ROMAN GREEK: LATINISMS IN THE GREEK OF FLAVIUS JOSEPHUS*

I. INTRODUCTION

In 1935, Johannes Hering published his dissertation entitled *Lateinisches bei Appian*. In his introduction, he states that while the influence of Greek on Latin had been the subject —already by 1935—of several investigations the same could not be said of the reverse, the influence of Latin on Greek.[1] The state of affairs some seventy years later is little changed. While the important and unequalled study of J. N. Adams addresses the question in certain instances, the main concern of his book is with speakers of Latin, whether Latin was their native or a later acquired language and their use of, struggle with or rejection of Latin with relation to conceptions of identity.[2] Even in a recent work focused on language change in which Greek authors such as Diodorus and Dionysius writing under or in imperial Rome are examined, the influence of Latin is not taken into consideration.[3]

While the present study by no means attempts to address this situation as a whole, its aim (as is the case with a few other, more recent studies) is much the same as Hering's,[4] namely, to examine in what ways the Greek of Josephus was influenced by Latin. Of course, Latin would not have been the only language to influence his Greek. Aramaic, Josephus' native language, certainly played a role. Attempting to determine the degree of influence each of these languages exercised on Josephus' Greek is also a goal of this study.

Before considering the impact Latin left on Josephus' writings, it will be helpful to review briefly the sort of investigations that have been done by those philologists and linguists who have concerned themselves with the language of Josephus. Afterwards, it will also be of benefit to consider evidence both direct and indirect relating to Josephus' knowledge of Latin. Lastly, a word on the methodology here employed will be provided.

Philological studies of Josephus' Greek

For philologists, the main concern regarding the Greek of Josephus has been the attempt to determine who influenced the Jewish historian more, Thucydides, Polybius or Dionysius of Halicarnassus.[5] While this may be a natural avenue of investigation,

[1] J. Hering, *Lateinisches bei Appian* (Diss., Leipzig, 1935), 8.

[2] J. N. Adams, *Bilingualism and the Latin Language* (Cambridge, 2003).

[3] S. Wahlgren, *Sprachwandel im Griechisch der frühen römischen Kaiserzeit* (Göteborg, 1995).

[4] E. Famerie, *Le latin et le grec d'Appien* (Geneva, 1998); M. Dubuisson, *Le latin de Polybe: les implications historiques d'un cas de bilinguisme* (Paris, 1985).

[5] The scholar who has cast the longest shadow over discussions of Josephan language and style is H. St. J. Thackeray, *Josephus: The Man and the Historian* (New York, 1929), 116ff., who argued the infamous 'assistants theory'. This theory, that two assistants were more responsible than Josephus himself for the various literary allusions in his works, has been variously rejected.

the evidence presented is often rather scanty and the methodology sometimes questionable. There is also a pre(mis)conception tacitly underlying all such investigations and one which explicitly comes to the fore in another article on Josephus' language,[6] namely the exclusion of Latin authors as possible influences.[7] It is only relatively recently that classical philologists have begun to look to Rome for possible forces at work on the narratives of Josephus.[8] These investigations, however, while necessary, interesting and representative of the direction future studies of Josephus should take, are little if at all concerned with his language from a linguistic standpoint.[9]

Linguistic studies of Josephus

On the other hand, linguists have been concerned with the author's native language, Aramaic, and its influence on his Greek, while work on Latin influence has been relegated to the occasional note or haphazard compilation.[10] Interest in the influence

T. Rajak, *Josephus: The Historian and his Society* (London, 1983), 62–3, 233–6, sums up the theory and the reasons to reject it. Concerning questions of influence exercised by various Greek historians, A. M. Eckstein, 'Josephus and Polybius: a reconsideration', *ClAnt* 9.2 (1990), 175–208, argues along with S. J. D. Cohen, 'Josephus, Jeremiah, and Polybius', *H&T* 21 (1982), 369ff. that Josephus' works have much in common with Polybius'. R. J. Shutt, *Studies in Josephus* (London, 1961) argues that Josephus imitates the style and vocabulary of Dionysius of Halicarnassus more than he does other historians, while D. J. Ladouceur, *Studies in the Language and Historiography of Flavius Josephus* (Diss., Providence, RI, 1976), 4–18, and 'The language of Josephus', *JSJ* 14.1 (1983), 21–35, believes Shutt's conclusions are wholly untenable. On the other hand, G. Mader, *Josephus and the Politics of Historiography: Apologetic and Impression Management in the Bellum Judaicum* (Leiden, 2000), esp. 55–104, argues that Josephus used Thucydides as his main model for a large extent of the *Bellum Judaicum*.

[6] G. M. Paul, 'The presentation of Titus in the *Jewish War* of Josephus: two aspects', *Phoenix* 47 (1993), 56–66, points out that Josephus employs past unreal conditional sentences for dramatic purposes in the characterization of Titus. Paul notes that this is not a common peripatetic device among Greek historians but rather Latin ones. Nevertheless, Paul claims that Josephus' use of Homer as a model is more likely than of Roman historians.

[7] In the introduction to his translation, H. St. J. Thackeray, *Josephus vol. 2, The Jewish War, Books I–III* (Cambridge, MA, 1926), xviii–xix, points out some parallels to Virgil and Sallust but attributes them to the assistants. S. Schwartz, *Josephus and Judean Politics* (Leiden–New York, 1990), 37, n. 48, agrees with Thackeray's conclusion and states, 'Josephus' first priority at Rome must have been the study of Greek, not Latin, classics, and it is hard to imagine that he would have spent much time by 81 studying Virgil and Sallust even if he had managed to learn Latin.'

[8] While it is unnecessary to mention all such works, special note should be taken of the following works and authors: S. Mason, 'Flavius Josephus in Flavian Rome: reading on and between the lines', in A. J. Boyle and W. J. Dominik (edd.), *Flavian Rome: Culture, Image, Text* (Leiden, 2003), 559–90; S. Mason, *Flavius Josephus, Translation and Commentary Volume 9: Life of Josephus* (Leiden, 2000); M. Beard, 'The triumph of Flavius Josephus', in Boyle and Dominik (above), 543–58; H. Chapman, *Spectacle and Theatre in Josephus' Bellum Judaicum* (Diss., Stanford, 1998); and M. Goodman, 'Josephus as Roman citizen', in F. Parente and J. Sievers (edd.), *Josephus and the History of the Greco-Roman Period: Essays in Memory of Morton Smith* (Leiden, 1994), 329–38.

[9] One of the most recent pieces on Josephus' language is from L. Ullmann and J. J. Price, 'Drama and history in Josephus' *Bellum Judaicum*', *SCI* 21 (2002), 97–111. This piece, however, is concerned with showing how Josephus' description of the rise and fall of Herod (*BJ* 1.204–673) is full of borrowings from not only Greek but Roman theatre. One of the larger thrusts of the piece is to make clear that the literary devices employed in this section are to be attributed to no one other than Josephus.

