JOSEPHUS, POMPEY AND THE JEWS

A comparison of the two accounts by Josephus of the period leading to the defeat of Aristobulus II of Judea by Pompey in 63 B.C. reveals that there is a difference in presentation of material which occasionally gives rise to irreconcilable views of the encounter between the Romans and the Jews (Bellum Judaicum I.123–54; Antiquitates Judaicae 13.398–14.97). It would seem that, between the time of writing of the Bellum (in the 70s) and of the Antiquitates (dedicated in the Domitianic period, 93/4), Josephus altered his perspective of the late Hasmonaean period. In this paper, I shall point to some of the major incongruities in Josephus’ portrayal of these events, and I shall suggest that the reason for the different views that appear lies in the sources he used for this period of history.

---

1. Introduction

One school of thought suggests that the *Bellum Judaicum* was written to justify the Roman conquests of Judaea, particularly the overthrow of Jerusalem undertaken by Titus. In some respects this observation must be correct. Josephus himself had not had a distinguished record acting for the Jews against the Romans, and in the *Bellum* he has blatantly tried to justify his own activities by demonstrating the invincible power of the Romans and the inevitability of the defeat of those Jews who had stirred up the Jewish nation against the Romans. A pro-Roman tendency is clearly evident in the descriptions of the period from A.D. 66.

In addition, Josephus wrote the *Bellum* at Rome in the early 70s, and he presented a Greek version of it to the emperor himself (Contra Apionem 1.48–50). The fact of the presentation alone dictates that the sections dealing with the affairs of the Flavians must have shown the imperial house in a good light. The reasons for writing the *Antiquitates*, however, seem less obvious. Josephus completed the *Antiquitates* during the reign of Domitian (ca 93/4), but this work is without specific reference to the emperor, except for dating purposes. As such, there seems to have been no particular reason for Josephus to glorify the Roman achievement over Judaea in this later work, and the *Antiquitates* has been viewed generally as without particular bias towards the Romans, although an occasional reservation has been expressed.

In comparison with the *Bellum*, the *Antiquitates* does bear a point of view less understanding of the role and position of the Jewish kings, which may have given rise to its negative portrayal of both the Hasmonaeans and the Idumaean Herod. This negativity has been assigned to an anti-Herodian bias developed later in life by Josephus, and/or to his increasing appreciation of the role of the Pharisees in the history of the First Century B.C., both of which factors are seen

---

3 Shutt, 18ff.; Schwartz (1990), 15; Varneda, 54ff., 95ff.; Cohen, 97ff.
4 Josephus seems to have aimed the *Antiquitates* at the Greek-speaking world: *AJ* 1.5, 9; cf. 16.174.
5 This has been hinted at by Marcus; see in particular ad 14.72. Fault has been found with many other incidents recorded in the *Antiquitates* by Alon, 26ff.
6 On the anti-Herodian bias, see Laqueur, 128–220; Schwartz (1990), 120, 125–6. Laqueur, 145ff., has also noted that some bias has arisen in the *Antiquitates* owing to the pro-Roman nature of its sources; cf. Varneda, 81; Schwartz (1990), 92ff. (cf. 151–4, 170ff., 185ff.). Schwartz (1990) suggests that Josephus backed the Herodian high priests in the 70s and 80s, then withdrew his support. This sounds like special pleading!
7 Schwartz (1990), 151–4, feels that the *AJ* has an ambivalent or inconsistent attitude towards Herod and other Herodians; cf. Cohen, 236ff.
to have given the *Antiquitates* a pro-Pharisee, anti-king stance, at least more than was apparent in the *Bellum*.8

Theories concerning the changing and developing viewpoints of Josephus do explain the apparent bias against the Jewish monarchs in the *Antiquitates*, but they do not necessarily explain the pro-Roman and the less-than-sympathetic portrayal of the Jews also evident in the *Antiquitates*. I should like to suggest that all of these 'developments' found in the *Antiquitates* arise from changes in perspective which Josephus adopted and adapted from his various sources: that he shifted from his parochially Jewish stance in the *Bellum* to one which incorporated a broader view of matters.

A typical example of the way that Josephus modified his stance to incorporate the 'Roman' point of view can be seen in the reasons he gives for Pompey's interference in the internal affairs of Judaea. When Josephus considers the overall aspect of the conflict between the Romans led by Pompey and the Jews, in the *Bellum*, he links Roman intervention in Jewish affairs to the struggle for the Judaean kingship, a contest which had arisen between the incumbent Hasmonaean king, Aristobulus, and his elder brother, Hyrcanus.9 Since Pompey entered the fray ostensibly to adjudicate between the warring brothers, Josephus sees the Jews as partly responsible for their own hardships, but Pompey himself is not viewed as a disinterested participant. He is portrayed as having taken ruthless advantage of the struggle over the kingship to force the Jewish kingdom under Roman control.10 In this respect at least, the war against Pompey is presented from a Jewish point of view.11

In the *Antiquitates*, the theme of internecine struggle similarly underlies the description of Pompey's participation in Jewish affairs, but Josephus in addition points to the nature of the rule of the Hasmonaeans as a major factor behind the turmoil in the Jewish state,12 and he seems almost to excuse, on the grounds

---

8 Schwartz (1990), 170–1; cf. 211–2, 215–6, claims that the *BJ* has an agenda governed in part by 'the interests of Agrippa and the old high priests' (cf. 16–8, 130ff., 141ff., 176ff.). He also relates the change between the *BJ* and the *AJ* to Josephus' new theme of God's rewarding the righteous and punishing the transgressors; cf. Varneda, 251–3.

9 In *BJ* 1.19, Josephus notes that the squabbles of Aristobulus and Hyrcanus attracted the attention of the Romans and Pompey, but he states no more than this. In this, Josephus draws a loose parallel with the type of internal political disturbances that brought on the Jewish war of A.D. 66; see 1.12, 4.386, and see also his 'own' speech in 5.395–6, cf. 5.362ff.

10 In some respects, the portrait of Pompey in 63 B.C. in the *Bellum* is a pale version of that of Titus in A.D. 70. On Titus, see Cohen, 234–5.

11 As we might have expected from reading Josephus' introduction to this work (e.g. 1.7–9, 12); cf. Varneda, 164. On this aspect of the *BJ* see further pp. 12–9; also Rajak, 10.

12 On the theme of internal dissension, see, for example, *AJ* 14.491. In *AJ* 13.417 and 430–2, Josephus sees the long-term fate of Judaea as having been brought about by Queen Alexandra through her unwomanly ambition and her lack of provision for the future peace
of Rome’s strategic needs, the fundamentally destructive role Pompey played. He implies, in the Antiquitates, that Pompey’s ambitions had not lain at all in the direction of Judaea, but that he had needed the country to be peaceful so that he could pursue his military objectives elsewhere. In the Bellum the aggressive intentions of the Romans are clear; in the Antiquitates the Romans bring sufferings upon Jews almost by default.

The interpretations Josephus offers for the origin and course of the conflict may differ only slightly, but it is important that the changes in aspect tend, virtually without exception, in affairs dealing with the Late Hasmonaean period, to put the Roman position (in the Antiquitates) in a better light. Let us examine some of the details of the events of this period to substantiate this point further.

2. Pompey in Judaea

In 78 B.C. the Jewish king Alexander died, leaving his kingdom in the hands of his wife, Alexandra. The queen assumed the throne herself, allegedly deeming both her sons unsuitable for kingship: the elder, Hyrcanus, because of his incompetence, although she did appoint him high priest; the younger, and good governance of her kingdom. The theme that the royal house was responsible for Judaea’s plight is repeated in AJ 14.77. No such comments about Alexandra are to be found in the Bellum. Her reign is in fact praised (BJ 1.112). There are some places in the Bellum where criticism of Hasmonaean rule might be inferred. BJ 1.170 suggests at first glance that the people did not want any form of kingship, but the context of these comments against the ‘monarchical’ rule of Hyrcanus suggests that it was Hyrcanus himself who was the problem. Later, Antipater, father of Herod the Great, seems to have had no trouble in being accepted as king (BJ 1.207, cf. 209, 213). Josephus records that there was much opposition to the decision by Antony to make Herod and his brother tetrarchs of Judaea (BJ 1.245–7).

13 This change in perspective is dubbed simply ‘matters of nuance’ by Schwartz (1990), 120, and the whole thrust of this argument runs generally counter to modern opinions of the AJ. See, for example, Leuty, 40ff., Cohen, 236ff.

