University of Groningen

Josephus' Autobiography (Life of Josephus)

Mason, Steve

Published in:
A Companion to Josephus

DOI:
[10.1002/9781118325162.ch3](https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118325162.ch3)

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:
2016

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Mason, S. (2016). Josephus' Autobiography (Life of Josephus). In H. H. Chapman, & Z. Rodgers (Eds.), *A Companion to Josephus* (pp. 59–74). Wiley-Blackwell. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118325162.ch3>

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

CHAPTER 3

Josephus's *Autobiography* (*Life of Josephus*)

Steve Mason

3.1 Introduction

As the briefest of Josephus's writings the *Life* has attracted more holistic study than his other works. Because of its content, it has also been given the introductory position in modern translations. There is nothing wrong with that, as long as we remember that it was composed after the *Judean War* and *Judean Antiquities*, and not with the purpose of providing merely factual information. The little work has much to teach us about the author's values, assumptions, style, literary interests, and historiography. One of the hardest things to find in it is the life of Josephus.

In this chapter I hope to show why that is so. I aim to assist new readers of the work by contextualizing it historically and considering its purposes, contents, structures, and themes. At the end I shall ask about its historical utility, comparing it for that purpose with parallel material in Book 2 of the *Judean War*.

3.2 Date and Occasion

Any interpretation needs to reckon with the context in which the *Life* appeared. A seemingly safe starting point is the observation that Josephus wrote it as an appendix to his major history, the *Judean Antiquities*. In self-congratulatory remarks at the end of the *magnum opus* he writes (20.262–268):

262 Encouraged by the completion of what I had projected, I would now say plainly that no other person who had wished to do so, whether a Judean or a foreigner, would have been able to produce this work in such a precise way for Greek speakers. 263 For among my compatriots I am admitted to have an education in our country's customs that far surpasses theirs, *and* I worked very hard to share in the learning of Greek letters and poetry ... 266 Perhaps it will

not be a provocation to jealousy, or strike ordinary folk as gauche, if I review briefly both my own ancestry (*genos*) and the events of my life while there are still those living who can either challenge or corroborate. 267 With these matters I shall conclude the *Judean Antiquities* (*Epi toutois de katapausô tēn archaiologian*), comprising twenty volumes and 60,000 lines, and should the Deity permit I shall again make mention cursorily (*kata peridromēn hypomnēsô palin*) of both the war and what has happened to us [= me?] until the present day, which belongs to the thirteenth year of the rule of Domitian Caesar and my own fifty-sixth year since birth. 268 I have also resolved to write in four volumes about our Judean views concerning God ...

After this introduction, the *Life* begins without an introduction of its own, and with a celebration of Josephus's ancestry (1–6).

Just as the *Judean Antiquities* looks ahead immediately to the *Life*, Josephus concludes the autobiography by addressing the history's dedicatee (cf. *Ant.* 1.8–9): "Having repaid you, Epaphroditus, most excellent of men, with the entire record of the *Antiquities* up to the present, I conclude the narrative here" (*entautha katapauô ton logon*, 430). The shift from the future tense ("I shall conclude") in *Judean Antiquities* 20 to the present of the same verb at the end of the *Life* ("I here conclude") shows the expectation realized (cf. Barish 1978, 66–71). Incidentally, it confounds rigid genre distinctions.

Josephus's aim to conclude his great history with his *Life* is reflected in the citation and manuscript traditions. Eusebius, who knew his works intimately, does not mention a separate *Life* in his summary of Josephus's corpus (*Hist. eccl.* 3.9.3–4), but quotes a passage from *Life* 361ff. as from "the end of the *Antiquities*" (*Hist. eccl.* 3.10.8). All the manuscripts of *Judean Antiquities* include *Life* with Books 11–20, A and W noting that *Life* 430 marks the "end of Josephus's *Antiquities*."

Further, scholars have observed a continuum of style and diction from *Judean Antiquities* 20 to the *Life*. Abandoning the awkward experiments of Books 17–19, both adopt a simpler, relaxed style, which may reflect Josephus's natural voice. In addition to the examples offered by Thackeray (1929, 18–19), consider phrases such as "the children of Asamonaeus" (*Life* 2; *Ant.* 20.190, 347), "minor and incidental charge" (*Life* 13; *Ant.* 20.215), "run the risk that his action would come to trial" (*Life* 90; *Ant.* 20.47), "instigators of sedition" (*Life* 170, 340; *Ant.* 20.4, 127, 174), and "fraternize" (*Life* 242; *Ant.* 20.164–165).

Further still, the *Life* assumes its audience's knowledge of matters recently discussed in *Judean Antiquities* 20: the emperor Nero and his wife Poppaea (*Life* 16; *Ant.* 20.195), the Roman governor Felix (*Life* 13; *Ant.* 20.173–178), Agrippa II and his sister Berenice (*Life* 48; *Ant.* 20.145–146), and the special status of Tiberias and other territories that now belong to the king (*Life* 38; *Ant.* 20.159).

If we had only this evidence, we would conclude that the *Life* appeared as a companion to the *Judean Antiquities* (93/94 C.E.), at some time before Domitian's assassination on September 18, 96 C.E. Domitian is the last emperor whom Josephus honours for his benefactions (*Life* 429), and it seems unthinkable either that the ruling emperor could have been ignored or that Josephus would have continued praising Domitian after his death, when his memory was being avidly expunged (Pliny, *Paneg.* 52.4–5; Suetonius, *Dom.* 22). In *Judean Antiquities* 20.267 Josephus said that he was writing in Domitian's thirteenth year, and *Life*'s ending makes the best sense if it was written shortly thereafter. The unstudied style, with formulaic phrases and simple sentences (Mason 2001, li–liii), and the evident lack of meticulous research all suggest that Josephus *could* have added this appendix quickly.

The fly in the ointment is his criticism (*Life* 359) of a rival historian, Justus of Tiberias (below), for not making his account public while King Agrippa II was alive. This notice that

the king is dead raises two problems: When did he die? And, depending on the answer: How can the *Life* be related to the *Judean Antiquities*? These two issues have complicated the appealing picture of an autobiography appended to the *Judean Antiquities*, though after a review of the complications I shall support that simpler picture.

