

Introduction

Flavius Josephus and Flavian Rome

JONATHAN EDMONDSON

FROM YOSEF BEN MATTITYAHU TO
T. FLAVIUS JOSEPHUS

In late July 67 CE the self-confessedly reluctant leader of the Judaeen forces in the Galilee during their great revolt against Rome found himself a prisoner of the Romans. Yosef ben Mattityahu, born into an aristocratic family of priestly rank from Jerusalem in 37 CE, had surrendered after unsuccessfully attempting to defend the town of Jotapata from capture by the Roman army led by T. Flavius Vespasianus (Jos. *Bj* 3. 316–97). Vespasian spared his life, allegedly prompted by the persuasive intercessions of his son Titus. But just as Vespasian was about to send him off to Rome to stand trial before the emperor Nero, Yosef requested an interview with the Roman general. At this crucial meeting, he prophesied that one day Vespasian would be ‘Caesar and emperor’ of the Romans, ‘master of land and sea and the whole human race’, as in turn would his son Titus. At first Vespasian was sceptical, but on learning that a number of Yosef’s earlier prophecies had come true, including his accurate prediction of the length of the siege of Jotapata, he ameliorated the conditions of his captivity by granting him clothing and other gifts and allowing him to marry a fellow prisoner. Titus also helped to make his life as prisoner more comfortable (*Bj* 3. 396–408; cf. *Vit.* 414; the prophecy: *Bj* 3. 400–2; Gray 1993: esp. 35–79).

Two years later on 1 July 69 Vespasian was acclaimed emperor by the legions stationed at Alexandria in Egypt and soon afterwards the other eastern legions swore allegiance to him (Levick 1999: ch. 4; Griffin 2000a: 1–11). At this point Vespasian remembered the prophecy that Yosef ben Mattityahu had made and on the recommendation of his advisory body (*consilium*) liberated

him from captivity, ordering that his chains be cut with an axe, symbolically to remove the stigma of his two years of imprisonment (*Bj* 4. 622–9). For this ‘new man’ from a relatively undistinguished family from Sabine Reate, Yosef’s prophecy along with the host of others that had emanated from various oracular sources in Judaea, Egypt, and Cyprus (Suet. *Vesp.* 4. 5; 5. 2–7; Levick 1999: 67–70) suggested that a great variety of divinities supported, and hence legitimated, his elevation to the principate. From this point on, the life of Yosef ben Mattityahu was to be irrevocably linked with the fortunes of the Flavian house: the new emperor Vespasian and his sons Titus and Domitian.

After his liberation Yosef attached himself to the entourage of Vespasian and Titus, following them to Alexandria in December 69 (*Vit.* 415) and then returning with Titus to Judaea to witness the siege of Jerusalem and then the fall and destruction of the Temple in 70. Further benefactions followed, with Titus granting Yosef land in the fertile coastal plain between Jerusalem and the Mediterranean to recompense him for the fact that he would henceforth lose access to his own estates near Jerusalem (*Vit.* 422 with the comments of Mason 2001 ad loc.). These had probably been commandeered to supply the Legio X Fretensis and the units of auxiliary infantry and cavalry, now all stationed in Jerusalem. That Yosef was held in a position of some esteem is suggested by the fact that he was able, so he claimed, to intercede with Titus to win the release of his elder brother and numerous friends and acquaintances from captivity without their needing to pay ransom money (*Vit.* 418–21).

In the spring of 71 Yosef accompanied Titus back to Rome. This was not the first time he had visited the city. He had travelled there in 63 or 64 to petition for the release of some Jewish priests sent by M. Antonius Felix, procurator of Judaea, to await investigation by Nero. He claims that he was introduced to Nero’s wife, Poppaea Sabina, by one of Nero’s favourites, a Jewish mime-actor called Aliturus, whom he had met soon after arriving via Puteoli. Poppaea interceded with Nero on Yosef’s behalf, won the release of the priests, and then bestowed ‘enormous gifts’ upon him (*Vit.* 13–16).¹ This expedition had

¹ For the suggestion that Nero’s court may have been residing in the Bay of Naples area at this time, see Rajak, below, Ch. 4. For the possibility that Josephus’ narrative of this episode was purposely ironic, see Mason, below, Ch. 12.

Introduction: Flavius Josephus and Flavian Rome

marked Yosef's debut in the public affairs of Jerusalem when he was in his mid-twenties. In the summer of 71 soon after his return to Rome Yosef witnessed the famous and glittering triumphal parade of Vespasian and Titus 'over the Judaeans' (*ex Iudaeis*) (*BĴ* 7. 123–57). The vivid details and positive tone with which he describes the event sit incongruously alongside the fact that it must have been a hugely dispiriting event for Jews everywhere, and in particular for the large Jewish community of Rome (Goodman 1994*b*: 331–2 and Ch. 8, below). He soon received further benefactions: lodgings in Vespasian's old family home on the Quirinal, a stipend, and, not least, Roman citizenship (*Vit.* 423; cf. Suet. *Dom.* 1). As was normal in such circumstances, the Judaeen priest assumed a Roman name which patently linked him to the patron responsible for his grant of Roman status: Yosef ben Mattityahu henceforth became T(itus) Flavius Josephus.

In this way he joined the sizeable community of diaspora Jews resident in the city of Rome, unable and/or unwilling to return to his native land, where detractors continued to carp against his conduct during the campaigns against Rome in the Galilee that had ultimately resulted in Roman victory (*Vit.* 425). He described himself by implication as 'as one of the most renowned of the Jews living in Rome' (*BĴ* 7. 447): in other words, one of the leading members of the diaspora Jewish community in the capital (Leon 1960; Gruen 2002: 15–53). Like a number of others in the Graeco-Roman world who had been compelled to withdraw from public life and leave their native communities (for instance, Herodotus, Thucydides, Polybius, or Sallust), in his enforced leisure at Rome Josephus turned to the writing of history (*Ap.* 1. 50). First, he prepared a seven-volume account of the 'War of the Jews against the Romans' that lasted from 66 to 73/4 CE (the so-called *Bellum Judaicum*). His main reason for composing this was, he claims (*BĴ* 1. 1–2), to counter the tendentious histories of the war that were already circulating: some put together from hearsay and containing inaccurate or contradictory versions of events, others written by eye-witnesses, but misrepresenting the events either to flatter the Romans or attack the Jews. He had first composed an account of the war in his 'native language' (i.e. Aramaic) for 'barbarians [that is, non-Greek speakers] in the interior' (*BĴ* 1. 3), by which he meant, as he himself went on to

explain, ‘Parthians, Babylonians, the remote peoples of Arabia, Jews beyond the Euphrates, and inhabitants of Adiabene’ (*Bḡ* 1. 6). As Rajak (1983: 174–84, 230–2) and Millar (1993: 499–500) have argued, this must mean that he wrote this first version in Aramaic for both Jewish and gentile readers beyond the frontiers of the Roman Empire. He then translated this work into Greek (*Bḡ* 1. 3)—with the help of certain ‘associates’ (*synergoi*) (*Ap.* 1. 50)—explicitly so that ‘Greeks and Romans not involved in the campaigns should not remain ignorant of these events, relying on flattering or fictitious accounts’ (*Bḡ* 1. 6).²

The last datable reference in the work concerns the dedication of the Temple of Peace in the centre of Rome in 75 CE (*Bḡ* 7. 158–62; cf. Dio 66. 15. 1), and Josephus later claimed that he ‘presented the volumes [of the *Bellum Judaicum*] to the emperors [Vespasian and Titus] when the events were still fresh in people’s minds’ (*Vit.* 361). This would suggest that some parts at least of the Greek version were ready for presentation prior to Vespasian’s death on 23 June 79. He then goes on to state that it was Titus who endorsed the work, now perhaps complete, with his signature and ordered that it ‘be made public’ (*Vit.* 363). Furthermore, the passage in which Josephus describes Vespasian’s former supporter, A. Caecina Alienus, in highly unflattering terms (*Bḡ* 4. 644) could only have been written after Caecina’s fall from grace and execution by Vespasian in 78 (Barnes, Ch. 6, below). In short, Josephus appears to have completed his work between 78 and 81 after previously receiving the encouragement and approval of Vespasian and Titus (C. P. Jones 2002: 113–14). It is distinctly possible that Josephus later revised the final book to give a more prominent and flattering role to Domitian after the latter had assumed power on his brother’s death on 13 September 81.³

At some point in the 80s he embarked on his most substantial work, the *Jewish Antiquities*, which came to fill twenty volumes comprising no fewer than 60,000 lines of text, as he himself was

² The older view that he was commissioned to write this by his Flavian benefactors as official propaganda has little to recommend it: see Mason 1998: esp. 72–4.