[10] B. Brüne, 'Latinismen bei Josephus', *Flavius Josephus und seine Schriften in seinem Verhältnis zum Judentume, zur griechisch-römischen Welt und zum Christentume* (Wiesbaden, 1969 = Gütersloh, 1913), 175–7, lists several phrases claimed to be Latinisms. Of these, three are accepted here and will be discussed below. E. Stein, *De Woordenkeuze in het Bellum Judaicum van*

of Josephus' native language is understandable and justifiable. Still, in these studies, it is either tacitly or explicitly denied that Latin had much of an influence on his Greek.[11] Even though Redondo admits that Josephus could have had a relatively early knowledge of Latin and recognizes that some reflex of that familiarity passed into his Greek, it is striking that Redondo reduces the four languages known by Josephus—Aramaic, Hebrew, Greek and Latin—to a single opposition between Greek and Aramaic.[12]

Is such an assumption, however, so unfair? As Redondo points out, 'there is no indication on the fact that Josephus spoke it [Latin] occasionally to any audience'.[13] While it is true that there is no direct evidence from Josephus or any other ancient source that he spoke Latin on any occasion, there is evidence for non-native speakers learning Latin well enough for positive performance.[14]

Second-language learners of Latin

That subjects of the empire in the West learned Latin is a given. What is often doubted is whether subjects in the East bothered to do so. Citing a passage from Gellius (19.9ff.), however, Adams points out that even some Greeks were quite familiar with Latin literature and spoke Latin well enough to feel confident in deriding the accent of a native speaker of Latin from Spain.[15] In a similar vein, Holford-Strevens (1993) and Rochette (1997) have demonstrated that Latin was more widely known than has been previously assumed—especially by scholars of Josephus.[16] In addition, and more directly related to a study on the language of Josephus, there is also evidence for native speakers of Aramaic learning Latin. Adams presents a good deal of epigraphic evidence for Palmyrenes, living in Rome or serving in the military, as ready learners of Latin.[17] Evidence of a native speaker of Nabataean who had migrated to Rome quickly acquiring Latin is also provided.[18] In

Flavius Josephus (Diss., Amsterdam, 1937) lists two Latinisms in a work largely concerned with borrowings from Greek tragedians and historians. It should be noted that both of these were already in Brüne and only one is a Latinism. S. Mason (n. 8, 2000), in his translation and commentary to Josephus' autobiography, makes note of what are basically several calques for Roman institutions, e.g. 37, n. 181, οἱ κράτιστοι for *viri egregii* (*Vit.* 29).

[11] J. Redondo, 'The Greek literary language of the Hebrew historian Josephus', *Hermes* 128.4 (2000), 420–1. J. Bernardi, 'De quelques sémitismes de Flavius Josèphe', *REG* 100 (1987), 18–27, is only concerned with Aramaicisms.

[12] Redondo (n. 10), 421.

[13] Ibid.

[14] I am here following the definition for 'positive performance' as explained by Adams (n. 2), 5–6. Of the four skills a language learner uses, listening, reading, speaking and writing, the last two are positive, while the first two are passive.

[15] B. Rochette, *Le latin dans le monde grec: recherches sur la diffusion de la langue et des lettres latines dans les provinces hellénophones de l'empire romain* (Brussels, 1997), 267–9, and Adams (n. 2), 16–17, both discuss this passage from Gellius. Rochette (269), focuses on the fact that the Greeks in the passage express their views regarding Latin poetry and not about Latin itself. Adams (16), focuses on the sociolinguistic aspect of the passage and the importance of a Spanish versus a Greek accent. Neither questions the idea that Greek literati could have been well versed in Latin literature.

[16] B. Rochette (n. 15) and L. A. Holford-Strevens, 'Utraque lingua doctus: some notes on bilingualism in the Roman Empire', in Liverpool Classical Papers 3: *Tria Lustra: Essays and Notes Presented to John Pinsent, Founder and Editor of Liverpool Classical Monthly, by some of its Contributors on the Occasion of the 150th Issue* (Liverpool, 1993), 203–13.

[17] Adams (n. 2), 247–71 on Aramaic in general, 247–64 on Palmyrene.

[18] Adams (n. 2), 264.

his concluding section on contact between speakers of Latin and Aramaic, Adams explains that 'given the power of Rome, it is not surprising that Aramaic speakers should sometimes have been learners of Latin, *particularly if they moved to the West for some reason* or joined the army'.[19] With this astute observation in mind, let us now briefly consider the situation in which Josephus found himself and whether or not it is possible to conclude, even with a lack of direct evidence, that Josephus was probably to some extent competent in Latin.

Conclusions: Josephus at Rome

Picking up on Adams' statement, it should be noted that Josephus did not 'move to the West for some reason' but for a very good reason: he had no choice. Born around C.E. 37 to a priestly aristocratic family in Judea, at the age of twenty-six Josephus took part in an embassy to intercede on behalf of some of his countrymen at Rome (*Vita* 13). There, he won their release through the intercession of Nero's wife Poppaea, into whose graces Josephus had found his way (*Vita* 16). During the early phase of the first Jewish rebellion (C.E. 66–74), Josephus led the defence of Galilee. In C.E. 67, however, he was forced to surrender himself to the Romans (*BJ* 3.392). Two years later Josephus was released from custody (*BJ* 4.622ff.). From then on, Josephus accompanied the future emperor Titus on campaign and was present with him at the fall of Jerusalem. Afterwards, Josephus returned to Rome with Titus, where Vespasian granted him citizenship, lodging and a pension (*Vita* 422–3). Rome remained Josephus' home for the rest of his days. Indeed, it is at Rome that Josephus wrote his works: *Bellum Judaicum*, *Antiquitates Judaicae*, *Vita* and *Contra Apion*.[20] He died sometime after C.E. 100. As a man who had actually taken up arms against the Romans, he owed his life to them and in particular to the Flavians.

While Josephus' Greek would have been of assistance in his dealings with the Romans, it should be borne in mind that the Romans and indeed Josephus himself were not unwavering lovers of the Greek language and culture.[21] As Adams points out, the Romans had a certain insecurity regarding the relationship between Greek and Latin and often used Latin to assert their authority.[22] A cursory glance at the *Apologia* of Apuleius reveals the other side of that same coin: that non-native Latin speakers could assert their literary knowledge and especially their use of Latin as evidence of their Roman identity in order to gain the acceptance, favour or decision of a Roman official.[23]

It certainly, then, would have served Josephus well to have been able to acquire, or improve, his Latin as quickly as possible. For a man who had survived the civil

[19] Adams (n. 2), italics added.

[20] *Bellum Judaicum* was published between C.E. 75 and 79. *Antiquitates Judaicae* was published in C.E. 93 or 94. *Vita* was either published along with *AJ* in C.E. 93/94 or after 100 and appended to *AJ*. For a detailed discussion of the question of *Vita*'s date, see Mason (n. 8, 2000), xv–xix. *Contra Apion* was published sometime after *Vita*.

[21] E. Gruen, 'Jewish perspectives on Greek culture and ethnicity', in I. Malkin (ed.), *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity* (Washington–Cambridge, MA, 2001), 352–3, points out several instances of Josephus' disparaging of Greek culture. Josephus also has nothing good to say about Greeks' character at *BJ* 1.16 where they are described as eloquent only in matters where personal profit is concerned. Also, Mason (n. 8, 2000), xxi and 45–7, notes that the views expressed towards Greek culture in *Vita* 40–2 are similar to those found in Roman literature.

[22] Adams (n. 2), 756.