The learned ninth-century Patriarch Photius claims in his book note on Justus's lost *Chronicle of the Judean Kings* (*Bibl.* 33), which he mainly criticizes for ignoring Christianity, that the work extended from Moses to the death of Agrippa—in the third year of Trajan (i.e., from January 28, 100 C.E.). Many scholars of the past century or so have dismissed this as an error, without great worry given that Photius was writing eight centuries after the events (e.g., Luther 1910, 55–58; Frankfort 1961; Rajak 1973, 361; Schürer and Vermes 1973, 1.481–483; Cohen 1979, 170–180; Smallwood 1981, 572–574; Siegert et al. 2001, 1; Kushnir-Stein 2002; Jones 2002). They have pointed to the absence of coins from what would have been the last five years or more of Agrippa's reign, and to inscriptional evidence from Auranitis (a large swathe of Agrippa's kingdom) that it was under direct Roman rule by 96/97 C.E. The last inscription undeniably from Agrippa's reign dates to 92/93 (Schürer and Vermes 1973, 482 n. 47), possibly 85/86, while the latest coins are arguably from 88/89, though possibly 94/95 (Jones 2002, 115–116; Kushnir-Stein 2002, 127).

Some scholars further observe that the later volumes of *Judean Antiquities*, no later than 93/94, appear to assume Agrippa's passing before then (Luther 1910, 55–58). Josephus details the youthful indiscretions of Agrippa I, the king's father (18.145–154), and does not shrink from mentioning rumors of the bachelor Agrippa II's incestuous relations with his sister, his sacrilegious activities in Jerusalem, and his reputed preference for foreigners (20.143–146, 189–196, 211–218). *Judean Antiquities* 17.28 says that the Romans have succeeded Herodians as rulers of Batanaea, which together with Auranitis constituted the southern half of Agrippa II's territory. Finally, 18.128 declares that “in less than a century” since Herod's death (4 B.C.E.), “his descendants—and they were many—have perished, except for a few.” It is hard to imagine the point of such a reflection if Herod's most illustrious descendant, friend to both powerful Romans and Josephus, were still alive.

As to how Photius could have been so mistaken, Schürer's revisers cleverly suggested that he might have transposed information from a beloved source, Jerome's *Lives of Illustrious Men*. Jerome has a tiny entry on Justus before a full paragraph on Clement of Rome (*Vir. ill.* 14–15), who died in “the third year of Trajan” (Schürer and Vermes 1973, 482 n. 47). Perhaps Photius ran the two entries together (though he did not copy either), or that date stuck in his mind and he misplaced it? The suggestion is valuable not because it is likely but because it reminds us how many unknown conditions could have generated errors in such a late account.

Other eminent scholars, however, have assumed or vigorously defended Photius's date, a position that anchors their understanding of the *Life* (Ewald 1886, 8.74; original Schürer 1898–1901, 1.77, 87–88; Laqueur 1920, 1–6; Thackeray 1929, 16–19; Gelzer 1952, 67–90; Kokkinos 1998, 396–399). They do not find it easy to dismiss Photius, who gives the impression of having taken Agrippa's death-date, which would have been important for a book on all the Judean kings, directly from Justus. They find support in coins and inscriptions that *might*, depending on how one interprets them, show Agrippa active as late as 95. These would invalidate a death-date of 92/93, though they would still leave an evidentiary vacuum for Agrippa's final years (assuming Photius). Even to begin weighing the relevant issues here would divert us irresponsibly, but they involve the king's back-dating of his ruling era to two or three starting points, the exact identification of those points (49, 54–56, 60–61 C.E.? See Kushnir-Stein 2002; Kokkinos 2003) and his chronological consistency.

Here it must suffice to say that Agrippa's friend and contemporary Josephus knew the king to be dead when he wrote the *Life* (359), though it seems that Domitian still reigned (429). Passages in *Judean Antiquities* 17–20 also suggest the king's demise. Coin dates that *might* leave Agrippa breathing until 95 might still offer just enough time for Justus to bring out his already written work and for Josephus to read and mention it before Domitian meets his end, but the timing would be close. At any rate, the material evidence cannot count as confirmation of Photius's date, nor of the earlier date (e.g., showing Agrippa to have left major parts of his kingdom by 96). If the material evidence required us to find the king alive until 95, it would create a third option, between 92 and 100. But since experts have understood it to be compatible with Agrippa's departure by 92/93 (Jones 2002; Kushnir-Stein 2002) and we cannot be sure how Photius came up with his information, most scholars see no reason to keep Agrippa alive past 93.

I discuss the issue chiefly because acceptance of Photius has produced some of the most sophisticated research on the *Life*. If Agrippa died in 100, our present *Life* was written after that, in spite of its apparent connections with Domitian. But if it appeared so late, how should we explain its clear links with the *Judean Antiquities*? One proposal imagined two versions of the *Life*: an initially brief sketch of Josephus's career (*Life* 1–27, 414–430) accompanying the *Judean Antiquities* in 93/94, which he later expanded to include his Galilean career and refute Justus, after 100. Few historians have been convinced, however, by such a paltry original *Life* (cf. Barish 1978, 61–62). Would not such a greatly expanded, free-standing *Life* written for a new purpose after 100, have received its own Introduction like Josephus's other works? And why would the *Life* remain so closely bound to the *Judean Antiquities*?

The other logical option, widely accepted since the mid-nineteenth century as the seemingly necessary consequence of Photius's dating, was to posit two versions of the *Judean Antiquities*. The idea was that Josephus *planned* to cover his life on completion of the *Judean Antiquities*, and so wrote those anticipatory lines (above), but he was distracted by the more urgent need to produce the *Against Apion*. Losing the momentum for writing a *Life* for some years, he was finally goaded into fulfilling the unfulfilled promise of *Judean Antiquities* 20.266 by Justus's work, which attacked him "both as an historian and a man" (Ewald 1886, 8.71–74). The great Josephus-scholar Thackeray adjusted this picture by considering the *Life* an afterthought prompted by Justus's work after 100. Josephus had not contemplated it when he wrote the *Judean Antiquities*, but must have "inserted" its introductory lines in the new accompanying edition of *Judean Antiquities* (Thackeray 1905, 466). The notion that after 100 Josephus would rewrite the clear dating of his work to 93/94, to accommodate his new introduction of the *Life*, tells us much about learned opinion of our author's intelligence or attentiveness in that period. And the idea that Josephus would produce a new edition of the twenty-volume *Judean Antiquities* to accompany the wee (and unrelated) *Life* would seem the definition of "the tail wagging the dog."