³ S. Schwartz 1986; but Schwartz’s crucial argument that the Catullus governor of Cyrenaica of *Bḡ* 7. 437–53 should be identified as L. Valerius Catullus Messallinus, *cos. ord.*, 73, is seriously flawed: see C. P. Jones 2002: 114; Cotton and Eck, Ch. 1, below. For other reasons for a Domitianic version, see Barnes, Ch. 6, below.

Introduction: Flavius Josephus and Flavian Rome

proud to boast (*AJ* 20. 267). He claims to have been encouraged to write this work by one Epaphroditus, ‘a lover of literature and of history in particular’ (*AJ* 1. 5) and someone who ‘had been associated with great events and diverse vicissitudes’ (*AJ* 1. 8–9), but whose identity continues to tantalize (Laqueur 1920: 23–30; Mason 1998b: 98–101; Cotton and Eck, below, Ch. 1; C. P. Jones, below, Ch. 10). In this work he provided a detailed account of the origins of the Jews—their ‘archaeology’, a term highly and consciously reminiscent of Thucydides’ ‘archaeology’ of the Sicilians at the start of Book 6 of his history of the Peloponnesian War (6. 1–5)—and of their constitution, law, and customs. He then traced their history right down to the outbreak of the revolt against Rome in 66 CE. The work was finished, according to its author, ‘in the thirteenth year of Domitian’s reign’ (*AJ* 20. 267): that is, between September 93 and September 94 (C. P. Jones 2002: 114–18). But for whom did Josephus write this massive work?

In the opening section, he states that he was writing for a Greek audience (*AJ* 1. 5) and confirms this at the very end of the work, when he boasts unabashedly that he alone of Jews and gentiles possessed the necessary combination of a deep knowledge of Judaism and sufficient Greek rhetorical skills to ‘write so accurately for Greeks’ (*AJ* 20. 262). Some have claimed that he wrote the work for his fellow Greek-speaking Jews to salvage his reputation, which had been significantly tarnished by his capitulation to the Roman army at Jotapata in 67, his acceptance of Roman gifts, and his celebratory account of the triumph of Vespasian and Titus in the final book of the *Jewish War*.⁴ In particular, he may have been hoping to convince the Jewish diaspora communities of the eastern Mediterranean cities and especially the new rabbinic centre at Jamnia (Yavneh) of his credentials as a serious Jew, proud of his heritage. This ‘apologetic’ interpretation has recently come under close scrutiny and

⁴ On the latter, see Beard 2003, characterizing Josephus as a ‘Flavian apparatchik’, who ‘picked up the official spin and made the spectacular ceremonial of 71 the key dynastic moment where Julio-Claudian history stopped—and Flavian history started’ (p. 558). One wonders whether Josephus’ glittering account of this triumph spurred Plutarch to produce a similarly detailed description of the triumph of L. Aemilius Paullus after his victories over the last Macedonian king Perseus in his biography of this leading Roman (Plut. *Aem.* 32–4).

some now prefer to accept Josephus' claim that he was addressing a gentile audience, who were keen to learn more about the customs and history of the Jews (e.g. Mason 1998*b* and 2003*b*). Some of these gentiles may have included Romans from the city of Rome, who looked to history to provide moral *exempla* for good and bad conduct and who also might have found interesting material in Josephus' detailed discussion of the 'constitution' of the Jews for a comparative assessment of Rome's political system under the increasingly autocratic Domitian (Mason 2003*b*: esp. 573–89).

Even if he did not enjoy as close a relationship with Domitian in the 80s and 90s as he had with Vespasian and Titus in the 70s, Josephus still received privileges from the last of the Flavian emperors and his wife Domitia Longina, including tax exemption on the property given to him by Titus in Judaea. Domitian also allegedly protected Josephus from scurrilous accusations, as his father had done earlier when Josephus had first settled in Rome (*Vit.* 429 with comments of Mason 2001 ad loc.; cf. *Bḡ* 7. 447–50).

Buoyed with enthusiasm from having completed such a monumental task, Josephus announced in the final chapters of the *Antiquities* his plans for two further works: first, he proposed to append to the *Antiquities* a brief review of his own ancestry (*genos*) and the events of his life 'while there are still people alive who can either disprove or corroborate' this account (*Aḡ* 20. 266); this work, he explained, would contain a summary account of the Jewish war and of 'what has happened to us' down to 93/4 CE (*Aḡ* 20. 267); and secondly he hoped to write a work in four books on the beliefs that 'we Jews hold concerning God and his essence, as well as about the laws whereby we are permitted to do some things, but forbidden from doing others' (*Aḡ* 20. 268). Josephus completed the first of these works, the *Life*, it appears, shortly after the *Antiquities*. As we have seen, it ends by mentioning the personal honours and protection he received from Domitian, material which could hardly have been included after the assassination of Domitian on 18 September 96 and the formal damning of his memory. The years 94 and 95 thus seem the best in which to place the composition of the work. However, references in the work to the death of King Agrippa II (*Vit.* 2, 359) have called this dating into question, since Photius, the

Introduction: Flavius Josephus and Flavian Rome

ninth-century Patriarch of Constantinople, categorically placed Agrippa's death in the year 100 CE (*Bibl.* 33). If correct, this would mean that Josephus was at work on his *Life* at least until 100 or 101. However, it has now been decisively shown that Photius was in error and that Agrippa II died (or was at least deposed) in 88/9 (Kushnir-Stein 2002). This resolves the difficulties and allows the *Life* to have been written immediately after the *Antiquities*, with which it shares many stylistic similarities (Mason 2001: pp. xiv–xix; C. P. Jones 2002: 118–20).

As for the second work announced at the end of the *Antiquities*, on Jewish theology and customs, it is unclear whether Josephus ever produced this or at least in the manner in which he had initially envisaged. Some have argued that this was indeed Josephus' final work, *On the Antiquity of the Jews*, better known as the *Against Apion*. However, this comprises two books, not the anticipated four, and it only partially fits the description provided by Josephus at the end of the *Antiquities*. Thus Josephus either changed his plans completely or, more plausibly, modified his initial scheme to address head-on certain contemporary criticisms of his *Jewish Antiquities*. It is the necessarily polemical aim of his final work that Josephus underlines in its opening chapters:

Since I observe that a considerable number of persons, influenced by the malicious calumnies of certain individuals, discredit the statements in my history concerning our antiquity, and adduce as proof of the comparative modernity of our race the fact that it has not been thought worthy of mention by the best known Greek historians, I consider it my duty to devote a brief treatise to all these points; in order at once to convict our detractors of malignity and deliberate falsehood, to correct the ignorance of others, and to instruct all who desire to know the truth regarding the antiquity of our race. (*Ap.* 1. 2–3, Loeb trans.)

In the *Against Apion* he developed a systematic and vigorous defence of Judaism in the face of Greek ignorance or wilful misrepresentation of it (Feldman and Levison 1996). It is not entirely clear when Josephus completed this work, but most scholars argue for a date in the 90s, probably before the death of Domitian. The fact that he mentions neither Nerva nor Trajan has led to the assumption that he died not long after Domitian, but this is essentially an argument from silence (C. P. Jones 2002: 120).

He might either have died shortly before Domitian or have lived on for some time after completing his final work, the *Against Apion*, but there is no way of confirming this.

FLAVIAN ROME

As we have seen, it was his personal links with Vespasian and Titus that brought Flavius Josephus to the city of Rome, and it was here that he wrote his four major works, filling thirty volumes. Since Vespasian had come to power through civil war, he had to move quickly to legitimate his new regime. In this process his bringing of peace to the entire Roman Empire after civil strife was certainly of major importance, but the Flavian victory in putting down the serious revolt in Judaea was also central. Just as one hundred years earlier Augustus had packaged his victory over M. Antonius and Cleopatra at Actium as a victory over a dangerous foreign queen, so now the Flavians recast their campaigns in Judaea as an 'external war' (*externum bellum*) which threatened the whole security of the Roman Empire (cf. Tac. *Hist.* 2. 76, where Vespasian's army is described as 'toughened by experience and the queller of an external war (*belli domitor externi*)'). The Roman victory restored concord and peace to the Roman world, a theme that also received plenty of emphasis in the years that followed. Vespasian, born on 17 November 9 CE, was almost sixty on his *dies imperii*, 1 July 69. To alleviate any concerns about the succession, he gave his son Titus a prominent role from the start (Levick 1999: 184–95), and Josephus' *Jewish War* certainly fits well with that agenda. There was also a feeling of moral regeneration as Vespasian, proud of his roots in small-town Italy, represented himself as a down-to-earth, frugal, and hard-working leader in distinct contrast to the extravagant tastes and style of rule of predecessors such as Nero or Vitellius. Furthermore, the fabric of the city of Rome had suffered first at the hand of Nero's megalomania and then in various assaults during the civil wars of 68–9. To remedy this, Vespasian undertook a major programme of public building, which was continued by Titus and then by Domitian. It was thus in an atmosphere of marked political, moral, and physical renewal that Josephus settled down to live and write in Rome.

