

## **THE GOD AWAY FROM HIS CITY: THE FALL OF JERUSALEM IN 70 CE. FLAVIUS JOSEPHUS' VIEW FROM *BELLUM IUDAICUM***

*El Dios lejos de su ciudad: la caída de Jerusalén en  
el año 70 EC. La mirada de Flavio Josefo a partir  
del Bellum Iudaicum*

Francesca LORENZINI  
*Università degli Studi Roma Tre*  
Francesca.lorenzini@uniroma3.it  
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0004-1808-9055>

Fecha de recepción: 08/10/2024      Fecha de aceptación: 24/10/2024

ABSTRACT: Once the first Jewish revolt (66-70 CE) was over, the *koben Yosef ben Matityahu* – known since 71 CE in Flavian-era Rome as *Titus Flavius Iosephus* – wrote his first work entitled *Bellum Iudaicum* (75-79 CE) to provide the Jews and Romans with an exposition of the events he had experienced as a former general of Galilee. However, *BJ* is more than a military account. It is the last page of the sacred history of the ἔθνος τῶν Ἰουδαίων before the Temple was destroyed.

The destruction – according to Josephus – was due to the ἀσέβεια of the rebel groups who generated στάσις and impurity. They desecrated the holy city and made themselves guilty of injustice and *contaminatio* in the eyes of God. For that reason, Jerusalem could no longer be his seat. God's remoteness – in the form of divine punishment as χόλος τοῦ θεοῦ – is

actually the highest form of justice. God turned away, and the Romans became the executors of his will.

*Keywords:* Theocracy; *contaminatio*; ἀσέβεια; first Jewish revolt; στάσις.

RESUMEN: Una vez terminada la primera revuelta judía (66-70 EC), el *koben Yosef ben Matityahu* –conocido desde el año 71 EC en la Roma de la época flavia como *Titus Flavius Iosephus*– escribió su primera obra titulada *Bellum Iudaicum* (75-79 EC) para ofrecer a los judíos y romanos una exposición de los acontecimientos que había vivido como exgeneral de Galilea. Sin embargo, *BJ* es más que un relato militar: es la última página de la historia sagrada del ἔθνος τῶν Ἰουδαίων antes de la destrucción del Templo.

Esta destrucción –según Josefo– se debió a la ἀσέβεια de los grupos rebeldes que generaron στάσις e impureza. Profanaron la ciudad santa y se hicieron culpables de injusticia y *contaminatio* ante los ojos de Dios. Por esa razón, Jerusalén ya no podía ser su sede. La lejanía de Dios –en forma de castigo divino como χόλος τοῦ θεοῦ– es, en realidad, la forma más severa de justicia. Dios se apartó y los Romanos se convirtieron en los ejecutores de su voluntad.

*Palabras clave:* Teocracia; *contaminatio*; ἀσέβεια; primera revuelta judía; στάσις.

## 1. INTRODUCTION: BETWEEN JERUSALEM AND ROME

In 70 CE, after a month-long siege, the city of Jerusalem fell to the Romans. The destruction of the Temple, one of the most traumatic events in the history of the Jewish people, was the dramatic outcome of the first Jewish revolt that began in 66 CE. The aim of this contribution is to re-read the fall of Jerusalem as the result of divine abandonment, the image of a God far from his holy city. The *focus* will be on two aspects: firstly, the pre-eminence of the concept of theocracy for the Jewish nation; secondly, the *stasis* will be assessed as an element of internal contamination-pollution that caused God's estrangement from his civil and religious spaces, first and foremost the Temple. The starting point for this analysis will be the Jewish historian Flavius Josephus, in particular his early work *Bellum Iudaicum*.

Looking at the history of Roman Judea in the first century CE, Jerusalem and Rome are certainly the undisputed protagonists, but –as stated by Pierre Vidal-Naquet and Per Bilde– Josephus necessarily stands between

the two. Flavius Josephus is a key figure, and his life parable is both complicated and fascinating<sup>1</sup>. He was born in Jerusalem in 37-38 CE as the *kohen Yosef ben Matityahu*. As Josephus himself proudly declares at the beginning of his work *Vita*, his family descended from a prestigious and ancient priestly lineage-linked (on his mother's side) to the royal house of the Hasmoneans:

(1) 1. Now in my case, my ancestry is rather distinguished, having originated with priests long ago. Just as the basis of noble birth is different among various [nations], so also among us membership in the priesthood is a certain proof of an ancestry's brilliance. 2. Now in my case, my ancestry is not merely from priests; it is also from the first day-course of the twenty-four – an enormous distinction, this – and indeed, from the most élite of the divisions within this [course]. Further, I have a share of royal ancestry from my mother because the children of Asamoneus, of whom she was a descendant, for a very long time served as high priests and exercised the kingship of our nation<sup>2</sup>.

From this passage, it is clear that Josephus identified the traditional Jewish aristocracy with the priesthood by birth and that he considered himself close to the priestly circles that formed the Jewish *élite* at the time<sup>3</sup>. For the purposes of this analysis, however, it is particularly relevant that Josephus was a *testis* and *auctor* of the first Jewish revolt (66-70 CE), in which he participated as a general leading Galilee. The ambiguity of his pragmatic choices (the shift to the Roman side during the war) earned him the reputation of an opportunistic traitor par excellence<sup>4</sup>. After his capture, Josephus indeed collaborated with Titus as an interpreter for the Roman army. From 71 CE he spent his life in Rome under the imperial protection

1. For a general introduction to Flavius Josephus as a man and historian see Cohen, *Josephus in Galilee*; Vidal-Naquet, *Flavius Josèphe*; Bilde, *Flavius Josephus between*; Rajak, *Josephus: The Historian*; Chapman and Rodgers, *A Companion to Josephus*.

2. Joseph., *Vit.* 1 (1-2): [1] Ἐμοὶ δὲ γένος ἐστὶν οὐκ ἄσημον, ἀλλ' ἐξ ἱερέων ἄνωθεν καταβηκός. ὡσπερ δ' ἡ παρ' ἐκάστοις ἄλλη τίς ἐστὶν εὐγενείας ὑπόθεσις, οὕτως παρ' ἡμῖν ἡ τῆς ἱερωσύνης μετουσία τεκμήριόν ἐστιν γένους λαμπρότητος. [2] ἐμοὶ δ' οὐ μόνον ἐξ ἱερέων ἐστὶν τὸ γένος, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐκ τῆς πρώτης ἐφημερίδος τῶν εἰκοσιτεσσάρων, πολλὴ δὲ καὶ τούτῳ διαφορά, καὶ τῶν ἐν ταύτῃ δὲ φυλῶν ἐκ τῆς ἀρίστης. ὑπάρχω δὲ καὶ τοῦ βασιλικοῦ γένους ἀπὸ τῆς μητρὸς; οἱ γὰρ Ἀσαμωναίου παῖδες, ἃν ἔγγονος ἐκείνη, τοῦ ἔθνους ἡμῶν ἐπὶ μῆκιστον χρόνον ἡρχιεράτευσαν καὶ ἐβασίλευσαν. (Ed. and Translation by Mason, *Life of Josephus*, 3-6).

3. On Josephus and his aristocratic-priestly ideal as a family *background* see Thoma, "High Priesthood", 196-216; Gussmann, *Das Priesterverständnis*, 198-228; Tuval, *Jerusalem Priest to Roman Jew*, 260-275.

4. Rappaport, "Josephus Personality", 68-82.

of the Flavians (as his *tria nomina* demonstrate by the citizenship he acquired) and almost certainly died there around 100 CE<sup>5</sup>. It was in the shadow of that empire and the new dynasty that Josephus became a historian and wrote his four works (*Bellum Iudaicum*, *Antiquitates Iudaicae*, *Vita* and *Contra Apionem*) always looking to his ἔθνος τῶν Ἰουδαίων<sup>6</sup>.

In order to better understand Josephus as a witness to the first Jewish revolt, it is an obligatory step to briefly dwell on the political dynamics of Roman Judea in the first century CE. The history appears as a complex picture of conflict, resistance and cooperation between the Jewish *elites* and the Roman authorities. In 6 CE, Judea came under the direct control of Rome. Its territory was assimilated and added to the senatorial province of Syria under the leadership of a *praefectus Iudaeae*, who normally resided in Caesarea, the chosen administrative capital. Judea, therefore, did not become an autonomous province but the southern part of the province of Syria<sup>7</sup>. The *praefectus Iudaeae* was in turn subject to the authority of the *Legatus Augusti pro praetore* stationed in Antioch<sup>8</sup>. From an administrative point of view, Rome never treated Judea as a region with a special character, thus in a different way from the other provinces of the Empire.