Laqueur (1920) reworked these proposals into a comprehensive and durable reconstruction, involving revisions of each of Josephus's narratives. His crucial point was that Josephus must have written *Life*'s main content when it still mattered. That could not have been after 100, when Justus's history appeared—and Josephus was long since ensconced in Rome. Josephus must have written such a vigorous defence of his Galilean career, much more concerned with John of Gischala than Justus, while he was still there (1920, 121, 247–278). The Jerusalem leaders who had dispatched him to pacify Galilee had reason to suspect that he had become a rogue warlord in rivalry with John. After they dispatched the delegation to fetch him (*Life* 189–335), Laqueur proposed, he wrote an administrative report explaining

his behaviour and insisting that he *had* pacified Galilee, in spite of John's harassment. This report would later evolve into our *Life*. But first, after his surrender to the Romans, he was commissioned to write Flavian propaganda about the conflict. For that purpose he refashioned the report to portray his participation in the war as that of a dutiful general. By the early 90s, Josephus's Flavian boosters were gone and he turned to writing nationalistic apologetics, producing the *Judean Antiquities* in that vein—*sans* autobiography. Finally, after Agrippa's death (in 100) and Justus's production of a fine rival history, which was destroying his credibility and ruining the market for his work, he really had to defend himself. So he dusted off the original administrative report, throwing in new material to meet Justus's challenge, but creating the alleged hodge-podge we have today.

The lynchpin of Laqueur's analysis was his confidence that our present *Judean Antiquities* reveals the scars of post-Agrippian revision: the passages noted above and also a double conclusion. The one that now comes at the very end (*Ant.* 20.258, 267–268) must have been the original, since it counts the number of lines in the finished 20 volumes. The sentences that introduce the *Life* (20.259–266) must come from the post-100 edition—now bundled with the autobiography. Their presently awkward fusion must be due to confused copyists. Though broadly accepting Laqueur's outline, Thackeray (1929, 16–19) maintained his position that Josephus himself spliced the second ending into the first, neglecting to iron out the wrinkles.

Sensibilities change, and in 1978 Barish demonstrated to the satisfaction of most (now of a different generation) that *Judean Antiquities* 20.259–268 makes respectable sense as a paragraph written at one go, both concluding the history and introducing the *Life*. Still, Laqueur's importance for scholarship and influence on such giants as Thackeray, Gelzer (1952), and Cohen (1979 below) requires that those of us who wish to understand the *Life* think carefully about its literary unity.

The standard view, to which I formerly subscribed (Mason 1991, 316–324), finds whatever coherence our *Life* has in Josephus's effort to refute Justus of Tiberias's competing history, whether in 93/94 or after 100. We have just seen that having a reason to write would not necessarily entail, in the view of many scholars, crafting a coherent piece of literature suited to the purpose. Laqueur and Thackeray thought that, though responding to Justus, Josephus preserved all sorts of vestigial material (cf. Hölscher 1916). That view is hard to reconcile with the fairly clean lines of Josephus's other works, and it leaves one wondering how such a refutation of Justus could have had any chance of success. Most others have therefore considered the anti-Justus polemic more thoroughgoing, determining the shape of our narrative even where Justus is not clearly visible (recently Rodgers 2006). Where Josephus claims that he was tricked into supporting John's schemes, that he raped no women, or that he was generous to opponents, Justus must have claimed the opposite (Niese 1896, 227; Luther 1910; Drexler 1925, 293–312; Schalit 1933; Rajak 1973; Mason 1991). Even still, the sections on Josephus's ancestry, youth, family life, and later career in Rome have seemed to almost everyone a merely conventional frame.

The main problems with the Justus explanation are that it does not explain the structure or content of the *Life*, including these opening and closing sections that seem so important to Josephus, and that it severs his own clear connection with the *Judean Antiquities*. The surrogate prologue (above) makes no mention of any such provocation, which would be surprising given Josephus's clear declarations of apologetic-polemical intent elsewhere (*War* 1.1–8; *Apion* 1.1–5). He claims to write the *Life* because he is extraordinarily pleased with himself after completing the *Judean Antiquities*, and imagines that his audiences want to know more about him. Since the Introduction makes his ancestry a crucial point

(*Ant.* 20.266) and the *Life* immediately elaborates the issue (1–6), we cannot brush it aside as merely introductory to the engagement with Justus. Anyway, where is the engagement with Justus? He does not appear until *Life* 34, and then as the leader of one faction in Tiberias, beside his father. His book is mentioned incidentally (40), though Josephus keeps the focus on his behavior (41). He devotes a digression to Justus's book, it is true, but that comes near the end (336–367) as a clear digression or even afterthought: "Having come this far in my narrative, I want to go through some points against Justus, the very one who has written an *œuvre* concerning these things, and against the others [who have written bad history]" (336). And even the digression contains little or nothing that defends Josephus's *Judean War*.

The mismatches between *Life*'s content and any programmatic intention to rebut Justus have forced scholars to reconsider. Cohen (1979) is indispensable here. Cohen's aim was not to interpret the *Life* as such, but to explore the conflicts between it and the *Judean War* concerning Josephus's time in Galilee as a basis for getting at what really happened. To establish a control database, he examined the extensive parallels between *Judean War* 1–2 and *Judean Antiquities* 13–20, where he found Josephus's procedure to vary: sometimes he rewrote and embellished the earlier work; in other cases he must have gone back to *Judean War*'s sources. When it came to Josephus's career, Cohen found the version in *Judean War* 2 to be much more artful and thematically structured, the *Life* rather incoherent. This and the many conflicts between the two led him to conclude that Josephus could not have used the *Judean War* as a source. Unless he carelessly relied on faulty memories, he must have returned to some early notes, the source for *Judean War*'s version (Cohen 1979, 77). Thus far, Cohen stands in the Laqueurian tradition, though he has replaced speculation about Josephus's biographical-psychological shifts with careful literary comparison and weighing of logical alternatives.

Why, then, did Josephus compose our *Life*? Cohen sensibly first tried to figure out what Justus might have said to attract Josephus's digression against him. The digression would make little sense if Justus had accused the captured general of having once been a rebel, or even if he had attacked Josephus as a historian, given also that Josephus was not writing for money. In fact, the digression is mostly about the blame for Tiberias's revolt. When King Agrippa died (in 92 C.E.), Cohen proposed, Tiberias's leaders must have been eager to recover their pre-Agrippa status, on a par with that of Sepphoris (cf. Justus's speech, *Life* 37–40). But their participation in the revolt, which Vespasian had needed to suppress, would have damaged their case. Justus therefore produced his account now, in this new situation after Agrippa's death, in part to charge Josephus with forcing his otherwise loyal city into revolt—an old but newly relevant matter. That is why this question dominates Josephus's digression against Justus (Cohen 1979, 137–140).

Cohen thus agreed with the standard view that Justus's work spurred Josephus into action (1979, 126–128). But finding little structure or method in the *Life*, like Laqueur, he imagined Josephus not only repackaging old notes for this new purpose (not *Judean War* itself), but also taking the opportunity to work up at least five other themes having nothing to do with Justus, for some other uncertain audiences who might read the work. For them, Josephus dwelt on his pedigree and (putative) Pharisaic allegiance—this theme being aimed largely at the Yavnean leaders of the new rabbinic movement (Cohen 1979, 144–151)—his brilliance in fighting the Romans but also his pro-Roman sympathies, and the character Philip ben Jacimus (Cohen 1979, 144–169).