14 The date is either 78 or 76 B.C. Problems arise in trusting AJ 14.4 for the date of Alexandra’s death. According to the Bellum, Alexander dies from disease and overwork (1.106), whereas in the Antiquitates he dies from heavy drinking, disease and overwork (13.398 cf. BJ 1.97). Although this difference is subtle, the AJ does depict Alexander as less worthy of having ruled because of his drinking problem.

15 The portrait of Alexandra is quite positive in the Bellum, but she is inconsistently depicted in the Antiquitates. Josephus notes that she was loved by the people (BJ 1.107–8; AJ 13.407) and that her opinion was respected by both Hyrcanus and the Pharisees (AJ 13.428–9); that she protected the country against its enemies (BJ 1.112, 115; AJ 13.409, 419, cf. 429, 432); and that she listened and acted upon some complaints against the Pharisees (AJ 13.417, cf. BJ 1.108, 114). In the Antiquitates Josephus disapproves of her
Aristobulus, because of his excitable temperament. In the Antiquitates and the Bellum, it is her religiosity and womanly weaknesses that lead her to become dependent on and subordinate to the Pharisees, and the latter in turn take advantage of her (1.110–12). Josephus implies that Alexandra put too much weight upon religious matters and that, because she was a woman, she was not strong enough to withstand the religious pressures being applied by the Pharisees. By inference, what Judaea required at the time was a king independent of the Pharisees.

In the Antiquitates, however, the dying king Alexander is said to have advised his wife to share power with the Pharisees because of their influence over the people, and he is made to claim that the Jews hate him because he has not treated the Pharisees well (13.401–2). The Antiquitates suggests that the people had sided with the Pharisees against the king, and the ‘revised’ account of Josephus gives some legitimacy to the activities of the priests who are associated, most particularly in the Antiquitates, with ‘popular’ rule; that is, to what is later depicted as a rule without kings.

In the Antiquitates, Josephus has introduced the idea, not evident in the Bellum, that what the Jews really wanted and needed was to replace the kingship with hierocracy. This looks forward to the settlement Pompey in fact imposed on the kingdom after the destruction of the temple at Jerusalem (AJ 14.73–4). The Bellum, on the other hand, notes the inherent popularity of Alexandra (1.107), not that of the Pharisees, and does not express any views on the need or wish of the people for the dissolution of the monarchy.

As we pick up the the story-line of Josephus again, in the Bellum, it is said that the partisan activities of the Pharisees against many leading Jews prompted these men to approach Aristobulus to plead their case before the queen. In this version of the events, Josephus makes it clear that many leading Jews saw Aristobulus as a natural leader and that he had influence with his mother, since he won indulgence for these men (1.114). The Bellum presents both Aristobulus and the leading Jews in a neutral light, even at times in a sympathetic light.

assumption of the throne (13.417, 431–2), yet seems to have acknowledged her capacity to rule (AJ 13.430–1; BJ 1.112).

16 On the supposed incompetence of Hyrcanus, see further BJ 1.203, AJ 13.423. It is odd, for this reason, that the queen should have made him high priest, since that office was very prestigious. On Aristobulus, see BJ 1.107–9; AJ 13.407, cf. 14.13.

17 See also Schwartz (1990), 172ff., who also relates the difference to the changing opinions of Josephus.

18 On implicit influence of Pharisees with the people, see AJ 13.401, 406.

In the *Antiquitates*, however, Aristobulus is relegated to being only one of a group of leading citizens who approach the queen to complain about the Pharisees; these leading men are said to have threatened the queen by intimating that they could leave the country to go to fight for her enemies; and, in addition, Aristobulus is reported to have been looking simply for an opportunity to strike at the queen and to have made open complaint against her (13.410–16). The *Antiquitates* thus marks out Aristobulus as an adventurer who does not deserve the position of king and his followers as truly disaffected from the regime. This portrayal of Aristobulus prefigures his takeover of the kingdom, and it suggests that his treachery against the regime was of long-standing.

When the queen fell ill, Aristobulus started an uprising against her and against her designated successor Hyrcanus. In the *Bellum*, Josephus comments on the many devoted followers of Aristobulus (1.117), but in the *Antiquitates* he notes rather the dismay of the populace at this turn of events (13.422–5), and he supplies the added information that many foreign potentates joined Aristobulus to take advantage of Judaea in its weakness (13.427). The *Antiquitates* undermines the suggestion of the *Bellum* that Aristobulus enjoyed evident popularity, and the *Antiquitates* hints again that the interests of Judaea could only have been compromised by his leadership (cf. *AJ* 13.431).

Josephus notes that Alexandra died after a reign of nine years, and he records that Aristobulus claimed the government outright. Hyrcanus, for perhaps two years or so, resisted the forces of his brother, but Aristobulus was the leader preferred by the Jews. Hyrcanus was finally forced to acknowledge Aristobulus as king and at first swore to restrict his ambitions.20 Although he had agreed to these terms, Hyrcanus, prompted by a faction hostile to the new king, sought to take over the country again, this time with outside help, that of the Nabataean Arabs.21

In the *Bellum*, the Nabataean king, Aretas, is said to have helped Hyrcanus because of the righteousness of his cause (along with a few gifts). In the *Antiquitates*, the faction of Hyrcanus allegedly bribed Aretas by means of gifts and by offering to hand over cities and large grants of territory. In the latter version, the edge is taken off the position of Hyrcanus, who is portrayed as ready to surrender substantial parts of the kingdom to win his case, and this type of innuendo mirrors the impression of Aristobulus: that he, like Hyrcanus, was eager to betray his country by inviting in foreign interests. The groundwork is being carefully laid by Josephus in the *Antiquitates* to have the Romans intervene to put an end to the corruption of the Jewish state by the Hasmonaeans.

---


The tendency to denigrate both Hasmonaean kings appears again in the *Antiquitates* when Josephus describes the outcome of Aretas' support for Hyrcanus. He reports that Hyrcanus would have gained supreme power in Judaea in 64 B.C., since Aristobulus was at his mercy, had not Aristobulus bribed M. Aemilius Scaurus, who had been sent by Pompey to oversee matters in the region. In the *Bellum*, Josephus states that Scaurus was bribed only by Aristobulus (1.128), whereas in the *Antiquitates* it is said that Hyrcanus also offered Scaurus bribes (14.30–1). The latter work discredits both contenders for the Jewish throne.

Josephus has recorded in the *Bellum* that Scaurus had rushed from Damascus to intervene in Judaea because the civil disturbances there offered him a 'god-sent opportunity' (*BJ* 1.127). The phraseology of the *Bellum* at this point implies that Scaurus was undisguisedly seeking a reason to interfere in affairs in Judaea, and to this end he threatens the Jews with Roman forces. The *Bellum* openly admits and describes the aggressive actions of the Romans. When he came to pen the *Antiquitates*, however, Josephus omitted the information that Scaurus was looking for trouble. This omission concerning the blatantly aggressive attitude of Scaurus is significant, since without this intelligence the Romans appear to have had a neutral stance on the issue of the kingship and to have been interested only in a peaceful resolution of the conflict.

Scaurus decided in favour of Aristobulus. Although at first it seemed that Pompey was going to respect this decision, when he actually entered the region of the Levant, he began to follow a different policy, one which eventually forced Aristobulus into conflict. The *Bellum* and the *Antiquitates* diverge in their description of these events. First, the *Antiquitates* fleshes out the interaction between Pompey and the Jews with a remarkable amount of detail, very little of which is given in the *Bellum*. Josephus' knowledge of the happenings of this period has apparently increased substantially, particularly when he describes the movements of Pompey. In addition, the actual course of events prior to the outbreak of hostilities at Jerusalem is described quite differently in the two works, and lastly, the *Antiquitates* offers strategic motives for Pompey's attacks on the Jews which are not to be found in the *Bellum*.

In the *Bellum*, Josephus takes the reader directly to a meeting between the Romans and the Jews at Damascus. He claims that the faction of Hyrcanus bribed and cajoled Pompey to turn against Aristobulus, and that, although Aristobulus could have used bribery to influence the Romans in his favour, he chose not to and left in a huff. In the *Bellum*, it is after Aristobulus leaves Damascus that Pompey accepts the arguments of Hyrcanus' side and virtually declares war on Aristobulus (1.131–3). The *Bellum* suggests that Aristobulus thought that there was no

---

22 *BJ* 1.127: ἐξ ἐρματον. The opportunity was one which Scaurus had evidently lost in the case of Damascus, which Lollius and Metellus had just captured (*AJ* 14.29). See also Burr, 875–87.
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point in discussing the issue with Pompey, since the price for his compliance was too high. The Bellum also indicates that Pompey was insulted by Aristobulus' rebuff and that this was the reason for his subsequent attacks on the king.23

In the Antiquitates, however, notice is given of diplomatic activity prior to the meeting at Damascus (14.34–8), where representatives of the warring brothers are said to have met with Pompey. On this occasion, Aristobulus is said to have sent a very expensive gift which Pompey later dedicated in the temple of Jupiter on the Capitoline.24 In the presence of Pompey, Nicodemus, the envoy of Aristobulus, is said to have made accusations against Scaurus and Gabinius (whose presence has not previously been mentioned), that they had taken bribes,25 and it is noted that the result of this denunciation was to make these two officers hostile to the cause of Aristobulus. The overall impression of Aristobulus in this section of the Antiquitates is of a king overtly corrupt, inherently deceitful, and stupid as well.