This is why the idea of 'provincial exceptionalism' has no basis. According to the pragmatic action applied by Rome in other provinces, maintaining a stable government was only possible through the close cooperation of the local elites in exchange for privileges and opportunities for advancement in the eyes of Rome itself. Indeed, Roman provincial politics in the provinces relied on local elites to control the rest of the population<sup>9</sup>. Looking at Judea in the first century CE, the Temple was the symbol of identity and the center of the local economic domination system, collecting regular contributions throughout the Empire and accumulating great wealth. For this reason, the Romans turned their attention to the priestly elite of Jerusalem as their main collaborators *in loco*. They

5. On Josephus' life in Flavian Rome see Edmondson and Mason and Rives, *Flavius Josephus and Flavian*; Nodet, "Josephus' Attempt", 103-125; Curran, "Flavius Josephus in Rome", 65-86.

6. See Stern, "Josephus and the Roman Empire", 71-80; Price, "Provincial Historian", 101-121; Hollander, *Josephus, the Emperors*; Mason, "Josephus as a Roman Historian", 13-36.

7. On Judea under Rome from 6 CE and the subsequent internal dynamics see Eck, *Rom und Judaea*, 1-53; Labbé, *L'affirmation*, 233-251; Eck, "Herrschaft, Widerstand, Kooperation", 31-52.

8. Eck, "Judäa als Teil", 123-138.

9. An example of this aspect (the control of local elites) was the granting, precisely during the Flavian dynasty, of the *ius Latii* to Hispania. See Caballos Rufino, "Latinidad y municipalización", 101-120; Andreu-Pintado, "En torno al *ius Latii* flavio en Hispania", 37-46.

chose the high priests because they identified them as a wealthy ruling class they needed for their internal affairs, such as tax collection. However, the Romans were victims of this choice due to a 'cultural misunderstanding'; wealth was, in fact, not a primary value in Jewish (theocratic) society<sup>10</sup>. These Roman high priests were, therefore, perceived by the Jewish people as the product of foreign domination, powerful creatures for their wealth otherwise doomed to oblivion<sup>11</sup>. Josephus – in a nostalgic and apologetic tone – tried several times to exonerate the Jewish ruling class (he himself belonged to it) for its failure in relations with Rome. However, there is no doubt that much of the responsibility for the Jewish-Roman war must also be attributed to this Jewish (claimed) ruling class<sup>12</sup>.

## 2. *BELLUM IUDAICUM*: A MILITARY ACCOUNT IN SEARCH OF GOD'S WILL

And it is precisely the *Bellum Iudaicum* (75-79 CE), Josephus' first work, that is our main source for the first Judeo-Roman war. *Bellum*, first written in seven books in Aramaic (Josephus' native language) and later translated into Greek, tells the story of the first Jewish revolt culminating in the fall of Jerusalem and the burning of the Temple<sup>13</sup>. It is interesting to note (for what will be analysed later) that *Bellum* is situated in the long tradition of Greco-Roman historiography, particularly that of Thucydides. This is clear from Josephus' proem<sup>14</sup>:

1. The war of the Jews against the Romans – the greatest not only of the wars of our own time, but, so far as accounts have reached us, well nigh of all that ever broke out between cities or nations – has not lacked its historians. Of these, however, some, having taken no part in the action,

10. Goodman, *The Ruling Class of Judaea*, 33-45.

11. On the relationship between Rome and the Jewish High Priesthood see Smallwood, "High Priests and Politics", 14-34; Horsley, "High Priests and Politics", 23-55; Trampedach, "Schwierigkeiten mit der Theokratie", 117-142; Trampedach, "High Priests and Rome", 251-265; Pfeiffer, "Der Hohepriester", 968-987.

12. Goodman, *The Ruling Class of Judaea*, 109-135; Goodblatt, "Priestly Ideologies", 225-249; Price, *Jerusalem under siege*, 27-51.

13. Price, *Jerusalem under siege*, 180-194; Mason, *A History*; Mason, "Josephus's Judean War", 89-108.

14. Cf. Thuc., 1.1. 1: Θουκυδίδης Ἀθηναῖος ξυνέγραψε τὸν πόλεμον τῶν Πελοποννησίων καὶ Ἀθηναίων, ὡς ἐπολέμησαν πρὸς ἀλλήλους, ἀρξάμενος εὐθύς καθισταμένου καὶ ἐλπίσας μέγαν τε ἔσεσθαι καὶ ἀξιολογώτατον τῶν προγεγενημένων [...]. See Mader, *Josephus and the Politics*, 56-67 and 147-159; Price, "Josephus and the 'Law of history'", 8-20; Ravallesse, *Le parole degli sconfitti*, 91-107.

have collected from hearsay casual and contradictory stories which they have then edited in a rhetorical style; while others, who witnessed the events, have, either from flattery of the Romans or from hatred of the Jews, misrepresented the facts, their writings exhibiting alternatively invective and encomium, but nowhere historical accuracy. In these circumstances, I – Josephus, son of Matthias, a Hebrew by race, a native of Jerusalem and a priest, who at the opening of the war myself fought against the Romans and in the sequel was performe an onlooker<sup>15</sup>.

Josephus presents himself as an ideal participant-spectator of what he defines as the greatest war of his time, perhaps even the greatest ever recorded. His purpose is clear: to give a more balanced exposition of the facts to the Jews and the Romans<sup>16</sup>. The Jewish historian thus asserts a claim to impartiality and objectivity in his chronicle that is lacking in previous accounts of the conflict<sup>17</sup>. However, compared to other official accounts not *super partes* (to flatter the Romans or defame the Jews), *Bellum* also had to preserve a deeper ἀλήθεια. In the disaster of the Jewish-Roman war, Josephus tried to grasp the will of God. Why did God decide the fall of Jerusalem and the destruction of his seat, the Temple? For this reason, *Bellum* was conceived as a fundamental part of Jewish sacred history, not just a military account<sup>18</sup>.

Before being a priest or a rebel general, Josephus was a Jew of his time. One concept, better than others, expresses the image of God and his relationship with the Jewish people from a concrete historical, political and religious perspective. This concept can be defined as “theocracy”, and its roots lie in the biblical tradition. In his last work *Contra Apionem* (93-95 CE), Josephus coined – through a linguistic and intellectual effort – this term to describe the Jewish πολιτεία to a Greco-Roman audience<sup>19</sup>:

15. Joseph., *BJ* 1. 1. 1-3: [1] Ἐπειδὴ τὸν Ἰουδαίων πρὸς Ῥωμαίους πόλεμον συστάντα μέγιστον οὐ μόνον τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς, σχεδὸν δὲ καὶ ὧν ἀκοῆ παρελήφαμεν ἢ πόλεων πρὸς πόλεις ἢ ἔθνῶν ἔθνεσι συρραγέντων, οἱ μὲν οὐ παρατυχόντες τοῖς πράγμασιν, ἀλλ' ἀκοῆ συλλέγοντες εἰκαῖα καὶ ἀσύμφωνα διηγήματα σοφιστικῶς ἀναγράφουσιν, [2] οἱ παραγενόμενοι δὲ ἢ κολακεία τῇ πρὸς Ῥωμαίους ἢ μίσει τῇ πρὸς Ἰουδαίους καταψεύδονται τῶν πραγμάτων, περιέχει δὲ αὐτοῖς ὅπου μὲν κατηγορίαν ὅπου δὲ ἐγκώμιον τὰ συγγράμματα, τὸ δ' ἀκριβὲς τῆς ἱστορίας οὐδαμοῦ, [3] προυθέμην ἐγὼ τοῖς κατὰ τὴν Ῥωμαίων ἡγεμονίαν Ἑλλάδι γλώσση μεταβαλὼν ἅ τοῖς ἄνω βαρβάροις τῇ πατρίῳ συντάξας ἀνέπεμψα πρότερον ἀφηγήσασθαι Ἰώσηπος Ματθίου παῖς ἐξ Ἰεροσολύμων ἱερεὺς, αὐτὸς τε Ῥωμαίους πολεμήσας τὰ πρῶτα καὶ τοῖς ὕστερον παρτυχῶν ἐξ ἀνάγκης. (Transl. by Thackeray, *The Jewish War* Books I-III, 3).

