

Citation style

Kaizer, Ted: Rezension über: Jonathan Edmondson / Steve Mason / James Rives (eds.), *Flavius Josephus & Flavian Rome*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005, in: *Plekos. Elektronische Zeitschrift für Rezensionen und Berichte zur Erforschung der Spätantike*, 9 (2007), S. 117-127, DOI: 10.21245/rec.ant.2088992944, heruntergeladen über Website



copyright

This article may be downloaded and/or used within the private copying exemption. Any further use without permission of the rights owner shall be subject to legal licences (§§ 44a-63a UrhG / German Copyright Act).

Jonathan Edmondson, Steve Mason and James Rives (eds.): *Flavius Josephus & Flavian Rome*. Oxford: Oxford University Press 2005. xvi, 400 pp, with 8 illustrations. £ 75. ISBN 0-19-926212-8.

Joseph Sievers and Gaia Lembi (eds.): *Josephus and Jewish History in Flavian Rome and Beyond*. Leiden/Boston: Brill 2005 (Supplements to the *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 104). xv, 454 pp. Euro 126.00. ISBN 90-04-14179-0.

Both volumes here under review have developed from the continuing interest on the one hand in the Jewish historian Flavius Josephus and, on the other, in Rome and its empire under the Flavian dynasty, exemplified best in the progress made with the Brill Josephus Project¹ and in the publication in 2003, again by Brill, of a massive book on various aspects of Flavian Rome.² Both volumes are also, in their own way, the result of recent efforts to bring these two issues together, and found their origin in international colloquia held respectively in Canada and Italy. The OUP volume, edited by J. Edmondson, S. Mason and J. Rives, sprang from a combination of a conference and a graduate seminar at York University in Toronto in May 2001, although the editors – who emphasize that “a conference is one thing, a useful book something else” (vi) – chose not to include some of the original presentations and added new ones instead. The Brill volume, edited by J. Sievers and G. Lembi, presents the proceedings of a colloquium held in September 2003 at the Pontifical Biblical Institute and the Pontifical Gregorian University in Rome, “within walking distance of the Arch of Titus and of Josephus’ place of work, if he actually lived on the Quirinal

1 Under the general editorship of Steve Mason, in *Flavius Josephus: Translation and Commentary*. Leiden: Brill 2000–, an international team of scholars is producing the first comprehensive commentary to all works by Josephus. For information on published volumes, see <http://www.yorku.ca/smason/JosComm.html>. In the meantime, Tessa Rajak’s standard work from 1983 has received a new edition: *Josephus: the Historian and his Society*. London, sec. ed. 2002.

2 A. J. Boyle and W. J. Dominik (eds.): *Flavian Rome: Culture, Image, Text*. Leiden: Brill 2003, with an illuminating review by O. Hekster in *Scripta Classica Israelica* 23, 2004, 294–296. Most recently, R. R. Nauta, H.-J. van Dam and J. J. L. Smolenaars (eds.): *Flavian Poetry*. Leiden: Brill 2006 (Mnemosyne Supplements 270), focused on one specific aspect. Cf. P. J. Heslin: *The Transvestite Achilles: Gender and Genre in Statius’ Achilleid*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2005. The recent stream of publications on aspects relating to the Flavian period had been anticipated by R. Darwall-Smith: *Emperors and Architecture: a Study of Flavian Rome*. Brussels: Latomus 1996 (Collection Latomus 231).

Hill” (ix).³ Considering the fact that both volumes share a substantial part of their agendas – namely to go beyond plundering Josephus’ writings for the information they provide with regard to their subject matter, by exploring the efforts by the Jewish historian also as those by a literary author who needs to be placed in a Roman context – it is perhaps surprising that of the many contributors to these two volumes (sixteen in *Flavius Josephus & Flavian Rome*; twenty-three in *Josephus and Jewish History in Flavian Rome and Beyond*) only three (Barclay, Chapman and Mason) have a piece in both. Although this is of course positive in that it avoids unnecessary overlap, it may also be remarked that *Flavius Josephus & Flavian Rome* really is an Anglo-Saxon piece of collaborative scholarship (including works by Israeli scholars), while *Josephus and Jewish History in Flavian Rome and Beyond* is much more international.