After the first round of diplomatic activity reported in the Antiquitates, Josephus goes on to describe the destructive path taken by the forces of Pompey as he made his way, probably from Syrian Antioch, to Damascus (AJ 14.38–40), where he gave the disputants a chance to present their cases in person. It is at the meeting at Damascus that we hear explicitly for the first time in the Antiquitates that the whole Jewish nation was against the idea of kingship. Leading Jews are reported to have claimed that the country wanted neither Hyrcanus nor Aristobulus as king but preferred priests to rule again.26 These sentiments look forward once again to Pompey's final settlement of the kingdom.

It is also reported in the Antiquitates that the charge was levelled by the leading Jews, that Aristobulus and Hyrcanus were trying to enslave the Jews

23 Dio 37.15.2–3 has a very brief account of the interaction between Pompey and the Jews.
24 AJ 14.34–6. This gift was said to have been inscribed, not with the name of Aristobulus but with that of his father. There are, however, textual difficulties here, since the epitomator of Josephus and the Latin translation say that the name inscribed on the gift was that of Aristobulus. See Marcus, ad loc. The item could have been dedicated by Alexander in the temple of Jerusalem, since such offerings to the temple were not unusual, and even Romans were known to have made offerings (e.g. Sossius in BJ 1.357, AJ 14.488). It might have been removed by Pompey after the capture of the temple. Pompey 'explained' the item as a diplomatic gift rather than as something impiously taken from the temple (Dio 36.16.4). See Seager, 51–2.
25 BJ 1.157 and AJ 14.80–1 suggest that Pompey did not, however, lose faith in Scaurus, since he left him in charge of the later province of Judaea. Gabinius was later noted for his honest dealings, especially where the publicani were concerned. See Badian, esp. 89.
26 More than two hundred of the most outstanding men (according to Diodorus Siculus 40.2.2) were at Damascus to make this claim. The suggested enmity between Aristobulus and the priests is surely exaggerated (see also Alon, 27–34), since it was mostly this group which fought with him against Hyrcanus when the latter was supported by the Nabataeans (AJ 14.20) and which fought to the bitter end against Pompey as the designated faction of Aristobulus (BJ 1.143, 150–1; AJ 14.14.58, 66–8). On AJ 14.20, see Laqueur, 142–3.
(14.41). In return, the Hasmonaean brothers put their cases, but the reported contents of their respective speeches contain material prejudicial to both contenders for the throne. In the first speech, Hysanus states his rights to the throne by primogeniture, then goes on to claim that Aristobulus had made raids on nearby countries, stirring up the problem of piracy in the area, and that the nation had revolted against him. Hyrcanus is then said to have produced a thousand Jews of high standing to support his case, provided for this purpose by Antipater (14.43), father of Herod the Great.

The charge that Aristobulus was behind piracy in the region portrays him as a renegade, a man unworthy of kingship and hated by his people, and a long-term enemy of Rome’s power, perhaps even as an ally of Mithridates. The argument works implicitly in favour of the necessity of Roman intervention. Such implications about Aristobulus do not appear in the Bellum and seem ridiculous from the Jewish point of view. Why would Aristobulus have become engaged in all these theatres of war when he was having so much trouble simply holding his own against Hyrcanus, and why would he, on the one hand, antagonise the Romans, when, on the other, he was expending so much energy overtly conciliating the Romans?

In reply to the speech by Hyrcanus against him, Aristobulus in the Antiquitates notes the incompetence of his brother, and himself produces witnesses, but these are described as a bunch of useless fops (14.44–5). The blatant denigration of the followers of Aristobulus makes him the unworthy proponent of an unworthy group of effeminate courtiers. Further, the insults allegedly levelled by Aristobulus against Hyrcanus in return make Hyrcanus’ case less substantial. In the Bellum, on the other hand, Josephus implies that Aristobulus did not even present a case to Pompey, let alone participate in the circus described in the Antiquitates (cf. BJ 1.132). The Bellum also intimates that Pompey decided immediately in favour of Hyrcanus, and that he effectively commenced hostilities against Aristobulus straight after the diplomatic activity in Damascus (1.133).

Josephus paints a different picture in the Antiquitates: that Pompey openly criticised Aristobulus for his use of force, but did not make a final decision

---

27 BJ 3.414ff. notes that piracy was a problem at Joppa when Vespasian was in the region in A.D. 68. Josephus records that these pirates had seriously disrupted traffic along the coast of Phoenicia and Syria, but he says nothing about activity in the time of Aristobulus. Justin 40.2.4 suggests that Pompey feared Judean and Arabian brigands invading Syria. On the pro-Roman bias of the source, see Laqueur, 153–4.

28 The account of the Antiquitates is supported to some extent by the epitome of Diodorus Siculus 40.2, who notes the meeting, although Florus 1.40.30–1 suggests that the meeting perhaps took place at Jerusalem after the defeat of Aristobulus. On Strabo as a source common to both Diodorus and Josephus AJ 14.34, see Laqueur, 148–52.

29 Diod. Sic. 40.2.2 claims that Pompey made threats and criticised the party of Hyrcanus for having in unspecified ways harmed the Romans. In this he is in conflict with Josephus,
about the kingship at this time, at the conclusion of the meeting at Damascus, because he feared that Aristobulus would try to stir up the country and prevent him and his army from marching through Judaea to attack the Nabataeans. Josephus then asserts that Aristobulus proceeded to do exactly what Pompey feared he would; yet, in fact, the king did nothing but retreat from the Romans, and he yielded to every demand made by Pompey. Despite the lack of any evidence of hostility on the part of Aristobulus, he is depicted paradoxically in the Antiquitates as the aggressor against the Romans.

In the Bellum the ultimate objective of Pompey, to attack the Nabataeans, is not recorded, and Pompey, we should note, did not go on to attack the Nabataeans, at least according to Josephus; yet one inference to be drawn from the

who assigns the trouble to Aristobulus. The name Hyrcanus may have inadvertently been placed in the epitomised text of Diodorus instead of that of his brother. Note, however, that there exists the same general view of the Jews, who are said by Pompey to have harmed the Romans, although in fact they appear to have done nothing against the Romans to warrant this charge.

30 AJ 14.42–7. Florus 1.40.30 states that Pompey was made an arbiter in the case to decide between the brothers, and that he chose Hyrcanus; that when Aristobulus tried to regain power, he threw him into chains.

31 On the Nabataeans, see AJ 14.31, and on Pompey’s ambitions, see AJ 14.46, 48; Plutarch, Pompey 38; Appian Mith. 106; Dio 37.15.1–2, cf. Florus 1.40.31. Burr, esp. 876ff., feels that Pompey’s ambition against the Nabataeans was in fact the only reason he attacked the Jews; cf. Laqueur, 156. Aristobulus would have been likely to help Pompey against the Nabataean Kingdom, which so recently had supported Hyrcanus. Aristobulus in fact had already inflicted a defeat upon the Nabataeans as they were withdrawing from Jerusalem, after they had been ordered to leave by Scaurus (BJ 1.127; AJ 14.31–2). Pompey may have suspected that Aristobulus would block him, as Alexander, Aristobulus’ father, had tried to block the Syrian monarch when he wanted to march through Judaea against the Nabataeans (BJ 1.99–102). Yet Aretas the Nabataean king had also turned on Alexander, defeating him in battle (BJ 1.103). The Judeans and the Nabataeans seem to have been inveterate enemies.

32 The Jews could obviously not compete militarily against the Romans. That Pompey’s army was large is suggested by the comments attributed to Aristobulus’ friends, who point out to him that he cannot beat the Romans (BJ 1.135, cf. AJ 14.48). We should also note the trail of destruction left by Pompey in 63 as he made his way southwards from his winter quarters to Damascus (AJ 14.38–40). His aggressive intentions were obvious.

