιστάμενος . . . μήθ' ὅσα ἔπαθον Ῥωμαῖοι ἐπὶ τῆς Ἰωταπάτων πολιορκίας ἣ ἔδρασαν ἡμᾶς παρακολουθήσας . . . ἀλλ' ἴσως τὰ κατὰ τὴν Ἱεροσολύμα πραχθέντα μετὰ ἀκριβείας, φήσεις, συγγεγραφέναι. καὶ πῶς οἶον τε; οὔτε γὰρ τῷ πολέμῳ παρέτυχες οὔτε τὰ Καίσαρος ἀνέγνως ὑπομνήματα* (V. 357 ff.). It is clear, at any rate, that the events at Jotapata and Jerusalem were narrated.

But the attack on Josephus must have been prominent and violent to prompt a special appendix to Josephus' *Antiquities*, for that is what the *Vita* was.<sup>1</sup> In the manuscripts it is entitled Josephus' *βίος*; in fact it focused on the most controversial six months of his life and was cast in the form of a reply to Justus. Only a brief introduction and conclusion about the rest of Josephus' life were provided. Josephus must have had good reason to write like this.

There is a further point. Josephus makes much of Justus' waiting twenty years, until Vespasian, Titus, and Agrippa were all dead, before publishing his work. Josephus uses this to score a point at Justus' expense: Justus, he maintains, had not dared to publish until there was no one alive who could refute his lies. This is rhetoric, but we do need an explanation. And to say<sup>2</sup> that Justus waited

<sup>1</sup> That the *Vita* was an appendix is clear: see the concluding paragraph of the *Vita*, which is a conclusion to the whole of the *Antiquities*, and also A.J. 20. 266, which announces the *Vita*. The *Vita* itself has no introduction, and opens with a δέ. When Eusebius quotes from the *Vita* he calls it the

*Antiquities* (H.E. 3. 10. 8 ff.). All our manuscripts but one have the two works together.

<sup>2</sup> As Jacoby does, loc. cit. On Greek writings which combined autobiography with self-defence, see Momigliano, *The Development of Greek Biography* (1971), 58 ff.

for the leisure of his retirement is inadequate by itself—Josephus' *Bellum* should have been challenged immediately.<sup>1</sup> The most plausible explanation is that Justus simply could not have attacked Josephus during Agrippa's lifetime: Josephus was patronized by the Emperors on whom Agrippa depended, and Agrippa acknowledged Josephus' history as trustworthy and even contributed material himself (V. 364–7). This suggests that the purpose of Justus' work was to make certain 'revelations' about Josephus, even if other material was presented as well.

The 'revelations' fall under several heads. First, and most fundamental, that Josephus was personally responsible for the revolt of the Galilee in general, and of Tiberias in particular (V. 341). This is the charge which Josephus rebuts by pointing to the great militancy of the Tiberians after his own departure (350). It is in retaliation that he maintains that Justus was wholly responsible for all the disasters (41). This dispute lies behind much of the debate: Justus must have pointed to many occasions on which in his view Josephus had aided and abetted the extremists. This of course turned Josephus' eventual desertion into an even more shocking act; but we do not know how far his desertion was emphasized by Justus. It would also make Josephus suspect in the eyes of his Roman patrons; but we may doubt both whether they would have read Justus' book, and whether they would have cared. The charge can most readily be understood if it is seen as appealing to men with a more intimate fear and hatred of Zealots: the more prosperous Jews of the cities would constitute such a readership. It is, of course, the same readers, with the same assumptions, to whom Josephus addresses his reply. Their criticisms of Josephus would have been the opposite of those directed at him in modern times.

Both Josephus and Justus wrote of the war as unwelcome. Josephus argues a necessary causation: he writes that he only mentions the massacre of Jews in the cities as an illustration, *ὅτι οὐ προαίρεσις ἐγένετο τοῦ πολέμου πρὸς Ῥωμαίους Ἰουδαίους, ἀλλὰ τὸ πλεόν ἀνάγκη* (V. 27). Why should he want particularly to make the point here?—it had been adequately developed in the *Bellum*. We may suspect that Justus had said that, but for Josephus and others like him, there would have been no war at all.

It is important for Josephus to present himself as having obeyed instructions throughout, therefore having little choice of alternative action. He describes the circumstances in which and the instructions with which he had originally been sent to Galilee; the instructions were to wait and to equivocate:

τῶν Ἱεροσολυμιτῶν οἱ πρῶτοι θεασάμενοι τοὺς μὲν ληστὰς ἅμα τοῖς νεω-  
τερισταῖς εὐπορουμένους ὄπλων, δέξαντες δ' αὐτοὶ μὴ ἀνοπλοὶ καθεστηκότες

<sup>1</sup> The *Bellum* was written after 75, when the Temple of Pax, whose reconstruction is referred to at *B.J.* 7. 158, was completed (Dio 66. 15). See Niese, *Josephus opp.* iv, p. iv; but certainly before 79, when Vespasian died. If Justus' work was published some twenty years after it was first written, this would be some time after A.D. 90 (it need not have included Masada). The death of Agrippa II would be a precise *terminus post quem*—if we knew its date. On this, see below, pp. 361–2.

Rühl, *op. cit.* 307, maintains that Justus' work could not be published during Titus'

lifetime because Justus told the truth about the Romans in general and Titus in particular, and was not prepared to distort history as Josephus had done in order to cast a favourable light on them. But I do not think that Josephus' history is in this way dominated by adulation of Titus (argued elsewhere). For the same reason, Luther's comparison with the Elder Pliny's delay in publication (*op. cit.* 69 n. 3) does not seem to be helpful: for Pliny, as a writer of *Roman* history, the need for adulation was a real hindrance.

ὑποχείριοι γένωνται τοῖς ἐχθροῖς, ὁ καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα συνέβη, καὶ πυθόμενοι τὴν Γαλιλαίαν οὕτω πᾶσαν Ῥωμαίων ἀφεστάναι, μέρος δ' αὐτῆς ἡρμεῖν ἔτι, πέμπουσιν ἐμὲ καὶ δύο ἄλλους τῶν ἱερέων καλοὺς κάγαθοὺς ἄνδρας, Ἰωάζαρον καὶ Ἰούδαν, πείσοντας τοὺς πονηροὺς καταθέσθαι τὰ ὄπλα καὶ διδάξοντας ὥς ἔστιν ἄμεινον τοῖς κρατίστοις τοῦ ἔθνους αὐτὰ τηρεῖσθαι. ἔγνωστο δὲ τούτοις αἰεὶ μὲν ἔχειν τὰ ὄπλα πρὸς τὸ μέλλον ἔτοιμα, περιμένειν δὲ τί πράξουσιν Ῥωμαῖοι μαθεῖν. (V. 28–9).