16. Lanfranchi, “Flavio Giuseppe personaggio”, 125-162.

17. Overman, “The First Revolt”, 213-221; Mason, “Of audience and meanings”, 71-100.

18. Price, “Some aspects”, 109-120; Sievers, “Religious Language”, 182-199.

19. Amir, “Theokratia as a Concept”, 83-105; Schwartz, “Josephus on the Jewish Constitution”, 30-52.

164. There are infinite varieties in individual customs and laws among humanity as a whole, but in summary one may say: some have entrusted the power of government to monarchies, others to the rule of the few, others again to the masses. 165. But our legislator took no notice of any of these, but instituted the government as what one might call – to force an expression – a “theocracy”, ascribing to God the rule and power. 166. and, persuading everyone to look to him as the cause of all good things, both those that are common to all humanity and those that they themselves received when they prayed in difficulties, and that neither any deed nor anything that anyone thought in private could escape his attention<sup>20</sup>.

From the point of view of the Jewish people, θεοκρατία means God's dominion<sup>21</sup>. The political and religious spheres thus merge perfectly. In God as the unique Κύριος and ἡγεμών are, in fact, placed ἀρχή and κράτος. This recognition, through the Mosaic Covenant known as *berit*, has a fundamental practical implication for the Jewish people. Indeed, nothing escapes God's control because God is the sole Author of history and acts, especially in times of difficulty, to bring salvation to his people. An example found in the biblical tradition is *Exodus* 19-20, namely the episode of the liberation of the Jewish people from Egyptian slavery. However, again according to the biblical model, when the Jewish people stray from the Law, God acts by punishing and only then promoting reconciliation<sup>22</sup>. This historical-material philosophy of theocracy, as the concrete image of God's power, was shared by every single Jew in the first century CE, certainly by the rebel group of the Zealots.

### 3. THE ΣΤΆΣΙΣ ΟΙΚΕΙΑ: THE GREATEST OFFENCE TO GOD

The Zealots were proponents of a radical interpretation of theocracy. They rejected any form of rule except divine government, thus recognising God as their only Lord and no mortal master. Referring to the Fourth

20. Joseph., *Ap.* 164-166: [164] Οὐκοῦν ἄπειροι μὲν αἱ κατὰ μέρος τῶν ἐθῶν καὶ τῶν νόμων παρὰ τοῖς ἅπασιν ἀνθρώποις διαφοραί, κεφαλαιωδῶς ἂν ἐπίοι τις: οἱ μὲν γὰρ μοναρχίαις, οἱ δὲ ταῖς ὀλίγων δυναστείαις, ἄλλοι δὲ τοῖς πλήθεσιν ἐπέτρεψαν τὴν ἐξουσίαν τῶν πολιτευμάτων. [165] Ὁ δ' ἡμέτερος νομοθέτης εἰς μὲν τούτων οὐδοτιοῦν ἀπέιδεν, ὡς δ' ἂν τις εἴποι βιασάμενος τὸν λόγον θεοκρατίαν ἀπέδειξε τὸ πολίτευμα θεῶ τὴν ἀρχὴν καὶ τὸ κράτος ἀναθεῖς. [166] Καὶ πείσας εἰς ἐκεῖνον ἅπαντας ἀφορὰν ὡς αἴτιον μὲν ἁπάντων ὄντα τῶν ἀγαθῶν, ἃ κοινῇ τε πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις ὑπάρχει καὶ ὅσων ἔτυχον αὐτοὶ δεηθέντες ἐν ἀμηχάνοις, λαθεῖν δὲ τὴν ἐκεῖνου γνώμην οὐκ ἐνὸν οὔτε τῶν πραττομένων οὐδὲν οὔθ' ὧν ἂν τις παρ' αὐτῷ διανοηθῆ. (Ed. by Mason and Transl. by Barclay, *Against Apion*, 261-263).

21. On Theocracy see Cancik, “Theokratie und Priesterherrschaft”, 65-77; Gerber, *Ein Bild des Judentums*, 148-153; Trampedach, “Die Hasmonäer”, 37-65.

22. Spilsbury, “God and Israel”, 172-194.

Philosophy, Josephus places the birth of this ideology of resistance at the beginning of direct Roman rule in Judea in 6 CE. Josephus informs us that the seeds of discord for the outbreak of the revolt were sown at that time, and in 66 CE the Zealots reaped them<sup>23</sup>. However, the rebel front in 66 CE was more complicated and fragmented with various groups in opposition to each other. In addition to the Zealots of priestly extraction Josephus, on other occasions, refers to the rebels as *λησται* or *sicarii*. The Jewish historian is often intentionally confusing about the rebels and their original motivations, which could also have been of a more socio-economic nature as in the case of the *sicarii*<sup>24</sup>. Nevertheless, this allows Josephus to develop an anti-revolutionary polemic that must be understood in apologetic terms towards the entire Jewish people. Josephus in fact isolated the rebels as a minority of innovators by dissociating them from the Jewish tradition represented by the priestly aristocracy<sup>25</sup>.

Furthermore, the Jewish historian obscured the religious substratum of their revolt as much as possible. Josephus' criticism can be seen in this light: the rebels (from his point of view) are *θεομάχοι*, guilty of all contamination, who, by their actions, drove God out of the holy city and the Temple. However, the rebels – especially the Zealots – fought against Rome according to the formula of the *theios* war. The rebels believed in the *συγγένεια* and *συμμαχία* of God who was on their side and would support (as often happened in Jewish history) their efforts to end Roman rule<sup>26</sup>. God would thus have shown his theocratic power as He did during the Maccabean revolt. For this reason, their hopes for divine intervention focused on the Temple, which became an ideological point, the symbol of Jewish resistance. According to Josephus, it was precisely this claim of divine closeness and assistance by the rebels and their leaders that caused

23. The episode of the census in 6 CE under the *Legatus* of Syria, *Publius Sulpicius Quirinius*, is reported by Josephus both in *Bellum* and in his second great work *Antiquities of the Jews*. From Joseph., *BJ* 2. 117-118: [117] Τῆς δὲ Ἀρχελαίου χώρας εἰς ἐπαρχίαν περιγραφείσης ἐπίτροπος τῆς ἱππικῆς παρὰ Ῥωμαίοις τάξεως Κωπώνιος πέμπεται μέχρι τοῦ κτείνειν λαβῶν παρὰ Καίσαρος ἐξουσίαν. [118] ἐπὶ τοῦτου τις ἀνὴρ Γαλιλαῖος Ἰούδας ὄνομα εἰς ἀπόστασιν ἐνήγη τοὺς ἐπιχωρίους κακίζων, εἰ φόρον τε Ῥωμαίοις τελεῖν ὑπομενοῦσιν καὶ μετὰ τὸν θεὸν οἴσουσι θνητοὺς δεσπότας. ἦν δ' οὗτος σοφιστῆς ἰδίας αἰρέσεως οὐδὲν τοῖς ἄλλοις προσεοικῶς. Cf. *AJ* 18. 23-25. See Hadas-Lebel, “«Pas d'autre maitre que Dieu»”, 155-164.

24. On the Zealots see always Hengel, *Die Zeloten*; Horsley, “The Zealots”, 159-192; Bohrmann, *Flavius Josephus, The Zealots*, 192-208. Regarding the *sicarii* see Brighton, *The Sicarii*; Rappaport, “Who were the Sicarii?”, 323-342; Vandenberghe, “Villains called Sicarii”, 1-33.

25. Price, *Jerusalem under siege*, 1-27; Firpo, “La terminologia”, 675-714; McLaren, “Going to war”, 129-153.

26. Krieger, “„Beobachtungen”, 209-221; Brizzi, “Il discorso di Agrippa II”, 138-155 in particular 148-151.



the fall of Jerusalem and the ruin of the Jewish people<sup>27</sup>. This is clear once again from the prologue of *Bellum*. The true and most profound cause of the ruin of the Jewish nation is the *στάσις οικεία* that caused the lack of *ὁμόνοια* in Jerusalem:

10. For, that it owed its ruin to civil strife, and that it was the Jewish tyrants who drew down upon the holy temple the unwilling hands of the Romans and the conflagration, is attested by Titus Caesar himself, who sacked the city; throughout the war he commiserated the populace who were at the mercy of the revolutionaries, and often of his own accord deferred the capture of the city and by protracting the siege gave the culprits time for repentance. 11. Should, however, any critic censure me for my strictures upon the tyrants or their bands of marauders or for my lamentations over my country's misfortunes, I ask his indulgence for a compassion which falls outside an historian's province. For of all the cities under Roman rule it was the lot of ours to attain to the highest felicity and to fall to the lowest depths of calamity<sup>28</sup>.