The city's major sanctuary, the Capitoline temple of Jupiter

Introduction: Flavius Josephus and Flavian Rome

Optimus Maximus, had been destroyed by fire during the conflicts of 69, and Vespasian made it a priority to rebuild it in its traditional style. Its immediate restoration had great symbolic value for advertising the resurgence of Rome under the new dynasty; the Flavians were to be seen as pious restorers of the Roman state (Levick 1999: 126). Other parts of the urban centre were radically remodelled to remove all trace of the memory of the tyrant Nero. His gargantuan 'Golden House' was demolished to make way for buildings that left a distinctly Flavian stamp on the urban landscape. The 'Flavian amphitheatre' (known since the eleventh century as the 'Colosseum' after the 'Colossus', the colossal statue of the sun-god Sol that had stood outside the amphitheatre ever since it had been moved there by Hadrian) quickly rose to occupy the site of the monumental lake of Nero's pleasure palace; Nero's private baths were remodelled to become the Baths of Titus, a major public amenity; and to demonstrate his piety towards a neglected predecessor, Vespasian completed the Temple of the Deified Claudius on the Caelian hill, a project begun in 54 by Claudius' widow Agrippina, but then abandoned after her death in 59. The poet Martial aptly summed up the symbolic force of this building programme in one of his epigrams commemorating the inauguration of the Flavian Amphitheatre in 80 (*Spect.* 2. 11-12):

reddita Roma sibi est et sunt te praeside, Caesar,
deliciae populi, quae fuerant domini.

Rome is now restored to herself, and with you as our
leader, Caesar,
the delights which had once been those of a master
are now those of the people.

Suetonius hints at the importance of the suppression of the revolt in Judaea in the official Flavian version of events at the start of his life of Vespasian. The *gens Flavia*, he relates, had 'taken in hand and eventually stabilized an empire that had been unsteady for a long time and almost tottering' (*Vesp.* 1. 1: *incertum diu et quasi vagum imperium suscepit firmavitque tandem gens Flavia*). Josephus makes the same connection immediately after his description of the triumph of Vespasian and Titus: 'After the triumphal ceremonies and after restoring the empire of the Romans to its strongest state, Vespasian decided to erect a temple

of Peace' (B γ 7. 158). The Flavian victory was proclaimed far and wide. Coins issued first by Vespasian and then by Titus trumpeted the fact that 'Judaea had been taken' (IUDAEA CAPTA), with a female personification of Judaea slumped and bound as a captive beneath a Roman military trophy or, on later issues, a palm tree. Their similarity to Augustus' coins with the legend 'Egypt taken' (AEGYPTO CAPTA) was hardly a coincidence. The fact that Domitian, who had played no part in the military campaigns, also issued coins with IUDAEA CAPTA as late as 85 shows how important the event was to the Flavian dynasty (Cody 2003: esp. 105–13).

But Roman military victories such as this brought peace to the world, and Romans were to be permanently reminded of this achievement in another part of the monumental centre of the city (see Millar, below, Ch. 5). For in 75 CE Vespasian dedicated the Temple of Peace, whose precinct was no less than ten times the size of the 'Altar of Peace' dedicated by Augustus in 9 BCE. Its construction, like that of the Flavian Amphitheatre, was funded from the booty of the military campaigns; and, as a further reminder of the Flavian achievement, the treasures seized from the Temple in Jerusalem—including the golden menorah, the golden table, and various golden vessels—embellished the shrine, as did an impressive collection of masterpiece Greek statues by renowned classical sculptors such as Polyclitus, Praxiteles, Myron, Lysippus, and others (La Rocca 2001: 195–201, with figs. 17–19). Many of these had previously belonged to Nero's private art collection; they now became publicly accessible to anyone who visited the Temple of Peace, a further example of the Flavians making 'the delights which had once been those of a master now those of the people' (*deliciae populi quae fuerant domini*) in Martial's formulation.

Vespasian also set up a public library of major works of Greek and Latin literature in the two halls flanking the shrine. This helped not just to advertise the new dynasty's general support for literature, but also to emphasize that literature should be available for all Romans, not just the elite. A striking analogue to Augustus' public libraries on the Palatine, it provided another link between the Flavians and the first *princeps*, who had also brought peace to the world after civil war. It is not completely fanciful to suppose that the works of T. Flavius Josephus were

Introduction: Flavius Josephus and Flavian Rome

added to this library on their completion. Indeed his *Jewish War* may have served as a key text for the explication of the monument, as it accentuated the valuable contribution that the Flavians had made to restoration of peace to the Roman Empire. The triumph *ex Iudaeis* was recalled by the monumental arches erected to Titus during his own lifetime at the curved end of the Circus Maximus and soon after his death on the Sacred Way leading into the main Roman Forum (see further Millar, below, Ch. 5).

The establishment of a permanent *fiscus Iudaicus* ('Jewish Treasury') further reminded both Romans and Jews of the subjugation of Judaea. Previously all practising Jews, no matter where they resided, had paid a small annual levy to the Temple in Jerusalem, but its destruction in August 70 had brought all cult activity there to an end (see further Rives, below, Ch. 7). Henceforth Vespasian required that all Jews now pay an annual levy of two *denarii* to support the cult of Jupiter Capitolinus and in particular to subsidize the rebuilding of his temple (*BJ* 7. 218; Dio 66. 7. 2; Smallwood 1976: 371–85). The victory of Jupiter over Yahweh could not have been advertised more dramatically. The operations of the *fiscus Iudaicus* seem to have become even more intrusive under Domitian, as general hostility towards the Jews increased, despite some elite Roman interest in Jewish customs and history. As Martin Goodman stresses (below, Ch. 8), Josephus found himself in the somewhat paradoxical position of trying to convince Jews that their God had acquiesced in the victory of Rome (as in the speech he had himself deliver during his account of the siege of Jerusalem at *BJ* 5. 362–419, esp. 367–8, 412) and to persuade Romans of the essential compatibility between Jews and Romans and of the validity and antiquity of Jewish traditions at a time when the dynasty ruling Rome needed to stress their role in subjugating Judaea.

The supposed concord between Vespasian and his sons Titus and Domitian was another important theme of Flavian ideology (Griffin 2000a: 56–60), and one that found expression in Josephus' *Jewish War* (4. 597–9; 7. 119, 152). Hence it is no surprise that Domitian highlighted the continuity of the Flavian *gens* in his own public building programme in Rome. He completed the Temple of the Deified Vespasian in the Forum, the Temple of the *gens Flavia* on the Quirinal on the site of the

family's home, and the Portico of the Deified in the Campus Martius with its shrines to both the Deified Vespasian and the Deified Titus. Like his father, he underlined his traditional piety by magnificently restoring—after yet another fire—the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus on the Capitol. He also followed his father's lead in providing buildings for the pleasures of the people, adding further tiers to the Flavian Amphitheatre and building a new stadium and odeum in the Campus Martius. His Forum Transitorium linked the Temple of Peace with the Forums of Augustus and Julius Caesar, thereby creating a visible vertebrate link between the Julian past and the Flavian present.

However, Domitian gradually moved away from the civic-minded and populist style of his father and brother to one that was more aloof and autocratic. No longer the *civilis princeps*, he insisted on being addressed as 'master and god' (*dominus et deus*) (Suet. *Dom.* 13. 1–2; Mart. *Epigr.* 5. 5; 7. 34; 9. 28; Griffin 2000a: 80–3). His huge expansion of the imperial residence on the Palatine, now a true *palatium* with its massively domineering structures such as the 'royal court' (*aula regia*), left none in doubt of the changed tone of the dynasty.⁵ Suetonius singles out the rebellion of Antonius Saturninus in 89 as a key turning-point after which he became crueller and more tyrannical (*Dom.* 10. 5). Relations between senate and *princeps* were strained still further in 93 with a series of expulsions and executions of senators (Syme 1978 and 1983) until things became so intolerable that on 18 September 96 Domitian was murdered by a group of friends, freedmen, and perhaps even his wife (Suet. *Dom.* 17. 3; the date is confirmed by the *Fasti Ostienses*).