The OUP volume opens with a proper and lengthy introduction by the hand of J. Edmondson, pointing out how, traditionally, Josephus has been overlooked by many classicists and Roman historians, and how his works – mainly containing information about Judaea, Jewish culture and the Hebrew Bible – have nearly always been considered to form part of the theological rather than the classical canon.⁴ Bringing together these two strands of scholarship, this book suggests (with some interesting exceptions) that “it was Josephus’ experiences

3 It followed six previous international colloquia on Josephus, originally instigated by the *Institutum Judaicum Delitzschianum* at Münster to accompany a project to publish Greek-German editions with commentary of those works by Josephus that had not been treated in such manner in the 20th century (*Jewish Antiquities*, *Life* and *Against Apion*). The proceedings of these colloquia (held at Münster, Brussels, Aarhus, Amsterdam, Paris and Dortmund respectively) were all published in the series *Münsteraner Judaistische Studien* (Münster: LIT Verlag 1998–2003). Of the intended editions with commentary only the *Life* has been published (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2001). For further information about the Münster project, see <http://egora.uni-muenster.de/ijd/forschen/josephus.shtml>. Note that its founding father, the institute’s director F. Siegert, states in his afterword to the present volume (425) that “officially [the project] has even died, being now reduced to a very modest kind of afterlife.” At the end of his own paper in the volume (422–423) he gives an overview of the status of progress of the project: ‘Anhang: der Stand des Münsteraner Josephus-Projekts’.

4 However, in this context it should not be forgotten that the fundamental study of how the Roman empire was governed owes, in a way, its existence to a Roman historian’s reading of Josephus: F. Millar: *The Emperor in the Roman World* (31 BC–AD 337). London: Duckworth 1977, sec. ed. 1992, viii: “it can at least be affirmed that this book had a perfectly simple and concrete origin, namely in the reading of Josephus’ *Jewish War* and the latter part of his *Antiquities* in the late summer of 1961, and in the observation that, in the events there described, the population of Judaea repeatedly applied to the emperor in person for decisions in their affairs but never received any spontaneous communications from him.”

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" (20). The fourteen chapters that follow are divided over three parts. Part I, 'Josephus in the social and political context of Flavian Rome', opens with a prosopographical study by H. M. Cotton and W. Eck ('Josephus' Roman audience: Josephus and the Roman elites'), which places Josephus in a rather gloomy situation: the proud Jewish priest and general, who liked to boast about his connections to Vespasian and Titus, seems – as far as the evidence is concerned – to have been isolated from the upper classes in Rome, to such a degree that he dedicated three of his works to a *grammaticus* who himself was (according to the *Suda*) a freedman of an otherwise not attested governor of Egypt. It is further argued that "this isolation is not altogether unlikely" (p.52), taking into account Josephus' status as a member of a defeated and unpopular social group. In contrast, G. W. Bowersock ('Foreign elites at Rome') calls Josephus "arguably the most famous" of the "representatives of foreign elites to be found in Flavian Rome" (53). He argues that, despite the fact that hardly any Near Eastern Senators have been identified for this period,⁵ Josephus' presence in Rome alongside that of even more prominent Jews such as Agrippa (II) and his sister Berenice was part of a "larger pattern of imperial restructuring" (61) of the Roman elite on the part of the new dynasty, and that Vespasian aimed at a "cultivation of loyal elites" (62) from conquered peoples along the lines of the policies of Augustus and his direct successors, with Josephus following in the footsteps of Herod the Great's court historian Nicolaus of Damascus. In any case, participation by members of the Jewish elite (both royal and priestly) in upper class life at Rome did not, as Bowersock notes, stop the Bar Kockba revolt from happening a generation or two later, which stands in contrast to the successful assimilation to Rome's ruling class by the descendants of the kings of Commagene, so famously shown by the acquisition by Philopappos (the grandson of the last ruling king of Commagene, Antiochus IV) of consular status and membership of the jet set priesthood of the *fratres arvales*.⁶ The third chapter, by D. R. Schwartz ('Herodians and *Ioudaioi* in Flavian Rome'), deals with "two apparently disparate issues, one historical and one philological", on the grounds that an understanding of why the Flavians did not reinstate the Herodian dynasty in Judaea (a fact which has always been taken for granted) will illuminate the development of the meaning of the Latin and Greek terms