As can be seen, Josephus' model of *stasis* is once again Thucydides. According to Josephus, in their determination for freedom from Rome, the rebel leaders with their groups established themselves as tyrants in the city, causing civil war. Their fellow citizens thus became sacrificial victims of their selfish and violent ambition<sup>29</sup>. Therefore, from the Jewish historian's point of view, Jerusalem certainly did not fall because of Rome. Jerusalem fell because the civil war was the greatest offence to God and provoked his reaction as divine punishment<sup>30</sup>. According to the Jewish perspective, *stasis* indeed implies contamination and impurity and for this

27. Blázquez, "Las guerras religiosas judías", 135-157; Bermejo Rubio, "El factor religioso", 5-32.

28. Joseph., *BJ* 1. 1. 10-11: [10] ὅτι γὰρ αὐτὴν στάσις οικεία καθείλεν, καὶ τὰς Ῥωμαίων χεῖρας ἀκούσας καὶ τὸ πῦρ ἐπὶ τὸν ναὸν εἴλκυσαν οἱ Ἰουδαίων τύραννοι, μάρτυς αὐτὸς ὁ πορθήσας Καῖσαρ Τίτος, ἐν παντὶ τῷ πολέμῳ τὸν μὲν δῆμον ἐλεήσας ὑπὸ τῶν στασιαστῶν φρουρούμενον, πολλάκις δὲ ἐκὼν τὴν ἄλωσιν τῆς πόλεως ὑπερτιθέμενος καὶ διδοὺς τῇ πολιορκίᾳ χρόνον εἰς μετόπιαν τῶν αἰτίων. [11] εἰ δὴ τις ὅσα πρὸς τοὺς τυράννους ἢ τὸ ληστρικὸν αὐτῶν κατηγορικῶς λέγομεν ἢ τοῖς δυστυχίμασι τῆς πατρίδος ἐπιστένοντες συκοφαντοίῃ, διδῶτω παρὰ τὸν τῆς ἱστορίας νόμον συγγνώμῃ τῷ πάθει: πόλιν μὲν γὰρ δὴ τῶν ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίοις πασῶν τὴν ἡμετέραν ἐπὶ πλεῖστόν τε εὐδαμονίας συνέβη προελθεῖν καὶ πρὸς ἔσχατον συμφορῶν αὐθις καταπεσεῖν. (Transl. by Thackeray, *The Jewish War* Books I-III, 7-8).

29. On *stasis* as a lack of *ὁμόνοια*, see always Gehrke, *Stasis*, 355-359; Price, *Thucydides and internal war*, 1-78. On Josephus-Thucydides specifically for the *stasis* see Pothou, *Thukydides Second-Hand*, 169-173.

30. Nikiprowetzky, "Josephus and the Revolutionary", 216-236.

reason it is the most serious form of ἀσέβεια towards God<sup>31</sup>. The purification, in the form of the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple by the Romans, was God's response to the ἀσέβεια of the rebels and their tyrants who had defiled his city with their massacres. Titus himself could have testified<sup>32</sup>.

#### 4. POLLUTION WITHIN THE CITY: THE REBELS AND THE μεταβολή OF VALUES

The murder of the high priest Ananus b. Ananus – described in the fourth book of *Bellum* – is a fundamental example of pollution within the city that ties into the motif of divine punishment:

318. I would not be in error if I said that the death of Ananus led to the capture of the city, and that from that very day, on which they saw their high priest and leader of their own preservation butchered in the middle of the city, the wall was overthrown and the Judeans' public affairs were destroyed. [...] 320. He was uncommonly freedom friendly and a lover of democracy, always placing the public advantage – and above all making peace – before his private interests. [...]. 322. Iesus had been yoked with him – lagging behind him in a comparison, to be sure, though still well ahead of the others. 323. But I reckon that God, after sentencing the city to destruction because it had become polluted, and wanting the holy places to be purged by fire, was removing their protectors and care-givers. 324. Those who were, just a short time before, wearing the sacred robe and officiating in the universal worship, receiving obeisance from those who had streamed into the city from around the world, were now seen discarded, naked, as fodder for dogs and beasts<sup>33</sup>.

31. Mader, *Josephus and the Politics*, 123-133; Mason, "Pollution and Purification", 181-203.

32. Gruen, "Roman perspectives", 27-43; Parente, "The Impotence of Titus", 45-71.

33. Joseph., *BJ* 4. 318-324: [318] οὐκ ἂν ἀμάρτομι δ' εἰπὼν ἀλώσεως ἄρξαι τῇ πόλει τὸν Ἀνάου θάνατον, καὶ ἀπ' ἐκείνης τῆς ἡμέρας ἀνατραπῆναι τὸ τεῖχος καὶ διαφθαρήναι τὰ πράγματα Ἰουδαίους, ἐν ἧ τὸν ἀρχιερεῖα καὶ ἡγεμόνα τῆς ἰδίας σωτηρίας αὐτῶν ἐπὶ μέσης τῆς πόλεως εἶδον ἀπεσφαγμένον. [...] [320] [...] φιλελεύθερός τε ἐκτόπως καὶ δημοκρατίας ἐραστής, πρό τε τῶν ἰδίων λυσίτελών τὸ κοινῇ συμφέρον ἀεὶ τιθέμενος καὶ περὶ παντὸς ποιούμενος τὴν εἰρήνην: [...] [322] παρέζευκτο δ' αὐτῷ καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, αὐτοῦ μὲν λειπόμενος κατὰ σύγκρισιν, προύχων δὲ τῶν ἄλλων. [323] ἀλλ' οἶμαι κατακρίνας ὁ θεὸς ὡς μεμιασμένης τῆς πόλεως ἀπώλειαν καὶ πυρὶ βουλόμενος ἐκκαθαρθῆναι τὰ ἅγια τοὺς ἀντεχομένους αὐτῶν καὶ φιλοστοργοῦντας περιέκοπεν. [324] οἱ δὲ πρὸ ὀλίγου τὴν ἱερὰν ἐσθῆτα περιεκείμενοι καὶ τῆς κοσμικῆς θρησκείας κατάρχοντες προσκυνούμενοι τε τοῖς ἐκ τῆς οἰκουμένης παραβάλλουσιν εἰς τὴν πόλιν, ἐρριμμένοι γυμνοὶ βορὰ κυνῶν καὶ θηρίων ἐβλέποντο. (Ed. and Translation by Mason, *Judean War* 4, 149-154).

Ananus was one of the most powerful high priests in first-century CE Judea, although he held the sacred office for only one year, in 62 CE (3 months). When the rebellion broke out, Ananus formed with the other high priest Jesus b. Gamaliel, a moderate government against the Zealots. However, Ananus was probably massacred in the heart of the city in 68 CE by Idumean rebels, close to the Zealots. Beyond his personal *elogium* toward Ananus, Josephus emphasizes one point: his elimination was the beginning of the fall of Jerusalem. According to Josephus, God himself decided the death of Ananus (who, until that moment, had protected Jerusalem) because he had already condemned the polluted city and wanted to purify the Temple with fire<sup>34</sup>. The violent murder of the high priest by the Idumean rebels was nevertheless a radical offence against God.

In a theocratic system like the Jewish one, as seen above, the high priest is, in fact, the one whom God chooses to be his representative minister among the Jewish people. The killing of the high priest is, therefore, a crime against God himself<sup>35</sup>. Moreover, the rebels added to their action the mortification and desecration of the body of the divine representative by not burying it. Still looking at the theme of pollution within the city, Josephus focuses – like Thucydides – on the ἀνθρωπεία φύσις and its visible effects. The rebels, with their actions of stasis, caused, in fact, a μεταβολή of values, a *mundus inversus*. From the point of view of the Jewish historian, the internal disaster generates a moral anarchy that is a radicalization of pollution and, therefore, an offence against God<sup>36</sup>. This is evident from another passage from the fourth book of *Bellum*:

381. But these [*scil.* Disciples] persisted so far on their course of savagery as to grant a share of earth neither to those being done away with inside not to those on the roads. 382. Instead, just as if they had made pacts to undo the very laws of nature together with those of their native city and, together with the offenses against humanity also to pollute the very Deity, they left the oozing dead beneath the sun. [...] 386. Every ordinance among human beings was thus being trampled down by them, divine things were being laughed at, and they kept scoffing at the oracles of the prophets as though they were the rantings of vagabonds [...]. 388. For there was in fact a certain ancient saying, by men from there at that time, that the city would be destroyed and the holiest place would be burned

34. Schwartz, *Josephus and Judaeae Politics*, 70-88; VanderKam, *From Joshua to Caiaphas*, 476-482.

35. Firpo, "L'uccisione", 223-235; Lorenzini, "I Sommi sacerdoti", 25-39.

36. Pothou, *Thukydides Second-Hand*, 195-223.

down by law of war, if civil strife should assail it and domestic hands first pollute the precinct of God. Though they had not disbelieved these things, the Disciples offered themselves as their agents<sup>37</sup>.