Subsequently Josephus tells us how he received new orders to protect the Galilee, and how his two associates remained with him for a while to do this and then left (62 ff.). Josephus tried to bring the Zealots under his umbrella by securing pay from the people for them. At this point we meet the most famous of the alleged inconsistencies between the *Vita* and the *Bellum*, for the *Bellum* simply talks of Josephus' official command (2. 562 ff.).<sup>1</sup> But the omission of all the rest is natural in an account which was not concerned with a detailed examination of every shift in the Jewish position. The *Bellum* is a formal account, and inevitably more compressed: thus it is enough to say that at the beginning of the war, leaders were elected in Jerusalem and generals selected for the different regions; Josephus, having been allocated the Galilee, set about fortifying it. If we appreciate that this corresponds to Josephus' eventual position as described in the *Vita*, we see that there are not two inconsistent accounts, only two different ones, because they are written for different purposes.<sup>2</sup> Josephus provides his own defence: τῷ γὰρ ἱστορίαν ἀναγράφοντι τὸ μὲν ἀληθεύειν ἀναγκαῖον, ἕξεσιν δ' ὁμῶς μὴ πικρῶς τὰς τινῶν πονηρίας ἐλέγχειν (V. 339). The question in such a case must be how the addition in the *Vita* can contribute to Josephus' argument with Justus. And here it is clear that it was valuable to show that orders had been obeyed and an anti-war policy maintained as long as possible.

The same debate continues when Josephus tries to show that he had never willingly co-operated with the Zealots. He stresses his own refusal to let John of Gischala seize the imperial corn (70–4), and asserts that his colleagues were responsible; he insists that he only reluctantly agreed to John's oil deal for fear of the mob (74–5). Where (88) Josephus charges Justus with being eager for an alliance with John, this may be just throwing back what Justus had said about him (it was only later, as we have seen, that Justus co-operated with John.) Josephus' lengthy accounts of John's plots against himself probably have this same general purpose: they suggest that the two men could not possibly have been in league.<sup>3</sup>

At the same time, Josephus is suggesting here that personal malice was responsible for the attempts to topple him. The malice was mainly John's, and

<sup>1</sup> For an approach which emphasizes the inconsistency, see e.g. Thackeray, *Josephus the Man and the Historian* (1929), 10–11; cf. 5 and 49.

<sup>2</sup> Thackeray's note (Loeb, *Josephus*, ad B.J. 2. 568) is thus unfair, where he maintains that the *Vita* talks only of a purely pacific mission, while the *Bellum* talks of a warlike one: B.J. 2. 569 corresponds not to V. 29 but to V. 62. As to Josephus' purpose in the *Bellum*, it is true that he wants to

present the war as a serious and important one, but his personal motive in doing this has been exaggerated. Motzo's account, *Saggi di Storia e Letteratura Giudeo-Ellenistica* (1924), 221–2, is reasonably balanced. The other 'inconsistencies' between Josephus' two accounts need not be discussed here.

<sup>3</sup> Josephus does admit, however, that initially his relationship with John of Gischala had been satisfactory: B.J. 2. 590 and 615; V. 86. cf. Luther, op. cit. 18.

the Jerusalem authorities only succumbed to pressure and bribery (122 ff.; 196). Justus must have said that Josephus was universally unpopular. This was his second main contention. Josephus emphasized his popularity with the 'Galileans'—it is never specified precisely who they are (see, e.g., 122; 207; 244; 250-1; 259; 262). When mass attacks were made on Josephus, the hostility had, according to him, been fomented by his enemies (122-4; 132; 149). Justus must then have argued that Josephus should have left the Galilee, his position being untenable. To this Josephus could only reply by recounting a dream in which it was said to him: μέμνησο δ' ὅτι καὶ Ῥωμαῖοις δεῖ σε πολεμῆσαι (209). It was not the only time that he found himself falling back on the supernatural to justify a dubious position!

Other statements are the predictable stock-in-trade of invective. They were charges which, Josephus admits, had been levelled at him at the time: Justus was simply carrying on the old battles. The accusations were of bribery and corruption, vindictiveness, aiming at a tyranny (79-83; 260-1; 293 ff.), causing *stasis* (100). Josephus stresses the contrary of each of these—his own forbearance, honesty, moderation, clemency (100; 102-3; 110-11; 265; 321; 329-30; 379-80; 385 ff.).

Drexler and Schalit<sup>1</sup> make much of those charges which have a moral nature; they maintain that the dispute was a solely personal one, and that Josephus' character was at the heart of it. Personal accusations certainly were made. But by themselves these complaints would not have been enough to cause or to constitute a serious attack: such charges—and such behaviour—were universal. These charges were embroidery, even the emphasis on Josephus' unpopularity. The core of the dispute was whether Josephus had been a revolutionary.

Another count was that Josephus had ignored the Jewish law (135; 149). That must be why Josephus takes care to mention that he sent his bodyguard home for the Sabbath (159). This is an interesting indication both of Justus' position *vis-à-vis* the Jewish religion, and of how he would expect his readers to react. Evidently, a Jewish readership is expected. Josephus' *Bellum* had been different, and more ambitious, presenting the war to the outside world.

That Josephus and Justus hated each other—as perhaps only men on the same side can—there is no doubt. Justus had, as we saw, been Josephus' prisoner; and Josephus claimed that it was because Justus feared him that he had finally fled to Agrippa (393). Josephus had not attacked Justus in the *Bellum*, but he had ignored him, where Justus might have merited some mention—say in connection with the raids on the Decapolis cities. And Josephus had, in the end, had a more successful war than Justus: no doubt, as Josephus said (425), resentment and jealousy tended to be the motives of his accusers.

Most of the *Vita* is concerned with the plots to oust Josephus, and with his counter-measures. The attacks are not glossed over. These things can only have been presented by Justus as Josephus' ruthless and unscrupulous endeavours to put himself in sole control at his people's expense. Both pictures will be distorted. But on the whole, in his exposition of his own position, of his subterfuges and escapades, of his flexibility and cunning, Josephus displays not a little charm, intelligence—and even honesty. That this has not always been

<sup>1</sup> Drexler in 'Untersuchungen zu Josephus standes 66-70', *Klio* xix (1925), 277-375, und zur Geschichte des jüdischen Auf- section ii; Schalit, op. cit. 81 ff.

perceived is due, I think, to the distaste caused by his subsequent desertion.<sup>1</sup> Justus' polemic, so far as we can judge, will have been more virulent. Yet he was not in a position to utter reproaches, less culpable than Josephus only inasmuch as his role had been a less important one.

Justus need not have gone into all the incidents which Josephus discusses in detail. Indeed, he could have cast sufficient aspersions on Josephus in a few pages to call forth the lengthy blow-by-blow defence. Yet it is not impossible that he wrote at length. The *Vita* does not enable us to decide this.

We shall probably not do wrong, at any rate, to see Justus' work as more polemical than historical, although cast in the form of a history. History was used as a weapon against an historian. Similarly, Josephus replied in the form of a sort of autobiography.

There the militant purpose is clear even from the introduction and conclusion: Josephus' recitation of his own genealogy is directed at *τοῖς διαβάλλειν ἡμᾶς πειρωμένοις*, and the brief account of his life after the war stresses the protection which the Emperors had afforded him against many accusations from fellow Jews (425, 429).

It is striking that events long past still stimulated such violent writing. The role of the class of Josephus and Justus in those events must have led to the demoralization and disintegration of the whole group. What we catch in this dispute is surely an echo of the experience of a group which had lost its pride, much of its wealth and its city, yet could not grieve with the rest of the people.

#### IV. 'THE JEWISH KINGS'

Other evidence about Justus' literary output complicates the issue, but provides no certain information.