5 On which see Bowersock's own study: Roman senators from the Near East: Syria, Judaea, Arabia, Mesopotamia, in id.: *Studies on the Eastern Roman Empire*. Goldbach: Keip 1994, 141–159.

6 On Philopappos, see now M. Facella: *La dinastia degli Orontidi nella Commagene ellenistico-romana*. Pisa: Giardini Editori e Stampatori 2006 (*Studi Ellenistici* 17), 338–358.

Iudaei and Ἰουδαῖοι (from ‘Judaeans’ to ‘Jews’).⁷ Schwartz argues that neither the imperial context (the gradual demise of client kingdoms in this period), nor the fact that Agrippa II was without an heir while his sister was getting on as well, is sufficient to account for the fact that the house of Herod was not restored: “a fundamental element of the matter is to be found in the fact that the years after 70 saw the demise of the notion that *Ioudaioi* constituted the type of collective for which a king would be natural or relevant. With the demise of that notion the Herodians became irrelevant” (68). When the meaning of the term switched from ‘Judaeans’ to ‘Jew’, thus losing its link to a specific territory, kingship over this group did not longer have a *raison d’être*.⁸ In the last paper of Part 1, T. Rajak (‘Josephus in the Diaspora’) “gently challenges one of the main propositions of this volume”, as one of the editors puts it (20): she emphasis Josephus’ contacts *beyond* the city of Rome, since “Josephus the Roman had come to the heart of a Mediterranean empire at its height” (79), chronicling his travels to Diaspora communities and indeed his second and third marriage to women from Alexandria and Crete.

Part II, ‘The impact of the Jewish war in Flavian Rome’, opens with a paper by F. Millar (‘Last year in Jerusalem: monuments of the Jewish war in Rome’) investigating how the Jewish war became, in physical terms, a key element in legitimating the new dynasty that followed on the disastrous end of the Julio-Claudians and the subsequent year of the four emperors. The eventual capture of Jerusalem, accomplished only with “a massive concentration of forces”⁹ (101), was not just celebrated with a splendid triumph so fully described by Josephus (bell. iud. 7.123–157), but furthermore resulted in a building programme directly challenging the effects of Nero’s reign, prompting Martial to proclaim that “Rome has been restored to herself, and under your servance,

7 The latter a topic on which Schwartz himself had written before: *Studies in the Jewish Background of Christianity*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 1992, 5–15.

8 “It seems that it was clear in antiquity, as today, that kings rule *territories*” (68); “although the term *Ioudaioi* would survive, more and more it would be understood not as if it referred to people of or from a place called *Ioudaia* (Judaea), but, rather, as if it referred to Ἰουδαῖοι Ἰουδαῖοι, which I take to denote people devoted to *Ioudaismos* – what we call ‘Jews’, not Judaeans. Such people had no need for a king” (77).

9 In addition to the Roman troops a number of quasi-independent principalities had supplied forces, as was common in such circumstances. It is possible that Tacitus: *Histories* 5.1, *et solito inter accolae odio infensa Iudaeis Arabum manus multique*, is interpreted as a reference to archers from Palmyra, since later Rabbinical sources suggest Palmyrene involvement in the destruction of the Temple at Jerusalem. For references, see T. Kaizer: *Latin-Palmyrenean inscriptions in the Museum of Banat at Timișoara*, in C. Găzduc e. a. (eds.), *Orbis Antiquus. Studia in honorem Ioannis Pisonis*. Cluj-Napoca: Nereamia Napocae Press 2004, 567.