33 Josephus makes it clear that Pompey did not go further south than Jerusalem and that he never reached Petra, the Nabataean capital of Aretas. Scaurus did this in 62 (BJ 1.178; AJ 14.80–1). Despite claims that Pompey fought against (Plut. Pomp. 42; Appian Mith. 106; de Vir. Ill. 77) or conquered the Nabataeans (Florus 1.40.30; Dio Cassius 37.15.1–2; Festus Brev. 14, 16; Orosius 6.4.9, 6.6.1–2; Eutr. Brev. 6.14; cf. Dio. Sic. 40.4), we should accept the evidence of Josephus on this issue, because it is the most detailed source we possess, and is supported by Pliny’s record of Pompey’s achievements (Pliny NH 7.97–8). There is perhaps a suggestion of a further possible reason for the Roman incursion into Judaea recorded in Antiquitates 13.419–21, not in the parallel Bellum
Antiquitates concerning Pompey’s motives is that he had a large army on hand, not to use against the Jews, but against the Nabataeans who were his prime military target. This difference in appreciation of the overall military situation, arising as does from the fact that the Antiquitates reveals a knowledge of Pompey’s unfulfilled intentions, underlines the divergent historical interpretations of the Antiquitates and the Bellum.

The two accounts of Josephus run parallel again after the meeting at Damascus. Pompey, upset either because Aristobulus had left the meeting in a hurry (Bellum) or because he feared the king would attack him (Antiquitates), chased Aristobulus to the fortress of Alexandreion, and, after extensive negotiations, forced him to hand over this fortress to the Romans. Josephus, in the Antiquitates in particular, suggests the arrogance and potential duplicity of Aristobulus, yet, on every point, as both versions agree, the king seems to have ceded to Pompey.

Pompey was not content with the minor capitulation of Aristobulus at Alexandreion, so he began to make further military moves against the king, who had retreated to Jerusalem. En route to Jerusalem Pompey heard of the death of Mithridates, news which, according to the Bellum (1.138), spurred him on to be even more aggressive towards the Jewish monarch, but this item concerning Mithridates and the consequent impetus to Pompey’s military ambition has been omitted by Josephus from the Antiquitates. As with the case of the Scaurus, the Antiquitates has failed to report the truculent attitudes and actions of the Romans.

To try to appease Pompey, Aristobulus is reported to have left the security of his capital Jerusalem, and, in the subsequent negotiations, is said to have offered to surrender money, himself and the city, anything, it would seem, to avoid open hostilities with the Romans. In the Bellum, Aristobulus is ‘terrified’, goes to Pompey as a ‘suppliant’ and voluntarily surrenders himself into captivity (1.138). In the Antiquitates Aristobulus maintains his arrogance to the end. He goes out to Pompey simply because he has ‘changed his mind’ (presumably about attacking the Romans), makes offers of money and the surrender

1.115–6: that the Romans had already ‘saved’ Judaea from invasion by Tigranes of Armenia in 69. Note that Josephus has made a seemingly incorrect claim in the same context of the Antiquitates: that Lucullus invaded Armenia after Mithridates had fled to Iberia. Appian, Mith. 83, a more plausible source at this point, states that Mithridates had fled to the Armenian Tigranes for help. Josephus may have picked up the error about Lucullus’ movements from a source which was more interested in Pompey’s affairs and which had sought to undermine Lucullus by portraying his invasion of Armenia as a waste of time.

34 BJ 1.135–7; AJ 14.49–52. Incidentally, recorded in the Bellum but not in the Antiquitates is the fact that Hyrcanus, on at least one occasion at Alexandreion, was the one to ask his brother to parley with Pompey. The Bellum reveals a measure of concord between the brothers.

of Jerusalem, then Pompey 'forgives' him (14.55), implicitly allowing Aristobulus the freedom to leave.

Josephus reports, in Bellum 1.141, that Pompey put Aristobulus in custody immediately, then sent Gabinius to Jerusalem, where the partisans of the king refused him admission to the city (1.140). In the Antiquitates, however, it is claimed that Pompey did not arrest Aristobulus until after Gabinius had been refused admission to the city.\(^{36}\) The subtle difference between the accounts suggests a difference in interpretation of the events. The Antiquitates has an air of Roman justification about it, since yet again Aristobulus is portrayed intending to deceive the Romans, and the Romans as simply reacting to his duplicity.

Concerning the details of the siege of the temple of Jerusalem, the two accounts of Josephus are in almost perfect accord. Josephus records that, while Pompey's forces surveyed Jerusalem, the gates were opened to him by the faction of Hyrcanus, which recognized the superior strength of the Romans. The followers of Aristobulus retreated to the temple, which was separated from the city by a deep ravine, and Pompey tried in vain to come to terms with them. For three months Pompey's forces besieged the temple, aided by Hyrcanus, then, taking advantage of the religious practices of the Jews, captured the temple, where approximately of twelve thousand men, many of them priests, were killed.\(^{37}\)

The Bellum says that it was the faction of Hyrcanus which inflicted the heavier losses on the followers of Aristobulus when the temple was captured (1.150), whereas the Antiquitates allows the reader to assume that the Romans did most of the killing (14.70). Similarly, the Bellum reports that, although the Romans lost few men, many of them were wounded, but the Antiquitates notes simply how few of the Romans perished. In the Antiquitates, Josephus has excised notice of the military activities of the Jews, and has stressed the Roman achievement. This account favours the Romans, inasmuch as Pompey claimed the defeat of the Jews as part of his triumph, and he must have reported that the Jews were killed in their thousands by the Romans, with little loss to his men.

Both versions, however, make it clear that the priests were slain while in the very act of worshipping their god, and Josephus comments on the interest of the Romans in the piety of the priests, noting in the Bellum that Pompey admired the Jews for this (1.148), although in the Antiquitates the particular interest of Pompey is not recorded (14.64–8).\(^{38}\) The former work suggests the pride the

\(^{36}\) BJ 1.138–41; AJ 14.56–7. An abbreviated but similar account is also given by Dio 37.15.2–3, although he states that Aristobulus refused Pompey's demands.

\(^{37}\) BJ 1.141–51; AJ 14.57–71; see also Dio 37.15.3–16.4; Orosius 6.6.2–4.

\(^{38}\) See Schwartz (1990), 87, who notes this point. Similarly Schwartz (1990) sees a difference in the accounts over the reasons for the priests' continuing to sacrifice even though death threatened: in the BJ it is out of subservience to God; in the AJ out of subservience to the laws (pp. 196–7).
Jews had in their religious practices and the hope that others of importance appreciated these matters too. The fact that Josephus modified this observation for the *Antiquitates*, omitting Pompey, suggests that he found this comment inappropriate, not mentioned by other sources, or perhaps even contradicted elsewhere.

The military activity of the disaffected Jews paradoxically enabled Pompey to penetrate the holiest of holies, an act of wholesale sacrilege. In *Bellum* 1.152, Pompey’s intrusion is described as a συμφορά; 39 in *Antiquitates* 14.71: οὐ μικρὰ ... ἄβατον. This difference in approach to the sacrilege is instructive, reflecting again perhaps the changed perspective of the *Antiquitates*, since the later work did not view the intrusion as a ‘disaster’. Josephus continues to mitigate further the sacrilege to the inner sanctum of the temple in the *Antiquitates* by underscoring the respect that Pompey is said to have shown the holy items because of his piety and virtue. 40

The temple was purified again on Pompey’s instructions. Pompey thanked Hyrcanus for his support, 41 (which is described in a low-key fashion as χρήσι-μος in *Antiquitates* 14.73, but on a more important note as προσμιότατος in *Bellum* 1.153) by making him high priest. 42 Josephus reports, at the end of this section in the *Bellum*, one of this work’s few pro-Roman sentiments (1.153) – that Pompey’s goodwill, rather than compulsion, helped to resolve the difficulties faced by the Jewish people. 43 Since Titus in A.D. 70 also entered the inner sanctum of the temple and allegedly took great pains to try to ensure the integrity of the holy items, Josephus may have felt himself restricted in describing the sacrilege perpetrated by Pompey, since a comparison between the two generals could have been so easily drawn by Titus himself on reading the *Bellum*, and so we can understand his pro-Roman line at this point.

Pompey executed the leaders of Aristobulus’ faction and divided up the kingdom, making the northern sections part of the new province of Syria and turning the rest, Judaea to Egypt, virtually into a Roman province, over which he placed Scaurus. Pompey seems to have been determined to turn the country into a ‘conquest’, and, in the eyes of the *Bellum* at least, Pompey’s support of

39 Schwartz (1990), 87–8, asserts that the *AJ* does not note the reaction of the people to the sacrilege of Pompey as does the *BJ*. This omission by Josephus undermines the Jewish position. In *AJ* 14.487, the term συμφορά, however, is used to describe Pompey’s intervention in Judaea.