Photius' *Bibliotheca* (p. 33) gives us our most extended account: a whole paragraph devoted to a production of Justus:

Ἀνεγνώσθη Ἰούστου Τιβερίεως χρονικόν, οὗ ἡ ἐπιγραφή Ἰούστου Τιβερίεως Ἰουδαίων βασιλέων τῶν ἐν τοῖς στέμμασιν. Οὗτος ἀπὸ πόλεως τῆς ἐν Γαλιλαίᾳ Τιβεριάδος ὤρμητο. Ἀρχεται δὲ τῆς ἱστορίας ἀπὸ Μωϋσέως, καταλήγει δὲ ἕως τελευτῆς Ἀγρίππα τοῦ ἐβδόμου μὲν τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς οἰκίας Ἑρῳδου, ὑστάτου δὲ ἐν τοῖς Ἰουδαίων βασιλεῦσιν, ὃς παρέλαβε μὲν τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐπὶ Κλαυδίου, ὑξήθη δὲ ἐπὶ Νέρωνος καὶ ἔτι μᾶλλον ὑπὸ Οὐεσπασιανοῦ, τελευτᾷ δὲ ἔτει τρίτῳ Τραϊανοῦ, οὗ καὶ ἡ ἱστορία κατέληξεν.

Ἔστι δὲ τὴν φράσιν συντομωτάτος τε καὶ τὰ πλεῖστα τῶν ἀναγκαιοτάτων παρατρέχων. Ὡς δὲ τὰ Ἰουδαίων νοσῶν, Ἰουδαῖος καὶ αὐτὸς ὑπάρχων γένος, τῆς Χριστοῦ παρουσίας καὶ τῶν περὶ αὐτὸν τελεσθέντων καὶ τῶν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ τερατουργηθέντων οὐδὲν ὅλως μνήμην ἐποιήσατο.

Οὗτος παῖς μὲν ἦν Ἰουδαίου τινὸς ὄνομα Πιστοῦ, ἀνθρώπων δέ, ὥς φησιν Ἰώσηπος, κακουργότατος, χρημάτων τε καὶ ἡδονῶν ἥττων. Ἀντεπολιτεύετο δὲ Ἰωσήφῳ, καὶ πολλὰς κατ' ἐκείνου λέγεται ἐπιβουλὰς ῥάψαι. ἀλλὰ τὸν γε Ἰώσηπον, καίτοι ὑπὸ χεῖρα πολλάκις λαβόντα τὸν ἐχθρόν, λόγοις μόνον ὀνειδίσαντα ἀπαθῆ κακῶν ἀφεΐναι. Καὶ τὴν ἱστορίαν δὲ, ἣν ἐκείνος ἔγραψε, πεπλασμένην τὰ

<sup>1</sup> And to a lack of appreciation of the conventions of this kind of literature. Thus Thackeray: 'The work, in which the author

indulges his vanity to the full, is, alike in matter and in manner, the least satisfactory of his writings' (Loeb, *Josephus*, vol. i, intr. xiv).

πλείστα φασι τυγχάνειν καὶ μάλιστα οἷς τὸν Ῥωμαϊκὸν πρὸς Ἰουδαίους διέξεισι πόλεμον καὶ τὴν Ἱεροσολύμων ἄλωσιν.

If we are to take Photius' precise wording seriously, he is discussing *one work* of Justus throughout this notice. For he seems to take the war narrative to be part of a wider work: καὶ τὴν ἱστορίαν δὲ . . . πεπλασμένην τὰ πλείστα φασι τυγχάνειν καὶ μάλιστα οἷς τὸν Ῥωμαϊκὸν πρὸς Ἰουδαίους διέξεισι πόλεμον καὶ τὴν Ἱεροσολύμων ἄλωσιν. This wider work must be the same thing as the χρονικόν of the opening sentence, for that is the subject of the notice. It was referred to as ἱστορία as well as χρονικόν early on (although there ἱστορία might mean simply 'narration'). Photius at no point says, as is his custom in such cases,<sup>1</sup> that there also exists (or existed) another work by the same author.

Now it is clear that Photius' remarks on Justus' war narrative are derived entirely from Josephus, as are those on Justus' life and character: ἀνθρώπων δέ, ὡς φησιν Ἰώσηπος, κακουργότατος . . . ἀντεπολιτεύετο δὲ Ἰωσήφω . . . ἀλλὰ τὸν γε Ἰώσηπον . . . ἀπαθῇ κακῶν ἀφεῖναι. He evidently did not even look at this part of Justus' work. Does this mean that the book he had in front of him did not contain the war narrative? If so, Photius may be wrong about the relationship between the two, in supposing that the war narrative fitted into a wider work.<sup>2</sup> Perhaps Photius' vagueness about the nature of the composite work points in this direction. For it is unexpected to find a summary described as an ἱστορία; Photius' usage is normally careful.<sup>3</sup>

There are in fact three major obstacles to our believing that Justus did write one compendious work which treated Jewish history from the beginning. First, Josephus' description of the work he is discussing makes it sound like a war history.<sup>4</sup> Second, if the *Jewish Kings* was the same work as the war history, it must have been published by the time that Josephus' *Vita* and therefore his *Antiquities* came out;<sup>5</sup> and if it covered with any thoroughness the Jewish 'kings' from Moses to Agrippa II, we should have expected Josephus to take some explicit notice of it. If, on the other hand, there were two separate works (and Photius was being careless), the *Kings* could have appeared after the *Antiquities*. Third, it is hard to imagine a composite work which did justice to both themes. A combination would only be feasible if there was some kind of introduction in the form of a list of kings and then a reasonably (and perhaps very) full account of the revolt. But then how could such a work ever have been given

<sup>1</sup> See the notice on the historian Hesychius (cod. 69), where the last paragraph has: ἀνεγνώσθη δέ μοι καὶ ἑτέρα αὐτοῦ βιβλος, and that on the three works of Dexippus (82).

<sup>2</sup> Photius could be careless. For an assessment, see Henry's preface to the Budé edition of Photius' *Bibliotheca* (1965), xxiv–xxv. Such errors would be even more intelligible if N. G. Wilson's view, that Photius' claim to have worked from memory should be taken literally, is correct. See his article, 'The composition of Photius' *Bibliotheca*', *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies*, ix (1968), 451–5. For the traditional view, that Photius took notes from texts, see Ziegler in *R.E.* xx (1941), 690. A. Elter, *Rhein. Mus.* lxxv (1910), 175–9, shows how Photius misunderstood

the Neo-Platonic philosopher Hierocles through only glancing at a few parts of his *περὶ προνοίας*.

<sup>3</sup> Under Phlegon of Tralles (cod. 97) we find his *Ὀλυμπιονίκων καὶ χρονικῶν συναγωγὴ* referred to as *σύνταγμα* and *σύγγραμμα*, but not *ἱστορία*. Cephalion's *σύντομον* is called *ἱστορία* (68), but that has 9 books. Eunapius (77) wrote a *χρονικὴ ἱστορία*, a work of 14 books.

<sup>4</sup> See *V.* 40: τὴν ἱστορίαν τῶν πραγμάτων τούτων ἀναγράφειν, and also 357–60: cf. Luther, op. cit. 51.