Caesar, that is now the delight of a people which was once a master's" (epigr. 2, 11–12). Two triumphal arches to Titus¹⁰ along with the Colosseum and the temple of Pax managed to imprint on Rome the significance the new dynasty attached to its victory in Judaea.¹¹ T. D. Barnes ('The sack of the Temple in Josephus and Tacitus') continues this exploration of the Jewish war as some sort of "foundation myth" (129) for Rome's new rulers. Textual analysis of Tacitus' lost account of the war (possibly retrievable in part from the late fourth- and early fifth-century authors Sulpicius Severus and Orosius) and of poetry by Valerius Flaccus and Silius Italicus leads him to argue that it is wrong to think in terms of a 'static' Flavian propaganda, but that there were in fact "three successive 'Flavian versions' " (144) of the event, in turn giving the leading role to Vespasian, Titus and Domitian. J. Rives ('Flavian religious policy and the destruction of the Jerusalem temple') points out the conundrum of the deliberate destruction of the only¹² cult centre of Judaism on the one hand and the obvious endorsement of certain religious practices of the Jews on the other. We can get around this, Rives argues, by appreciating that the Flavians (and the ancients in general) did not think of what moderns call 'religion' in terms of an integrated and coherent system of beliefs, but as "an aggregation of national customs, philosophical positions, and cult practices" (159) instead. To destroy the magnificent Temple building is one thing, not to allow the characteristic cult to be re-established after a while quite another: even if the Flavians "did

- 10 One of them, posthumously erected under Domitian, still standing on the Upper Via Sacra and showing how Roman soldiers carried the sacred utensils from the Temple in triumph; the other one known only from the Severan marble city plan, a coin issued under Trajan and an inscription (ILS 264) recording rather fancifully how Titus had captured the Jewish capital "which before him by all generals, kings and peoples had been assaulted in vain or been left entirely untouched" (*omnibus ante se ducibus regibus gentibus aut frustra petitam aut omnino intemptatam*).
- 11 In addition Vespasian with his own hands helped to rebuild the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus on the Capitol after it had been destroyed by fire. The account of the reconstruction of the Capitol in Tacitus (hist. 4, 53) has been seen as "no less than the textual and religious reconstruction of Rome's proper relations with the gods" by J. P. Davies: *Rome's Religious History. Livy, Tacitus and Ammianus on their Gods*. Cambridge: CUP 2004, 209. Cf. G. B. Townend: *The restoration of the capitol in AD 70*, *Historia* 36, 1987, 243–248; J. E. Packer, *Plurima et amplissima opera: parsing Flavian Rome*, in A. J. Boyle and W. J. Dominik (eds.): *Flavian Rome: Culture, Image, Text*. Leiden: Brill 2003, 167–198.
- 12 Vespasian later also had the only other Jewish temple, that at Leontopolis in Egypt, closed. Josephus (bell. Iud. 7, 421) states that "the emperor, suspicious of the interminable tendency of the Jews to revolution, and fearing that they might again collect together in force and draw others away with them, ordered Lupus to demolish the Jewish temple in the so-called district of Onias."