40 See Marcus, ad 14.72.

41 *BJ* 1.153 also notes that Pompey did not establish Hyrcanus as king but reinstated him as high priest, although it seems to have been kingship that Hyrcanus had wanted.

42 The changing attitude to the type of help rendered by Hyrcanus to the Romans ties in with the earlier point of shifting military χύδος for the destruction of the temple to the Romans alone.

43 See Marcus, ad 14.72.
Hyrcanus was merely a ruse to force Aristobulus, the king, into opposition with the Romans.

The account of Pompey in Judaea in the Bellum concludes with a simple statement that Pompey set off for Cilicia (1.157), the vanquisher taking his prisoner Aristobulus with him. In Antiquitates 14.77–8, however, Josephus apportions blame for the events to Aristobulus and Hyrcanus. As a result of the actions of the brothers, Josephus laments, the Jews exchanged freedom for subjection to the Romans; territory and money were taken from them; and, finally, the kingship of Judaea fell to men of ordinary birth. To the last, the determination of Josephus to demean the achievements and patriotism of the Hasmonaeans in the Antiquitates continues.

In summary, we can observe that the Bellum and the Antiquitates differ in a number of significant ways. The Bellum displays the unabashed aggression of the Romans. The point of view of the Antiquitates, on the other hand, is one which qualifies Roman activities in Judaea as follows: that the ruling house was unworthy of kingship; that the priests and people wanted neither Hyrcanus nor Aristobulus as king; that Pompey, en route to Arabia, was invited to choose which brother should be king; that Aristobulus was plotting to harm the Romans and then failed to live up to his agreements; and that Pompey, who was in the region with a large army, was forced to overthrow this potentially malevolent king Aristobulus.

The case for a change in presentation of some of these affairs by Josephus has been put. Let us now consider whether or not we can determine that Josephus used different sources for the two works and the influence such a division of sources might have had on the composition of the Antiquitates in particular.

3. Sources Used by the Bellum and the Antiquitates

Josephus does not name the sources he has used for the Bellum. In the Contra Apionem he goes to great pains to demonstrate that there were sources apart from the Greeks who had written about the Jews, and this claim is echoed in the opening of the Bellum (1.17). In the preface to the Bellum, he also tells us that Greeks had translated Jewish history of the early period, taking their accounts from Jewish writers, and he states that he will begin the Bellum where Greek historians and Jewish 'prophets' have concluded (1.18).45

44 Varneda, 81; Schwartz (1990), 35.
45 Although it seems most likely that these 'prophets' were those of the canon of the Old Testament, they are not alone in being classed as such by Josephus. In AJ 1.240, he indirectly cites a 'prophet' Malchus (Cleodemus) who seems to have written some
The tenor of these remarks implies, at the very least, that there existed local Jewish histories of the period from the Second Century B.C. onwards, none, however, which could be classed among those of the προφήται of the earlier period (and the ‘modest’ suggestion of Josephus is that he will fill this breach by composing the Bellum; cf. AJ 1.5–12). Since the period from the mid-Second Century B.C. had been the first occasion of Jewish independence for many hundreds of years, it must have been a time well known to most Jews and documented in some way for local consumption, if only in school-book fashion. It is more than likely that Jewish sources were available to Josephus, had he wanted or needed to employ them.

Since he composed the Bellum originally in Aramaic (his ‘native’ tongue), then had this work translated into Greek, it seems not improbable that he had originally used sources in his native tongue. If he had used Greek sources, this would have involved him in the cumbersome process of translating their ideas from Greek into Aramaic, constructing his own work incorporating details from his Greek sources, then having these translated back into their original Greek.

Despite these problems of composition, most authorities accept that for the period from 170 to 4 B.C., including the events of 64/3, the Bellum followed the ‘General History’ of Nicolaus of Damascus as its main source. Since, howev-

Hellenising form of Jewish history – in Hebrew or Aramaic? – and not to have been one of the standard prophets of the Old Testament. Perhaps the terminology used by Josephus simply reflects lack of precision concerning distinctions in literary genres (Schwartz [1995], 10).

Josephus also seems to be overlooking the ‘Greek’ historians of the Jews, Nicolaus and Strabo, either because at the time he wrote the Bellum he did not know of their works, or because in a strict sense they had not ‘translated’ the works of Jews into Greek.

Josephus makes passing reference to the glory of the Hasmonaens in Contra Apionem 2.134, suggesting that such things were common knowledge. On his ‘school’ style, see Contra Apionem 1.53, perhaps a criticism of the early part of the Bellum. Momigliano (1977), 24–5, holds that the Jews never wrote local histories of the style of the Greek historiographical tradition. On what was available locally, however, see Schwartz (1995), 20, Feldman, 19–31.

On Josephus as his own source, see Shutt, 26–9; Cohen, 49, 50, 65 cf. 52ff., 65–6, cf. 232–3. There were Jewish sources – Herod, for example, wrote memoirs (AJ 15.174), and we have evidence for some Hellenising Jewish historians; Eupolemus, for example (Schwartz [1995], 31; cf. Feldman, 28–9). In AJ 1.5–7, Josephus also implies that he might have used Hebrew records.


Skill in Greek language was largely a servile talent, one ostensibly avoided by upper-class Jews. On this, see Feldman, 19ff.

Josephus took short-cuts wherever possible. He seems to have used already existing Greek translations of the Old Testament for the AJ (Thackeray, ad 1.5–7).

Schürer, i.51: generally, see Cohen, 49.
er, Josephus does not mention Nicolaus as a source for the *Bellum*, and this part of Nicolaus' history is extant only in excerpted form, and none of these extracts deals directly with Pompey in Judaea, it cannot be proven that Josephus used Nicolaus as an authority for the *Bellum*. To assume that Nicolaus was the main source for the *Bellum*, therefore, is unsubstantiated guesswork, and there are arguments which suggest instead that Josephus used Nicolaus only for the *Antiquitates*, not for the *Bellum*.

For example, when Josephus specifically names Nicolaus or others as authorities in the *Antiquitates*, it is often at points where the *Antiquitates* differs materially from the *Bellum*. In addition, many of the references to Nicolaus and Strabo as sources in the *Antiquitates* come in the form of direct quotations, a style not found in the *Bellum*. Are we to suppose that Josephus based the *Bellum* on the work of Nicolaus, then when he came to write the *Antiquitates*, he overlaid a work already derived from Nicolaus with verbatim extracts from that same source? The use of quotations rather implies that Josephus has inserted these to verify and justify the essence of what he had already published as 'history' in the *Bellum*.

52 Nicolaus is a historical participant in the dramas associated with King Herod in the *Bellum*. Strangely, it is as if when he wrote the *Bellum*, Josephus did not know that Nicolaus was a historian. In fact, Josephus calls him simply a friend of Herod; cf. *BJ* 1.629–38, 2.21, cf. 1.574.

53 In *AJ* 13.250–2, Nicolaus is cited for the information that Hyrcanus I accompanied Antiochus on campaign in 130 B.C., which is not mentioned in *BJ* 1.61–2. In *AJ* 13.284–7 and 313, quotations from Strabo are given which provide material not in *BJ* 1.86 or 1.84 respectively. Further, in *AJ* 13.324–71 there is much detail about Ptolemy Lathyros of Cyprus, Cleopatra his mother, Alexander Jannaeus' campaigns and of Syrian happenings, in the course of which Josephus cites Timagenes (344), then Strabo and Nicolaus (347); cf. *BJ* 1.86–7. (On this, see Cohen, 50–1.) Similarly, when discussing Antipater (AJ 14.9; cf. BJ 1.123), it is when citing Nicolaus that Josephus in the *AJ* gives a more detailed genealogy than that found in the *BJ* (cf. Laqueur, 136–8). In AJ 15.9 Strabo is quoted; not in BJ. Similarly, *AJ* 16.29–57 cites a speech of Nicolaus; not found in BJ (cf. also *AJ* 16.332–50). In AJ 16.179–83, Josephus says that Herod tried to pillage the tomb of David, and he uses Nicolaus as one authority for this – not mentioned in BJ. In *AJ* 17.106–27 Josephus quotes and paraphrases at length a speech allegedly made by Nicolaus which is also very briefly reported in *BJ* 1.637–8, but the two speeches are quite different in emphasis (e.g. in *BJ* Antipater made Pheroras a potential fratricide; not mentioned in *AJ*).