Cohen is surely right that the *Life* makes little sense as reworking of *Judean War*, given the glaring inconsistencies (see below). Of the remaining options, that Josephus wrote it as

a free creation from impaired memory or that he reverted to *Judean War's* sources, he prefers the latter (1979, 77). But it is not clear how that scenario would solve the problem of the glaring differences, or explain Josephus's procedure: troubling to go back to old notes when provoked by Justus, but making such a shambles of the result. Cohen discounts the possibility of a new literary creation, it seems, because he finds so little rationale or structure in it (1979, 169–170). We need to examine this question more closely.

3.3 Purpose and Life-Writing in Rome

Several contributions following Cohen's, agreeing that Justus's challenge cannot explain very much, even if it was on Josephus's mind as a provocation, and finding more coherence in the work, have offered other explanations. Rajak (1983, 146–155, esp. 154) thinks that the *Life* makes best sense as Josephus's effort, as a prominent survivor, to explain to the Jewish-Judean aristocracy of the Diaspora why, in the context of this national debacle, he failed as a moderate commander “to master the Galilee” and was rejected by the authorities. Josephus's digression on Justus is just that, incidental. Bilde (1988, 110–113), rejecting all defensive motives and sidelining Justus, briefly argues that Josephus writes to establish his personal qualifications: his priestly ancestry for *Judean Antiquities* and his personal experience of combat for *Judean War*. Neyrey (1994, 178–188) shows that the *Life* exhibits all the standard components of ancient encomium: you praised someone by surveying his ancestry, youth, political and military achievements, friends, benefits, and so on. My commentary on the *Life* (Mason 2001) seeks to develop these perspectives in light of Josephus's Roman context.

We might usefully glance at contemporary examples, to see both see how an author could make such bold claims as Josephus does and how a “life” could be focused disproportionately on one brief period (thus far Cohen 1979, 101–109).

Biography had been central to Greek literature and rhetoric from the start. Homer's great works were, in some sense, lives of Achilles and Odysseus. Later historians would highlight important individuals (Herodotus's Croesus and Persian kings; Thucydides' Pericles), or indeed write lives of great men (Xenophon's *Agesilaus*, *Cyropaedia*). Rhetoricians would drill into their elite students a prescribed model for praising a man's character (invertible if the need was to vilify): portray his illustrious ancestry, precocious youth, early signs of divine favor/protection, courageous public and military service, incorruptibility when tested, high-status friends and their generous benefits in recognition of his character, and his own treatment of friends and enemies (e.g., Cicero, *Part. or.* 75–82; Quintilian, *Inst.* 3.7.15). But it was in the late Roman Republic, in the fierce contests of great men for primacy, that autobiography seems to have found its voice (Misch 1950, 1.177–338).

In his review of Rome's great orators, Cicero describes a contest between the patrician M. Aemilius Scaurus and the Stoic P. Rutilius Rufus for the consulship of 115 B.C.E. Scaurus won, Rutilius sued for bribery, and Scaurus countersued on the same charge. Scaurus at some point produced a three-volume work, *On the Events of His Own Life* (*Brut.* 112–113). We naturally infer that its concern was to celebrate and defend his luminous character. Cicero himself, though a prolific writer in the political epicenter, faced frustration in getting word of his brilliant career out to a wide enough audience. He sent friends highly rhetorical accounts—in Greek, Latin, and celebratory verse—to provide all the source material they would need to write up his story. One begged off on the ground that he could hardly improve on Cicero, while another had already written a “rough and bare” version.

The orator grudgingly appreciated the effort, which had the appeal of a woman who wears no perfume (*Att.* 1.19; 2.20). Most affecting is Cicero's all-out plea to the best historian of his generation, Luceius, to mention him often and lavishly, ignoring the sober "laws of history" in this one case—and to do it soon, so that Cicero might enjoy some of the glory before his death (*Fam.* 5.12).

After a tumultuous political career that had seen him exiled and would see him murdered, Cicero contemplated writing his own life—as many great Romans had done, he notes. But he knew the pitfalls. Laudatory accounts are more persuasive if someone else does them. In writing about oneself, one must restrain praise. And such apparent immodesty puts off some of the people most desired as audiences. These examples illustrate the blurred relationships among historiography, rhetoric, biography, and autobiography in the first century (cf. Pelling 2006).

In the decade in which Josephus completed his *Judean Antiquities-Life*, his younger contemporary Tacitus produced a biography of his late father-in-law (ca. 98 C.E.). Tacitus begins with a reflection on the nature of life-writing in the case of great men, highlighting the tension between recording one's own virtues and leaving it to others. The consuls Scaurus and Rutilius furnish examples of better times, when public figures could write of their own virtues without fear or shame. Having recently emerged from Domitian's paranoid reign, when any hint of moral greatness would be snuffed out, Tacitus ostentatiously requests pardon even for writing the biography of another great man (*Agr.* 1).

The *Agricola* is a work full of paradox and puzzle (Whitmarsh 2006), especially if we would insist on clear genre distinctions, but similarities with Josephus's *Life* make it worth a look. First, it has a degree of ring composition, in that the opening (4–9) and closing (44–46) paragraphs focus on the subject's general character and personal life. In between, Tacitus takes up *Agricola*'s most glorious period as military commander, though this runs to years (in Britain) rather than Josephus's months (in Galilee). Throughout, the author saturates the story with the language of moral quality.

Thus: *Agricola* was born in an ancient and famous (*vetere et inlustri*) city, from a grandfather of the highest equestrian rank and a Senator father, distinguished for eloquence and wisdom; his mother was a woman of singular virtue. A boyhood spent in excellent pursuits was assisted by his place of retreat from the snares of Roman life: Massilia. As a youth, his soul burned with a love of the philosophical life. He would have pursued it with a devotion unsuited to a man with public responsibilities, had not his mother's practical wisdom restrained him (4). As was normal for a man of his class, he began his public life as *tribunus laticlavus* in a legion, where he proved himself—in contrast to the norm of lazy young men—devoted, serious, and brave (5). He then married a woman from a glorious birth-line (*splendidis natalibus ortam*). In his first province, with the financial responsibilities of a quaestor, he proved himself incorruptible amidst great temptation (6), and his praetorship in Rome was marked by a balance of suitable provisions for public celebration and lack of indulgence (7). As legionary legate in Britain, *Agricola* combined discipline and success with great moderation and modesty (7–8). Acknowledging his virtue, Vespasian bestowed singular honors: adlection among the patricians, a praetorian province, finally the consulship (9). Says Tacitus, "To speak of blamelessness and self-control in such a man would be an affront to his excellence" (9.4). The closing paragraphs of the biography offer a moving encomium (44–46).