According to Josephus, within the city, there was an annulment of the laws τῆς πατρίδος carried out by the Zealots. Furthermore, the rebels literally had the desire to pollute God himself by mocking and desecrating the divine law. Josephus recalls, on this occasion, the existence of an oracle. Jerusalem would fall, and the Temple would burn when civil war broke out among the Jews themselves, and they would desecrate the Temple with their own hands<sup>38</sup>. The Zealots – concludes Josephus – were the *autores* of all this, making it possible.

However, *stasis* also defiles the sanctity of the Temple and this is one of the most desacralising aspects of *Bellum's* narrative. The desecration takes place through the shedding of blood by the rebels inside the sacred place, and Josephus intentionally focuses on the communal nature of the violation of divine spaces. As can be seen from Book five, the incidents involving the Temple are driven by the tyrants Eleazar, John and Simon and the extreme *stasis* between them:

7. Each of these [*scil.* Tyrants Eleazar-John] having a considerable following of Zealots, the seceders took possession of the inner court of the temple and planted their weapons above the holy gates on the sacred façade. [...] 10. [...] thus there were continual sallies and showers of missiles, and the temple on every side was defiled with carnage [...] 15. For although these frenzied men had stopped short of no impiety, they nevertheless admitted those who wished to offer sacrifices [...] 16. For the missiles from the engines flew over with such force that they reached the altar and the sanctuary, lighting upon priests and sacrificers; 17. [...] fell there themselves before their sacrifices, and sprinkled with libations of their own blood that altar universally venerated by Greeks and barbarians.

37. Joseph., *BJ* 4. 381-388: [381] οἱ δὲ εἰς τοσοῦτον ὠμότητος ἐξώκειλαν, ὥς μήτε τοῖς ἔνδον ἀναιρουμένοις μήτε τοῖς ἀνὰ τὰς ὁδοὺς μεταδοῦναι γῆς, [382] ἀλλὰ καθάπερ συνθήκας πεποιημένοι τοῖς τῆς πατρίδος συγκαταλῦσαι καὶ τοὺς τῆς φύσεως νόμους ἅμα τε τοῖς εἰς ἀνθρώπους ἀδικήμασιν συμμιᾶναι καὶ τὸ θεῖον, ὅφ' ἤλιψ τοὺς νεκροὺς μυδῶντας ἀπέλειπον. [...] [386] κατεπατεῖτο μὲν οὖν πᾶς αὐτοῖς θεσμὸς ἀνθρώπων, ἐγελᾶτο δὲ τὰ θεῖα, καὶ τοὺς τῶν προφητῶν χρησιμοὺς ὡσπερ ἀγυρτικὰς λογοποιίας ἐχλεύαζον. [...] [388] ἦν γὰρ δὴ τις παλαιὸς λόγος ἀνδρῶν † ἔνθα τότε τὴν πόλιν ἀλώσεσθαι καὶ καταφλέξεσθαι τὸ ἀγιώτατον νόμῳ πολέμου, στάσις ἔαν κατασκήψῃ καὶ χεῖρες οἰκείαι προμιάνωσι τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ τέμενος; οἷς οὐκ ἀπιστήσαντες οἱ ζηλωταὶ διακόνους αὐτοῦς ἐπέδοσαν. (Ed. and Translation by Mason, *Judean War* 4, 176-180).

38. Regev, "Josephus, the Temple", 279-293.

18. The dead bodies of natives and aliens, of priests and laity, were mingled in a mass, and the blood of all manner of corpses formed pools in the courts of God<sup>39</sup>.

According to Josephus, the clash occurred between the rebels led by Eleazar, who took refuge in the inner courtyard of the Temple as their fortress against the rebels of John, who occupied the large outer courtyard<sup>40</sup>. For this reason, the Temple was desecrated and contaminated by continuous massacres because the victims of the carnage sprinkled the sacrificial altar with their blood. The rebels allowed access to the Temple to those who wanted to make offerings to God, but these remained victims of the *stasis* between tyrants and their followers. Josephus insists on a particular aspect of the *stasis*-massacre generated inside the Temple. The priestly blood, uncontaminated and pure by birth, mixed with the blood of other common people who were killed, making sacrificial offerings. All this happened before the eyes of God<sup>41</sup>. The Temple was thus removed from God's protection even before the Romans brought fire.

#### 5. JOSEPHUS' COMPLAINT: THE FALL OF JERUSALEM

The scene of the tyrants desecrating the Temple by shedding blood inside is followed – on a narrative level – by Josephus' complaint. Josephus turns directly to his city, Jerusalem personified:

19. What misery to equal that, most wretched city, hast thou suffered at the hands of the Romans, who entered to purge with fire thy internal pollutions? For thou wert no longer God's place, nor couldst thou survive, after becoming a sepulchre for the bodies of thine own children and

39. Joseph., *BJ* 5. 7-18: [7] καθ' ἕκαστον δὲ οὐκ ὀλίγοι τῶν ζηλωτῶν ἠκολούθησαν, καὶ καταλαβόμενοι τὸν ἐνδότερον τοῦ νεῶ περίβολον ὑπὲρ τὰς ἱεράς πύλας ἐπὶ τῶν ἁγίων μετώπων τίθενται τὰ ὄπλα. [...] [10] [...] συνεχεῖς δ' ἐκδρομαὶ καὶ βελῶν ἀφέσεις ἐγίνοντο, καὶ φόνοις ἐμπαίνετο πανταχοῦ τὸ ἱερόν. [...] [15] καίπερ γὰρ πρὸς πάσαν ἀσέβειαν ἐκλευσσηκότες, ὅμως τοὺς θύειν ἐθέλοντας εἰσηφίεσαν [...] [16] τὰ γὰρ ἀπὸ τῶν ὀργάνων βέλη μέχρι τοῦ βωμοῦ καὶ τοῦ νεῶ διὰ τὴν βίαν ὑπερφερόμενα τοῖς τε ἱερεῦσι καὶ τοῖς ἱερουργοῦσιν ἐνέπιπτε [17] [...] πρὸ τῶν θυμάτων ἔπεσον αὐτοὶ καὶ τὸν Ἑλλησι πᾶσι καὶ βαρβάροις σεβάσμιον βωμὸν κατέσπεισαν ἰδίῳ φόνῳ [18] νεκροῖς δ' ἐπιχωρίοις ἀλλόφυλοι καὶ ἱερεῦσι βέβηλοι συνεφύροντο, καὶ παντοδαπῶν αἶμα πτωμάτων ἐν τοῖς θεοῖς περιβόλοις ἐλιμνάζετο. (Transl. by Thackeray, *The Jewish War Books* IV-VII, 203-205).

40. Pitillas Salañer, "La guerra de los Judíos", 191-206.

41. Lanfranchi, "Μιταίνειν τὸν ναόν", 249-257.

converting the sanctuary into a charnel-house of civil war. Yet might there be hopes for an amelioration of thy lot, if ever thou wouldst propitiate that God who devastated thee! 20. However, the laws of history compel one to restrain even one's emotions, since this is not the place for personal lamentations but for a narrative of events. I therefore proceed to relate the after history of the sedition<sup>42</sup>.

Josephus complains vehemently that the holy city was no longer a fit seat for God. Jerusalem had become miserable because of the internal ἀσέβεια in the form of *contaminatio* through the *stasis* by the rebels. The Romans, therefore, acted as God's chosen agents in their role as purifiers. It was God's indignation in the form of the *χόλος τοῦ θεοῦ* that led to his *μετάνοια*, his passage to the enemy. Still looking at book five along these lines, Josephus reports his two speeches to the rebels in 70 CE in a Jerusalem under siege. Josephus tried to convince them to surrender to the Romans as the only solution to survive and not ruin an entire nation<sup>43</sup>. The first speech is in indirect form, while the second is a long *oratio recta*. Thus, in the first speech (5. 362- 376), Josephus implores the rebels to stop the war to save themselves and the people, the homeland and the Temple:

362. Josephus [...] implored them to spare themselves and the people, to spare their country and their temple [...]. 363. The Romans, he urged, though without a share in them, yet revered the holy places of their enemies, and had thus far restrained their hands from them; whereas men who had been brought up in them and, were they preserved, would alone enjoy them, were bent on their destruction. [...] 365. Be it granted that it was noble to fight for freedom, they should have done so at first; but, after having once succumbed and submitted for so long, to seek then to shake off the yoke was the part of men madly courting death, not of lovers of liberty. 366. To scorn meaner masters might, indeed, be legitimate, but not those to whom the universe was subject. For what was there that had escaped the Romans, save maybe some spot useless through heat or cold?