54 Quotations from Nicolaus: *AJ* 1.94, 1.159, 7.110, 13.250–2, cf. 16.29–58, 16.332–50; from Strabo: *AJ* 13.286–7, 13.319, 14.35–6, 14.114–8, 14.138–9, 15.9. Josephus does not say that he has used either source, but he simply refers to them to substantiate his own account, to differ from them (*AJ* 1.108), or to suggest that the reader look to them for further detail (*AJ* 12.127). His use of them for the *AJ* may also have been minimal, restricted largely to verbatim quotation.

55 Let us consider an example. In *AJ* 14.68 Josephus vouches for the religious piety of the Jews having been displayed all during the siege of Jerusalem, even while the temple was being taken. For verification of his claims, he cites the authority of Strabo, Nicolaus of
a) Major Sources For *Antiquitates* Books 13 and 14

As we have seen, the *Bellum* and the *Antiquitates* present parallel accounts of Roman intervention in Judaea in the 60s. There are few comments found in the *Bellum* which Josephus does not repeat in the later work, and so the *Antiquitates* differs from the *Bellum*, in the main, only in the extra material that has been added. It seems likely that most of the new material on the events of 63 B.C. comes from the three sources who are specifically mentioned during the relevant chapters of the *Antiquitates*: Nicolaus of Damascus, Strabo and Livy.

The works of Nicolaus were possibly used by Josephus in the account of Pompey in Judaea in the *Antiquitates* largely to add detail about the Idumaean Antipater, father of Herod the Great. Josephus has not followed Nicolaus blindly, however, since he recognises and criticises Nicolaus’ open bias towards the family of his patron Herod. On one occasion, this criticism refers only to the fact that Nicolaus apparently gave Antipater a slightly better pedigree than he himself had given him in the *Bellum* (*AJ* 14.8–10 cf. *BJ* 1.123), but later in his work, for events about Herod, Josephus more broadly highlights the obvious bias of Nicolaus towards his patron and says that he has acted to obviate it (*AJ* 16.183–7).

Generally, Josephus may have believed that Nicolaus was a reliable source for this particular aspect of Jewish history, and it is probably from this source that we get most of the quite detailed commentary on the dealings between Hyrcanus, Antipater and Aretas, the king of the Nabataean Arabs, which is missing from the *Bellum*. For example, in the *Antiquitates*, but not in the *Bellum*, Josephus notes that land and a dozen named cities were offered by Hyrcanus to Aretas as payment for his support against Aristobulus, an arrangement engineered clearly by Antipater (*AJ* 14.18). Josephus also records only in the *Antiquitates* that Hyrcanus offered Scaurus a bribe through an envoy (*AJ* 14.30–

---

56 Although it is outside the scope of this paper to compare all aspects of the *BJ* and *AJ*, the fact that the former describes some Roman military practices, whereas the latter does not, suggests that the latter was directed at an audience familiar with such matters. Varneda, 126–7, cites the descriptions of assault machines (*BJ* 4.19 ff.), the marching order of the Romans (*BJ* 3.115–26, cf. 5.47–50) and Roman standards (*BJ* 3.123), features perhaps of interest to a non-Roman reader. On a similar emphasis in the *BJ* on Roman institutions, see Varneda, 176–7.

57 On the use of Nicolaus and Strabo for the *AJ* particularly in Books 13 and 14, see Schwartz (1990), 48, 56; also Cohen, 50.

58 See Laqueur, 162.
1).\textsuperscript{59} and since Antipater was Hyrcanus' most formidable ally at this time, the offer was almost certainly made by Antipater himself. The details of these transactions probably derived from Nicolaus' work.

Similarly, the \textit{Antiquitates} describes in some depth the siege of Aristobulus in Jerusalem by Hyrcanus and Aretas. During the siege there is recorded an incident showing the impiety of the besieging forces, for which God is said to have punished the country by destroying all the crops in the land (\textit{AJ} 14.20–8).\textsuperscript{60} This piece of anecdotal information is not mentioned in the \textit{Bellum} and also probably comes from the work of Nicolaus.

Antipater was also present at the first diplomatic meeting with Pompey, since he was putting the case for Hyrcanus. As noted above, the \textit{Bellum} does not record this meeting, so the \textit{Antiquitates} has used additional sources for this event, and Josephus has clearly used more than one source, because there exists a chronological rift between \textit{AJ} 14.34 and 14.37. We can identify one source, that for \textit{AJ} 14.34–6, since Josephus names Strabo specifically as an authority, and Nicolaus is almost certainly the source for the later sections that detail the meeting, in which Antipater plays a vital role.

As soon as Pompey enters on the stage, Josephus in the \textit{Antiquitates} quotes an extract by Strabo (\textit{AJ} 14.35–6). From this point in the text, Josephus begins to introduce material which has a Romano-centric focus which finds no parallel in the \textit{Bellum}. For example, the \textit{Antiquitates} gives the specifics of the destructive route Pompey's forces took from his winter quarters to Damascus in early 63 B.C. (14.38–40). It is easy to jump to the conclusion that Josephus is using Strabo as a source for Pompey's activities and perspective, and this would help explain the shift in emphasis between Josephus' two accounts.\textsuperscript{61}

Indirect evidence for Strabo as a source for the \textit{Antiquitates} appears in the dating of the fall of Jerusalem in 63 B.C. In the \textit{Bellum} Josephus reports only that the city fell to the Romans in the third month of the siege (1.149). In the \textit{Antiquitates} Josephus gives the year, dating it both by an Olympiadi and by the

\textsuperscript{59} In \textit{AJ} 14.31–2, Josephus gives the considerations that allegedly prompted the decision of Scaurus in favour of Aristobulus: first, that Scaurus could not trust Hyrcanus to live up to his pledge; and second, that Scaurus thought that dislodging Aristobulus from Jerusalem would be too difficult, whereas the followers of Hyrcanus were few and his supporters, the Nabataeans, poor fighters anyway, and so Hyrcanus would be the easier to rule against. One implication is that Scaurus made a choice in favour of Aristobulus for all the wrong reasons; that Aristobulus did not deserve his crown. Laqueur, 144, puts the change in emphasis down to the later anti-Herodian bias of Josephus. This perspective of events, not in the \textit{Bellum}, could have been derived both from Nicolaus (concerning Jewish details) and from Strabo (on Roman motivation).

\textsuperscript{60} Cf. Schwartz (1990), 91, 183, who believes that Josephus here is not following Nicolaus.

\textsuperscript{61} See Laqueur, 145ff., 155, who, since he considers that Josephus employed Nicolaus for the \textit{Bellum}, suggests that this new material comes solely from Strabo.
consuls at Rome (14.66). In the Antiquitates he also supplies the precise day the temple fell, which he calls a ‘fast’ day (probably understanding by this the day of Atonement).

It has been argued convincingly that what Josephus’ source meant by a ‘fast’ day was in fact the Sabbath, which Greeks commonly believed was a fast day, and it has been suggested that Strabo must have been Josephus’ source at this point, since Strabo records precisely this in his Geography: that Pompey took Jerusalem on a ‘fast’ day and that this was a day on which Jews refrained from work (Strabo 16.2.40 [763]; cf. Dio 37.16.2–4). Josephus seems to have followed Strabo blindly on this point, since he reports the fall of Jerusalem on a ‘fast’ day along with the reference to an Olympiad and to the name of the Roman consuls, which has involved his account in some chronological difficulties.

The account of the second meeting between Pompey and the Hasmonaeans, that at Damascus, is reported in the Bellum differently from the Antiquitates. The differences, I believe, should be put down to Josephus’ introduction of material into the Antiquitates from the pens of both Strabo and Nicolaus. Strabo has presumably put the (Roman) theme, that the Jewish people did not want kings at all, since Nicolaus could scarcely have promoted this point of view. Nicolaus, on the other hand, has probably supplied some of the information detrimental to the cause of Aristobulus, and that which dealt with Hyrcanus and Antipater; such as, for example, that Antipater had provided Hyrcanus with a thousand Jews to support his case (AJ 14.43).

The influence of Strabo is also perhaps evident in the material that details Pompey’s motives for his actions, such as at the conclusion of the meeting at Damascus (AJ 14.46–8). Josephus also tells us in the Antiquitates, on this occasion, of the unfulfilled intention of Pompey to march against the Nabataeans. In addition, Strabo is probably also behind those parts of the Antiquitates that seem to enhance the Roman position (relative to the Bellum): for instance, when the potential deceit of Aristobulus is mentioned (on many occasions, but at the siege of Alexandreion and especially at the time prior to the siege of Jerusalem); when the details of Pompey’s victory over the Jews are given; and when blame is assigned to the Hasmonaeans for the destruction of Judaea’s liberty.