<sup>5</sup> Unless we suppose that there were two editions of the *A. J.* or the *Vita*, in which case Justus could have written after the *A. J.* first came out. See pp. 361–2 for a discussion.

the title mentioned by Photius? It is most likely, then, either that Photius saw a different work from that discussed by Josephus; or, alternatively, that the *Jewish Kings* was just a digression in the war narrative, later extracted and produced under an independent title.

What can we learn from Photius' description of the contents of what he saw? And can we supplement the information at any point?

1. The work began with Moses: ἄρχεται δὲ τῆς ἱστορίας ἀπὸ Μωϋσέως. Now twice in Christian writings Justus is associated with a dating for Moses. In Eusebius' *Chronicon* this takes the form of a synchronization between Moses, the Egyptian Pharaoh Amosis, and the Argive king Inachus, all of whom are put 500 years before the Trojan war: τοῖς χρόνοις ἀκμάσαι [sc. Moses] κατὰ Ἰναχὸν εἰρήκασιν ἄνδρες ἐν παιδεύσει γνῶριμοι Κλήμης, Ἀφρικανός, Τατιανὸς τοῦ καθ' ἡμᾶς λόγου, τῶν τε ἐκ περιτομῆς Ἰώσηπος καὶ Ἰουδτος, ἰδίως ἕκαστος τὴν ἀπόδειξιν ἐκ παλαιᾶς ὑποσχὼν ἱστορίας (p. 7b, Helm = *F.G.H.* 734 F2). In Syncellus it is similar, but two different Argive kings are mentioned: οἱ τε γὰρ ἐκ περιτομῆς πάντες Ἰώσηπος τε καὶ Ἰουδτος, οἱ τε ἐξ Ἑλλήνων Πολέμων φημὶ καὶ Ἀπίων, Ποσειδώνιος καὶ Ἡρόδοτος τὴν ἐξ Αἰγύπτου πορείαν τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ κατὰ Φωρωνέα καὶ Ἀπίδα τοὺς Ἀργείων βασιλεῖς συνέγραψαν, Ἀμώσεως Αἰγυπτίων βασιλεύοντος (pp. 116–17, Dindorf = *F.G.H.* 734 F3).

An earlier form of the synchronization is to be found in Eusebius, *Praep. Ev.* 10. 10. 15 (excerpting from Africanus), and *Praep. Ev.* 10. 12. 1–3 (from Clement of Alexandria—Clem. *Strom.* 1. 101) and in Tatian (*Pr. Hell.* 38). The source is given as Apion, who took from the Egyptian history of Ptolemaeus of Mende the association between Inachus and Amosis, and added the Exodus. In Africanus (*ap. Eus. loc. cit.*) the precise references to Apion's works are given. This already presents a problem, for Josephus ascribes to Apion a much later dating for the Exodus, contemporaneous with the foundation of Carthage, which Apion put in the first year of the seventh Olympiad (*C.A.* 2. 17).<sup>1</sup> But it is clearly better founded than the elaborations in the later texts, which add Josephus and Justus as sources. For the attribution to Josephus is certainly false. Josephus did not date Moses to the time of Amosis and Inachus, but simply claimed that he lived a very long time ago: ὁ δ' ἡμέτερος νομοθέτης ἀρχαιότατος γεγονώς (*C.A.* 2. 156). He never mentions any synchronization with Amosis and Inachus made by anyone else. Josephus is thus an importation, and we may suspect the attribution to Justus. It is easy to understand the introduction of two Jewish historians at this point. It was desirable to give this piece of chronology as venerable an origin as possible and for that it had to go back to the Jews themselves. Thus it was fathered on to Josephus and on to Justus, the two Jewish historians whose names were best known to the early Church (Justus having been immortalized by Josephus).

By the time the theory has reached Syncellus, it has become totally garbled. In spite of the change in the names of the Argive kings, the same synchronization is clearly intended. While Africanus (*ap. Eusebius*) wrote: μέμνηται δὲ καὶ Ἡρόδοτος τῆς ἀποστασίας ταύτης καὶ Ἀμώσιος ἐν τῇ δευτέρᾳ (already incorrect, since it is *Amasis* Herodotus talks of, and not the Exodus, but the Syrians in Palestine), Syncellus gives Herodotus as one of the actual sources of the full synchronization. He further gives Posidonius, and this looks suspiciously

<sup>1</sup> On this see Wacholder, 'Biblical chronology in the Hellenistic World Chronicles', *H.Th.R.* lxi (1968), 475. The origin of the

synchronism is probably Africanus. See H. Gelzer, *Sextus Julius Africanus* (1880–98), 20.



as though it derives from *Ἀπίων δὲ ὁ Ποσειδωνίου* in Africanus.<sup>1</sup> So neither Eusebius' *Chronicon* nor—still less—Syncellus can be trusted for information as to what Justus of Tiberias had written.

Therefore we have no reliable information of what Justus said about Moses. And Photius himself obviously did nothing more than glance at the work in front of him (or his notes or his mental picture) and record its starting point, as he often did.

We need not be surprised that Moses should be the beginning of a list of Jewish kings. To count him as a king would not have been unreasonable; Philo's *de Vita Mosis* makes this one of his four classifications, and in Jewish tradition Moses was often a king. Alternatively, *βασιλεύς* was used loosely.<sup>2</sup>

2. The history ended with the death of Agrippa II. Again Photius will have done nothing more than glance. Indeed, the statement could even be just an inference derived from Josephus' remark that Agrippa was dead when Justus published his history. For it is clear that Photius knew his Josephus, and had been through the *Vita*.

We are given a few obvious facts about Agrippa's life: the reigns he lived through, and an actual date for his death, the third year of Trajan. But that date has caused much trouble, since we must date Josephus' *Vita* accordingly (Josephus unequivocally talks of Agrippa's being dead at 359, and implies it by the tense at 367). But the *Vita* was an appendix to the *Antiquities*, and the *Antiquities* were published in 93/4.<sup>3</sup> Many attempts have been made to save Photius' date, the longest-lived being Laqueur's analysis of the end of the *Antiquities* into two conclusions, of which one would have been written in 93/4, and the other for a second edition of the *Antiquities*, this time together with the *Vita* (a revision of a very early work), after Agrippa's death.<sup>4</sup> But, apart from Photius, almost all the evidence for Agrippa's date of death points in the opposite direction.<sup>5</sup> It seems best, then, to take Photius' date as a mistake.<sup>6</sup> The evidence for the dating of Josephus' works can then be given its natural

<sup>1</sup> Jacoby refers the reader of the Syncellus text to the fragments of Posidonius on the Jews, which are taken from Josephus' *Contra Apionem* and from Strabo's *Geography* (F.G.H. 87 F 69–70). But there is no trace there of any ideas of this kind.

<sup>2</sup> See p. 365.

<sup>3</sup> Niese, loc. cit., *praef.* v; *A.J.* 20. 267.