Both the general tenor of this account and many specific items recall Josephus's autobiography, with the important difference that he writes of himself—and while Domitian yet lived. But the foreign captive presented no danger of the kind posed by high-status Romans.

We have seen that Josephus unabashedly introduces his ancestry, achievements, and abilities. He likewise concludes the *Life* (430): “These, then, are the things that occurred throughout my entire life; from them let others judge my character (*to êthos*) as they might wish.” We turn, then, to the content and structure of Josephus’s little work, asking how and to what extent it works as a portrait of his character by ancient standards, with abundant examples and little remainder.

3.4 Contents, Structures, Devices

Life’s contents may be readily summarized, though of course the groupings and headings are mine and open to debate.

- I. Ancestry, education, and juvenile honors (1–12a)
 - Ancestry (1–6)
 - Education (7–12a)
- II. Public life (12b–413)
 - A. Beginnings (12b–29)
 - Qualification for leadership: embassy to Rome (13–16)
 - Origins of mission to Galilee (17–29)
 - B. Fulfilment of basic mission in Galilee, early opposition (30–188)
 - Survey of Galilean situation, featuring Philip ben Jacimus at Gamala (30–63)
 - Confidence-building measures with populace, fortifications, amid resistance and revolt against Josephus led by John of Gischala (64–188)
 - Featured: John’s attempt to lead Tiberias against Josephus (85–103)
 - C. Delegation from Jerusalem sent to replace Josephus (189–335)
 - Delegation’s origin in John’s machinations and mandate (189–203)
 - Josephus’s despair—and reassuring dream-vision (204–212)
 - First exchanges with delegation (213–241)
 - Confrontation at Gabara (242–265)
 - Josephus’s counter-embassy to Jerusalem (266–270)
 - Confrontation at Tiberias (271–304)
 - Josephus confounds, captures, expels delegation (303–335)
 - D. Digression against Justus of Tiberias, lying historian (335–367)
 - E. Josephus’s successes, opponents’ failures (368–413)
 - John of Gischala neutralized (368–372)
 - Josephus humiliates uncooperative Sepphoris (373–380)
 - Josephus threatens Tiberias (381–389)
 - Justus of Tiberias flees (390–393)
 - Sepphoris narrowly escapes Josephus as Romans arrive (394–397)
 - Agrippa’s royal troops checked by Josephus’s army (408–409)
 - Philip, son of Jacimus, rescued from unjust punishment (407–409)
 - Justus of Tiberias condemned by Vespasian, though spared (410)
 - Summary remarks (411–413)
- III. Josephus’s domestic life, continued (414–429)
 - In Alexandria and the Jerusalem area with Titus (414–422)
 - In Rome and benefits from Flavian rulers (423–429)
- IV. Epilogue (430)

This outline already suggests a family resemblance with Tacitus's *Agricola*, which becomes clear in the details. Having introduced the *Life* in the *Judean Antiquities*, Josephus need waste no time in getting to the point: "My ancestry is rather distinguished," he opens (*Life* 1). On both paternal and maternal sides, he makes his rhetorical point clear, even if the dates and arithmetic remain fuzzy: I come from the best possible Judean stock (1–6). His father was a particularly eminent man, in the greatest city of the Judeans (7). As a boy, Josephus distinguished himself for insight, memory, and understanding of the laws (7–9). His unique talents led him not only to explore all the Judean philosophical schools, from age sixteen, but also to become a devotee (*zêlôtês*) of the most rigorous teacher and the simplest imaginable life in the desert. That period had to end, of course, and at age nineteen he returned to the *polis* to take his place in public life (10–12).

For his transitional experience, the young Judean had no avenue to a legionary tribunate as *Agricola* had. But his contemporary Plutarch would observe that young Greek statesmen with no opportunity for military glory (under Rome) might prove themselves in public lawsuits, and especially in embassies to the emperor, which "require a man of determination who possesses both courage and intellect" (*Mor.* [*Praec.*] 805a–b). Josephus opens his public career, gliding silently over seven years, with just such an embassy to Nero's court in Rome. Although a shipwreck claimed most of his shipmates, he was spared by divine protection and achieved his aim of liberating distinguished compatriots, returning with abundant gifts from Nero's wife (13–16).

This tone of moral celebration is matched at the end of the work by Josephus's detailed account of benefactions received from the powerful and his generous treatment of friends in turn (414–429). Although he was in no position to be adlected to the Senate or among the patricians, he can claim the singular distinction of being chosen as Titus's traveling companion for the ship voyage to Rome ahead of the triumph (422). Among his many tokens of honor, Josephus dwells on the distinguished ancestry of his current wife (427).

If a moral purpose is clear in the opening and closing sections of both lives, also in the central narrative no event is recorded simply as a matter of getting the dates or facts correct. In Josephus's case, virtually every episode in which he appears illustrates his courage and resourcefulness (114ff., 141ff., 165ff., 236ff., 283ff., 324ff., 373ff., 394ff., 398ff.), loyalty (62, 212ff.), piety and divine protection (14–15, 47–48, 80ff., 155ff., 208ff., 299ff.), justice (79, 128ff., 149ff., 331ff.), clemency (30–31, 82, 102, 112–113, 169ff., 242–245, 262ff., 304ff., 381ff.), liberality and treatment of friends (97ff., 230ff., 246ff., 252ff., 417ff.), patience (317ff.), prudence (17ff., 72, 77, 174ff., 185ff., 294ff.), or self-control and incorruptibility (67ff., 79–80, 266, 336ff.)—including a sexual restraint uncommon to young men with military power (80, 259). The story truly is about his character, and the wretchedness of his adversaries.

To help expose a subject's virtues, rhetoric favoured the technique of comparison (*comparatio*) with a less worthy or utterly despicable figure. Just as Tacitus throws young *Agricola*'s financial probity into relief by contrasting him with his boss and would-be accomplice, the proconsul of Asia (*Agr.* 6), Josephus contrasts his refusal to accept even the tithes due him as a priest (*Life* 80) with his colleagues' naked greed and easy corruptibility (63, 73). As the outline above suggests, however, his more enduring rhetorical foils are John of Gischala, the delegation from Jerusalem, and finally Justus of Tiberias.

Another literary technique, in this case for building suspense and sustaining interest, is Josephus's habit of beginning a story and bringing it to a critical point, only to leave it hanging for later resolution. So Philip, son of Jacimus's life-threatening plight is detailed at *Life* 46–61, but King Agrippa will not learn whether he is dead or alive until 179–181, and

the vicious rumours about him generated by Varus are quashed only at the end (407–409). Early in the piece Josephus describes how, when certain militant Galileans plundered Antipas's palace in Tiberias, he rescued the goods and handed them over to a royal-friendly group for safekeeping (66–69). We do not learn what has become of them until *Life* 295–296, where they return to play a crucial part in the story, placing Josephus in jeopardy. Again he introduces certain foreign noble refugees from King Agrippa's territory who had come to join the revolt, and the struggle he faced in protecting them against those who would force them to circumcise (112–113), but he discloses their fate only later (149–153).