not intend from the start to end the Temple cult permanently, this soon became a conscious policy” (151). Rives puts forward the idea that “Vespasian was not simply taking a precaution against further revolts in Judaea, but hoping to eliminate the anomalous cult organization that made the Jews throughout the Roman world into a people with an alternative focus of loyalty and national identity” (164). As Edmondson notes in the volume’s introduction, this argument matches Schwartz’ emphasis on the change of *Ioudaios* from a territorial to a religious notion: with the abolishment of the Temple cult, Judaea no longer had a “defining centrality” to Judaism, which now “would become by definition a diasporic cult” (24). Arguably the most provocative chapter is the short contribution by M. Goodman (‘The *fiscus Iudaicus* and gentile attitudes to Judaism in Flavian Rome’). The notorious *fiscus Iudaicus*, replacing traditional contributions on the part of Jews anywhere to the Temple at Jerusalem with a tax of two drachmas payable to the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus in Rome, helped to keep the Flavian victory as much alive in the common psyche as did the above-mentioned monumental architecture. The well-known episode in Suetonius (Dom. 12, 2) – recording how “an old man, ninety years of age, was stripped naked by the procurator, in a very crowded court, that it might be determined whether he was circumcised or not”, in order to decide whether he should be chargeable with the poll tax – shows how for Domitian it was a means to associate himself even stronger with his father’s and brother’s campaign. Goodman argues against the widely held view that Judaism in Flavian Rome attracted many non-Jews, and puts forward to hypothesis that the coin series issued under Nerva with the legend *fisci Iudaici calumnia sublata* (“the malicious accusation of the treasury for the Jewish tax has been removed”) did not refer to an obliteration of the malignant accusations that non-Jewish Romans had fallen victim to, but to the (temporary) abolishment of the poll tax as such under Nerva. As Goodman himself says, “the precise import of the legend on his coins [...] is debated and debatable” (176).¹³

The final section of the volume, Part III, is called ‘Josephus: literature and historiography in Flavian Rome’. It addresses the question of the Jewish historian’s familiarity with trends in the literary world of Rome, and starts with a piece by C. S. Kraus (‘From *exempla* to *exemplar*? Writing history around the emperor in imperial Rome’) that urges us to consider the nature of the Latin historiography (mostly now lost) written between Livy and Tacitus, which must have been read by Josephus. The short paper by C. P. Jones (‘Josephus and

13 For an earlier, different approach to this topic by Goodman himself, see: Nerva, the *fiscus Iudaicus* and Jewish identity, JRS 79, 1989, 40–44. Cotton and Eck, in their contribution to the same OUP volume, note that Goodman’s new hypothesis was “anticipated” (46 n.13) by M. Hadas-Lebel: La fiscalité romaine dans la littérature rabbinique jusqu’à la fin du III^e siècle, Revue des Études Juives 143, 1984, 5–29. They themselves remain firmly in the ‘traditional’ camp.

Greek literature in Flavian Rome’) presents Josephus as standing “aloof alike from the Greek and from the Latin culture of the city” (207), thus providing a literary parallel to the relatively isolated political and societal figure sketched by Cotton and Eck in their contribution to the volume. L. H. Feldman, ‘Parallel lives of two lawgivers: Josephus’ Moses and Plutarch’s *Lycurgus*’) notes that, despite a substantial similarity in themes between Josephus’ account of Moses and that of Lycurgus by Plutarch, the Jewish historian actually does not mention the Greek biographer and moralist once, and suggests the possibility that this was the case because of Plutarch’s hostile attitude towards the dynasty to whom Josephus owed so much. The final three papers of the volume deal with rhetoric, central to Josephus’ narrative as it is to that of other ancient historians. In a long and dense paper, S. Mason (‘Figured speech and irony in T. Flavius Josephus’) presents Josephus as “a heavy user of figured speech and irony” (288), adding – in the words of Edmondson – “an unexpected playfulness and depth to the historian’s narrative voice” (28), finally enabling Josephus to enter the realm of the Classical authors properly.¹⁴ Or, to borrow once again from the introduction to the volume: “literary style and rhetorical subtlety mattered to Josephus” (29). H. H. Chapman (‘Spectacle in Josephus’ *Jewish War*’) shows how Josephus makes use of the popular literary tool of ἐνάργεια ‘vivid description’, to describe a variety of spectacles. She also argues how one spectacle in particular (the destruction of the Temple) is presented in such a way as to convince his readership to support a future rebuilding of Judaism’s most holy place. Considering that the Temple had been rebuilt before, after destruction in war, it is not impossible that this was indeed part of Josephus’ agenda. Only with the advantage of hindsight does the permanence of the Temple’s destruction become a historical necessity. J. Barclay (‘The empire writes back: Josephan rhetoric in Flavian Rome’) applies post-colonial theory to analyse how Josephus, in *Against Apion*, not only presents Judaism within “a subtly Romanized piece of argumentation, which transposes Jewish thematics into a specifically Roman key” (316), but also as an expression by a member of a subordinate group within Roman society of the traditions of that subordinate group, always “under the constraints, and to some degree within the terms” (319) of the culture of the controlling group. Barclay concludes “that in a melody apparently composed of complicity and cultural subservience, there can sound soft notes of self-assertion and resistance, at least for some ears” (332).