The city of Rome witnessed a period of great literary creativity under the Flavian emperors (Boyle and Dominik 2003; Boyle 2003; Hutchinson 1993; Hardie 1993; Coleman 1986). Epic poets such as Valerius Flaccus, Silius Italicus, and Papinius Statius flourished under Flavian patronage, as did gifted epigrammatists such as Martial and historians such as Pliny the Elder and the young Tacitus, even if the latter preferred not to complete his first historical work during the dark final years of Domitian's rule (Sullivan 1991; Beagon 1992; Wallace-Hadrill 1990b; Syme

⁵ For Domitian's buildings in Rome, see B. W. Jones 1992: 79–98 (with bibliography); Packer 2003. For the oppressiveness of the new palace, cf. Stat. *Silv.* 4. 2, with Fredrick 2003.

Introduction: Flavius Josephus and Flavian Rome

1958a: esp. ch. 3). Pliny the Elder was not just a historian; he collected a multitude of 'miraculous facts' from all over the known world for his encyclopaedic *Natural History*, dedicating the spoils of his researches to Titus (*NH* praef. 1). He was working at the same time as Josephus was sitting down to write his *Jewish War*, and the two were both supported in their literary endeavours by Titus. It was Vespasian who established the first publicly funded chair of rhetoric at Rome, with M. Fabius Quintilianus, from Calagurris in Hispania Citerior, its first salaried incumbent. Quintilian trained many leading Romans in oratory, including the younger Pliny, and after his retirement in the late 80s canonized the principal elements of Roman rhetoric in his monumental *Training in Oratory* (*Institutio Oratoria*) (Clarke 1996: chs. 10–11; Kennedy 1969; Winterbottom 1975). Rome under the Flavians was also an important centre of Greek letters: Dio Chrysostom, the rhetorician and philosopher from Prusa in Bithynia, was well connected to Vespasian and Titus, although he eventually ran afoul of Domitian and was exiled, as were other Greek intellectuals including Epictetus and Artemidorus (C. P. Jones 1978; Sidebottom 1996). The moral philosopher and biographer, Plutarch from Chaeronea in Boeotia (whose full Roman name was L.(?) Mestrius Plutarchus), spent some time in Rome giving lectures—perhaps under Domitian (C. P. Jones 1971; Russell 1972). How the historian Josephus fitted into this very active literary milieu has not to date received much scholarly attention; it is one of the main aims of this volume to attempt to locate him more clearly in his Roman literary context.

FLAVIUS JOSEPHUS AND FLAVIAN ROME

It is clear, therefore, that Yosef ben Mattityahu, later T. Flavius Josephus, spent much of his life operating at the intersection of three powerful cultural traditions: Jewish, Greek, and Roman. Born into an aristocratic Hellenized Jewish milieu in Jerusalem, he remained fiercely proud of his Jewish origins throughout his career. Jerusalem as an important city of the eastern Mediterranean could not avoid experiencing the impact of Greek language, culture, and philosophical ideas, especially in the wake of Alexander the Great's liberation of the city from Persian control

in 332 BCE, after which it, along with the whole of Judaea, fell under the sway of two powerful Hellenistic dynasties: first, the Ptolemies and then the Seleucids. Hellenizing tendencies were balanced by a growing pride in Jewish traditions, especially after the Hasmonean priests emerged to rule an expanded Judaea from 152 BCE as the power of the Seleucids was on the wane after their military defeat by Rome and then under the pressure of dynastic struggles in Antioch. The elites of Judaea had constantly to strike an acceptable balance between greater integration within the broad cultural *koiné* of the Hellenistic eastern Mediterranean and the need to preserve the distinctive traditions of Judaism (Rajak 1983: 11–64). The spread of Roman control over Judaea following Pompey's settlement of the East in 63 BCE added a further layer of complexity. In short, the fact that Judaea fell under a series of different imperial masters was of prime importance, as Seth Schwartz (2002) has recently emphasized, for shaping the cultural and political experience of those who lived there.

A significant body of scholarship has been devoted to the interplay between Hellenism and Judaism in Josephus. The many contributions of Louis Feldman and Tessa Rajak have over the last twenty-five years clarified and deepened our understanding of how Josephus navigated between these Jewish and Hellenized traditions or, better, how these traditions were becoming increasingly integrated in first-century Jerusalem (Rajak 1983 and 2001; Feldman 1993 and 1998*a*). But since all of Josephus' works were written in the city of Rome, it seems appropriate to shift the focus to explore the extent to which his Roman situation affected his view of the world he wrote about. To what extent did social relations with his patrons, friends, and fellow diaspora Jews in Rome affect his writings? How well did he know earlier Roman literature and to what extent did he seek to locate himself within its traditions, especially those of Roman historiography? How much did the distinct milieu of Flavian Rome, with its new ideologies and sense of renewal after the excesses of Nero and the subsequent civil wars, affect his description and explication of the experiences and customs of the Jews? In what ways did his personal relationship with Vespasian, Titus, and Domitian colour the way he viewed and represented the past, both Jewish and Roman?

Introduction: Flavius Josephus and Flavian Rome

More ambitiously, this volume seeks to bring together approaches to Josephus that are too often kept apart as a result of the artificial disciplinary boundaries of the academic world. Scholarship on Josephus has generally fallen to scholars in religious studies and theology rather than to classicists or Roman historians. There are many good reasons for this. Josephus' works mainly describe Jewish, rather than Roman, *realia*. His narratives are full of references to biblical and post-biblical personalities, to Jewish law and custom, and to places and conditions in Judaea. It was inevitable that scholars whose primary interests lay in that region's history and literature, or in biblical interpretation, would lead the effort to interpret Josephus (Drexler 1925; Guttman 1928; Thackeray 1929; Schlatter 1932; Attridge 1976; Cohen 1979; Sterling 1992; Feldman 1998a).

At the same time, most classicists and Roman historians were happy to cede Josephus to their colleagues in religious studies. Only those portions of his narrative that dealt directly with Roman affairs were taken up by Roman historians (e.g. Crook 1951; Timpe 1960; Brunt 1977; Barrett 1989: ch. 10; Levick 1999: chs. 3–4). Necessarily, these were read to some extent without the contextual benefits provided by an in-depth study of Josephus' entire corpus. We would not wish to exaggerate the separation of disciplines with respect to the study of Josephus, and it is true that some scholars who have used Josephus for aspects of Roman history have done so in a contextualized manner (e.g. Vidal-Naquet 1978; Wiseman 1991; Shaw 1993 and 1995). Furthermore, classicists did some of the fundamental work on Josephus, for example, Niese (1896) and Laqueur (1920), and many of those who devote their energy to studying Josephus today have significant classical training. Recently, a number of studies of Josephus, the province of Judaea, or the Jews under Roman rule have shown a detailed awareness of both Jewish and Roman issues (Yavetz 1975; Cohen 1979; Moehring 1984; Goodman 1987; Bilde 1988; S. Schwartz 1990 and 2001; Price 1992; Gruen 2002). Yet it remains true that this major author who lived and wrote in Rome under the Flavian emperors is hardly ever studied with attention to his Roman audiences by either community of scholars. Josephus' name does not often come up in scholarly accounts of Roman literature in this period, even of Greek writers in Rome. There is thus nothing on him in

the canonical *Cambridge History of Greek Literature* (Easterling and Knox 1985) or in important recent studies of Hellenism and Greek literature in the Roman Empire (Swain 1996; Whitmarsh 2001). Furthermore, he only very rarely makes an appearance in general accounts of Graeco-Roman historiography (for example, Fornara 1983; Plass 1988).

There are some promising signs that Josephus' exclusion from the classical canon is starting to come to an end. Two essays are devoted to him in a wide-ranging and important collection of papers on Flavian Rome (Beard 2003; Mason 2003*b*), while he has been considered worthy of inclusion in recent volumes on the history of Greek and Roman political thought (Rajak 2000) and on Greek cultural identity under the Roman Empire (Gleason 2001). Moreover, a recent study of authority and tradition in ancient historiography (Marincola 1997) includes liberal reference to Josephus. But we still find ourselves at a significant crux in the history of disciplinary specialization: most Josephan scholars lack the background in Flavian Roman history and literature to locate him effectively in that context, while those who have the requisite background have not often been interested or trained in the peculiarities of Josephan scholarship. Flavian Rome has certainly become a field of growing interest for historians and literary scholars alike (B. W. Jones 1984 and 1992; Levick 1999; Griffin 2000*a*; Coleman 1986; Hardie 1993; Boyle and Dominik 2003) and the time is ripe to explore in detail the place that Josephus occupied within that Roman world.