42. Joseph., *BJ* 5. 19-20: [19] τί τηλικούτον, ὦ τλημονεστάτη πόλις, πέπονθας ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίων, οἱ σου τὰ ἐμφύλια μύση πυρὶ καθαροῦντες εἰσηλθόν: θεοῦ μὲν γὰρ οὔτε ἦς ἔτι χῶρος οὔτε μένειν ἐδύνασο, τάφος οἰκειῶν γενομένη σωματῶν καὶ πολέμου τὸν ναὸν ἐμφυλίου ποιήσασα πολυάνδριον: δύναιο δ' ἂν γενέσθαι πάλιν ἀμείνων, εἴγε ποτὲ τὸν πορθήσαντα θεὸν ἐξίλαση. [20] ἀλλὰ καθεκτέον γὰρ καὶ τὰ πάθη τῷ νόμῳ τῆς γραφῆς, ὡς οὐκ ὀλοφυρμῶν οἰκειῶν ὁ καιρὸς, ἀλλ' ἀφηγήσεως πραγμάτων. δίδειμι δὲ τὰ ἐξῆς ἔργα τῆς στάσεως. (Transl. by Thackeray, *The Jewish War Books IV-VII*, 205-207).

43. Chapman, "Spectacle", 289-315 in particular 296-303; Mason, "When Suffering Meets Passion", 187-209.

367. Fortune, indeed, had from all quarters passed over to them, and God who went the round of the nations, bringing to each in turn the rod of empire, now rested over Italy. [...] <sup>44</sup>.

From Josephus' point of view, the rebels' obstinacy was madness, and it was absurd to oppose the world power, Rome. His discourse is *Realpolitik*<sup>45</sup>. It was certainly right to fight for freedom, but it had to be done at the beginning, not after years of absolute foreign rule. The Jewish historian draws a sharp contrast between the responsible behavior of the Romans towards the sacred spaces and that of the bloodthirsty rebels. However, from this first discourse, Josephus' view of the ideological-theological side of the Rome-Jerusalem war emerges well. The Jewish historian interprets the superiority of the Romans as God's will. In fact, Josephus states that God, who decides power among peoples, had stopped and now resided in Italy. This image of God changing residence from Jerusalem to Rome fits well with the Roman practice known as *evocatio deorum*, the invitation to the gods of a besieged city to join Rome before the fall of the city<sup>46</sup>. However, the case presented by Josephus here is different. It was the God of Jerusalem whom he had chosen. The ἀσέβεια of the rebels had led God to temporarily move away from Jerusalem and transfer his protection to Rome. The rebellion was, therefore, to be seen as a sin against God himself. The surrender to Rome was indeed according to his will<sup>47</sup>.

In his second discourse (5. 376-419), Josephus addresses the greatest paradox. The rebels saw God as their ally while they polluted his Temple with their actions:

376. "Ah, miserable wretches," he cried, "unmindful of your own true allies, would you make war on the Romans with arms and might of hand? What other foe have we conquered thus, 377. and when did God who

44. Joseph., *Bj* 5. 362- 367: [362] Οὗτος [...] πολλά κατηντιβόλει φείσασθαι μὲν αὐτῶν καὶ τοῦ δήμου, φείσασθαι δὲ τῆς πατρίδος καὶ τοῦ ἱεροῦ [...]. [363] Ῥωμαίους μὲν γε τοὺς μὴ μετέχοντας ἐντρέπεσθαι τὰ τῶν πολεμίων ἅγια καὶ μέχρι νῦν τὰς χεῖρας ἐπέχειν, τοὺς δ' ἐντραφέντας αὐτοῖς κἂν περισωθῆ μόνους ἔξοντας ὠρμησθαι πρὸς ἀπώλειαν αὐτῶν. [...] [365] εἰ γὰρ δὴ καὶ πολεμεῖν ὑπὲρ ἐλευθερίας καλόν, χρῆναι τὸ πρῶτον: τὸ δ' ἅπαξ ὑποπεσόντας καὶ μακροῖς εἴξαντας χρόνοις ἔπειτα ἀποσειεσθαι τὸν ζυγὸν δυσθανατούντων, οὐ φιλελευθέρων εἶναι. [366] δεῖν μέντοι καὶ δεσπότης ἀδοξεῖν ταπεινότερους, οὐχ οἷς ὑποχείρια τὰ πάντα. τί γὰρ Ῥωμαίους διαπεφυγένας, πλὴν εἰ μὴ τι διὰ θάλλπος ἢ κρύος ἀχρηστον; [367] μεταβῆναι γὰρ πρὸς αὐτοὺς πάντοθεν τὴν τύχην, καὶ κατὰ ἔθνος τὸν θεὸν ἐμπεριάγοντα τὴν ἀρχὴν νῦν ἐπὶ τῆς Ἰταλίας εἶναι. [...]. (Transl. by Thackeray, *The Jewish War Books IV-VII*, 313-315).

45. Gichon, "Aspects of a Roman Army", 287-309; Hadas-Lebel, "La contribution", 515-525.

46. Rives, "Flavian Religious Policy", 145-167; Wilker, "God is with Italy now," 157-187.

47. Ravallese, *Le parole degli sconfitti*, 377-382.

created, fail to avenge, the Jews, if they were wronged? Will you not turn your eyes and mark what place is that whence you issue to battle and reflect how mighty an Ally you have outraged? [...] 378. For myself, I shudder at recounting the works of God to unworthy ears; yet listen, that you may learn that you are warring not against the Romans only, but also against God. [...] 390. In short, there is no instance of our forefathers having triumphed by arms or failed of success without them when they committed their cause to God: if they sat still they conquered, as it pleased their Judge, if they fought they were invariably defeated [...] 400. For it is, I suppose, the duty of the occupants of holy ground to leave everything to the arbitrament of God and to scorn the aid of human hands, can they but conciliate the Arbiter above. [...] 402. How much more impious are you than those who have been defeated in the past! Secret sins – I mean thefts, treacheries, adulteries – are not beneath your disdain, while in rapine and murder you vie with each other in opening up new and unheard of paths of vice; aye and the temple has become the receptacle for all, and native hands have polluted those divine precincts, which even Romans revered from afar, forgoing many customs of their own in deference to your law. 403. And after all this do you expect Him, thus outraged, to be your ally?<sup>48</sup>.

The rebels were thus not only fighting against Rome but also against God himself, even though they were not (according to Josephus) supported by the divine *συμμαχία*. Moreover, Josephus, in retracing the history of the *ἔθνος τῶν Ἰουδαίων* and its moments of difficulty, emphasises a fundamental theocratic aspect. God had always intervened to save his people. Indeed, Jewish history taught that rebellion against the current government had always led to painful failures without God's support<sup>49</sup>.

48. Joseph., *BJ* 5. 376-403: [376] ἄ δειλοί, βοῶν, καὶ τῶν ἰδίων ἀμνήμονες συμμαχῶν, ὅπλοις καὶ χερσὶ πολεμεῖτε Ῥωμαίοις; τίνα γὰρ ἄλλον οὕτως ἐνίκησαμεν; [377] πότε δ' οὐ θεὸς ὁ κτίσας ἂν ἀδικῶνται Ἰουδαίων ἐκδικος; οὐκ ἐπιστραφέντες ὄψεσθε πόθεν ὀρμώμενοι μάχεσθε καὶ πηλίκον ἐμιάνατε σύμμαχον; [...] [378] ἐγὼ μὲν φρίττω τὰ ἔργα τοῦ θεοῦ λέγων εἰς ἀναξίους ἀκοάς; ἀκούετε δ' ὅμως, ἵνα γνῶτε μὴ μόνον Ῥωμαίοις πολεμοῦντες ἀλλὰ καὶ τῷ θεῷ. [...] [390] καθόλου δ' εἰπεῖν, οὐκ ἔστιν ὅ τι κατάρθρωσαν οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν τοῖς ὅπλοις ἢ δίχα τούτων διήμαρτον ἐπιτρέψαντες τῷ θεῷ: μένοντες μὲν γε κατὰ χώραν ἐνίκων ὡς ἐδόκει τῷ κριτῇ, μαχόμενοι δὲ ἔπταισαν αἰεὶ. [...] [400] δεῖ γάρ, οἶμαι, τοὺς χωρίον ἅγιον νεμομένους ἐπιτρέπειν πάντα τῷ θεῷ δικάζειν καὶ καταφρονεῖν τότε χειρὸς ἀνθρωπίνης, ὅταν αὐτοὶ πείθωσι τὸν ἄνω δικαστὴν. [...] [402] οὐ τὰ κρυπτά μὲν τῶν ἀμαρτημάτων ἠδοξήκατε, κλοπὰς λέγω καὶ ἐνέδρας καὶ μοιχείας, ἀρπαγαῖς δ' ἐρίζετε καὶ φόνους καὶ ξένας καινοτομεῖτε κακίας ὁδοῦς, ἐκδοχεῖον δὲ πάντων τὸ ἱερόν γεγονεν καὶ χερσὶν ἐμφυλίου ὁ θεῖος μεμῖανται χώρος, ὃν καὶ Ῥωμαῖοι πόρρωθεν προσεκύουσι, πολλὰ τῶν ἰδίων ἐθῶν εἰς τὸν ὑμέτερον παραλύοντες νόμον. [403] εἴτ' ἐπὶ τούτοις τὸν ἀσεβηθέντα σύμμαχον προσδοκάτε; πάνυ γοῦν ἐστὲ δίκαιοι ἰκέται καὶ χερσὶ καθαραῖς τὸν βοηθὸν ὑμῶν παρακαλεῖτε. (Transl. by Thackeray, *The Jewish War Books* IV-VII, 317-327).