The Brill volume, that refers to the contributions in a brief preface only, is divided into five sections. Part One, ‘Historiography’, opens with a paper by

14 Mason devotes more space here to the *Jewish War* than to the *Jewish Antiquities*, but has dealt with the latter in a separate piece: Flavius Josephus in Flavian Rome: reading on and between the lines, in A. J. Boyle and W. J. Dominik (eds.): *Flavian Rome: Culture, Image, Text*. Leiden: Brill 2003, 559–589.

D. Mendels ('The formation of an historical canon of the Greco-Roman period: from the beginnings to Josephus') arguing that the loss of Josephus' sources (the Hebrew scriptures obviously excluded) has parallels in the disappearance of the writings used by the authors of the main Latin historical narratives. The brief contribution by L. Troiani ('La genèse historique des *Antiquités juives*') makes some remarks about the motivation behind Josephus' composition of his longest work, and J. Barclay ('Judean historiography in Rome: Josephus and history in *Contra Apionem* Book 1') applies the above-mentioned post-colonial theory to different passages in Josephus' final work, making the point that "Josephus' provocative claim is that [the] Judean tradition stands not as a radical alternative to the mainstream historiographical tradition, but as a variant within it, even as its supreme exemplar of accuracy and truth" (42). Also interested in Josephus' audience, but writing from a completely different angle, F. Parente ('The impotence of Titus, or Josephus' *Bellum Judaicum* as an example of "pathetic" historiography') discusses a number of passages related to Titus' apparent inability to save the Temple from destruction. Parente firmly states that the seven books were written with an eye to Diaspora Jews, and that Josephus tried (but did not manage) to convince them that the impotence of Vespasian's son was evidence that "the Romans were 'servants' and instruments of the Deity" (69). S. Mason ('Of audience and meaning: reading Josephus' *Bellum Judaicum* in the context of a Flavian audience') revisits the theme of his essays in the OUP volume and in the Brill volume *Flavian Rome* (see above, with n. 14), but with more specific attention to the Flavian audience that was supposed to read the *Jewish War*. Contra Parente, Mason concludes, after reviewing a number of clear pointers in the text, that the Greek version of the *Jewish War* was written by Josephus "in the first instance – without precluding secondary and tertiary readerships – for sympathetic or at least tractable audiences in his adopted home city of Rome, who shared with him an elite education and world of discourse" (73), and that "only when such concrete conditions are ignored [...] can Josephus be interpreted as a mouthpiece of Roman propaganda, in the traditional way" (99). The article by J. J. Price ('The provincial historian in Rome') goes in the directly opposed direction, not interested in the intended, but in the actual audience. It fits well with the conclusions drawn by Cotton and Eck and by Jones in the OUP volume, namely that Josephus was neither part of the upper class of Rome nor a prominent member of the city's literary circle. Price argues that this "exclusion was also partly self-imposed. His interests and literary purposes, as well as his artistic technique, remained profoundly provincial, despite his location in the capital" (118).