<sup>4</sup> Laqueur, *Der Jüdische Historiker Flavius Josephus* (Giessen, 1920), 1 ff. Laqueur is followed by M. Gelzer, 'die *Vita* des Josephus', *Hermes* lxxx (1952), 67–90, and Pelletier, *Flavius Josèphe, Autobiographie* (Budé, 1959), pp. xiii–xiv. Against this view see Frankfort's remarks, 'La date de l'Autobiographie de Flavius Josèphe et les œuvres de Justus de Tibériade', *Rev. Belge de phil. et d'hist.* xxxix (1961), 52–8. There are passages throughout the body of the *Antiquities* which suggest that Agrippa II was dead when they were written. And the *Vita* flatters Domitian, mentioning no subsequent Emperor.

Motzo (op. cit. 217–19) produced a simpler and better theory which was not

exposed to these criticisms—that a second edition of the *Vita* was produced as a reply to Justus' attacks. But I find it hard to see why Josephus should have rewritten his Autobiography, a work of a different kind produced seven years earlier, instead of simply sitting down and writing a defence.

<sup>5</sup> It is not necessary to recapitulate the arguments expounded by Frankfort, op. cit. There is no evidence that Agrippa was alive after 95, and perhaps not even after 92. The only possible (but not necessary) exception is an inscription (from the Hauran or Djebel Druze) where a man appears to have passed directly from the service of Agrippa to that of Trajan (H. Seyrig, *Syria* xlii [1965], 31–4).

<sup>6</sup> Tillemont (*Histoire des Empereurs*, ii. note 41) already suspected this, without knowing the archaeological evidence. He suggested that Trajan's name was written in error for that of Titus or Domitian. Cf. also Rosenberg in *R.E.* x (1917), 149–50; Jones, *J.R.S.* xxv (1935), 229; *P.I.R.*<sup>2</sup>, 872.

interpretation, and there is no need for elaborate accounts of his process of publication.

To trace the origins of a mistake amidst the manifold inaccuracies in our texts of the chronographers and in Photius is a hazardous exercise. But one possibility looks attractive. In Syncellus' chronological tables, the third year of Trajan appears to be 92 years after the birth of Christ.<sup>1</sup> According to this reckoning, the 'third year of Trajan' would indeed be the likely date for the publication of Justus' work (some year or two before the *Antiquities* and the *Vita*), and thus for a *terminus ad quem* for Agrippa's death. It therefore looks as though the date derives from a chronographer whose mistake Photius inherited. A good candidate is Africanus.<sup>2</sup>

We remain ignorant of whether Justus' work gave a date for the death of Agrippa II or not, and if it did, what that date was.

3. The extreme conciseness of the work: it is no puzzle what Photius means by this, nor whence he derives it, for he goes on to explain: *ὥς δὲ τὰ Ἰουδαίων νοσῶν, Ἰουδαίος καὶ αὐτὸς ὑπάρχων γένος, τῆς Χριστοῦ παρουσίας καὶ τῶν περὶ αὐτὸν τελεσθέντων καὶ τῶν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ τερατουργηθέντων οὐδὲν ὅλως μνήμην ἐποιήσατο*. Thus Photius is not, primarily, making a statement about the style of Justus' history.<sup>3</sup> The omission of Christ will have been evident from cursory inspection and was of obvious interest.<sup>4</sup> At the same time, the work he saw is not likely to have been very extensive, or Photius could not have phrased his objection in the way he did. The description *χρονικόν* also implies this.

4. We can now go back to the very first point made by Photius—the purported title of the whole work: *Ἰουστοῦ Τιβερίεως Ἰουδαίων βασιλέων τῶν ἐν τοῖς στέμμασιν*. This is a peculiar title. *Στέμμα* is both a garland and a family tree. Does the title mean '(a history of) the Jewish Kings who are in the genealogies'? If so what were the 'genealogies'? Or could it be translated, in spite of the presence of the article, '(a history of) Jewish Kings arranged in genealogies'? Or, again, perhaps only one genealogy is involved, since *στέμμα* is generally used in the plural.<sup>5</sup>

The title occurs in a slightly different form in relation to an anecdote about the trial of Socrates in Diogenes Laertius' *Life* (41). This supposedly appears in *Ἰουστός ὁ Τιβερεὺς ἐν τῷ Στέμματι* and runs: *Πλατῶνα ἀναβῆναι ἐπὶ τὸ*

<sup>1</sup> Dindorf ii. 285.

<sup>2</sup> See Gelzer, op. cit. *passim*, for Syncellus' debt to Africanus. It is likely that any chronographer would fit into his scheme the date when Justus' history appeared (based on the information of Josephus.) Frankfort (op. cit.) notes that there are almost as many dates for the publication of Justus' work as there are chronographers. No special claims are made for this explanation of how the mistake arose. Another curious detail (pointed out to me by Fergus Millar) is that Jerome's brief notice on Justus (*de Vir Ill.* 14–15) is followed by a notice on Clement, the Apostolic father, where Clement is also said to have died in the third year of Trajan. Luther (op. cit. 52, following Niese) suggests that Photius confused the date of publication of the chronicle with the last date in it.

<sup>3</sup> Jacoby, *R.E.* x. 1345; Christ, *Geschichte*

*der griechischen Literatur*, ii. 1. 602 (1920).

<sup>4</sup> Cf. the treatment of Josephus in this respect. Origen remarked on Josephus' disbelief in Christianity and claimed (incorrectly) that Josephus explained the fall of the Temple as due to the execution of James brother of Jesus (*Contra Cels.* 1. 47 = *G.C.S.* i. 97; in *Matth.* 10. 17 = *G.C.S.* x. 22. 7–14); Eusebius, who seems to have been the first surviving author to have had a text containing the *Testimonium Flavianum* in its present, and at least partly interpolated, form, made much of Josephus as a witness to Christ: *Dem. Evang.* 3. 124 (*G.C.S.* vi. 130–1); *H.E.* 1. 11 (*G.C.S.* ii. 1. 78–80), etc. Others followed Eusebius.

The tradition of remarking on Justus' omission had a long life; Voltaire made the same point, *Œuvres*, xx. 599 (Paris, 1818).

<sup>5</sup> See *L.S.J.* s.v. *στέμμα*.

βῆμα καὶ εἶπεῖν “νεώτατος ὢν, ὃ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, τῶν ἐπὶ τὸ βῆμα ἀναβάντων”. τοὺς δὲ δικαστὰς ἐκβοῆσαι, “Κατάβα, κατάβα”. Here we are in a different world altogether, and far, it seems, from Jewish history.

Schürer interpreted the title in the first of the suggested senses and explained the passage in Diogenes Laertius by supposing that Justus wrote a whole series of royal family trees, of which Photius saw the part concerning the Jewish Kings, and Diogenes Laertius another part, referred to as one *στέμμα*. He drew the analogy of Castor of Rhodes, who, in the first century B.C. had written a work based on the histories of the kings of Assyria, the kings of Sicyon and of Argos, the kings of Alba and of Rome, and the Roman consuls.<sup>1</sup> It is not likely that Justus produced such a work. Whatever the exact character of Castor's lists,<sup>2</sup> to compile them was no easy task. Castor was evidently a scholar of some stature, remaining an authority, particularly for the ‘prehistoric’ period, long after his death.<sup>3</sup> Could Justus have achieved, unbeknown to us, a similar feat? If he had, he should have had a place in Josephus' *Contra Apionem*. But even if Josephus' spite refused him this, one of the chronographers of the Christian period would have quarried from his non-Jewish *Stemmata*, had such things existed.<sup>4</sup> Moreover, what we know of Justus makes it hard to envisage him as a sedentary antiquarian, devoting his time to recondite researches and calculations. Trying to write history, or something related to history, was another matter.