[23] B. Keith, 'Law, magic, and culture in the Apologia of Apuleius', *Phoenix* 51.2 (1997), 203–23.

upheaval in his own country, won the favour of the future imperial family and formerly won favour with Poppaea, every means of self-preservation including the ability to communicate well with his benefactors must have been familiar and desirable.

A word on methodology

Because it is not always clear what constitutes a 'Latinism', especially with regard to certain syntactical constructions, and because there is no ready handbook or general work on Latinisms, several works have here been frequently consulted. The dissertation of Johannes Hering mentioned at the outset has been regularly used as a ready and reliable resource for Latinisms as well as for the overall structure of the study. Alongside Hering's work, Dubuisson's (1985) study of Polybius, Famerie's (1998) of Appian, and Adams' (2003) of bilingualism have also been frequently and profitably employed in identifying Latinisms and Latinate constructions.[24] Unfortunately, some more modern studies on Latin influence on Greek or on later Greek generally have proved less fruitful for the purposes of this study.[25]

Whenever and wherever possible, however, other, previously identified Latinisms in Josephus have been quarried from earlier works.[26] Searches were carried out both electronically, using the *TLG*, and by hand.[27]

II. RESULTS

Lexical[28]

ἔτος τι ἄγειν

AJ 19.350: τὸν βίον κατέστρεψεν, ἀπὸ γενέσεως ἄγων πεντηκοστὸν ἔτος καὶ τέταρτον

Carrying out the fifty-fourth year after his birth, he died.   (*AJ* 19.354)[29]

---

[24] Adams (n. 2). Dubuisson and Famerie (n. 4).

[25] In a recent piece on the influence of Latin on the Greek system of address, E. Dickey, 'The Greek address system of the Roman period and its relationship to Latin', *CQ* 54.2 (2004), 494–527, argues that the classical address system was lost in the Hellenistic period and replaced by a Latin-based one in the Roman period. In literary works of the Roman period, however, authors tended to use the classical system much in the same way that they continued to use the classical language. A quick look at Dickey, *Greek Forms of Address: From Herodotus to Lucian* (Oxford, 1996), 22, 270, 273 and 276 reveals that Josephus does not use a Latinate system of address. In fact, only four of the 195 addresses in Josephus employ terms usual in the Latinate system, and these are not used in a Latinate way. Rochette (n. 15) is concerned with Latin diffusion as opposed to how that diffusion impacted on the Greek of any given author. V. Bubenik, *Hellenistic and Roman Greece as a Sociolinguistic Area* (Amsterdam, 1989) is also largely unconcerned with Latin influence on any given author and is more focused on the development of Koine and its regional variations as reflected in the epigraphic evidence.

[26] For this, Dubuisson (n. 4) has proved most beneficial in terms of numbers and discussion.

[27] The method of collection will be made clear at the beginning of each section. In all events, the text used is B. Niese, *Flavii Iosephi Opera* (Berlin, 1885–94).

[28] Lexical searches were carried out electronically using the *TLG* edition E. The results discussed here have all been identified as Latinisms by Hering (n. 1), 11–33, though his discussion is limited to Appian's usage and does not touch on the occurrences of these words in Josephus.

[29] Citations listed in parentheses are other instances of the phrase or word under discussion.

The phrase ἔτος τι ἄγειν is not used in classical Greek to denote age. Instead, phrases consisting of ἔτος τι with ζῆν, ἔχειν, εἶναι, βιόω or γίγνομαι are by far more common. On the other hand, the expression ἔτος τι ἄγειν corresponds directly to the Latin *annum agere* (as in Cic. *Sen.* 32, *quartum ago annum et octogesimum*). The similarity in meanings of these two verbs especially with regards to their shared meaning of 'to spend time' has obviously led to the extended use of ἄγειν in these instances in the Greek of Josephus.

πρὸς γάμον ἄγειν
πρὸς γάμον διδόναι

AJ 5.155: ἀνδρὶ Βενιαμίτῃ δώσειν πρὸς γάμον θυγατέρα

. . . to give his daughter in marriage to a Benjamite man.
(*AJ* 12.154, 13.116, 14.353, 16.224, 20.139, 20.145, 20.149; *Vita* 4)

These phrases are in no way classical. In classical Greek, there are several verbs and idioms to express the idea 'to marry someone' (among others, Hdt. 1.107, θυγατέρα διδόναι τινὶ γυναῖκα: Eur. *Or.* 1654–5, ὃς δ᾽ οἴεται // Νεοπτόλεμος γαμεῖν νιν, οὐ γαμεῖ ποτε). Josephus also uses these more classical phrases (as in, *AJ* 13.110, τήν τε θυγατέρα δώσειν αὐτῷ . . . γυναῖκα: and *AJ* 1.265, Ἡσαῦς . . . γαμεῖ Ἄδαν τὴν Ἥλωνος καὶ Ἀλιβάμην τὴν Εὐσεβεῶνος). The phrases πρὸς γάμον ἄγειν and πρὸς γάμον διδόναι quite strikingly correspond to the Latin, *in matrimonium dare/agere* (as in, Livy 1.9, *filia Aeneai in matrimonium data*: Caes. *B Gall.* 1.9.5, *Orgetorigis filiam in matrimonium duxerat*).

συγγνώμην διδόναι

BJ 1.11: διδότω παρὰ τὸν τῆς ἱστορίας νόμον συγγνώμην τῷ πάθει

May he [the reader] grant [me] an allowance for the affections beyond the custom of history.
(*BJ* 1.484, 6.391)

There are several ways to grant or obtain pardon, forgiveness, or lenience in classical Greek (συγγνώμην ἔχειν, συγγνώμην ποιεῖσθαι, συγγνώμην νέμειν, συγγνώμη γίγνεται, and συγγνώμη ἐστί). Of the various classical ways, Josephus favors συγγνώμην νέμειν and συγγνώμην ἔχειν (as in, *AJ* 2.156, ὡς ἀνθρώπινον τοῖς τοιούτοις συγγνώμην νέμειν: and *AJ* 16.186, ἐκείνῳ μὲν οὖν πολλὴν ἄν τις, ὡς ἔφην, ἔχοι τὴν συγγνώμην). συγγνώμην διδόναι, however, is a reflection of the Latin phrase *veniam dare* (as in, Livy 8.35.2, *ut veniam errori . . . daret*). The occurrence of this Latinate phrase in the passage quoted is especially striking seeing that the citation is from the earliest part of Josephus' earliest work, and thereby demonstrates that the influence of Latin on Josephus' Greek was present from the very beginning of his literary career.

ἐξοπλίζειν

BJ 6.70 (classical): Καῖσαρ δὲ τοῦ σημείου κατακούσας ἐξοπλίζει τήν τε δύναμιν διὰ τάχους

Caesar, upon hearing the signal, quickly armed the forces.

AJ 9.179 (Latinate): καταλείπειν δ᾽ ἐξωπλισμένον τοῖς Σύροις καὶ τοῖς ἀπ᾽ αὐτῶν πολεμίοις.

. . . leaving him unarmed before the Syrians and the enemies after them.