The many examples of this A-B-A technique, which Josephus employs also in his *Judean War* and *Judean Antiquities*, lead us to ask whether the *Life* has, like them, a concentric pattern overall. Given what we have already observed in relation to the work's matching opening and closing sections, it should not surprise us to find more of the same, but the clarity of the concentric structure in the *Life* is surprising.

First, those opening and closing sections (1–29; 414–429) do not merely host similar subject matter; the specific parallels of content and language are striking. Both feature Josephus's voyage from Judea to Rome, divine (as distinct from human) provision for him (15, 425), extreme dangers (14, 416), conspicuous benefits from an emperor's *wife* (16, 429—perhaps attenuating his connections with Nero and Domitian), his brother (8, 419), children (5, 426–427), and anonymous accusers (6, 416). Only at the end of the Introduction and beginning of the Conclusion does Josephus refer readers to the *Judean War* for accurate details (27, 412). No reader could miss the similar feel and the sense of completion created by this narrative frame.

Moving inward from that frame, we find many anticipations near the beginning of what will come near the end. Justus is introduced early (36–42), then addressed at length later (336–367, 390–393), and the diction of the later passages recalls the earlier parallels (“revolutionary activities,” “proceed toward weapons,” emphasis on education, his recent book). Although John of Gischala is more continuously present, he emerges from Gischala as a troublemaker for Josephus at *Life* 70–76, until Josephus is finally able to confine him to his lair, cowed and beaten (372). Early on, Josephus writes to Jerusalem's leaders for confirmation of his mandate (62–63); only after many trials does he decisively receive their clear support (309).

Most impressive are two major revolts against Josephus's leadership by the people of Tiberias, led by John of Gischala. Sitting at the one-quarter and three-quarter marks of the narrative (85–103, 271–308/335), they share a remarkable number of features. The first begins with John's arrival for (deceptively) “the care of the body” at the nearby springs (85), a phrase that Josephus will use again only of himself (genuinely) at the end of the second revolt (329). In both stories, Josephus is warned of the rebellion by a certain Silas—of whom he claims to have spoken earlier (89, 272). *Life*'s only two references to a stadium come in each passage (92, 331). In both, Josephus addresses the populace and then has to flee the mob, apparently by secret passage, to the lake, where he escapes on a boat to safer Tarichea—“against expectation” (*para doxan, aprosdokêtôs*; 96, 304). At the conclusion of both episodes, the generous Josephus must vigorously dissuade his loyal Galileans from attacking John, who temporarily retreats to Gischala (97–101, 305–308).

Given such clear movement toward and then away from a center, is there a narrative fulcrum of some kind around *Life*'s middle section? The printed Niese text comprises 15,835 words. If we look for something significant around the halfway point, we indeed find an important though seldom discussed episode. Namely, Josephus hears from his father in Jerusalem about the delegation being dispatched to bring him back dead or alive.

Overcome with anguish, he decides to return to Jerusalem of his own accord. But the people will not let him go (202–207). While deeply perturbed, he has a “wonderful sort of dream,” in which a figure stands over him and reassures him of future greatness, even in combat against the Romans (209). This recognition (Aristotle’s *anagnórisis*) begins a reversal or undoing (*peripeteia*) of the narrative flow to this point. Suddenly discovering a courage that will preserve him through the end, Josephus enlarges and musters his forces for the campaign ahead (210–215). As it happens, this scene falls in the dead center of the work. The exact halfway point of the Niese text is the 7,918th word, which comes in the middle of *Life* 214. A bare sentence and half earlier comes this narrative reversal, in Josephus’s decision to stay and fight (*Life* 212 ends at word 7,857).

This kind of ring-composition is not a science, of course. Seeding a narrative with elements that will return in a *roughly* reverse order serves aesthetic purposes. It satisfies a general (and famously Greek) taste for symmetry, enfolding the entire text in a “periodic” sort of coil. It might aid memory and also provide a vivid sense of closure, as what was wrapped with increasing tightness begins to unfold. Most importantly, it heightens the emotional and sometimes tragic tone (as in *War* and *Antiquities*), as we watch characters caught willy-nilly in a cosmic drama (see Chapter 1 by Mason on *War* in this volume). At any rate, the fulcrum is undeniably there, in *Life*’s only dream-revelation. In the paragraphs immediately before and after the dream, for example, Josephus uses four phrases to describe the emotional people’s responses to him, in one sequence beforehand and then in reverse order afterward. Moving out from the center: “women and children” (207, 210), “they were begging” (206, 210), [not to] “leave them in the lurch” (205, 210), and “their territory” (205, 210).

Although the *Life* lacks *Judean War*’s important speeches, it reflects a similar view of the speech-reality relationship. The whole narrative elaborates a “double game,” in which nothing is as it appears and everyone, including Josephus, is readily saying things he does not mean, and which are not true. Programmatic is the decision of Jerusalem’s elite, after openly cautioning the people about revolt against Rome and finding themselves in mortal peril, to profess agreement with popular sentiment (*Life* 21–22). From now on, Josephus will *play the role* of a rebel commander against King Agrippa, whom he actually respects, and the Romans, with whom he seeks peace. He quotes Justus of Tiberias to show that man’s amazing skill at manipulating the masses with words. His fault is not that, but the moral defect of narrow self-aggrandisement (36–40). Josephus himself creates an unexpected crisis when he declares that he has been sent to demolish Antipas’s former palace, in an effort to win over Tiberias’s malcontents, and is unexpectedly taken too seriously (65–69). In the service of his noble aims and good character, he dissembles whenever necessary (126–131, 136–144, 324–326). But everyone is doing it. He includes an entertaining exchange of mutually deceptive letters between himself and the Jerusalem delegates (217–236; cf. 285–290). Irony is pervasive and essential to the story.

3.5 Relation to *Judean War* 2 and Historical Utility

When Josephus refers *Life*’s audiences to the *Judean War* for a “(more) accurate/precise account” (27, 412), we can only wonder whether he is having a laugh, or mocking the earnest efforts of later scholars. In spite of our powerful inclination to find a core of basic events, allowing for understandable variation, the differences between the two accounts of his life resist happy reconciliation. These appear both in the internal content of episodes and, at least as worryingly, in the overall sequences of cause and effect. In limited space here

I can only alert the reader to the problem with a few examples, to show that the situation precludes any simple effort to declare one of the two versions *reliable*.