There are obvious benefits to be gained by both sides in studying Josephus in his Roman context. Increasingly, whether as a function of the new historicism or simply out of the need to understand Josephus in a more adequate way, scholars are beginning to ask about his audiences. After all, much of an ancient author's literary technique can be appraised only on the basis of working assumptions about the audience and what that audience knew. When Josephus talked about political constitutions (Mason 1998*b* and 2003*b*: 573–88) or spoke of the dangerously fickle 'masses' (e.g. *AJ* 4. 37) or of aristocracy as the 'noblest' form of constitution (*AJ* 4. 223) or of the 'tyranny' of rebel leaders or monarchs (*BJ* 4. 208 on the rebel John of Gischala; *AJ* 1. 114 on King Abimelech), when he included moralistic assessments of his characters (of Herod the Great,

Introduction: Flavius Josephus and Flavian Rome

for instance, at *AJ* 16. 1–5, 395–404; 17. 168–71; Mason 2003b: 570–1) or celebrated the simple agrarian life (*Ap.* 2. 293–4; *AJ* 18. 19 on the Essenes), when he described the foibles of Nero and Poppaea (*BJ* 2. 250–1; *AJ* 20. 196; *Vit.* 16), how would all of this have sounded against the grid of Roman assumptions? How did he see—or practise—the relationship between rhetoric and historiography?⁶ A fully engaged literary interpretation of Josephus, therefore, must involve an investigation of Josephus' social world and cultural milieu in Rome. This holistic approach should yield a Josephus who is both more intelligible as a real author to Josephan specialists and simply more interesting to scholars of Flavian Rome.

This book is organized into three parts: 'Josephus in the Social and Political Context of Flavian Rome', 'The Impact of the Jewish War in Flavian Rome', and 'Josephus: Historiography and Literature in Flavian Rome'. Part I discusses the context for understanding Josephus' social and political position in Rome and seeks to advance the discussion about possible primary audiences for his works. It seems clear from their stated aims that Josephus wanted his works to be read immediately, and so he was not like the elder Pliny, who preferred to suppress his histories until after his own death, not wishing to be accused of toadying to the ruling *princeps* (*NH* praef. 20). To help orient the investigation, Hannah Cotton and Werner Eck (Chapter 1) begin by defining what it meant to be a member of the elite in Flavian Rome and then consider Josephus' possible connections with this elite. In the end, they find little firm evidence to link him on a regular and ongoing basis to the imperial court or to the leading senators of his day. They suggest that he was a rather lonely and isolated figure, a theme picked up later by Christopher Jones (Chapter 10).

In the course of their analysis, Cotton and Eck probe the identity of one of the most elusive figures in Josephus' works, the Epaphroditus to whom he dedicated the *Antiquities* (*AJ* 1. 8) and its pendant, the so-called *Life* (*Vit.* 430), as well as his final work, the *Against Apion* (*Ap.* 1. 1; 2. 296). They argue decisively against identifying him with Nero's *a libellis*, who lived on in

⁶ For the relationship, see Cic. *Fam.* 5. 12; *De or.* 2. 51–64; Plin. *Ep.* 5. 8; Wiseman 1981; Woodman 1988.

Rome until Domitian executed him in 95/6 as an example to other members of the imperial court of the dangers of assisting an emperor's suicide (Suet. *Dom.* 14.4; Dio 67. 14. 4). The other preferred candidate, M. Mettius Epaphroditus, mentioned in the *Suda* (E 2004 Adler) as a teacher of grammar and literary critic who specialized in Homer, Hesiod, and Callimachus and received a statue in Rome in his honour (*CIL* 6. 9454 = *ILS* 7769), is just as problematic. Cotton and Eck make the telling observation that if this freedman of relatively low rank was his patron, then Josephus had indeed become a rather peripheral figure in Roman society under Domitian despite his protestations about the patronal favours bestowed by that emperor and his wife (*Vit.* 429). To this we might add that by the early 90s he could not have still been living in the lodgings provided by Vespasian on his arrival in the city in the Flavian family home on the Quirinal, since Domitian was now turning this into the Temple of the *gens Flavia*, on which work was completed in 94 CE. Perhaps in the end Josephus' status as an observant Jew did marginalize him in Rome and prevent him from participating fully in the life of the imperial court. Jewish dietary laws would not have allowed him to dine with the Caesars or other members of the Roman elite.

A rather different picture, however, is sketched in Glen Bowersock's contribution (Chapter 2), where he sets Josephus' career against the fortunes of other eastern aristocrats who developed close ties with the Roman elite, including the imperial house, and spent much time in Rome, participating in the social, cultural, and political life of the *urbs*. Nicolaus of Damascus may have served, Bowersock suggests, as something of a model for Josephus. A Greek-speaking Syrian, Nicolaus first came to Rome as an ambassador, as did Josephus in 63 or 64 (*Vit.* 13–16). Nicolaus continued to lobby Augustus on behalf of Herod the Great and the Judaeian kingdom and eventually became a significant historian, interpreting the Roman revolution and Augustan solution for Hellenophone inhabitants of the eastern provinces. A number of notables from the Near East were prominent in Flavian Rome: for example, Agrippa II and his sister Berenice, mentioned frequently in Josephus' works (*BJ* 2. 344–407; *Vit.* 343, 355–6, 364–7, 393), or Antiochus IV of Commagene, a king who had supported Rome with troops during the war in Judaea,

but in 72 found himself a Roman prisoner, suspected of collusion with the Parthians. Like Josephus, he was just about to be sent in chains to Rome for trial when Vespasian intervened to release him and provide him with revenues and patronal support. Bowersock sees Josephus as part of an influential group of eastern aristocrats in Rome who not only gained the political and material support of the Flavian house, but also produced a 'new historiography that explained the Jews to the Graeco-Roman world and the Romans to the Jews'; in other words, they were worth supporting since they might serve as mediators between Rome and one of the potentially most troublesome subject peoples of the Roman Empire.

Daniel Schwartz in Chapter 3 pursues further the nexus between Rome and Judaea by asking why the Flavians never appointed Agrippa II client king of Judaea as a reward for his active support of the Romans during the 'war against the Judaeans'. Josephus certainly portrayed him in highly favourable terms as a loyal and courageous Roman ally in his *Jewish War*, although he receives a much more hostile press in *Jewish Antiquities*. Schwartz's answer is to suggest that the reason for this may have been that 'Judaea' was no more: the Flavians had once and for all, they hoped, subjugated the old kingdom. As their coins proclaimed, Judaea was now 'in captivity' (IUDAEA CAPTA); it no longer had coherence as a geographical territory. Roman authors of the Flavian period almost universally prefer to describe the region as 'Idumaea' or 'Palaestina'. Hence in a conceptual sense there was no kingdom of Judaea left for Agrippa II to rule over.

This has important ramifications for our understanding of the problematic term 'Ioudaios' in Greek / 'Iudaeus' in Latin. The ongoing debate whether we should translate this as 'Judaeans' or 'Jew' reverberates across several chapters of this book, and we have purposely not tried to force all contributors to a unified position on this. Of all the contributors, Schwartz discusses it at greatest length and shows how 'Ioudaios/Iudaeus' was initially an ethnic term that referred to a people who lived in a physical place: 'Judaeans' in the sense of someone who dwelt in Judaea. But after the Romans suppressed the revolt in 70 and chose not to restore a Herodian king to a place called 'Judaea', the term became more a religious or national label, Schwartz argues,

than an ethnic one, with 'Jew' or 'Jewish' now its overwhelmingly dominant cadence. In some sense it was parallel to the expanding sense of 'Romanus' as this term came to refer to many more people than just those who resided in the city of Rome. With the destruction of the Temple of Jerusalem, as Rives also emphasizes (Chapter 7), there was no longer any physical cult centre or any fixed location for 'Ioudaioi/Iudaei'. And as another religious group without an easily identifiable cult centre, the Christians, grew in prominence in the later first century, this 'definitely religious movement, not a territorial one' provided 'Ioudaioi/Iudaei' with a useful parallel. 'Jews' and 'Christians' now became widely scattered, diasporic communities, defined by religion rather than by place of residence.