In classical Greek, ἐξοπλίζειν means 'to arm'. Indeed, Josephus uses the verb with exactly this meaning in the passage from *BJ*. In his later work, however, he uses the verb with a meaning that reflects the Latin *exarmare* 'to disarm' (as in, Lucan 8.386, *Medos proelia prima exarmant*).[30] It must be noted, however, that there is a variant reading of ἐξωπλισμένοις, which would then modify τοῖς Σύροις and have its classical meaning, while leaving the direct object unstated. In spite of this, Niese and other editors adopt the reading presented here. There are obvious advantages to retaining the accusative. First of all, without it, καταλείπειν has no direct object. Second, the change from accusative to dative would be an easy mistake for a scribe more familiar with classical Greek than with the Latinate meaning of ἐξοπλίζειν. If the accusative is retained with Niese and others, it is a striking example of the direct influence of Latin on the Greek of Josephus.

ἐπιτάφιος ἔπαινος

AJ 7.6: ἔγραψε δὲ καὶ θρήνους καὶ ἐπιταφίους ἐπαίνους Σαούλου καὶ Ἰωνάθου

He wrote dirges and funeral orations of Saul and Jonathan.

Eulogies are expressed with the phrase ἐπιτάφιος λόγος in classical Greek. Josephus is here mirroring the Latin, *laus*/*laudatio funebris* (as in, Livy 8.40.4, *vitiatam memoriam funebribus laudibus reor*). Also found in post-classical Greek for 'eulogy' is ἐπιτάφιος. This usage is also attested in Josephus in two passages (*AJ* 7.42, 17.177). Again interesting to note is the complete lack of possibility that this Latinism could have found its way into the text from Josephus' source, seeing that his source at this point would have been the Old Testament.

στρατόπεδον τίθεσθαι

BJ 4.662: τὸ πέμπτον ἐν Γάζῃ τίθεται στρατόπεδον

He placed the fifth camp in Gaza.

Vit. 214: τίθεμαι κἀγὼ στρατόπεδον

I also placed a camp.

In classical Greek, the idea 'to encamp' is usually expressed with στρατοπεδεύειν, στρατόπεδον ποιεῖσθαι, or τειχίζειν among others.[31] In these two instances, the influence of the Latin *castra ponere* (as in Caes. *B Gall.* 7.35; Livy 2.53.4; Sall. *Jug.* 75) is very clear. In most other instances Josephus uses the classical στρατοπεδεύειν (as in, *AJ* 6.170, ἐπί τινος ὄρους στρατοπεδευσάμενος). In the first passage cited, it could be possible to argue that he has made a mistake and simply literally translated what he found in the commentaries of Titus. Concerning the second passage, however, there seems little chance Josephus was relying on a Latin source to write his autobiography.

---

[30] This use also occurs in Appian 26.21, 526.19, 714.10 and 485.26, as Hering (n. 1), 20–1, points out. Famerie (n. 4), 238, n. 138, notes that this word also occurs in Patristic literature (*PG* 34.428A) with the metaphoric meaning of 'to be disarmed, to be defenseless'.

[31] Dubuisson (n. 4), 201, 344, n. 540.

Latinisms previously identified

All the Latinisms so far discussed were first pointed out by Hering in his discussion of Appian.[32] They have not, however, been discussed in other works about Josephus as Latinisms. As mentioned above, though, other authors have noted Latinisms in Josephus. Because the Latinity of these phrases has already been discussed by others, there is no need to do so again here. In order to more fully appreciate the lexical impact of Latin on Josephus, however, they will simply be listed with their Latin parallels, the occurrences in Josephus and reference to the most fruitful discussion on the Latinity of each phrase:

ἀπελπίζειν: *desperare* (*BJ* 1.462, 4.397, 5.354, 5.490, 6.368)[33]

ἀποτίθεσθαι τὴν ἀρχήν: *deponere imperium/magistratum/consulatum* (*AJ* 5.232)[34]

διακλείειν: *intercludere* (*BJ* 1.365, 4.427, 6.89; *AJ* 14.46, 18.164, 18.260, 19.102)[35]

διαρπαγή: *direptio* (*AJ* 6.120, 122, 142, 8.294, 9.40, 9.82, 9.84, 12.267, 19.93; *Vita* 333)[36]

στρατόπεδον κινεῖν: *castra movere* (*BJ* 1.297; *AJ* 14.406)[37]

τὰ νῶτα τοῖς πολεμίοις ἐντρέπειν: *terga vertere* (*AJ* 20.78)[38]

τάχα μὲν . . . τάχα δὲ: *modo . . . modo* (*BJ* 1.616)[39]

ἐνέδραν τιθέναι: *insidias ponere* (*AJ* 6.135)[40]

Roman institutions

So far in discussing the lexical Latinisms of Josephus, no mention has been made of how Josephus discusses things Roman, for example government or military officials. Such vocabulary, however, was unavoidable for anyone writing historical works in which the Romans played any role whatsoever. Two quick examples should suffice to make clear the point that Josephus' works are filled with this sort of institutional vocabulary as well. First, Josephus employs ὕπατος for *consul* a total of thirty-four times in all. Second, for *procurator* Josephus uses ἐπίτροπος no fewer than twenty-five times in his works. One can imagine how often Greek equivalents for words such as *cohors*, *legio*, *senator* and the like are employed by Josephus. While this is no place for a full discussion of the terms Josephus uses for 'la transposition des réalités romaines' as Dubuisson calls it, one should simply be aware that the Greek of Josephus is filled with such words and that they occur in every stage of his writing.[41]

---

[32] Hering (n. 1), 11–33.

[33] Dubuisson (n. 4), 154, 320, n. 55.

[34] Dubuisson (n. 4), 155, 321, n. 64.

[35] Dubuisson (n. 4), 158–60, 322, n. 108. Also, Hering (n. 1), 15–16.

[36] Dubuisson (n. 4), 160–1, 323, n. 121.

[37] Dubuisson (n. 4), 182–3, for a discussion on κινεῖν generally and 183 for this idiom. Also, Brüne (n. 10), 175 and Stein (n. 10), 124.

[38] Brüne (n. 10), 175.

[39] Brüne (n. 10), 177.

[40] Dubuisson (n. 4), 167–9.

[41] Dubuisson (n. 4), 18–59. Famerie (n. 4), 65–211 also devotes much time to the discussion of institutional vocabulary in Appian.

Syntactical

(1) Temporal dative: time within which[42]

In classical Greek, the dative used on its own in expressions of time denotes a point in time, that is time 'at which'. Some post-classical Greek authors, however, use the dative, with no preposition, to express the idea of time 'within which', an idea that is otherwise conveyed in classical authors by ἐντός or ἐπί with the genitive, κατά with the accusative, ἐν with the dative or the genitive with no preposition.