As for overall structure, *Judean War* 2 presents the following main events and narrative logic. (1) Josephus is one of several generals chosen to command a sub-theater of the war: Galilee and Gamala. He rushes north from Jerusalem to recruit and train 100,000 soldiers and fortify the towns (2.566–579). (2) He is soon opposed by John of Gischala, a local troublemaker engaged in slippery business practices to lift himself out of poverty (2.585–594). (3) Young militants from Dabaritta, after robbing a steward of King Agrippa II as he traveled nearby, bring the proceeds to their new commander in Tarichea. Josephus tries secretly to return the property to the king, but he is exposed and his life endangered. He singles out the ringleaders and flogs them within an inch of their lives (2.595–613). (4) John tries to foment rebellion from Josephus in Tiberias. Josephus not only stymies his effort but persuades John's 3,000 followers to abandon him (2.614–625), forcing him into surreptitious plots. (5) John persuades the Jerusalem authorities to send a four-man delegation to remove Josephus. Although they quickly win over Galilee's major centers, Josephus outwits them and quickly sends them home (2.626–632). (6) The Tiberians rebel against Josephus on their own, appealing to King Agrippa for help. Josephus uses clever tricks to subdue them, punishing a ringleader named Cleitus with the self-administered severing of a hand (2.633–645). (7) Tiberias and Sepphoris revolt from Josephus. After allowing his soldiers to plunder both cities as a lesson, in the interest of winning their gratitude and trust, he orders the booty restored to its owners (2.645–666).

Life's narrative logic and sequence cannot be reconciled with *Judean War*'s account. Square brackets draw attention to differences in order. (1) Josephus is dispatched with two other priests to pacify Galilee and await events (28–30). As he shifts roles to become a commander, he gathers a force numbering in the hundreds, eventually a few thousand (90, 118, 213, 321). (2) John of Gischala is the wealthy leading man of Gischala, well connected in Jerusalem (43–45, 70–76, 189–192). [4] Although John foments revolt in Tiberias during an ostensible visit to the baths, that episode cannot result in his loss of followers, which in turn cannot explain his arrangement of the delegation, because this is only the beginning of his activity in *Life*. Those elements from *Judean War* are postponed to the end here (370–371). Many other features of this first Tiberian revolt are re-used, as we have seen, for *Life*'s third revolt (the second led by John), three-quarters of the way through the story (287–335), which has no parallel in *Judean War*. [3] Young Dabarittans rob *the wife* of Agrippa's steward (he does not appear), and steal different things. Josephus's actions and speeches are also different in content and strategy. [6] Though it comes after the delegation episode in *Judean War*, the Tiberians' revolt and failed appeal to Agrippa come well before that crucial episode in *Life* (155–174), and many details are different—including Josephus's order that Cleitus cut off *both* his hands (*Life* 172). [5] Now comes the dominant story in *Life*, the detailed account of the delegation (189–335). Its content is different and largely incompatible with *Judean War*'s version (below). (7) *Life* separates the two final revolts of Sepphoris and Tiberias (373–389). It does not mention the return of plunder as a goodwill gesture in these contexts, though that does come after the third Tiberian revolt, not mentioned in *Judean War* (*Life* 333–335).

It is not only that events have a different sequence and different causes in *Life*, but the episodes themselves can have astonishingly different content. Consider the single most important event of Josephus's Galilean career: the delegation from Jerusalem. The accounts agree that there were four men, but who were they? *Judean War* 2.628 names them as Yoesdrus, son of Nomicus, Ananias Sadouki, and two "sons of Jonathan" named Simon and

Judas. *Life* 197 has two non-priestly Pharisees named Jonathan and Ananias, a priest-Pharisee named Yozar, and a young man of chief-priestly ancestry named Simon. In that story, the Pharisee Jonathan is so clearly the leader that they are usually called “Jonathan’s group” (199–201, 216, 226–232, etc.). Our willingness to allow that people often had two different names, or that the Greek spelling of Hebrew names would vary (e.g., Yozar and Yoesdrus are likely the same), cannot help us reconcile the two groups—unless we resort to the fundamentalist wheeze that would imagine seven or eight men in the group. For *Judean War* has no Jonathan at all. If we speculated that *Judean War*’s Judas son of Jonathan happened also to be a Jonathan, we would be checkmated by the fact that *Judean War*’s Simon and Judas/Jonathan are *brothers*, whereas *Life*’s Simon has a chief-priestly pedigree, while its Jonathan is a lay Pharisee.

3.6 Conclusion

These observations require us to distinguish between literary-rhetorical and historical concerns. We have seen that the *Life* is thematically and structurally coherent. This does not mean that it is perfect: it has a few loose ends, such as references to things already said that have not been said (as far as we know). But even the lauded *Judean War* has some of those puzzles, the *Judean Antiquities* more, and anyone who has written or edited substantial academic pieces should hesitate to accuse. The similar style contributes to the same atmosphere of a unified story, permeated by the ironic double game that the times necessitated, its mid-section embellished in slow motion. This analysis removes a basic support from the image of Josephus responding to Justus’s challenge by cooking up a stew from warmed-up, decades-old leftovers. The present work is a respectable unity, suiting a single compositional situation: Josephus’s desire to celebrate his life and character. This is true even though we cannot know why he made the decisions he did, for example, to feature Philip ben Jacimus. (Were Philip’s relatives, or the man himself, among his friends?) Those episodes obviously contribute to various themes—Gamala’s situation, King Agrippa’s character, divine vindication of the just—but still we may wonder.

On the historical side, the many general and specific differences confirm that in writing the *Life* Josephus did not pore over an unwieldy scroll of *Judean War* 2. But the notion that he returned to *Judean War*’s sources would create as many problems. Why would he have done that, and how would that explain the same differences? We should rather imagine him freely composing the *Life* for his new situation upon completing the *Judean Antiquities*. He wants to celebrate his life and achievements with the people who have shown such interest in his work in Rome, especially Epaphroditus and his circle. They must have been well disposed, uncritical, and trusting—just the group with whom Josephus could expand as he wished on his character without fear of heckling. Of course, he knows that in his prime he composed the famed *Judean War*, and he proudly refers to it for “accurate details.” But just as academics do not spend their time re-reading their youthful publications, he had no reason to revisit *that* story. He is recalling his own life, after all. Apparently he has forgotten much of what he wrote in the definitive history, even the names and relationships of those men from Jerusalem who once loomed so large. But such disparities do not visibly worry him. Everything in his environment encouraged variation in storytelling, new arrangements, and the extraction of different moral lessons from the same events. Who could possibly care if he told stories differently—except modern historians?