The papers in Part Two, 'Literary questions', all study specific literary techniques employed by Josephus. H.H. Chapman ('"By the waters of Babylon": Josephus and Greek poetry') draws attention to the poetic allusions the at-

tentive reader can find in the *Jewish War*, based on Josephus' use of Homer, Pindar and some of the Greek tragedians, and argues that this was all part of the historian's scheme to convince his audience of his own opinion about the revolt. D. Dormeyer ('The Hellenistic biographical history of king Saul: Josephus, A.J. 6.45–378 and 1 Samuel 9:1–31:13') places an understanding of Saul's kingship as a parallel to the Hasmoneans, in contrast to David's dynasty as a parallel to the Herodians, in the context of a silent form of self-advertisement on the part of Josephus for the role of ruler over his people, now that the war had proven the "Davidic messianic hopes" (154) to be in vain, and portrays Josephus as "merely a miniature Saul" (157). The analysis by T. Landau ('Power and pity: the image of Herod in Josephus' *Bellum Judaicum*') of the employment of rhetorical techniques by Josephus in the narratives concerning Herod in the *Jewish War* is a foretaste of the fuller treatment in her book on this topic, which in the meantime has seen the light, again with Brill.¹⁵ J. W. van Henten ('Commonplaces in Herod's commander speech in Josephus' A.J. 15.127–146') studies Herod's commander speech in the *Jewish Antiquities* (a more elaborated version of the one found in bell. iud. 1, 373–379) in the context of comparable speeches found in the works of the great Greek historians, "searching for conventional motifs" (190) and concluding that Josephus had "not only incorporated rhetorical forms and vocabulary, but also many *topoi*" found in his predecessors.

Part Three, 'Josephus and Judaism', contains three essays. P. Spilsbury ('Reading the Bible in Rome: Josephus and the constraints of empire') leans heavily on the theory put forward by Barclay in the OUP volume (see above), which he was allowed to read before publication, and shows how the way in which Josephus dealt with the Hebrew Scriptures was not only affected by his Roman context in an obvious manner, but also more subtly, revealing "within his speech subaltern tones quite unlike the voice of Rome" (227). T. Jonquière ('Josephus' use of prayers: between narrative and theology') focuses on the role played by prayers – "put almost exclusively into the mouths of Jewish personages and addressed almost exclusively to the Jewish God" (243) – in Josephus' transmission of ideas about Judaism within the context of a Greek historiographical setting, and the short paper by N. Förster ('Some observations on Josephus' description of the Essenian morning prayer') also deals with prayers, arguing that "the ideal of the praying community [...] was spread across cultural and religious boundaries during Greco-Roman times" (245).

In Part Four, 'Histories and history', we find some topics addressed similar to those in the other volume. B. Eberhardt ('Wer dient wem? Die Darstellung des Flavischen Triumphzuges auf dem Titusbogen und bei Josephus

15 T. Landau: *Out-Heroding Herod: Josephus, Rhetoric, and the Herod narratives* (Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity [Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums] 63). Leiden/Boston: Brill 2006.

(B.J. 7.123–162)’) revisits the spoils relief from the arch of Titus (but without the respective image, in contrast to Millar’s well-illustrated paper), calling both the relief and Josephus’ account of the triumph “Herrschaftsinstrumente” of the Flavian dynasty, while emphasising that from a theological perspective the visual and the literary source “völlig verschiedene Grundkonzeptionen zugrunde liegen” (277): in contrast to the arch, Josephus presents the Flavians as subject to the power of the divine, not the other way around. J. S. McLaren (‘Josephus on Titus: the vanquished writing about the victor’), stating that Josephus may have been “conquered”, but not “submissive” (295), revisits the image the historian sketches of Titus and makes the point – along the lines of the contribution by Spilsbury, and indeed Barclay in the OUP volume – that one ought to look carefully for negative features in Titus’ image alongside the more visible positive ones. G. Haaland (‘Josephus and the philosophers of Rome: does *Contra Apionem* mirror Domitian’s crushing of the “Stoic opposition”?’) gives an interesting spin to Josephus’ final work against the background of the subduing by Domitian of a senatorial faction with Stoic sympathies. Towards the end of her paper, however, she chooses to identify Josephus’ enigmatic patron Epaphroditus as the well-known freedman of Nero, rather than the *Suda*’s *grammaticus*, in contrast to the analysis by Cotton and Eck in the other volume (see above). G. Schimanowski (‘Alexandrien als Drehscheibe zwischen Jerusalem und Rom: die Bedeutung der Stadt im Werk des Josephus’) emphasises the importance of the Egyptian metropolis in Josephus, and G. Jossa (‘Jews, Romans, and Christians: from the *Bellum Judaicum* to the *Antiquitates*’) discusses Josephus’ references to the Christians, not, however, asking how authentic those are, but why they do appear in the *Jewish Antiquities* as opposed to the earlier *Jewish War*. Finally, B. S. Jackson (‘The divorces of the Herodian princesses: Jewish law, Roman law or palace law?’) points out the valuable contribution that the Josephan passages can make to the study of marriage and divorce in the Jewish world.