It is on the Jewish diaspora that Tessa Rajak focuses our attention in Chapter 4. She lays out the evidence for the continued importance of Josephus' personal connections with diaspora 'Ioudaioi' in the years after he had settled in Rome. First, he needs to be related to the large diaspora community in Rome itself, a community that is now more clearly understood as a result of work by scholars such as Leon (1960), Noy (2000), and Gruen (2002). However, we need to remember that most of the archaeological and epigraphic evidence for it dates to the second or third centuries (Rutgers 1995), which makes it difficult to be certain about its precise nature in the later first century, when such evidence is far from plentiful. Rajak makes a strong argument for interpreting 'Rome' in a much broader sense. From this it follows that any attempt to set Flavius Josephus into his 'Roman' context needs to consider his place in the Roman Empire of the Flavian period. In some ways, this view gently challenges one of the main propositions of this volume: namely that it was Josephus' experiences in the city of Rome, his contact with Roman patrons and Roman audiences, and his increased exposure to, and understanding of, Greek and Roman literature and rhetorical traditions that had a formative influence on his own writings. Rajak prefers to emphasize that he may also have maintained connections in various parts of the eastern Mediterranean even after he had settled in Rome. His second wife was from Alexandria, where they had met when Josephus arrived as part of Vespasian's entourage in December 69 (*Vit.* 414, 426). His third wife was from the diaspora Jewish community on

Introduction: Flavius Josephus and Flavian Rome

Crete. Rajak surmises that they may have met in Crete during a possible visit to the island by Josephus rather than in Rome, as many have assumed (see the comments of Mason 2001 on *Vit.* 5). He also had some dealings with the diaspora community in Cyrene, where he was accused before the proconsul Catullus (*Vit.* 424; cf. *BJ* 7. 447–8).⁷ She also suggests, rather more speculatively, that he may have returned to Judaea to visit his estates and possibly the emerging Rabbinic centre at Jamnia (Yavneh) and may even have visited the diaspora communities of Asia Minor. So for Rajak, Flavius Josephus—despite his Roman citizenship and obvious links to the Flavian emperors—still retained a strong Jewish identity. Romans and Roman literary traditions were important to his development as a historian. He also learned Greek and became increasingly proficient in it. But still he could not help seeing the world through Jewish eyes.

This led to occasional cultural blind-spots in interpreting Roman actions. As Levick has noted (1999: 227 n. 8), his narrative of the omens and oracles presaging Vespasian's rise to power (*BJ* 3. 399–408; 4. 623–6) retains a number of distinctly Jewish features: for example, the use of the messianic singular in Josephus' own prediction of Vespasian's ascent. Similarly in this volume Rives shows (Chapter 7) how Josephus' understanding of what a 'religion' constituted remained essentially Jewish; despite his years in Rome, he simply never came to see religion in the same terms as Romans such as Vespasian and Titus. Furthermore, some of his narrative elements, for example, having God speak in the early books of the *Jewish Antiquities*, were clearly drawn from Biblical traditions and, as Christopher Jones comments (Chapter 10), 'must have struck Greek readers' (and many Roman readers too, we may add) as 'rather outlandish'.

The second part of this volume focuses on a defining event for all inhabitants of Judaea, all diaspora Jews, including Josephus, and also for the Flavian dynasty: the Roman victory in Judaea and the destruction of the Temple in Jerusalem in 70. The

⁷ The identification of this proconsul with L. Valerius Catullus Messalinus, *consul ordinarius* with Domitian in 73 and consul for a second time in 85, is decisively rejected by Cotton and Eck (Ch. 1, below), a dissociation that strikes an important blow against the arguments for the supposed second edition of Josephus' *Jewish War* produced after Domitian's death or even as late as the reign of Trajan (S. Schwartz 1986).

impact of this event on Judaism hardly needs comment, but it also provided a source of legitimacy for the new Flavian dynasty. In Josephus' works, written against this double backdrop, we see his ongoing efforts to interpret the fall of his native city in terms comprehensible to his Roman audience.

Fergus Millar begins the section in Chapter 5 by exploring in detail the role of the Flavian victory in Judaea in the physical transformation of the city of Rome. He begins with a detailed reading of the triumph of Vespasian and Titus *ex Iudaeis* in June 71, an event made more memorable by Josephus' lavish description of it (cf. Künzl 1988: 9–29; Beard 2003; and see Chapman, below, Chapter 13). The defeat of the Jews and the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple were enshrined in the very fabric of the urban centre and hence in Roman public memory, reminding the inhabitants of the city of the decisive role played by Vespasian and Titus in that victory. Millar emphasizes how the triumphal arches to Titus (erected in 81 and after his death), the Flavian Amphitheatre (inaugurated in 80), and, most of all, the Temple of Peace (dedicated in 75) were all related to the Flavian victory in Judaea and helped give the dynasty a lasting legitimacy.

That legitimacy was bolstered, as Millar shows, by the way in which Vespasian made a conscious effort to present himself as the absolute antithesis of Nero, whose buildings, especially his 'Golden House', served his own selfish excesses rather than the public good. How the diaspora Jewish community of Rome reacted to the triumph and to the display of the most sacred treasures from the Temple at Jerusalem in a Roman shrine, the Temple of Peace, is further explored by Goodman in Chapter 8. He points out how the spectacle and the later monuments that recalled that event would all have contributed, along with the institution of the 'Jewish Treasury' (the *fiscus Iudaicus*), towards the creation of a generally oppressive atmosphere for Jews in Flavian Rome. Indeed for Goodman, one of the defining features of the Flavian dynasty was its hostility to Jews and Millar's study creates a very vivid impression of how this was achieved through spectacle, monument, and public memory.

Timothy Barnes in his contribution (Chapter 6) comparing Josephus' and Tacitus' (lost) account of the sack of the Temple from *Histories* Book 5 underlines the importance of the Jewish

Introduction: Flavius Josephus and Flavian Rome

War as a central defining event, or in his words even a ‘foundation myth’, for the Flavian dynasty. Barnes goes on to nuance this considerably by arguing that there was not one, but in fact three successive versions of this foundation myth. The first, developed in the 70s, glorified Vespasian, the second gave much greater prominence to Titus, while the third integrated Domitian into the story. Tacitus in the *Histories*, whose lost account is partially recoverable from the early-fifth-century universal chronicle of Sulpicius Severus from Aquitania, had Titus consult his *consilium* and then give the order to his troops to torch the Temple. Cassius Dio, writing a century or so after Tacitus, also gave Titus a leading role in precipitating the destruction (66. 6. 2–3). Josephus’ narrative, on the other hand, suggests that Titus was more favourable to Judaism than he really was and tries to exculpate him from responsibility for destroying the Temple. Downplaying the role of Vespasian, Josephus perhaps reproduces something of the ‘second version’ that boosted the image of Titus (on which see also Yavetz 1975; Thérond 1981; Paul 1993; Leoni 2000). Barnes’s discussion is also very important for our understanding of Josephus’ working methods as a historian and the chronology of his works. For he goes on to show that Josephus, just like Plutarch and Tacitus, may well have used as a source the (lost) histories of Pliny the Elder, which probably ended by describing the triumphal procession of 71. As a result, we have some evidence for Josephus using a Latin historian and, more generally, for his conscious reworking of such material to suit the particular situation in which he found himself while writing the *Jewish War*.

James Rives in Chapter 7 returns to the destruction of the Temple, but looks at it from a different angle, that of Flavian religious policies. Vespasian and Titus, he argues, were fully aware of the ramifications of the destruction. In Roman religious terms, their actions would result in the elimination of the major cult centre of the Jews. The removal of the chief cult objects (the menorah, the table, and the sacred vessels) to Rome symbolized the end of the cult in Jerusalem, and emphasized the notion, found in Josephus (*BJ* 6. 299–300; cf. Tac. *Hist.* 5. 13), that the Jewish God had abandoned his people and gone over to the Roman side. In some senses then, Rives argues, this amounted to a sort of *evocatio* of a foreign deity, as so often

occurred when Roman armies captured enemy cities. The fact that Vespasian soon closed the only other temple in diaspora Judaism, at Leontopolis in Egypt (*Bḅ* 7. 421), confirms that he was keen to close down cult centres that he considered potential focal points for further Jewish resistance against Rome. The impact then of the Roman victory extended right into the very cult organization of Judaism. Rives's conclusions intersect with the observations of Daniel Schwartz (Chapter 3) on the disappearance of a fixed topographical sense to the term 'Ioudaios/Iudaeus' under the Flavians. From the moment that the Temple was destroyed, Jerusalem and, more broadly, Judaea lost their defining centrality to Judaism. Henceforth, Judaism would become by definition a diasporic cult, as was that other cult that derived from it, Christianity.