62 The AJ, by giving the dating by Olympiads, suggests that Josephus here is definitely consulting some Greek-oriented work (Hahn, 255ff.; McGing, 499). In addition, the overlap of an Olympiad date and a consular date suggests that the fall of the city took place in the first half of the year.

63 See Marcus, ad AJ 14.66 and Thackeray, ad BJ 1.149; also Laqueur, 161–3. In his ‘History’ Strabo may not have added the rider which clearly identifies the ‘fast’ day with the Sabbath. Josephus probably had before him only the information about the ‘fast’. See also AJ 14.487.

64 On the bias of Strabo against the Hasmonaeans, see 16.2.37, 40 (761–3).
The influence of Livy is generally harder to detect than that of Strabo and Nicolaus, but Josephus may have consulted him for details of chronology, when, for example, he needed to specify a date by a consular year. The use of consular dates, we should note, is limited to events in Book 14 of the *Antiquitates* (69 to 37 B.C.),\(^6^5\) a period also dealt with in some depth by Livy, and it is within this section of the work that Livy is actually named as an authority by Josephus (cf. *AJ* 14.68).

These observations about the *Antiquitates* give the impression that Josephus used Nicolaus, Strabo\(^6^6\) and probably Livy as his sources for additional detail on Pompey’s campaigns in Judaea and upon the details of the activities of Antipater, sources which were perhaps not used for the *Bellum*. If this is so, then the use of these three authorities would account for the less sympathetic portrayal of the Jews that appears in the *Antiquitates*.

b) Chronology and Sources for the *Bellum* and *Antiquitates*

The suggested pattern of Josephus’ use of sources: unspecified (perhaps Jewish) sources for the *Bellum*; and Nicolaus of Damascus, Strabo and occasionally Livy for the *Antiquitates*, is found again when we consider the works of Josephus from another angle, that of his use of chronological references. The *Bellum* tends to follow local Jewish systems of dating; the *Antiquitates*, on the other hand, avoids uniquely Jewish dating criteria, and supplies ‘international’ dates.

For the most part in the *Bellum* Josephus uses referential systems of time unique to the Jews, and so these chronological pointers must derive ultimately from Jewish sources. Since the *Bellum* (unlike the *Antiquitates*) dealt with a period of history which was easily able to be cross-referenced with universally recognised systems of dating, the fact that Josephus has not regularly used external dating criteria in the *Bellum* (as he does in the *Antiquitates*) suggests that his immediate sources also did not follow generally accepted patterns of international dates, but instead restricted their range to local Jewish standards. On this basis, the argument that in the *Bellum* Josephus followed the account of this period by Nicolaus of Damascus, a Syrian Greek, seems unlikely.\(^6^7\)

---

\(^{65}\) *AJ* 14.4, 66, 389, 487. In the first example, Josephus has made an error over the dating, perhaps because he followed a source less reliable for Jewish matters, such as Livy presumably was; see Marcus, ad loc. In *AJ* 14.389, Josephus also seems to have had trouble reconciling his Greek and Latin dates; see Marcus, ad loc.

\(^{66}\) As he implies in *AJ* 14.104, where he notes that Nicolaus and Strabo do not differ significantly in details about Pompey (and Gabinius), but he does not actually say that he used either source.

\(^{67}\) For a summary of the general opinion that Nicolaus served as Josephus’ source for the *Bellum* for this period, see Schwartz (1990), 223, cf. 38–9, 45, 120.
The *Bellum* operates first by using Jewish sacerdotal genealogies (1.31, 1.36–7, etc.), then, after the advent of Aristobulus I, by recounting the lengths of Jewish ‘regnal’ periods (1.84, 1.106, etc.). It is only in the Roman Imperial period that Josephus adopts a more widely accepted system of dating, that by the years of Roman emperors,68 but these in effect served the same purpose as Jewish regnal periods, as local coinage from these periods demonstrates. In the Maccabean period of the late Second and First centuries B.C., coins sometimes record the regnal year of the king, as do some coins of the Herodian period, and coins from the Imperial period appear bearing the year of the emperor.69 In the local Jewish context, therefore, dates were given by means of the reigning power. This is the system that Josephus has followed almost exclusively in the *Bellum*.

Apart from ‘regnal’ dating, only occasionally does the *Bellum* use recognisable external dating criteria, but these references demonstrate the general paucity of ‘international’ chronological standards applied elsewhere in the work. For example, Josephus does refer in the *Bellum* to the one hundred and seventy years of ‘Macedonian’ (i.e. Ptolemaic and Seleucid) domination of Judaea (1.53), but this period of domination by the ‘Macedonians’ is opened-ended to non-Jews, since only Jews would have known when this takeover of Judaea had occurred. In the corresponding reference in *Antiquitates* 13.213, however, Josephus has expanded this dating criterion, reckoning in addition by the ‘Syrian’ kingdom and specifying further that ‘Syrian’ chronology began when Seleucus Nicator occupied Syria (312/1 B.C.). This was an easily recognised standard,70 even though it had been the Ptolemaic kings who had first taken control of Judaea. The difference in aspect between the two works could not be clearer.

On one occasion only does the *Bellum* adopt a truly international standard, a date by an Olympiad (1.415),71 but this exceptional date is used in the context of Herod’s foundation of Caesarea. Josephus had close links with this town: he had many dealings with it as a general in 66; he spent two years in captivity there (where he may have begun to make notes for the writing of the *Bellum*); and he married a native of the town. During his two years in the town, he must have seen inscriptions dealing with Herod’s foundation of Caesarea72 and with

---

68 For example, to Nero: *BJ* 1.20, 2.284, 2.555.
69 Meshorer, esp. i. 35ff.; ii. 5ff. On Roman Imperial coinage minted at Caesarea for example, see Levine, 21.
71 Josephus himself notes that fact that Olympiads were used for ‘international’ dating, e.g. *Contra Apionem* 1.184, 185. cf. 2.17. See Samuel, 189–90, 243.
72 It is likely that there were inscriptions recording the establishment of the games of Caesarea, particularly since both Augustus and Livia made sizeable contributions to the events (*BJ* 1.415, *AJ* 16.136–41). Note the ancient reference to inscriptions of Caesarea, allegedly made by Apollonius of Tyana (*Ep.* 11), cf. Levine, 35, 36–8.
the celebrations of its games. The town itself also became important in the Flavian period, since Vespasian turned it into a *colonia*. This strong association with Caesarea and deep knowledge of the local history of the site prompted Josephus to describe Herod’s building activities there at very great length, and for the same reasons he no doubt recorded the official date associated with its ‘foundation.’

Josephus has to some extent in the *Bellum* tried to give the whole period of Jewish history an overall chronology, but this he has done late, in Book 6, when he records the date of the sack of the city of Jerusalem by Titus (6.438–42). From King David, he tells his reader, until Titus 1179 years have elapsed. The perspective is yet again wholly Jewish.

In addition to the infrequent use of international chronological standards, there are several anomalies in the *Bellum* which suggest a uniquely Jewish system of reference, particularly in the early part of the work. For example, when describing the events ca. 170 B.C. Josephus refers only to the fact that sacrifices at the temple of Jerusalem had been interrupted for three years and six months (1.32). In the comparable reference in *Antiquitates* 12.248, Josephus does not reckon by the suspension of temple sacrifices, instead he gives a date both by the Seleucids and by an Olympiad. Similarly, there are curious chronological anomalies to be found in the *Bellum*; first in *BJ* 6.269–70, where, although there is a reckoning given by Vespasian’s reign and that of Cyrus the Great, there is a further point of reference which seems peculiarly Jewish; secondly, in *BJ* 6.435–7, where, again after dating by Vespasian, Josephus uses an unknown system of chronology, perhaps one related to that found in 6.269–70.