Above all, it is an unwarranted assumption that Justus should have strayed beyond Jewish history. No evidence indicates it. Other interpreters have been even more daring. Luther, developing Schürer, invented a completely separate third work, whose name was *Στέμμα* in the sense of ‘garland’.<sup>5</sup> (Schürer had tried to make them both one and two works at the same time, and thus to have the best of both worlds.) But the *Στέμμα* and the *Στέμματα* must surely be the same thing, whatever that is. Otto and Rühl<sup>6</sup> met this difficulty by postulating only one work, called *Στέμματα*, ‘garlands’, and taking this to have been a miscellany like the *Στρωματεῖς* of Clement of Alexandria and the *Κεστοί* of Africanus. We can agree with Jacoby<sup>7</sup> that this is implausible. Neither of those miscellanies included genealogy or chronography or any other kind of history. In addition, the hypothesis implies total ignorance on the part of Photius about the kind of book he was talking about.

In the Photius passage, where *στέμματα* is combined with *βασιλεῖς*, the sense

<sup>1</sup> For the fragments of this author's *Χρονικά* see Jacoby, *F.G.H.* ii. B. 250. On the nature of the work, Schwartz, *Die Königslisten des Eratosthenes und Kastor*, *Abh. Göttingen* 40 (1895); Kubitschek in *R.E.* x (1919), 2350 ff.; Jacoby, *F.G.H.* ii. B. Comm., p. 814 ff. (1930).

<sup>2</sup> It is hard precisely to assess the character of Hellenistic and post-Hellenistic chronological writings, as is clear from Jacoby's remarks in *F.G.H.* ii. B. Comm. Some of the difficulties are also apparent in the article of Wacholder (op. cit.). We cannot for example, ascertain the lay-out and scope of the work of Menander of Ephesus, who, according to Josephus, wrote τὰς ἐφ' ἑκάστου τῶν βασιλέων πράξεις τὰς παρὰ τοῖς Ἕλλησι

καὶ βαρβάρους γενομένας ἐκ τῶν παρ' ἑκάστοις ἐπιχωρίων γραμμάτων σπουδάσας τὴν ἱστορίαν μαθεῖν (*C.A.* i. 116).

<sup>3</sup> Jacoby, *F.G.H.* ii. B. Comm., p. 817.

<sup>4</sup> See Momigliano, ‘Pagan and Christian historiography in the fourth century’, in *Paganism and Christianity in the Fourth Century* (1963), and R. Bultmann, *History and Eschatology* (1958), 56–8, on the special importance of relative chronology to Christian historians.

<sup>5</sup> Op. cit. 53–4.

<sup>6</sup> Otto in *R.E.* suppl. ii (1913), 14; Rühl, op. cit. 294; and following them, Christ, ii. 1. 602.

<sup>7</sup> Loc. cit. 1344.

of *στέμματα* can only be intended as 'genealogies'. While this is not known to us as a title for any published king-lists, it would make quite an acceptable one.

We still have to accommodate Diogenes Laertius. The anecdote could well fit into a preamble or an aside written in rhetorical style. Justus may have begun his work with, or inserted into it, a plea of lack of experience in this kind of activity, and used the anecdote as an illustration. It would parallel Josephus' modesty about his knowledge of Greek (*A.J.* 20. 264), a profession in which there is no doubt also a certain amount of affectation. It is clear of course that Justus' digression in itself betrays a desire to parade the author's Greek culture. That would be the case, whatever its immediate context; it is a significant revelation.

If we adopt the second proposal adumbrated (p. 360), that the king-lists had been in the war history but were subsequently excerpted, then the Plato anecdote will fit in more easily, since the work in which it appeared will have been Justus' first known historical enterprise, and a longer one. The title might then be read '(a list of) the Jewish Kings in the genealogies of Justus of Tiberias', and 'genealogies' be used to refer to a part of Justus' whole work—like Thucydides' *ἀρχαιολογία*. A chronographer would have made the extract, at a time when the whole work was still available. Africanus again springs to mind, for his following immediately on Justus in Photius' *Bibliotheca* might suggest that they were in the same manuscript, or, at any rate, somehow related. This would seem to be the best solution.

There is nothing incongruous about a king-list introduced somewhere into the war history. It is noteworthy that in the *Bellum* Josephus does not plunge straight into his account of the revolt, but gives first some earlier history. Also in Josephus, we find an example of a genealogical digression: in the *Antiquities* (20. 224), when he has reached Claudius' reign, and has mentioned the completion of the Temple, he enumerates all the High Priests since Aaron, the first. The same could be done for the kings of Israel.

There is another case where, independently, the same activities on the part of an excerptor have been suspected; but, again, a simpler explanation is not excluded. The title is an almost identical one. For Clement of Alexandria claims to quote from the *περὶ τῶν ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ βασιλέων* of Demetrius (the third-century-B.C. Alexandrian chronographer) a passage about the two captivities, of Sennacherib and of Nebuchadnezzar (*Clem. Strom.* 1. 141. 1.). The other surviving fragments of Demetrius are in Eusebius (*Praep. Ev.* ix),<sup>1</sup> transmitted, like the Clement quotation, by Alexander Polyhistor. Eusebius gives no title. The fragments are a skeleton résumé of parts of the Bible narrative. Their purpose seems to be to establish the precise chronological relationship between events, and the genealogical relationship between persons. The first two, which are the major ones, link Moses with the patriarchs. Some passages seem to be simple narrative, like the one about the sweetening of the

<sup>1</sup> On Demetrius, see Freudenthal, *Alexander Polyhistor* (1874), 6 ff.; *Jewish Encyclopedia* iv (1903), 512; *R.E.* iv (1901) 2813 ff.; Gutman, *Jewish Hellenistic Literature Before the Maccabean Period*, 132–48 (1969; Hebrew); Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* i (1972), 690–4 and ii nn. 80–100. The fragments are collected by Freudenthal, and by Jacoby, *F.G.H.* iic 722. Clement (*Strom.* 1. 153. 4)

gives the same title to the work of the second-century writer Eupolemus. Eusebius once refers to a part of that as *περὶ τῆς Ἡλίου προφητείας* (*P.E.* 9. 30). See *F.G.H.* 723 F 1b and 2b. But whatever flexibility there was in the attribution of titles, a work on the Jewish War by Justus could hardly have been called 'On the Jewish Kings'.

bitter water (Freudenthal, frag. 4). We cannot tell how far the summarizing is due to Polyhistor and how far to Eusebius. As was observed by Freudenthal,<sup>1</sup> the title in Clement does not fit the fragments in Eusebius well. Only in a very loose sense indeed can their subject-matter be called 'the Judaeian kings'. Yet it is most improbable that there were two works. Freudenthal, therefore, thought that the true title had been something like *περὶ Ἰουδαίων*, and that the title in Clement was that of an excerpt, dealing, perhaps, with the period of the monarchy. Our alternative would be to suppose that *βασιλεῖς* could be used freely as the title of a work containing genealogical and chronographical material.<sup>2</sup> Similarly, if we do not accept the excerptor theory for Justus, and hold that the title in Photius was the title of Justus' second work, then in his case too, as has been said, *βασιλεῖς* might be loosely used.