The destruction of the Temple is also the starting point for Martin Goodman's Chapter 8, since its disappearance provided a context for Vespasian to devise what became for Jews the most hated symbol of their subjugation to Rome following their revolt. For all Jews throughout the Roman Empire were now required to contribute two *denarii* per annum to the 'Jewish Treasury' (*fiscus Iudaicus*) in Rome to support the cult of Jupiter Optimus Maximus on the Capitol rather than to Yahweh's Temple in Jerusalem, as had been their previous practice. Goodman underlines how this institution served to commemorate the Flavian victory in Judaea just as effectively as the monuments erected in Rome and analysed here by Millar (Chapter 5) or the official Flavian version, or better versions, of the event, discussed by Barnes (Chapter 6). Domitian was particularly punctilious in collecting this tax, thus associating himself by proxy with the campaigns his father and older brother had waged, but from which he had been excluded. Goodman goes on to suggest—in distinctly heterodox fashion—that the coins issued by Domitian's successor, Nerva, in 96 and 97 advertising the 'removal of the abuse of the Jewish treasury' (*FISCI IUDAICI CALUMNIA SUBLATA*) may refer to a temporary abolition by Nerva of the *fiscus Iudaicus*. Even though this view may not convince everyone, his discussion of the traditional interpretation of these coins, namely that Nerva outlawed malicious accusations against gentiles in Rome who had allegedly adopted a Jewish way of life, throws considerable light on the diverse attitudes towards Judaism in

Introduction: Flavius Josephus and Flavian Rome

Domitianic Rome. There was hostility, but also sympathy, and in some cases enough interest to prompt conversion to Judaism. In the course of his discussion, Goodman isolates some further possible acquaintances and supporters of Josephus: especially T. Flavius Clemens (the grandson of Vespasian's brother) and his wife Flavia Domitilla (the daughter of Domitian's sister), who in 95 were condemned to death and exile respectively by Domitian on a charge of 'atheism', that is, for converting to Jewish ways.

In the third part, 'Josephus: Historiography and Literature in Flavian Rome', the focus shifts from the social and political context to the literary world of Flavian Rome and to Josephus' place within that world. To what extent was Josephus connected to Roman literary and historiographical developments? How familiar did he become with earlier and contemporary Roman literature, especially historiography? Was he influenced by contemporary trends in Greek and Roman literature and rhetoric?

Christina Kraus begins in Chapter 9 with an analysis of history-writing in Latin in the first century CE, to provide a Roman context for the subsequent contributors' analysis of Josephus as a literary author. She demonstrates how from the late Republic onwards exemplarity became a key feature of Roman historiography. Historians provided their readers and listeners with many competing examples of good and bad conduct, inviting them to reflect upon these individuals and, in a sense, to reassess the past. Kraus shows how the exemplary figure is at the same time an individual and a type; as history concentrates our gaze on these figures, we see them both as unique, historically determined individuals whose actions are available for (re)interpretation, and as didactic—and hence relatively fixed—paradigms. In the early imperial period, there was increasing interest in exemplarity, most starkly in the disembodied *exempla* that make up Valerius Maximus' *Memorable Words and Deeds* or Frontinus' *Strategemata*. As history came to focalize increasingly on the emperor, it took an incontrovertibly biographical turn. Despite Plutarch's insistence in the early second century on the essential difference between history and biography (*Alex.* 1), it is no surprise that what was strictly in terms of genre 'history' was increasingly identified as 'biography'. Thus Tertullian and Jerome both later referred to Tacitus' *Annals* as 'Lives of

the Caesars' (Tert. *Scorpiace* 15. 3, with Barnes 1971: 202; Jer. *Comm. Zach.* 3. 14. 1–2). Individuals became more and more conspicuous in the narrative, none more so than the emperor himself. Like the statues that peopled the public spaces of Rome, these literary portraits, or self-portraits, were designed to captivate readers and listeners, with vivid description (*enargeia*) and rhetorical emphasis helping to retain their attention.

Much scholarship has been devoted to how Josephus was influenced by his reading of Greek historians of the distant and more recent past, notably Thucydides, but also Polybius, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Strabo, and Nicolaus of Damascus (Thackeray 1929: 100–24; Shutt 1961: 59–109; Attridge 1976: 53; Mason 2003b: 572–3). The Attic Greek in which he chose to write was certainly a medium with a long and distinguished literary pedigree. But much less attention has been paid to the extent to which he was influenced by contemporary Greek literature. To explore this issue, Christopher Jones attempts in Chapter 10 to piece together what we know about the Greek literature that was produced in Flavian Rome. It is difficult, as he explains, to locate very many specific Greek writers in the city precisely during Josephus' period of residence there. Josephus wrote his *Jewish War* in part to counter the work of others who had already produced unsatisfactory tendentious accounts of the war, some probably in Greek (*BJ* 1. 1–2). Towards the end of his career he came to detest strongly the subsequent account of the war produced by Justus of Tiberias (*Vit.* 40, 336–67), and Jones wonders if Josephus' resentment can be explained at least in part by the fact that Justus was more fully assimilated than he was to Greek literature and Roman culture. He was also influenced to a degree, Jones argues, by Dio Cocceianus (later known by the name Chrysostom), the sophist and rhetorician from Prusa in Bithynia, who was in Rome until his relegation by Domitian. Dio's Alexandrian oration (*Or.* 32), written under Vespasian, may have given Josephus ideas for his narrative in Books 18–19 of *Jewish Antiquities* of the troubles in that city between the Greek and Jewish communities and for his treatment of the Alexandrian Greeks Chaeremon and Apion, his two main targets in the *Against Apion*. For Jones, of all contemporary Greek authors who operated in Rome, Plutarch may have had the most impact on Josephus, especially his imperial lives, but he cautions

Introduction: Flavius Josephus and Flavian Rome

against pushing the connection too far. After all, they may both have been reacting independently to events current in the 70s, as Jones demonstrates with regard to their examination of the role of Tyche/Fortuna in shaping history. At least they both seem to have used as a source a historian writing in Latin, Pliny the Elder (see also Barnes, Chapter 6). This provides some support for the argument that as a historian Josephus was interested in many of the same political themes as his Latin predecessors and contemporaries (Mason 2003*b*). However, Jones suggests that after the death of Titus in 81, and especially as Domitian's attacks on Jewish sympathizers became more virulent in the 90s, Josephus may have worked in increasing literary isolation, though not necessarily in ignorance of current affairs. If his last works are all to be dated before 96, then he may have died with little expectation that he would be read and appreciated.

Louis Feldman probes the relationship between Josephus and Plutarch further in Chapter 11 by comparing their treatment of two famous lawgivers: Josephus on Moses and Plutarch on the Spartan Lycurgus. Feldman isolates a whole series of similar themes in their narratives, including the moral virtues that both Moses and Lycurgus shared: wisdom, courage, justice, and especially moderation and piety, as well as their overlapping political views. In particular, he shows how both felt strongly that the introduction of alien principles and institutions would destroy the internal harmony of the state. However, as Feldman points out, even though Josephus cites no fewer than sixty-one authors by name, Plutarch is not among them. Plutarch was certainly interested in, and knowledgeable about, Judaism and one might expect them to have had common interests if they had met in Rome. Plutarch, however, was quite hostile towards the Flavian dynasty and this may explain Josephus' silence. Another way of explaining the common features would be to posit a common source. Although the texts do not allow any firm conclusions to be drawn, Feldman's detailed discussion throws light upon the sort of issues that were of interest to these two Greek authors in Flavian Rome, as well as upon their working methods as writers. His analysis confirms the general point made by Kraus (Chapter 9) that historical writing at Rome was becoming increasingly biographical as more and more emphasis was placed on moral exemplarity. Plutarch's

Lycurgus and Josephus' Moses provide a clear example of that trend.

Kraus's discussion of the development of Roman historiography in the first century CE reminds us of the centrality of rhetoric to the shaping of historical narrative; the last three contributions to this volume, by Steve Mason, Honora Chapman, and John Barclay, provide detailed and rich analyses of some of the rhetorical techniques that formed such a hallmark of Josephus' writing. Mason in a challenging contribution (Chapter 12) argues for the importance of irony in Josephus' historical narratives, and, in so doing, adds an unexpected playfulness and depth to the historian's narrative voice. As he demonstrates, this is what a Roman audience would have been looking for in a historian, and the only reason previous scholars have not unearthed this quality is because they have not read Josephus in his Roman context. Using Ahl's classic article (1984) on the art of safe criticism as his starting point and locating his discussion firmly within the context of Graeco-Roman rhetorical theory, Mason proceeds to re-read passages of the *War*, the *Antiquities*, and the *Life* to demonstrate the ironic content of those works. He shows how Josephus uses irony to undercut the standard image of the supposedly clement Titus, in so doing 'systematically undermining the Flavian representation of the war'. In this regard, his analysis confirms the earlier contribution of Barnes (Chapter 6), in which he excavates three separate Flavian versions of the war. Mason also suggests that Josephus depicted the Jewish revolt not as a war against Rome, but simply as civil strife (*stasis*), again a rather subversive view for an author who has too quickly been written off as a mouthpiece of Flavian propaganda.