In the *Bellum* Josephus also refers to years from the Babylonian captivity (1.70), a date of great relevance to the Jews, but he supplies no other chronological details, which implies that this reference came from a Jewish history. On the other hand, the context surrounding the corresponding reference in the *Antiquitates* has supplied many other relative dates, so that the period of the captivity can be easily calculated in ‘absolute’ terms (13.301, cf. 13.253–4,

---

73 Josephus records the celebration of games by Agrippa I in A.D. 44 (*AJ* 19.343).
74 Josephus refers to the town on many, many occasions, and he gives a disproportionately long description of Herod’s building programme there; cf. *BJ* 1.408–15; *AJ* 15.331–41. His interest may have also stemmed out of Caesarea’s political importance as a Roman provincial capital, and it is noteworthy that Vespasian and Titus spent much time there (Vespasian: *BJ* 4.87, 130, 419, 443, 491, 501, 550, 588, 620.; Titus: *BJ* 4.663, 5.1, 40, 7.20, 22, 36, 407.) On its early importance, Levine, 34ff.
75 Similarly in *BJ* 1.16, he speaks of the length of time Antiochus Epiphanes held Jerusalem, of interest only to Jews. The importance of the temple is noted by A. Momigliano (1987), 89–91.
76 Other references to the Babylonian captivity are less specific; *BJ* 2.86, 5.389, 6.250, 6.268, cf. 6.439.
260, 269–70, etc.). It seems clear that, in the case of the *Antiquitates*, Josephus has availed himself of a source without the solely Jewish frame of reference apparent in the *Bellum*.

By way of contrast to the *Bellum*, the *Antiquitates* almost overflows with external dating criteria which, since they do not come from the *Bellum*, must, therefore, derive from the sources Josephus used to ‘upgrade’ the *Bellum* into the *Antiquitates*.

For the earlier books of the *Antiquitates* (where dates must have been in any case largely conjectural), Josephus has, wherever possible, provided an external date of some sort. For example, in *Antiquitates* 1.80, Josephus gives a date with reference to Noah, and he also specifies a Jewish month in this context, but then converts this to the equivalent months by the Macedonian and Egyptian calendars. In contrast, not once in the *Bellum* has Josephus supplied a reference to a Macedonian month. Although Josephus need not necessarily have copied the names of the Macedonian and Egyptian months from his sources for the *Antiquitates*, he has clearly altered his perspective from the predominantly Jewish point of view of the *Bellum* to an outsider’s point of view, perhaps reflecting the influence of an ‘international’ source on the *Antiquitates*, such as, for example, that of the Syrian Nicolaus of Damascus. A difference in attitude to the importance of chronology in the *Antiquitates* is underlined by the fact that Josephus notes the attention to chronology paid by the prophet Daniel in his book (AJ 10.267).

All through the account of the period of Seleucid domination of Judaea, the *Antiquitates* uses Seleucid dating, which the *Bellum*, as I have noted, does only once. In some books of the *Antiquitates*, in fact, Josephus has provided

77 Josephus has provided a strong chronological framework. In AJ 13.236, he mentions the 162nd Olympiad, and later, the 177th in association with Roman consular dates (AJ 14.4). Between these two citations, an absolute time-frame has been established. In AJ 13.259–64, Josephus has also recorded a *senatus consultum* which could have been dated by a Roman audience through the mention of Roman magistrates. Note the chronological difficulties imported into AJ 13.254 (cf. BJ 1.62), presumably by Nicolaus of Damascus, who has been named immediately prior to this passage (13.250–1), and who was probably the source for all of this new chronological information. Strabo is also cited by Josephus in AJ 13.286–7, 319, 347 (with Nicolaus). Seleucid regnal dates have also been given in AJ 13.365 and 387. The contrast with the lack of a system for this period in the *Bellum* is striking. On the chronology for the *AJ*, see Cohen, 42ff.

78 Also AJ 2.311, 3.201, 3.239 (Macedonian alone), 4.84 (with Athenian month), 4.327, 8.61–2 (with reference to Eiromos and the foundation of Tyre), 8.100, 11.106–7 (with regnal years of Darius), 11.109, cf. 11.286.

79 The extant works of Nicolaus and Strabo unfortunately show little, if any evidence of ‘international’ dating. We do not, however, possess their ‘Histories’ in full.

80 There are other examples: in BJ 1.37–8 and 1.61, no dates are provided, but in the parallel passages, AJ 12.285 and 13.236 respectively, the Seleucid system is found. We should
Seleucid and other chronographic criteria to date events on a year-by-year basis.\textsuperscript{81} Again this contrasts with the vague references given in the \textit{Bellum}.

When Josephus describes the Jewish 'regnal' period in the \textit{Antiquitates}, in addition to references to lengths of reigns (as appear in the \textit{Bellum}), he most carefully cross-dates the beginning of the whole period, the 'regn' of Hyrcanus, against the regnal year of Antiochus VII of Syria and against an Olympiad (13.236).\textsuperscript{82} Similarly, the \textit{Antiquitates} announces the start of Herod's kingship with notice of both an Olympiad date and the names of the Roman consuls (14.389). Such a pattern of cross-referential dating suggests that Josephus has at least referred to a range of different sources for the \textit{Antiquitates}, since none of this attention to chronological detail is evident in the earlier \textit{Bellum}.\textsuperscript{83}

On other standards too the \textit{Bellum} is found wanting in comparison to the \textit{Antiquitates}. Although the \textit{Bellum} has mentioned one Olympiad, that for the foundation games of Caesarea, the \textit{Antiquitates} refers to this dating criterion quite often.\textsuperscript{84} Lastly, it is only in the \textit{Antiquitates} that we find dating by Roman consular years, a sign that Josephus has modified the \textit{Bellum} using a source that had at least some notion of what the Romans were doing.\textsuperscript{85}

All of the chronological evidence discussed above suggests in summary that in the \textit{Bellum} Josephus did not follow sources which used international conventions of dating, as any 'Greek' history would have; rather he has followed sources which used idiosyncratic, Jewish systems of dating.\textsuperscript{86} In compar-

\textsuperscript{81} Also note that, in contrast to the \textit{BJ}, the \textit{Maccabees} also uses dating by Seleucid regnal periods, e.g. 1.1.11, 1.1.21, etc., even for periods after Judaea was supposedly free of 'Macedonian' domination, e.g. 1.15.10, 1.16.14, 2.1.10. See also Cohen, 44–7.

\textsuperscript{82} This is quite noticeable in Book 12 where a succession of Seleucid dates in the 160s is provided (12.246, 12.285 [cf. \textit{BJ} 1.37–8 (undated)]; 12.297, 12.313, 12.361, etc.).

\textsuperscript{83} Josephus seems in fact to have created chronological difficulties by introducing so many styles of dating. See Marcus, ad \textit{AJ} 13.236; note similar problems for the start of the reign of Hyrcanus II (\textit{AJ} 14.4).

\textsuperscript{84} If Josephus used the same sources for the \textit{Bellum} and the \textit{Antiquitates} at points where, in the latter, for example, he introduces consular dating, we must assume that he deliberately omitted such dates when writing the \textit{Bellum}, then returned to his original sources twenty years later when composing the \textit{Antiquitates} to reimpose these dates on his text. It seems more likely that the \textit{Antiquitates} had the \textit{Bellum} as its basis, but that Josephus expanded the original by the addition of material from a variety of new sources, which contained, en passant, dates by Roman consuls, by Olympiads and by Seleucid eras.

\textsuperscript{85} An analogous pattern is discernible in the documents concerning the woman Babatha, where it is only after the Roman conquest of Arabia in A.D. 106 that consular dating is in evidence. After 106, the documents are dated by consuls and by the 'Macedonian' calendar. See Lewis, esp. 27–8.

\textsuperscript{86} On overt chronological problems, see Cohen, 32–3. Momigliano (1987), 46ff., notes an indifferent attitude to external chronological matters also in the book of Daniel.
ison with the *Antiquitates*, the *Bellum* is a work of parochial derivation and design. In stark contrast, the many and varied systems of dating used in the *Antiquitates*, arising as they do from the detailing of the general history of the period, have elevated the *Antiquitates* to a work of international standing, and it is clear that Josephus has consulted many non-Jewish sources for this work. On this basis, it is not unexpected that the *Antiquitates* exhibits a broader appreciation of the overall context in which occurred the episodes of Jewish history previously described in the *Bellum*, and thus displays a less pro-Jewish point of view.

4. Conclusion

First, I have attempted to show that the *Antiquitates* portrays the actions and motives of Pompey in Judaea from the Roman perspective, whereas the *Bellum* deals with the Jewish view-point. Secondly, I have suggested that this alteration in perspective has arisen from the totally different types of sources used by Josephus for the two works for the *Bellum*, local Jewish works; for the *Antiquitates*, Nicolaus of Damascus, Strabo and Livy. If these points are accepted, then the possibility arises of treating the two accounts by Josephus of the demise of the Hasmonaeans virtually as two separate sources. Which version is to be preferred is a question that obviously cannot be answered, but the pro-Roman line evident in the *Antiquitates* surely hints that the later account is the less reliable and should warn historians not to accept that Roman intervention in Judaea was necessary or inevitable.  
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87 As does, for example, the otherwise very good analysis of this period in the 60s B.C. by Smallwood, 1–30, amongst others.