49. Nagy, "The Speech of Josephus", 141-167; Shutt, "The Concept of God", 171-189.



However, it was God himself who established the *καιρός* to act, looking above all at the *εὐσέβεια* that his people showed him. The rebels, on the other hand, engaged in terrible crimes, and, once again, Josephus could state that the Temple had become the receptacle for all these things; a divine place, which even the Romans worshipped, had been defiled by the hands of the natives themselves. Josephus could thus conclude with one of his most elaborate thoughts on the theological significance of the Jerusalem-Rome war. The Jewish historian believed that God had fled from his Temple and was now on the side of those against whom the rebels were fighting, the Romans<sup>50</sup>.

## 6. THE GOD OR GODS ARE GOING AWAY: JOSEPHUS AND TACITUS

God's departure from Jerusalem and the Temple culminates in the final moments of the siege. In the sixth book, Josephus recounts a prodigious episode – which, according to the Jewish historian, was one of God's last warnings to the rebels – that occurred on Pentecost:

299. Moreover, at the feast which is called Pentecost, the priests on entering the inner court of the temple by night, as their custom was in the discharge of their ministrations, reported that they were conscious, first of a commotion and a din, and after that of a voice as of a host, "We are departing hence"<sup>51</sup>.

The priests heard mysterious voices coming from the inner courtyard of the Temple and exclaiming "from this place we are leaving". However, Josephus' account of this episode during the final moments of the siege is not the only one. The imperial historian Tacitus, in his Jewish *excursus*, book five of the *Historiae*, also reports this prodigious episode:

13. 1. *Evenerant prodigia [...] et subito nubium igne conlucere templum. Apertae repente delubri fores et audita maior humana vox, «excedere deos»; simul ingens motus excedentium*<sup>52</sup>. (Tac. *Hist.* 5.13.1).

50. Firpo, "Ναὸν...τῷ θεῷ", 277-294; Spilsbury, "Josephus on the burning", 306-327; Nodet, "On the Destruction"; 236-249.

51. Joseph., *BJ* 6. 299: [299] κατὰ δὲ τὴν ἑορτήν, ἣ πεντηκοστή καλεῖται, νύκτωρ οἱ ἱερεῖς παρελθόντες εἰς τὸ ἔνδον ἱερόν, ὡς περ αὐτοῖς ἕθος πρὸς τὰς λειτουργίας, πρῶτον μὲν κινήσεως ἔφασαν ἀντιλαβέσθαι καὶ κτύπου, μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα φωνῆς ἀθρόας «μεταβαίνομεν ἐντεῦθεν». (Transl. by Thackeray, *The Jewish War Books IV-VII*, 462-463).

52. Lorenzini, "Sull'excursus giudaico", 241-262. Tacitus. *The Histories: Books IV-V*, 196-197.

According to Tacitus, the doors of the Temple opened wide and, suddenly, a superhuman voice was heard exclaiming “the gods are leaving”, *excedere deos*. However, in recalling the same event, there is a difference between Tacitus and Josephus. Josephus resorts linguistically – as much as ideologically – to the plural form ταῦτα φωνῆς ἀθρόας μεταβαίνομεν ἐντεῦθεν referring to the abandonment of the divine presence in the Temple. The choice of the plural formula could be interpreted – in the view of the Jewish historian – as a conscious use of the *interpretatio*, referring to a plural pantheon of deities. Josephus would thus have been more certain to be better understood by his Greco-Roman audience. Otherwise, the reference to the plural formula by Josephus would be difficult to understand (and explain) considering the well-known Jewish monotheism. Tacitus may have instead used the plural formula *excedere deos* precisely to underline Jewish monotheism in contrast to the inclusive Greco-Roman pantheon<sup>53</sup>. In any case, Josephus suggests that the Jewish God would be an increasingly distant spectator.

## 7. CONCLUSIONS

Some conclusions about the divine abandoning of the contaminated holy city and the Temple, resulting in the ruin of Jerusalem in 70 CE, can now be outlined according to a three-point scheme<sup>54</sup>.

- a) According to the first point, God’s abandonment of the city and the Temple and his support for the Romans are included and explained by Josephus within the paradigm sin-punishment/obedience-reward, according to the interpretation of the biblical tradition, which is the model always followed by the Jewish historian. In other words, Josephus denies the Romans – and the Flavians – the credit for the victory and subordinates them to God’s purposes for the Jewish people. The fall of Jerusalem is established by God as a punishment for the rebels’ ἀσέβεια; therefore, the Romans are only the divine instrument to carry out the purification.
- b) The second point is partly related to the first and concerns what could be called the “theocratic paradox”. The view according to which – God is on the side of the Romans – is seen in opposition to the parallel claim of the rebels to be supported by the divine συμμαχία. The Zealots would have liked to involve God and cause

53. Gruen, “Tacitus and the Defamation”, 265-283.

54. Firpo, “La distruzione”; 774-802.

his active intervention in history through the revolt as happened on other occasions such as the Maccabean revolt<sup>55</sup>. However, from Josephus' point of view, their actions instead led to a temporary denial of the pact with God. The rebels led the Jewish people into their "war *theios*" without taking into account that it is only God who has always had control of history and the destiny of his people and who decides the right *καίρος* to intervene.

- c) The third and final point concerns the consideration of Josephus, a priest and Jew of the first century CE, regarding the history of his people. The entire history of the Jewish people is sacred because of the unique relationship between God and his people. However, if God is the *auctor* of history, after the fall of Jerusalem and the destruction of the Temple, the place to find answers (and consolation) is the Scriptures, the source of divine revelation. According to Josephus, only the Scriptures could provide a framework for conceiving destruction as a necessary part of sacred history. God was indeed working toward a specific *telos*, namely the restoration of the relationship broken between him and his people because of the rebels' *ἀσέβεια*. After the war, the image that the tragedy of 70 CE had not been beyond God's control or plan would certainly have provided reassurance, answering the question of God's role and relationship with his people. And Josephus, by then a diaspora Jew (defeated in war), through *Bellum Iudaicum* also provided an answer for his compatriots as part of a new world, the Roman Empire<sup>56</sup>.

#### PRIMARY SOURCES

Flavius Josephus. *Life of Josephus*. Translation and Commentary. Edited by Steve Mason. Leiden • Boston • Köln: Brill, 2001.

Flavius Josephus. *Against Apion*. Translation and Commentary by John M. G. Barclay. Edited by Steve Mason. Leiden • Boston: Brill, 2007.

Flavius Josephus. *Judean War 4*. Translation and Commentary. Edited by Steve Mason. Leiden | Boston: Brill, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004513778>.

Josephus. *The Jewish War. Books I-III*. Translated by Henry St. John Thackeray. Cambridge (Massachusetts): Harvard University press, 1927.

55. Farmer, *Maccabees, Zealots, and Josephus*; Maier, "Guerra santa?", 117-130.

56. Giovannini, "Die Zerstörung", 11-34.

Josephus. *The Jewish War. Books IV-VII*. Translated by Henry St. John Thackeray. Cambridge (Massachusetts): Harvard University press, 1927.