In his reading of *Antiquities*, Mason finds a number of 'points of intersection between Judaeian origins and traditional accounts of Rome's beginnings'. Josephus fails to make the comparisons explicit, but Mason plausibly suggests that a Roman audience would have made the necessary connections. In his view, Josephus' narrative would have been read as 'serial biographies with moral force', which relates him once more to the general Roman historiographical trends of his age that Kraus has outlined in Chapter 9. Moreover, he shows how Josephus' description of affairs in Rome between the end of Tiberius' reign and

Introduction: Flavius Josephus and Flavian Rome

the accession of Claudius in Books 18–19 would have been full of ironic undertones for an audience experiencing the worst of Domitian’s excesses from 89 onwards. Building on another recent essay where he has argued for a distinctly political reading of this section of the *Antiquities* (Mason 2003b), he here tracks the ironic tone that adds considerable bite to Josephus’ political analysis.

In the final section of his chapter, Mason concentrates on several key episodes in the *Life* to unpack the highly rhetorical nature of Josephus’ own self-image. Here too irony plays its full part, as Josephus fashions himself at times as a trickster almost worthy of Homer’s Odysseus, who needed to employ ‘double-speak’ and all sorts of rhetorical strategies to negotiate his difficult position, first, within Judaeon society and, later, between his Judaeon compatriots and his Roman patrons. In short, in a manner reminiscent of Tacitus, Josephus ‘conjures up a world of appearances detached from reality’. Josephus has rarely received such a thorough-going literary analysis, but as Syme showed in his classic work on Tacitus (1958a), it is only by means of a combined literary and historical approach that one can come anywhere near to a full understanding of a historian and thus be able to use him satisfactorily as a historical source. Josephus, like many other supposedly ‘second-rank’ historians, has long suffered by being used as a supposedly straightforward ‘quarry of facts’. The sort of ironic reading that Mason undertakes here should provide a salutary warning about the dangers of using him in this naive manner. Literary style and rhetorical subtlety mattered to Josephus. Even if his Greek was not of the first order nor his speeches specimens of the very highest oratorical quality, as Jones emphasizes in Chapter 10, this does not diminish the extent of his literary ambitions.

Exemplarity and vivid description (*enargeia*) were techniques that historians were increasingly using by the Flavian period, in particular as they came to be influenced by those rhetoricians and writers who formed part of the so-called ‘Second Sophistic’. Simon Goldhill (2001a) and Froma Zeitlin (2001) have recently illustrated how vivid description was a central strategy in the Second Sophistic, used to attract the viewer’s or listener’s or reader’s attention. Josephus was affected by this development, as Maud Gleason has argued (2001) by showing how crucial

body language and the highly visual treatment of bodies was to Josephus' narrative strategies. His participation in many of the events he describes in the *Jewish War* and *Life* gives his accounts a rhetorical 'vividness' and hence authority, while also tying him into a historiographical tradition that goes back to Julius Caesar, Polybius, and Thucydides.

In Chapter 13 of this volume Honora Chapman explores the importance of vivid narrative further by probing the importance of spectacle in Josephus' *Jewish War*. She provides a close reading of the spectacles that took place in the arenas of Caesarea and Berytus to mark Domitian's and Vespasian's birthdays in October and November 70 (*BJ* 7. 37–40) and the spectacular triumph that Vespasian and Titus held in Rome in the summer of 71 (*BJ* 7. 123–57). But to show how important *enargeia* was to Josephus, she focuses in particular on two spectacles narrated at some length in the *Jewish War*: first, his description of his own capture by the Romans at Jotapata, where he makes a historiographical spectacle of his own body, and, secondly, the detailed and vivid account of the destruction of the Temple in Jerusalem, where the Temple becomes a central spectacle in his narrative. The rhetorical emphasis that marks these episodes served to focalize a reader's or listener's attention, Chapman argues, and allowed the historian to underscore some key themes of the entire work: to celebrate the power of his Flavian patrons; to damn the rebels for their conduct during the rebellion; to enhance his own reputation as a Jewish general and priest, now resident in Rome; and, finally, to highlight the former grandeur of Jerusalem and its Temple, as well as the magnitude and tragedy of their destruction. For Chapman, Josephus promotes all of these motives through the medium of spectacle in order to suggest to his audience that they should view the destruction as tragic and support the reconstruction of Jerusalem and its sanctuary for the law-abiding Jewish people. Once again we see the historian using rhetorical techniques typical of his age to shape his historical narratives.

The final contribution, by John Barclay (Chapter 14), focuses on the most overtly rhetorical of Josephus' works, the *Against Apion*, and demonstrates how Josephan rhetoric can fruitfully be explored by an analysis of the cultural codes it utilizes. Building on earlier studies that have suggested that his *Against Apion* was

Introduction: Flavius Josephus and Flavian Rome

carefully composed for a Roman or Romanized audience (Mader 2000; Mason 2001), Barclay argues that we should examine the means by which Josephus designs his portrait of Judaism in line with aspects of the Roman cultural tradition, as well as how he deploys Romanized norms for the defence and eulogy of his non-Roman tradition. Throughout his discussion he relies on insights provided by current research on post-colonialism, which has explored the ways in which hybrid cultures are formed and the mechanisms by which subordinate (or 'subaltern') cultures redeploy the norms of the dominant culture for their own ends. Taking account of the constraints under which Josephus was writing, we should look out, Barclay suggests, for the ways in which he shapes Roman cultural values to his own ends and should be ready to hear hints of an assertion of Jewish superiority even in the midst of his general deference to Rome. Barclay then provides a close reading of a particularly revealing sample of Josephan rhetoric from the work (*Ap.* 1. 125–34). Its multiple and sometimes contradictory argumentative moves suggest that Josephus utilized Roman presumptions about power, as well as Roman denigration of Egyptian religion, but managed to turn Jewish history into one of 'friendship with', not 'slavery to', Rome. At two significant points Josephus also comments on the future of empires and the destruction of temples in ways which make no direct comment on Rome, but could be heard to bear implications for the political and moral evaluation of the Roman Empire. This would suggest that Josephus' Roman experiences, both in Judaea and in Rome, and perhaps also in the Jewish diaspora, all coloured his vision of his contemporary world and his sense of his Jewish past. Or, to paraphrase Barclay, Josephus transposed Jewish themes into a specifically Roman key.

As should be clear from these introductory remarks, the unity of the collection is assured not simply by the fact that all the papers concern Josephus and Flavian Rome, but also by a number of recurring themes and questions. We do not pretend that all contributors have reached a consensus on Josephus' relation to Flavian Rome. A number of details about Josephus' life while in Rome remain matters of dispute. Cotton and Eck and Jones tend to see Josephus at the margins, not very well integrated either with the social elite or with contemporary Greek writers operating in the city; for them he was a lonely, somewhat

isolated, even marginal figure. Others—for example, Bowersock, Mason, and Barclay—see him more connected to the social and literary elite and to contemporary Roman intellectual and cultural life: he was writing for a direct, primary Roman audience, and presented his narratives and arguments very much in a style that would have been appreciated by such an audience. On the other hand, Rajak argues for the continued importance of his links with diaspora Jewish communities of the eastern Mediterranean, preferring to emphasize his Jewish identity. To this end, she makes the good point that his children would not have been Roman citizens, since his various wives, their mothers, were all *peregrinae*, non-Romans. In addition, several details of his life such as the identity of his later patron Epaphroditus or his relation to Greek writers such as Plutarch remain controversial, as do some aspects of the chronology of his works.

However, on a number of points consensus does emerge. All the contributions in Part II of the volume, for instance, reinforce the centrality of Vespasian's and Titus' campaigns in Judaea and the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple as defining moments for the Flavian dynasty. And there can be little doubt that the story as Josephus told, and later retold, it in the *War* and in the autobiographical pendant to the *Antiquities* contributed towards the enshrining of that moment in Roman and Jewish memory. Several of the essays provide much needed literary analyses of Josephus' writing, and their conclusions have important repercussions for our use of Josephus as a source for both Jewish and Roman history. Cultural identity and cultural interaction are now much discussed questions in the study of the Graeco-Roman Mediterranean, and the sophisticated picture of Josephus that emerges from this volume will, we hope, make a fruitful contribution to those debates. His experiences as a local Judaeen political leader and military commander, Roman captive, partially favoured protégé of a new ruling dynasty, and prolific author make him a fascinating, if controversial, witness to the political and cultural impact of the Roman Empire on those subjected to it. As a Hellenized Jew (and Judaeen) who eventually became a Roman citizen, he was able to describe that world from a richly textured perspective. But it is his experiences—political, social, and cultural—in the city of Rome, a relatively neglected topic in both Josephan and Roman studies,

Introduction: Flavius Josephus and Flavian Rome

that provide the main focus for this volume. It is hoped that its contributions will increase our understanding of, and also stimulate debate on, both Flavian Rome and T(itus) Flavius Josephus.