5. Other references to Justus of Tiberias: these imply only knowledge through Josephus. Thus Eusebius, in the *Church History* (3. 10. 8), writes of Josephus attacking *Ἰουδοστον Τιβερίεα ὁμοίως αὐτῷ τὰ κατὰ τοὺς αὐτοὺς ἱστορήσασαι χρόνους πεπειραμένον, ὡς μὴ τάληθῇ συγγεγραφότα . . .* And Jerome (*de Viris Illustribus* 14) has 'Justus Tiberiensis de provincia Galilaea conatus est et ipse Judaicarum rerum historiam texere' etc. The entry of Stephanus of Byzantium (on *Τιβεριάς*) mentions *Ἰουστός ὁ τὸν Ἰουδαϊκὸν πόλεμον τὸν κατὰ Οὐεσπασιανοῦ ἱστορήσας*; and the *Suda* (s.v. *Ἰουστός, Τιβερέυς*) talks only about the work attacked by Josephus, saying *ἐπεχείρησε μὲν καὶ αὐτὸς Ἰουδαϊκὴν ἱστορίαν συντάξαι καὶ τινα ὑπομνήματα περιγράφειν ἄλλα τοῦτον Ἰώσηπος ἐλέγχει ψευδόμενον*. In Jerome's notice a second work is also mentioned: 'quidam commentarioli de scripturis'. Jerome must have been confused;<sup>3</sup> and this illustrates the tendency to make false attributions to Justus.

Thus there is nothing from outside to add to Photius, except what we have learnt from Diogenes Laertius. To sum up: Photius provides evidence for a slight contribution of Justus to Jewish historiography apart from what Justus wrote about the revolt. Diogenes Laertius shows that he dabbled in Greek culture. That is all that can be asserted with confidence.

## V. JUSTUS OF TIBERIAS AND JEWISH HISTORY

Into the text of the *Suda* (s.v. Phlegon of Tralles) Justus' name has been imported, on the assumption that he did write an extensive Jewish history. The text reads as follows:

τοῦτου τοῦ Φλέγοντος ὡς φησι Φιλοστόργιος<sup>1</sup> ὅσον<sup>2</sup> τὰ κατὰ τοὺς Ἰουδαίους συμπεσόντα διὰ πλείονος ἐπεξελθεῖν τοῦ πλάτους, Φλέγοντος καὶ Δίωνος βραχέως ἐπιμνησθέντων καὶ παρενθήκην αὐτὰ τοῦ οἰκείου λόγου ποιησάμενων ἐπεὶ τῶν γε εἰς εὐσέβειαν καὶ τὴν ἄλλην ἀρετὴν ἐλκόντων οὐδ' ὅτι οὐκ οὐδ' ὁδτος δέικνυται πεφροντικῶς, ὅνπερ οὐδ' ἐκείνοι τρόπον. τοῦναντίον μὲν οὖν ὁ Ἰώσηπος καὶ δεδοκῶτι ἔοικε καὶ εὐλαβουμένῳ, ὡς μὴ προσκρούσειεν Ἕλλησι.

<sup>1</sup> <περὶ> τοῦτου τοῦ Φλέγοντος [ὡς] Φιλοστόργιος φησι Kuester      <sup>2</sup> Ἰουδοστον vel potius Ἰώσηπον Vales.

Valesius' first emendation has won general acceptance.<sup>4</sup> But, quite apart

<sup>1</sup> Op. cit. 206.

<sup>2</sup> If king-lists were the first chronologies, that would be quite plausible. Since the Jews did not have a continuous history of monarchy, their patriarchs and great men would have to do instead in a survey which

went back to the period of the Pentateuch.

<sup>3</sup> Schürer, loc. cit. 59.

<sup>4</sup> e.g. Gutschmid, *Kleine Schriften*, iv (1893), 349; Wachsmuth, *Einleitung*, 438; Schürer, loc. cit. 52.

from the assumptions about Justus' work which are involved, it would seem the best way of making sense of this tortuous passage to replace *ῥσον* not by the name of another Jewish historian, but by that of Josephus, who is mentioned shortly afterwards.<sup>1</sup> The train of thought in the quotation from Philostorgius (a fifth-century bishop and historian) would then be as follows:

(a) Phlegon and Dio give brief versions in digression of the Jewish history which Josephus treats at length.

(b) They are able to use him because all three men have basically the same attitude: neither they nor he are in any way interested in the Christian aspect of the events involved (*τῶν γε εἰς εὐσέβειαν καὶ τὴν ἄλλην ἀρετὴν ἐλκόντων*).

(c) Indeed Josephus (from whom one might have expected otherwise) does the very opposite, and goes out of his way not to say anything which would not be pleasing to pagan Greeks.<sup>2</sup>

If we were to insert the name of a different Jewish historian, it would be hard to see what contrast was being subsequently drawn with Josephus. For if Josephus is writing to please Greeks his procedure will not be the opposite of the Greek historians mentioned above, but the same. And, indeed, why is Josephus introduced at all?<sup>3</sup>

It is of some importance to have established this, since there is now no reason to conclude from this passage that anyone except Josephus wrote an extensive Jewish history which was known to the early Church.

A serious attempt was made by Heinrich Gelzer to show that Jewish history from a source other than Josephus, and often in disagreement with Josephus, did reach the Christian world, and he then pointed to Justus as the only possible known candidate. He argued, in *Sextus Julius Africanus*,<sup>4</sup> that Syncellus' reports of the Maccabean dynasty, and of Alexander Jannaeus' character, his list of that king's conquests, and the story of the origin of Antipater, Herod's father (all of which he took to be from Africanus) derived from an early and independent historical source, and he identified this as Justus of Tiberias.

But he admits the divergence about the Maccabees to be insignificant. And with regard to Jannaeus, the differences also lie in minute details, mainly differences in wording and nomenclature. There is no difficulty in believing that the accounts are derivations from Josephus (together with the Maccabean literature in the first case.)

The story of Herod's descent is less easily dismissed.<sup>5</sup> It runs as follows (in Eusebius' version): Antipater, Herod's father, was the son of one Herod of Askalon, a temple slave (*ἱερόδουλος*) of Apollo. Antipater was kidnapped by Idumaeans and remained with them because his father was too poor

<sup>1</sup> Wacholder, *op. cit.* 475 n. 97, came to the same conclusion.

<sup>2</sup> For the use of *Ἕλληνες* to mean 'pagan Greeks', see Jones, *The Greek City* (1940), 298.

<sup>3</sup> For an exposition of the passage with the emendation 'Justus', see Gutschmid. The sense has to be: 'Neither Phlegon and Dio, nor Justus show any interest in what is conducive to piety. Josephus, on the other hand, avoids such subjects because he is afraid of the pagans'. This interpretation involves the additional difficulty of assuming

that Philostorgius was under the misconception that Justus was a pagan: hardly conceivable, if Philostorgius had read Josephus.

<sup>4</sup> 225-6.