    Concerning expressions of time 'within which', Hering noted that Thucydides, in his first four books, prefers the preposition ἐν with the dative to the alternatives.[43] For the idea of time 'within which', however, Thucydides does not employ the dative alone.[44] Polybius, on the other hand, is the first Greek historian to use this dative, though he generally tends to use ἐν with the dative.[45] After Polybius, Josephus is the next author to use the dative alone to express time 'within which.' According to Hering, however, Josephus uses this dative with far less frequency than Appian and tends to use other expressions just as often, as can be seen here:[46]

	ἐντός	ἐν dative	Genitive	Dative
Josephus[47]	—	3	—	3
Appian	1	24	8	44

    While Hering had little need to search a large portion of the text of other authors, the results he presents from Books 1 and 2 of *BJ* is hardly enough of a representative sample to understand how this dative is used in relation to equivalent expressions. Therefore, the corpus has been expanded from that searched by Hering and has thereby yielded some striking results:[48]

ἐπί genitive	κατά accusative	ἐν dative	Genitive	Dative
3	12	12	15	19

    By increasing the number of books under investigation, then, a better idea of how Josephus uses this dative has been reached. Contrary to Hering's findings, it is evident that the dative alone is the more common expression of time 'within which' used by Josephus. Is this use, however a Latinism? Or, does it find entrance via internal factors?[49]

---

[42] Searches for this and the following section on the dative of duration were done by hand. The whole of Josephus was not searched, but rather *BJ* 5: 7; *AJ* 1: 5: 9: 13: 17: 20; *Vita* (all); *Ap.* (all, excluding passages cited from other historians).

[43] Hering (n. 1), 34–8 discusses this dative. With regards to the authors other than Appian, however, Hering was concerned only with identifying their tendencies for expressions of time. He therefore only searched the first few books of each author's work. In the case of Josephus, that means the first two books of *BJ*.

[44] Hering (n. 1), 34–6 with table on 35.

[45] As Hering (n. 1), 35 and Dubuisson (n. 4), 238, both point out, this dative occurs in Pl. *Euthyd.* 303, Xen. *An.* 1.8.22, and in Hom. *Il.* 6.422. As Hering and Dubuisson discuss, however, the readings in Plato and Xenophon are doubted and usually emended by Heindorf and Bisschop respectively.

[46] Hering (n. 1), 35 with table.

[47] Hering (n. 1), 34–6 only examined the first two books of *BJ*.

[48] See Appendix A for a listing of the occurrences.

[49] These questions are raised by Adams (n. 2), 507 in his discussion of this dative.

As Adams points out, the similarity between the uses and also their 'graphic forms' gave rise to other instances of the dative used for the ablative by speakers whose first language was Latin as well as by those who were native speakers of Greek.[50] These new uses of the dative first entered the language when second-language speakers of Greek began to endow the dative with ablatival uses not common before. As a result, in any bilingual community, such as Rome, native speakers of Greek would have been in contact not only with native Latin speakers but also with speakers and writers of 'Roman Greek'. Therefore, new uses of the dative were incorporated into the language because of contact with 'Roman Greek' along with the imitation of the ablative in certain contexts. Such uses eventually became somewhat standard for later Greek writers who need not have perceived them as Latinisms—such could be the case with this dative.[51]

While Adams believes 'there is good reason to see a link between the usage in question [dative of time 'within which'] in Greek and Latin', he is not yet convinced that Latin was the only factor at play and suggests that more work is needed.[52] Besides the use of this dative by Polybius, Appian and Josephus, however, there are other factors to consider that strongly suggest that this dative is indeed a Latinism.

First of all, because the use of prepositions in general had become more common in later Greek than in classical Greek and because the preposition ἐν could be used both to express time 'at which' and time 'within which', one would expect that the use of ἐν with the dative would be the more common expression for time 'within which' as opposed to the dative alone. Additionally, the dative used alone had become less, not more, common in Koine. As Dubuisson notes with regard to this use of the dative, 'the extension of the dative alone . . . is, then, directly opposed to the natural tendencies of the language' and 'can hardly be explained without foreign influence'.[53]

Finally, in all of Greek literature before Polybius, there are only three instances of this dative. Two of these are doubtful readings and normally emended by editors.[54] In Polybius, there are only four instances.[55] Then, in the first century C.E., as has been seen, this dative burst back onto the scene, being used by authors who were exposed to Latin and its influence. It seems more likely that this occurrence was due to the influence of Latin than to coincidence.

Nevertheless, to say, as Hering did, that this dative is 'ohne Zweifel' a Latinism may be going too far for anyone who is satisfied with nothing less than every last shred of evidence.[56] On the other hand, it is hoped that with the added evidence from Josephus enough weight has been added to tip the scales in favor of the Latinity of this dative.

(2) Temporal dative: duration[57]

The range of the temporal dative was not only extended to expressions of time 'within which' but also to expressions of duration where one would expect the

---

[50] Adams (n. 2), 497–509.

[51] Adams (n. 2), 509.

[52] Adams (n. 2), 507–8.

[53] Hering (n. 1), 37. Dubuisson (n. 4), 239: 'L'extension du datif seul . . . est donc directement opposé aux tendances naturelles de la langue; ce phénomène ne se conçoit guère sans une influence étrangère.'

[54] See above, n. 42. Hom. *Il.* 6.422, ἰῷ ἤματι is the only reading of this dative not doubted.

[55] Dubuisson (n. 4), 238: 1.1.5, 4.32.8, 31.29, 12.38.1.

[56] Hering (n. 1), 37.

[57] The method of collection and books searched are the same for this section as the previous, n. 40.

accusative of extent, again due to the influence of the ablative. In Latin funerary
inscriptions as well as in literature (especially of the first century C.E.) the ablative was
also used to express duration.[58] In Greek authors writing before the first century C.E.,
this dative is even rarer than the previous one discussed.

Indeed, the dative of duration is absent from Thucydides, Polybius and Diodorus.
Instead, these authors employ ἀνά with the accusative, διά with the genitive, εἰς with
the accusative, ἐπί with the accusative and most frequently the accusative alone to
express duration—all of which are classical expressions.[59]

As with the dative of time 'within which', Hering compared Appian's use of the
dative of duration to other authors. For Josephus, Hering found that the accusative is
used most often, though only slightly so:

	ἀνά	εἰς	διά	ἐπί	Accusative	Dative
	(accusative)	(accusative)	(genitive)	(accusative)		
Josephus	—	—	—	2	14	10
Appian	4	13	5	15	30	34

Upon closer examination, however, it can be seen that the dative of duration is less
common in Josephus than Hering believed:[60]

ἀνά (accusative)	εἰς (accusative)	διά (genitive)	ἐπί (accusative)	Accusative	Dative
1	6	12	28	114	21

There is no question, then, that Josephus uses classical constructions with far
greater frequency than the Latinate dative. The infrequency of this dative becomes all
the more striking and surprising when one considers that the dative of duration has
also been identified as an Aramaicism.[61] It seems counter-intuitive that a use of the
dative that has both Latin and Aramaic forerunners should occur so rarely in an
author whose native language was Aramaic and who had constant contact with Latin
and Roman speakers of Greek. What this indicates regarding the relative influence of
Latin and Aramaic on Josephus' Greek will be discussed later.

(3) Temporal dative: dative absolute

AJ 14.237: Λευκίῳ Λέντλῳ Γαΐῳ Μαρκέλλῳ ὑπάτοις

. . . when Lucius Lentulus and Gaius Marcellus were consuls

The Latin influence in such a usage of the dative is self-evident. Often in Greek
inscriptions, such ablative absolutes are reproduced with the dative.[62] In this instance,
a decree of Lentulus exempting Jews from military service has been reproduced by
Josephus as such a decree would have appeared when posted. In Appian, Hering
identifies no less than five dative absolutes where a genitive absolute should stand.[63]

---

[58] See Adams (n. 2), 504–5, for a discussion of this ablative and the corresponding Greek
dative in inscriptions and Hering (n. 1), 38–41, for the discussion of the dative of duration as a
whole and the table on 41 for occurrences of the ablative of duration in various Latin authors.
[59] Hering (n. 1), table 39.
[60] See Appendix B for a listing of the occurrences.
[61] Bernardi (n. 11), 26 and Redondo (n. 11), 431.
[62] Adams (n. 2), 503–4. Hering (n. 1), 42.
[63] Hering (n. 1), 42–3.