The final section of the volume, Part Five, ‘Translation and transmission’, is short. G. Lembi (‘The Latin translation of Josephus’ *Antiquitates*’) draws attention to the “almost totally neglected” (372) sixth-century Latin translation of the *Jewish Antiquities*, and argues that it may throw light on previous textual traditions and on how they fared before the Greek version was eventually published properly – in addition to the tendency to regard the Latin version only for what it informs us about late Latin and translation in general.¹⁶ A. J. Forte (‘Translating Book 1 of Josephus’ *Bellum Judaicum*: some critical

16 E. g. R. Browning: review of F. Blatt: *The Latin Josephus*. Copenhagen: Munksgaard 1958, in *The Classical Review* 10 (n. s.), 1960, 46: “the Latin Josephus will probably be of little help in establishing the Greek text. But it will be fascinating to those interested in the history of translation and to students of late Latin in general.”

observations') compares the classic translation by H. St. J. Thackeray in the Loeb series with his own work for a forthcoming volume as part of Mason's Brill Josephus Project (see above, n.1), pointing out how his own "more literal translation" will "be more accurate than that of Thackeray and will be more faithful to the Greek" (403). In the final paper, F. Siegert ('Josephus und das Alphabet der Römer: Überlegungen zur Schreibung Griechischer Eigennamen in Lateinischer Schrift') addresses the orthographical problems encountered by the Münster team working on a Greek-German edition of Josephus' works (see above, n.3). Siegert also closes the volume with his 'Concluding remarks'. Even if "it is difficult to feel sympathetic towards Flavius Josephus" (428) as a person, the volume (and I think this can be said about both volumes here under discussion) has certainly contributed towards more "sensitivity for Josephus as a historian" (425), indeed as a historian firmly placed within a Roman context.

Both volumes are well produced, as one would expect from OUP and Brill. *Flavius Josephus and Flavian Rome* has a general bibliography ('References') at the end, followed by an index of sources, a general index and an index of modern authors, while *Josephus and Jewish History in Flavian Rome and Beyond* provides all references in the individual contributions, and is followed by an index of ancient sources only. Both volumes throw light on the complex interplay between the different cultural spheres of influence in Josephus' works, and simultaneously illuminate the literary and political worlds in which he participated. But there are obvious differences too. It is clear that *Josephus and Jewish History in Flavian Rome and Beyond* is above all a collection of conference papers, covering some wide-ranging aspects, while the editors of *Flavius Josephus and Flavian Rome* have managed, while providing space for 'divergent opinions', to create a much more coherent book. But what may be of even more relevance for the long run objective, i. e. to bring scholarship on Josephus together with that of the Roman empire under the Flavian dynasty, is simply the publication vehicle: there is a serious and unfortunate risk that the Brill volume, published as it is as a Supplement to the *Journal for the Study of Judaism*, remains largely unnoticed by Classical scholars. From that point of view the OUP volume, with a detail from Poussin's *The Conquest of Jerusalem* creating an attractive cover, starts from pole position. But really the two books must go hand in hand, and they ought to find a place next to one another on the shelves of all scholars interested in Josephus, Flavian Rome, and their interaction.

Ted Kaizer, University of Durham
ted.kaizer@durham.ac.uk