For the new work he exploits an array of adversaries, rivals, and accusers, using the dark screen of their villainy to illuminate his virtues. These range from the infamous John (exhibited in the Flavian triumph) to the what's-their-names from Jerusalem. Justus with his new accusations, far from worrying Josephus, joins the ranks of laughable losers who have dared to challenge our man. His confidence in ridiculing all such pests prepares for his rough handling of anti-Judean spokesmen, *seriatim*, in the *Against Apion*.

REFERENCES

- Barish, David A. 1978. "The Autobiography of Josephus and the Hypothesis of a Second Edition of his *Antiquities*." *Harvard Theological Review* 71: 61–75.
- Bilde, Per. 1988. *Flavius Josephus between Jerusalem and Rome: His Life, his Works and their Importance*. Sheffield: JSOT Press.
- Cohen, Shaye J. D. 1979. *Josephus in Galilee and Rome: His Vita and Development as a Historian*. Leiden: Brill.
- Drexler, Hans. 1925. "Untersuchungen zu Josephus und zur Geschichte des jüdischen Aufstandes." *Klio* 19: 277–312.
- Ewald, Heinrich. 1869–1886. *The History of Israel*, 8 vols., translated and edited by Russell Martineau, Joseph E. Carpenter, and John F. Smith. London: Longmans, Green, and Co.
- Frankfort, Thérèse. 1961. "La date de l'autobiographie de Flavius Josèphe et des œuvres de Justus de Tiberiade." *Revue Belge de Philologie* 39: 52–58.
- Gelzer, Matthias. 1952. "Die Vita des Josephos." *Hermes* 80: 67–90.
- Hölscher, Gustav. 1916. "Josephus." In *Paulys Realenzyklopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, edited by G. W. August Friedrich von Pauly et al., 18: 1934–2000. Stuttgart: A. Druckenmüller.
- Jones, Christopher P. 2002. "Towards a Chronology of Josephus." *Scripta Classica Israelica* 21: 113–121.
- Kokkinos, Nikos. 1998. *The Herodian Dynasty: Origins, Role in Society and Eclipse*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Kokkinos, Nikos. 2003. "Justus, Josephus, Agrippa II and his Coins." *Scripta Classica Israelica* 22: 163–180.
- Kushnir-Stein, Alla. 2002. "The Coinage of Agrippa II." *Scripta Classica Israelica* 21: 123–131.
- Laqueur, Richard. 1920. *Der jüdische Historiker Flavius Josephus: ein biographischer Versuch auf neuer quellenkritischer Grundlage*. Giessen: v. Münchow.
- Luther, Heinrich. 1910. *Josephus und Justus von Tiberias: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des jüdischen Aufstandes*. Halle: Wischan & Burkhardt.
- Mason, Steve. 1991. *Flavius Josephus on the Pharisees: A Composition-Critical Study*. Leiden: Brill.
- Mason, Steve. 2001. *Flavius Josephus: Translation and Commentary, Volume 9: Life of Josephus* [BJP], edited by Steve Mason. Leiden: Brill.
- Misch, Georg. 1950. *A History of Autobiography in Antiquity*, 2 vols., trans. by E. W. Dickes. London: Routledge and Paul.
- Neyrey, Jerome H. 1994. "Josephus' *Vita* and the Encomium: A Native Model of Personality." *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 25: 177–206.
- Niese, Benedict. 1896. "Der jüdische Historiker Josephus," *Historische Zeitschrift*, n. F. 40: 193–237.
- Pelling, Christopher. 2006. "Breaking the Bounds: Writing about Julius Caesar." In *The Limits of Ancient Biography*, edited by Brian McGing and Judith Mossman, 255–280. Swansea: Classical Press of Wales.
- Rajak, Tessa. 1973. "Justus of Tiberias." *Classical Quarterly* 23: 345–368.
- Rajak, Tessa. 1983. [repr. 2002]. *Josephus: The Historian and His Society*. London: Duckworth.
- Rodgers, Zuleika. 2006. "Justice for Justus: A Reexamination of Justus of Tiberias' Role in Josephus' Autobiography." In *The Limits of Ancient Biography*, edited by Brian McGing and Judith Mossman, 169–192. Swansea: Classical Press of Wales.

- Schalit, Abraham. 1933. "Josephus und Justus." *Klio* 26: 67–95.
- Schürer, Emil. 1898–1901. *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*, 3 vols. Leipzig: Hinrichs.
- Schürer, Emil. 1973–1987. *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ*. 3 vols. in 4, revised and edited by Geza Vermes et al. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.
- Siebert, Folker, Heinz Schreckenber, and Manuel Vogel. 2001. *Flavius Josephus: Aus meinem Leben (Vita)*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Smallwood, E. Mary. 1981. *The Jews under Roman Rule, from Pompey to Diocletian: A Study in Political Relations*. Leiden: Brill.
- Thackeray, Henry St. J. 1898–1905. "Josephus." In *A Dictionary of the Bible*, 5 vols., edited by James Hastings, 5: 461–473. New York: C. Scribner's Sons.
- Thackeray, Henry St. J. 1929. *Josephus: The Man and the Historian*. New York: Jewish Institute of Religion Press.
- Whitmarsh, Tim. 2006. "This In-Between Book': Language, Politics and Genre in the *Agricola*." In *The Limits of Ancient Biography*, edited by Brian McGing and Judith Mossman, 305–333. Swansea: Classical Press of Wales.

FURTHER READING

Students should begin their research on *Life* with the following scholarship:

- Cohen, Shaye J. D. 1979. *Josephus in Galilee and Rome: His Vita and Development as a Historian*. Leiden: Brill.
- Kokkinos, Nikos. 1998. *The Herodian Dynasty: Origins, Role in Society and Eclipse*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Mason, Steve. 2001. *Flavius Josephus: Translation and Commentary, Volume 9: Life of Josephus* [BJP], edited by Steve Mason. Leiden: Brill.
- Misch, Georg. 1950. *A History of Autobiography in Antiquity*, 2 vols., trans. by E. W. Dicks. London: Routledge and Paul.
- Neyrey, Jerome H. 1994. "Josephus' *Vita* and the Encomium: A Native Model of Personality." *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 25: 177–206.
- Rodgers, Zuleika. 2006. "Justice for Justus: A Reexamination of Justus of Tiberias' Role in Josephus' Autobiography." In *The Limits of Ancient Biography*, edited by Brian McGing and Judith Mossman, 169–192. Swansea: Classical Press of Wales.
- Whitmarsh, Tim. 2006. "This In-Between Book': Language, Politics and Genre in the *Agricola*." In *The Limits of Ancient Biography*, edited by Brian McGing and Judith Mossman, 305–333. Swansea: Classical Press of Wales.