This seems, however, to be the only occurrence of the dative absolute in Josephus and can be attributed more to his efforts to reproduce the style of such decrees than to another extension of the ablatival dative.

The middle[64]

In classical Greek, the middle voice is used mainly in two ways, either as a direct reflexive with the subject acting directly on herself or as an indirect reflexive with the subject acting for herself, with reference to herself or with something belonging to herself. In the first instance, 'self' is the direct object, in the second, indirect.

In his study on Appian, Hering noted several instances of a reflexive pronoun with verbs in the active or middle voice used to express the direct or indirect reflexive ideas discussed above in situations where a simple middle would seem to have sufficed in classical Greek.[65] Coupled with this, he found that Appian never used the verb ῥίπτειν reflexively in the classical way, that is in the active with a reflexive pronoun to mean 'to throw oneself'. Rather, he noted that Appian always used the middle of this verb in combination with a reflexive, something that would not be found in a classical author. Considering these factors, Hering posited that Appian's feel for the middle had been dampened by the fact that there is, strictly speaking, no middle in Latin.[66]

As noted at the outset, it is not always easy to determine whether a given phenomenon is the result of Latin influence or not. Such is the case in this instance. The attempt has therefore been made to demonstrate more concretely the influence of Latin on this aspect of Josephus' Greek by presenting only those phrases containing reflexives where one would expect a middle in classical Greek and those for which direct Latin influence can be rather confidently, indeed in some cases extremely confidently, argued. These phrases are here listed along with the corresponding Latin idiom:

sibi (com)parare

BJ 7.300: αὐτῷ τὸν Ἡρώδην τοῦτο τὸ φρούριον εἰς ὑποφυγὴν ἑτοιμάζειν
BJ 2.57: ἁρπαγὰς ῥαδίως ἐκ τοῦ πυρὸς αὐτῷ ποριζόμενος
BJ 2.437: δεύτερον ἑαυτοῖς ἔρυμα κατεσκεύασαν
                                   (*BJ* 3.70, 4.137, 5.26, 5.436; *AJ* 6.156, 13.63, 14.51)

se occultare/se celare/se condere

AJ 19.248: ἐν τῇ πόλει κλέπτοντες ἑαυτοὺς ἐνεδοίαζον πρὸς τὴν ἀκρόασιν
AJ 7.218: εἴς τινα τῶν αὐλώνων ἑαυτὸν ἀποκρύψει
                                   (*BJ* 3.341; *AJ* 6.99, 8.269, 13.108, 14.22, 19.126, 19.212)

se includere

AJ 7.220: ἂν δ᾽ ὁ πατὴρ αὐτὸν εἰς πολιορκίαν περικλείσῃ   (*BJ* 5.427; *AJ* 9.61, 13.36)

sibi defendere

AJ 2.73: οὐδὲν ἀμύνειν αὐτῷ δυνάμενον   (προσ- *BJ* 2.548, 3.478)

---

[64] Searches for this section were done electronically using the *TLG* edition E.
[65] Hering (n. 1), 53.
[66] Hering (n. 1), 55.

se vocare

AJ 4.73: καὶ οἱ κορβᾶν αὐτοὺς ὀνομάσαντες τῷ θεῷ   (*BJ* 4.161; *AJ* 12.239)

sibi parere/sibi acquirere

AJ 1.261: κτώμενος αὐτῷ τὴν ἄδειαν   (*AJ* 19.122; *Vita* 302)

se gerere

AJ 3.212: ἄγων ἑαυτὸν δημοτικώτερον   (*AJ* 19.213)

se dedecorare

BJ 7.324: πρὸς ὃν αὐτοὺς μὴ καταισχύνωμεν
AJ 1.9: ἐμαυτὸν αἰσχυνόμενος

se abrumpere

AJ 10.37: ἀπέρρηξεν ἑαυτὸν τῶν τοῦ πατρὸς ἐπιτηδευμάτων   (*Vita* 11)

se purgare

AJ 9.262: καθᾶραι δ' αὐτοὺς ἐκ τῶν προτέρων μιασμάτων   (*AJ* 12.106)

se suspendere

AJ 7.229: παρελθὼν εἰς τὸ μυχαίτατον τῆς οἰκίας ἀνήρτησεν ἑαυτόν

se contegere

AJ 9.209: ὁ δὲ Ἰωνᾶς συγκαλύψας αὑτόν

se exspoliare

BJ 6.399: οἱ μέν γε τύραννοι τῆς ἀσφαλείας ἐγύμνωσαν αὐτούς

se surripere

AJ 6.63: ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς ὄψεως αὐτὸν τῆς τῶν βασιλευθησομένων ἐξέκλεψεν

se dicare/se dedicare

AJ 4.72: ὅσοι δ' ἂν αὐτοὺς καθιερῶσιν εὐχὴν πεποιημένοι

se devovere

BJ 3.384: καθοσιώσαντες ἑαυτοὺς τῷ θανάτῳ

se dissimulare

AJ 7.257: μετασχηματίσας γὰρ ἑαυτὸν Δαυίδης

se exuere

AJ 9.111: ἕκαστος περιδύων αὑτόν

se amicire

AJ 1.44: φύλλοις οὖν ἑαυτοὺς συκῆς ἐσκέπασαν

se erigere

BJ 1.617: τῇ τόλμῃ παρακροτήσας ἑαυτόν

se vendere

BJ 4.248: ἂν ἡμεῖς Ῥωμαίοις προσπωλοῖμεν ἑαυτοὺς νῦν

se fidere

BJ 7.396: πάντες οὕτως αὑτοῖς ἐθάρρουν

sibi reperire

AJ 1.44: σκέπην αὑτοῖς ἐπενόουν·

Although it cannot be claimed that Josephus has entirely lost his feel for the correct use of the middle voice, it seems that in these instances Latin idioms and the lack of a middle voice in Latin have played decisive roles in forming some phrases used by Josephus. Josephus, as opposed to Appian, however, often uses the middle correctly, as can be seen by the fact that Josephus uses ῥίπτειν always in the classical sense and never employs a reflexive with the middle of that verb. Still, either his grasp of the middle was not tight enough to be impervious to Latin influence or that influence was so constant and pervasive that his use of the middle was affected.

Indirect discourse[67]

Another phenomenon in Josephus that seems to be a result of Latin influence is found in instances of indirect discourse in which the subject of the main verb and the verb of the indirect discourse are one and the same and where the latter is expressed by the reflexive in the accusative. While this usage is occasionally attested in classical Greek, it is relatively rare. Usually in classical Greek when the subject of the main verb and the verb of indirect discourse are the same, the subject of the indirect discourse is simply left out entirely. In Latin, on the other hand, it is the general practice to state the subject of the indirect statement whether it is the same as that of the main verb or not.