<sup>5</sup> Referred to first in Justin Martyr, *Tryph.* 52, and then appearing in Africanus, *ap.* Eusebius, *H.E.* i. 6. 2-3 and 7-11 (together with the story of how Herod had the Temple archives burnt in order to efface all memory of his ignoble origins). Finally, see Syncellus, i. 561.

to ransom him. Eventually, Hyrcanus, the Jewish High Priest, saw him and took a liking to him (it is not explained how.) This was the beginning of Antipater's progress.

The origin of this story is obscure. It was a fiction of which the Christians made use to explain their hatred of Herod.<sup>1</sup> But it is not likely to have been invented by them, and probably goes back to the Jews.<sup>2</sup> There are good reasons for believing that it was used as propaganda against Herod by his Jewish subjects. First, Justin Martyr (*Tryph.* 52) actually ascribes to the Jews the view that Herod was an Askalonite. Second, there is a parallel: the stigma of originating from a slave mother had been attached to an earlier Jewish king; in Josephus, it is John Hyrcanus (*A.J.* 13. 288-98), while in the Babylonian Talmud (*Kiddushin* 66a) the same story is linked with Alexander Jannaeus. Third, it is clear that Herod's Idumaeon, non-Jewish origin was displeasing to his Jewish subjects; it must have been because of this that he put out a story through his 'official historian', Nicolaus of Damascus, to the effect that his family came from Babylon.<sup>3</sup> Our story is such as could well have been produced by Jews. The conception of *εροδουλεία* would not have been strange to them: the institution was widespread in the East.<sup>4</sup> Josephus even ascribes it to the Temple at Jerusalem (*A.J.* 11. 128). Why Askalon? Herod must have liked the city; it was one of those which he beautified, giving it baths, fountains, and colonnades (*B.J.* 1. 432), and—more significant—there was a royal palace there (*A.J.* 17. 321).

It seems right, then, to attribute the story to Jews. But we do not need to investigate its literary transmission, for the tradition is not of the kind which would originate or circulate in history books. Even at a late date, Justin Martyr could have heard it from his Jewish interlocutors; he lived at Flavia Neapolis (in Samaria). Africanus' home was in Jerusalem.<sup>5</sup> The preservation in the Babylonian Talmud of the slander against Jannaeus shows that such stories survive. In the Judaism of this period, historians were not an important instrument of tradition. Therefore we should not introduce Justus of Tiberias. And nothing disturbs our conclusion, that Justus did not produce an extensive work on the history of the Jews.

The scant attention paid to Justus by Christian writers is significant. If Justus' work was substantial, it is odd that it was not studied in the early Church in the way that Josephus' was, and preserved. He would have fulfilled the same needs for Christians as Josephus did. Except, of course, one: Josephus was thought to have noticed Christ. But then, a suitable interpolation could easily have been made in Justus too.<sup>6</sup>

It would seem permissible to go further: whatever Justus did write was

<sup>1</sup> Otto, *R.E.* viii (1912), rightly dismisses Gelzer's attempts to vindicate its truth.

<sup>2</sup> See Otto, loc. cit., and Schalit, *König Herodes* (1969), 677; the subject is treated in detail by Schalit in 'Die frühchristliche Überlieferung über die Herkunft der Familie des Herodes', *A.S.T.I.* (1962), 109-60.

<sup>3</sup> See *A.J.* 14. 8, where Josephus refers to Nicolaus. Schalit makes use of these arguments.

<sup>4</sup> *L.S.J.* s.v. *εροδουλεία*; *R.E.* viii. 1459 ff.;

Tarn and Griffiths, *Hellenistic Civilization* (1952), 171.

<sup>5</sup> Vieillefond, *Les 'Cestes' de Julius Africanus* (Florence, 1970), argues that Africanus was a Jew, but the evidence he cites seems insufficient.

<sup>6</sup> The *Testimonium Flavianum* is partly or wholly interpolation. Of a vast literature, Norden's 'Josephus und Tacitus über Jesus Christus und eine messianische Prophetie', *Neue Jahrbücher* xxxi (1913), 637 ff., should be singled out.

submerged at an early stage. The account of the Jewish war totally disappeared. The conspectus of the Jewish kings (or of Jewish history) was known to some chronographers, and dug up by the erudite Photius. Wachsmuth<sup>1</sup> noticed that there was a gap in the line of literary references to Justus: 'Bis zum Anfang des fünften Jahrhunderts, hielt sich sein Werk im Ansehen, noch Philostorgios nennt ihn mit Auszeichnung neben und vor Josephus. *Dann verschwindet es aus der Litteratur*, um noch einmal unter den Bücherschätzen von Photius aufzutauchen.' If we eliminate Philostorgios, the gap becomes more striking; and it is still longer when we remember that Eusebius had no accurate knowledge. And that of Photius was sketchy! Justus in effect faded out after the first half of the third century, when it is probable that Africanus knew him, and perhaps also Diogenes Laertius (although he may well have taken the extract from a source).<sup>2</sup>

For the early Church, Justus was on occasion a convenient figure to whom to attach a statement about Jews which required additional validation. For German scholarship, he was a convenient figure to whom to attach traditions for which *Quellenforschung* could not otherwise provide a home.

In fact, Justus' literary achievements must have been very limited. Perhaps the Hellenized Judaism of Palestine had not enough Greek education to produce a literary tradition, even if it did, in part, produce Josephus. Herod's historian was a Greek from Damascus. Of the philosophers and grammarians of Askalon, of the *littérateurs* of Gadara, none, as far as we can tell, were Jews.<sup>3</sup> The very fact that Josephus could comment on Justus' pride in his excellent Greek shows that a Jew from Tiberias was not entirely at home in the world of Greek culture.<sup>4</sup>

But we know very little; the late evidence about Justus' writings is, sadly, of little value; even the notice of Photius scarcely increases our knowledge. It is on the writings of Justus' contemporary, Josephus, that we depend, and from him, we can understand something of Justus' culture, his attitudes, and his conduct.

Justus is a figure whose interest lies in his being a representative type, a product of those Hellenized, or partly Hellenized Palestinian cities which we should like to understand better. Judaism and Hellenism had, in these cities, a subtle relationship. In 66, their reaction to the Jewish revolt was a complex one. This was a time when men's allegiances and assumptions were put to the test, and it is instructive to observe what happened to Justus in these circumstances. The comparison with Josephus adds significance to the picture.

Thus, while it is from Josephus that we learn about Justus, Justus repays by illuminating Josephus. And so their disputes have in the end turned to mutual support.

Somerville College, Oxford

TESSA RAJAK

<sup>1</sup> *Einleitung*, 438.

<sup>2</sup> Luther (op. cit. 52) takes the opposite view to mine, believing that Justus was popular among the Christians.

<sup>3</sup> For the evidence that Nicolaus was not a Jew, see M. Stern, 'Nicolaus of Damascus as a source of Jewish History in the Herodian and Hasmonian age', *Bible and Jewish History, Studies Dedicated to the Memory of Jacob Liver* (Jerusalem, 1971; Hebrew), 375.

On Askalon: *Steph. Byz.*, s.v. *Ἀσκάλων*. On Gadara: Jones, *The Greek City*, 282.

<sup>4</sup> Compare Josephus on his own difficulties with Greek: he asserts that knowledge of foreign languages was frowned on by Jews (*A.J.* 20. 264). That does not mean that Josephus did not know the language. This study of Justus may help to put Josephus' position in perspective.