In classical Greek, though, authors place the subject of the indirect discourse in the nominative, when it is the same as that of the main verb. When the reflexive is used in indirect discourse, the purpose is usually for emphasis. For instance, if a verb introducing indirect discourse governs two different verbs, each with its own subject, or one verb with more than one subject, the reflexive is then generally employed.

Josephus' use of the reflexive as the subject of indirect discourse is considerably more frequent than one would expect in a classical author.[68] It seems likely that Latin has played a role here.

---

[67] Searches for this phenomenon were done by looking for instances of the reflexive pronoun in the accusative using the *TLG* edition E.

[68] See Appendix C for a listing of occurrences.

III. CONCLUSION

The obvious and first conclusion to be drawn is that the Greek of Josephus shows the heavy influence of Latin, visible not only in his vocabulary but in his syntax as well. Still, a few questions, posed at the outset, remain. Namely, was the influence of Latin on the Greek of Josephus anywhere near that of his native language of Aramaic?

While it would be difficult to answer such a question based only on the evidence here presented, there are earlier studies by Bernardi (1987) and Redondo (2000) that are focused on Aramaicisms. Using evidence from those studies along with that presented here, some comparisons between and conclusions about the respective influence of Aramaic and Latin on the Greek of Josephus can indeed be drawn.

Aramaic and Latin influence

Two of the Aramaicisms identified in these earlier studies have to do with expressions of time and shed a good deal of light on the situation under discussion here. First of all, κατά with the accusative to express time 'within which' is taken by Bernardi to be an Aramaicism in two instances in Book 5 of the *BJ*, Josephus' first work.[69] κατά with the accusative for this expression of time is obviously acceptable Greek of all periods. When it is used with ἡμέρα in the plural, however, Bernardi claims it as a result of Aramaic influence.[70] Of the twelve instances of κατά in this sense of time 'within which', those two mentioned by Bernardi are the only occurrences of ἡμέρα in the plural as its object. The last instance of κατά to express time 'within which' is found in the last work written by Josephus, *Ap.* 2.17. In other words, the use of the preposition did not fade with time, but the Aramaic use of it did.

There is another Aramaicism that seems to decrease with time, namely temporal ὡς. It will quickly be recognized that this construction is by no means unknown in Greek that is unaffected by Semitic influence. As Redondo points out, however, it is not the mere occurrence of temporal ὡς that marks the construction as Aramaic but its frequency.[71] In the first book of *BJ*, 10 per cent of the total instances of ὡς are temporal, while the frequency drops to 4 per cent in the last book.[72]

The dative of duration is also identified by both Bernardi and Redondo as corresponding to a use of the Aramaic and Hebraic dative.[73] As was seen above, Appian was familiar with and actually preferred this use of the dative to other expressions of duration. In Josephus, however, it is by no means the favoured construction for this expression of time. It is not even the second most common but the third. The accusative, which is unquestionably the preferred construction in classical Greek, is by far the most common durative in Josephus.

Also of import to this discussion is the distribution of this dative. In the two books of *BJ* examined here, this dative occurs a total of five times, in the six books of *AJ*, sixteen, in *Vita* none, in *Ap.* none as well. A closer look at the distribution in *AJ* is also noteworthy. Each of the sixteen dative of durations in *AJ* occur in Books 1, 5, 9 and

---

[69] Bernardi (n. 11), 25. It should be noted that Bernardi is concerned only with Book 5 of *BJ*. It will also be remembered that the order of publication of Josephus' works is as follows, *BJ*, *AJ*, *Vita*, *Ap*. For the dates of publication, see above n. 20.

[70] Bernardi (n. 11), 25.

[71] Redondo (n. 11), 430.

[72] Ibid.

[73] Redondo (n. 11), 431. Bernardi (n. 11), 26, points out that 'l'emploi du datif pour indiquer la durée pourrait correspondre à l'emploi de la préformante *l-* en hébreu'.

13. There are no such datives in Books 17 and 20 of *AJ*, in *Vita*, or in *Ap.*. It seems, then, that this dative, possibly influenced by the similar Aramaic and Hebrew usage, becomes less frequent as time goes on.

The dative of time 'within which', on the other hand, is used throughout the whole of the corpus. In Books 5 and 7 of *BJ*, there are seven such datives. This dative also appears in *Vita* and *Ap.* and is almost assuredly a Latinism corresponding to the use of the ablative.

Considering the consistent use of the dative of time 'within which' alongside the declining use of these Aramaicisms, for instance the dative of duration, temporal ὡς and κατά with ἡμέρα in the plural, it seems that Latin exercised a steady, and rather extensive influence on the Greek of Josephus, while Aramaic influence seems to have waned with time. While the Latinity of Josephus' Greek has long been overlooked and underappreciated, it is clear that this influence extended into every part of his Greek from his syntax to his vocabulary in all of his works.

Department of Classics, New York University   J. S. WARD
                                                              jsw298@nyu.edu

APPENDIX A

Dative of time 'within which'

ἐπί with the genitive—3 times:

BJ 5.490: ἐπί μιᾶς ὥρας
in one hour   (*Ap.* 1.184, 1.185)

κατά with the accusative—12 times:

BJ 5.236: εἰσῄει δ' ἅπαξ κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν μόνος
. . . he entered [the inner sanctuary] alone once in the year
                          (*BJ* 5.109, 5.312, 5.407; *AJ* 1.58, 1.80, 1.81, 1.86, 1.150, 5.212;
                                                              Vita 353; *Ap.* 2.17)

ἐν with the dative—12 times:

AJ 1.6: πόσους τε πολέμους ἐν μακροῖς πολεμήσαντες χρόνοις
. . . how many wars they fought in ages long ago
                                      (*AJ* 1.80, 1.121, 5.197, 5.271, 13.168, 13.427, 17.162,
                                                              20.118, 20.161; *Vita* 80; *Ap.* 2.25)

Genitive—15 times:

BJ 5.503: περιιὼν γὰρ αὐτὸς ἑκάστης ἡμέρας πολλάκις ἐπεσκόπει τὸ ἔργον
For, many times each day, [Titus] himself, going around, inspected the work.
                                      (*BJ* 7.123; *AJ* 1.55, 1.244, 5.45, 5.218, 9.54, 9.155, 9.164,
                                                              13.175, 13.217; *Vita* 293, 395, 404; *Ap.* 2.175)

Dative—19 times:

BJ 5.130: τέσσαρσι δ' ἡμέραις ἐξισωθέντος τοῦ μέχρι τῶν τειχῶν διαστήματος
. . . with a space having been leveled out up to the walls in four days
                                      (*BJ* 5.185, 5.291, 5.356, 5.388, 5.404, 5.509, 5.552;
                                      AJ 1.33, 1.244, 5.327, 5.350, 13.23, 13.217, 13.376, 17.162;
                                                              Vita 61, 269; *Ap.* 1.257)

APPENDIX B

Dative of duration

ἀνά with the accusative—once:

AJ 9.65: ἀνὰ μίαν ἡμέραν θρέψωμεν ἀλλήλας
. . . [we had agreed that] for one day, we would provide food for each other

εἰς with the accusative—6 times:

AJ 1.85: εἰς ἐννέα καὶ ἑξήκοντα πρὸς τοῖς ἐνακοσίοις βιώσαντα
. . . having lived for nine and sixty years in addition to the other 900
(*AJ* 1.268, 5.95, 5.112, 13.50, 13.128)

διά with the genitive—12 times:

BJ 5.67: διὰ νυκτὸς
. . . through the night   (*BJ* 5.68, 5.307, 5.511; *AJ* 1.331, 5.37, 5.60,
5.146, 13.176, 13.208; *Vita* 15; *Ap.* 2.189)

ἐπί with the accusative—28 times:

BJ 5.398: ἐπὶ μῆνας ἓξ ἐπολιορκοῦντο
. . . they were besieged for six months   (*AJ* 1.90, 1.185, 5.21, 5.24, 5.187, 5.209, 5.211,
5.232, 5.272, 5.275, 5.290, 5.291, 5.336, 9.15, 9.16,
9.156, 9.244, 9.258, 9.271, 13.22, 13.117, 17.200,
20.146, 20.149, 20.198; *Ap.* 1.154, 2.24)

Accusative—114 times:

BJ 5.394: ἠρημώθη δ' ἔτη τρία καὶ μῆνας ἓξ τὸ ἅγιον
. . . the sanctuary lay desolate for three years and six months   (*BJ* 5.51, 7.17, 7.157, 7.394;
AJ 1.55, 1.67, 1.72, 1.75, 1.83, 1.83, 1.83, 1.84,
1.84, 1.84, 1.87, 1.92, 1.104, 1.104, 1.106, 1.108, 1.149,
1.149, 1.152, 1.154, 1.173, 1.191, 1.226, 1.237, 1.256,
1.265, 1.299, 1.309, 1.346, 5.17, 5.72, 5.117, 5.138,
5.200, 5.212, 5.254, 5.270, 5.316, 5.359, 3.359,
9.19, 9.27, 9.66, 9.104, 9.104, 9.121, 9.160, 9.166,
9.172, 9.177, 9.204, 9.204, 9.205, 9.215, 9.216,
9.227, 9.227, 9.227, 9.228, 9.228, 9.243, 9.243,
9.257, 9.278, 9.278, 9.284, 13.52, 13.52, 13.52,
13.61, 13.218, 13.224, 13.228, 13.251, 13.318,
13.365, 13.365, 13.404, 13.404, 13.430, 13.430,
17.191, 17.191, 17.234, 20.92, 20.145, 20.148,
20.237, 20.237, 20.239, 20.240, 20.240, 20.241,
20.242, 20.242, 20.242, 20.245, 20.246, 20.251;
Vita 12, 47, 415; *Ap.* 1.132, 1.231, 1.231, 1.278,
2.25, 2.25, 2.134)

Dative —21 times:

BJ 5.346: τρισὶ μὲν ἀντέσχον ἡμέραις καρτερῶς ἀμυνόμενοι
. . . they held out for three days, defending themselves stoutly   (*BJ* 5.382, 5.389, 5.397, 5.466;
AJ 1.86, 1.87, 1.87, 1.89, 5.197, 9.142,
9.173, 9.177, 9.233, 9.234, 9.278, 9.287,
13.281, 13.299, 13.356, 13.398)

APPENDIX C

Indirect discourse

BJ 1.506: καὶ μιαρὸν μὲν ἑαυτὸν ὁμολογῶν

BJ 1.516: ψευσάμενος ἑταῖρον ἑαυτὸν εἶναι καὶ Ἀρχελάου πάλαι

BJ 2.184: ὥστε θεὸν ἑαυτὸν καὶ δοκεῖν βούλεσθαι καὶ καλεῖσθαι

BJ 4.602: τοῖς μὲν ἔργοις ἑαυτὸν ἄξιον ἡγούμενος

AJ 1.65: ἑώρα δίκην αὐτὸν ὑφέξοντα

AJ 1.198: ἐμήνυσαν ἑαυτοὺς ὄντας ἀγγέλους τοῦ θεοῦ

AJ 2.135: τῆς τοῦ πατρὸς ἐπ' αὐτῷ λύπης ἐσομένους αὐτοὺς αἰτίους ἔλεγον

AJ 2.137: λεγόντων δ' αὐτοὺς ἀλιτηρίους τοῦ πατρός

AJ 4.170: ἑτοίμους τε ἔλεγον ἑαυτοὺς . . . συναπιέναι τῷ στρατῷ

AJ 4.326: γέγραφε δ' αὐτὸν ἐν ταῖς ἱεραῖς βίβλοις τεθνεῶτα

AJ 5.52: οἱ δὲ ὁμολογεῖν αὐτοὺς Χαναναίους ἐπισφαλὲς ἡγούμενοι

AJ 5.52: λέγοιεν αὐτοὺς μὴ προσήκειν κατὰ μηδὲν Χαναναίοις ἀλλὰ πορρωτάτω τούτων
  κατοικεῖν

AJ 5.162: οἱ δὲ ἅμα τε ἠπατημένους αὐτοὺς ᾔσθοντο

AJ 6.17: ἀναξίους ἀποφαίνοντες αὐτοὺς

AJ 6.150: σὺ τοίνυν ἴσθι σαυτὸν δι' ὀργῆς ὄντα τῷ θεῷ

AJ 6.216: ἴσθι γὰρ σαυτὸν ἂν εὑρεθῇς ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς ἀπολούμενον

AJ 7.90: ἐνόμιζεν ἐξαμαρτάνειν αὐτόν

AJ 8.221: νομίσας αὐτὸν βεβλῆσθαι τοῖς λίθοις

AJ 9.57: οἱ δ' ἐκ τῆς ἀμαυρώσεως ἐκείνης ἀφεθέντες ἑώρων αὐτοὺς ἐν μέσοις τοῖς ἐχθροῖς
  ὑπάρχοντας

AJ 9.61: ὃς οὐχ ἡγούμενος αὐτὸν ἀξιόμαχον εἶναι τοῖς Σύροις

AJ 9.291: μετοίκους ἀλλοεθνεῖς ἀποφαίνουσιν αὐτούς

AJ 10.41: πάντων ἑαυτὸν αἴτιον νομίζων

AJ 10.115: βαδίζειν δ' αὐτὸν ἔφασκεν εἰς τὴν πατρίδα

AJ 11.340–1: ἔγνωσαν αὐτοὺς Ἰουδαίους ὁμολογεῖν

AJ 12.257: ὡμολόγουν αὐτοὺς εἶναι συγγενεῖς αὐτῶν

AJ 12.257: καὶ λέγοντες αὐτοὺς Μήδων ἀποίκους καὶ Περσῶν

AJ 12.364: οὐκ ἀξιοῦντες ἑαυτοὺς ὑπερορᾶσθαι δεινὰ πάσχοντας

AJ 13.30: θεασάμενος δ' αὐτὸν ὁ Βακχίδης ὑπὸ τῶν ἐχθρῶν ἀπειλημμένον

Ap. 1.92: Ἰώσηπος ἑαυτὸν ἔφη πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα τῶν Αἰγυπτίων αἰχμάλωτον εἶναι

Ap. 2.138: Ἀπίων δὲ τοῖς θύουσιν ἐγκαλῶν αὐτὸν ἐξήλεγξεν ὄντα τὸ γένος Αἰγύπτιον