Tacitus. *The Histories: Books IV-V. Annals: Books I-III*. Translation by Clifford H. Moore, Cambridge (Massachusetts): Harvard University Press, 1931.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Amir, Yehoshua. "Theokratia as a Concept of Political Philosophy. Josephus' Presentation of Moses politeia". *Scripta Classica Israelica* 8-9, (1985-1988): 83-105.
- Andreu-Pintado, Javier. "En torno al ius Latii flavio en Hispania. A propósito de una nueva publicación sobre latinidad". *Faventia* 29 n°. 2, (2007): 37-46.
- Bermejo Rubio, Fernando. "El factor religioso en la resistencia judía al imperio romano en el siglo I E.C. Cuestiones disputadas en torno a la cuarta filosofía". *Revista de la Sociedad Española de Ciencias de las Religiones* n°. 9, (2016): 5-32.
- Bilde, Per. *Flavius Josephus between Jerusalem and Rome. His life, his works, and their importance*. Sheffield: Journal for the Study of Judaism Press, 1988.
- Blázquez, José María. "Las guerras religiosas judías contra Roma". In *Guerra y religión en el mundo antiguo*, edited by Jordi Vidal Palomino and Antela Bernárdez Borja, 135-157. Zaragoza: Libros Pórtico, 2015.
- Bohrmann, Monette. *Flavius Josephus, The Zealots and Yavne. Towards a Rereading of the War of the Jews*. Bern: Peter Lang, 1994.
- Brighton, Mark Andrew. *The Sicarii in Josephus's Judean War: Rhetorical Analysis and Historical Observations*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2009.
- Brizzi, Giovanni. "Il discorso di Agrippa II (B. J. 2. 345- 401): regole della guerra a confronto?". In *Rethinking the Jewish War: Archeology, Society, Traditions*, edited by Anthony Giambrone, 138-155. Leuven: Peeters, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv1q26qtm.9>.
- Caballos Rufino, Antonio. "Latinidad y municipalización de Hispania bajo los Flavios. Estatuto y normativa". *Mainake* n°. 23, (2001): 101-120.
- Cancik, Hubert. "Theokratie und Priesterherrschaft. Die mosaische Verfassung bei Flavius Josephus, Contra Apionem 2, 157-198". In *Religionstheorie und politische Theologie, 3: Theokratie*, edited by Jacob Taubes, 65-77. München: Wilhelm Fink Verlag und Verlag Ferdinand Schöningh, 1987.

- Chapman, H. Honora. "Spectacle in Josephus' Jewish War". In *Flavius Josephus and Flavian Rome*, edited by Edmondson Jonathan and Steve Mason and James Rives, 289-315. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199262120.003.0014>.
- Cohen, Shaye J.D. *Josephus in Galilee and Rome: his vita and development as a historian*. Leiden: Brill, 1979. <https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004452374>.
- Curran, John. "Flavius Josephus in Rome". In *Flavius Josephus history and interpretation*, edited by Mor Menahem and Prina Stern and Jack Pastor, 65-86. Leiden: Brill, 2011. <https://doi.org/10.1163/ej.9789004191266.i-438.34>.
- Eck, Werner. *Rom und Judaea: Fünf Vorträge zur römischen Herrschaft in Palaestina*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007. <https://www.mohrsiebeck.com/en/book/rom-und-judaea-9783161624001/>.
- Eck, Werner. "Herrschaft, Widerstand, Kooperation. Rom und das Judentum in Judaea / Palaestina vor dem 4. Jh. n. Chr.". In *Jüdische Lebenswelten. Von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart*, edited by Baltrusch Ernst and Uwe Puschner, 31-52. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang Edition, 2016. <https://doi.org/10.3726/978-3-653-03750-0/12>.
- Eck, Werner. "Judäa als Teil der Provinz Syrien im Spannungsfeld zwischen den Legaten von Syrien und den ritterlichen Funktionsträgern in Judäa von 6-66 n. Chr.". In *Rethinking the Jewish War: Archeology, Society, Traditions*, edited by Anthony Giambrone, 123-138. Leuven: Peeters, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv1q26qtm.8>.
- Farmer, William. *Maccabees, Zealots, and Josephus: An Inquiry into Jewish Nationalism in the Greco-Roman Period*. New York: Praeger Publishers Inc (Verlag), 1956. <https://doi.org/10.7312/farm91872>.
- Firpo, Giulio. "La terminologia della resistenza giudaica antiromana in Giuseppe Flavio". *Rendiconti dell'Accademia dei Lincei. Classe di Scienze morali, storiche e filologiche* n° 9, (1997): 675-714.
- Firpo, Giulio. "L'uccisione di Anano ben Anano come vendetta di Dio". In *Amnistia, perdono e vendetta nel mondo antico*, edited by Marta Sordi, 223-235. Milano: Vita e Pensiero, 1997.
- Firpo, Giulio. "Ναὸν...τῷ θεῷ τὸν κόσμον εἶναι (Ios. Bell. Iud. 5, 458): la guerra escatologica e l'ecumene". In *L'ecumenismo politico nella coscienza dell'Occidente. Atti del Convegno di Bergamo, 18-21 settembre 1995*, 277-294. Roma: L'Erma di Bretschneider, 1998.
- Firpo, Giulio. "La distruzione di Gerusalemme e del Secondo Tempio nel 70 d.C." *Rivista Storica Italiana* n° 114, (2002): 774-802.
- Gehrke, Hans-Joachim. *Stasis. Untersuchungen zu den inneren Kriegen in den griechischen Staaten des 5. und 4. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.* Munich: C. H. Beck, 1985.

- Gerber, Christine. *Ein Bild des Judentums für Nichtjuden von Flavius Josephus: Untersuchungen zu seiner Schrift Contra Apionem*. Leiden: Brill, 1997. <https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004332461>.
- Gichon, Mordechai. "Aspects of a Roman Army in War according to the *Bellum Judaicum* of Josephus". In *The Defense of the Roman and Byzantine East*, edited by Freeman Philip and David Kennedy, 287-309. Oxford: British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara Monograph, 1986.
- Giovannini, Adalberto. „Die Zerstörung Jerusalems durch Titus: eine Strafe Gottes oder eine historische Notwendigkeit?“. In *Contra quis ferat arma deos? Vier Augsburger Vorträge zur Religionsgeschichte der römischen Kaiserzeit, zum 60. Geburtstag von Gunther Gottlieb*, edited by Dotterweich Volker and Pedro Barceló, 11-34. Munich: Vögel, 1996.
- Goodblatt, David. "Priestly Ideologies in the Judean Resistance". *Jewish Studies Quarterly* 3, (1996): 225-249.
- Goodman, Martin. *The Ruling Class of Judaea: The Origins of the Revolt against Rome A.D. 66-70*. Cambridge: Cambridge University press, 1987. <https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511552656>.
- Gruen, Erich Stephen. "Roman perspectives on the Jews in the age of the Great Revolt". In *The First Jewish Revolt. Archaeology, history and ideology*, edited by Berlin Andrea M. and J. Andrew Overman, 27-43. London: Routledge, 2002.
- Gruen, Erich Stephen. "Tacitus and the Defamation of the Jews". In *The Construct of Identity in Hellenistic Judaism*, edited by Erich Stephen Gruen, 265-283. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2016. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110375558-015>.
- Gussmann, Oliver. *Das Priesterverständnis des Flavius Josephus*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008. <https://doi.org/10.1628/978-3-16-151457-9>.
- Hadas-Lebel, Mireille. «La contribution de Flavius Josèphe à l'histoire militaire: armée romaine et combattants juifs pendant le siège de Jérusalem». In *Visions de l'Occident romain, Hommages à Yann Le Bohec*, edited by Cabouret Bernadette and Agnès Gros Lambert and Catherine Wolff, 515-525. Lyon: De Boccard, 2012.
- Hadas-Lebel, Mireille. « Pas d'autre maître que Dieu »: La « quatrième philosophie », politique et mystique». In *Rethinking the Jewish War: Archeology, Society, Traditions*, edited by Anthony Giambrone, 155-164. Leuven: Peeters, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv1q26qtm.10>.
- Hengel, Martin. *Die Zeloten. Untersuchungen zur jüdischen Freiheitsbewegung in der Zeit von Herodes 1. bis 70 n. Chr.* Leiden: Brill, (1976<sup>2</sup>). <https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004331723>.

- Hollander van William. *Josephus, the Emperors, and the City of Rome. From Hostage to Historian*. Leiden|Boston: Brill, 2014. <https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004266834>.
- Horsley, Richard A. "High Priests and The Politics of Roman Palestine: A Contextual Analysis of the Evidence in Josephus". *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Period* 17, (1986): 23-55. <https://doi.org/10.1163/157006386x00040>.
- Horsley, Richard A. "The Zealots: Their Origin, Relationships and Importance in the Jewish Revolt". *Novum Testamentum* 28, (1986): 159-192. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1560435>.
- Krieger, Klaus Stefan. „Beobachtungen zu Flavius Josephus' Terminologie für die jüdischen Aufständischen gegen Rom in der Vita und im Bellum Judaicum“,. In *Internationales Josephus-Kolloquium, Brüssel 1998 (Münsteraner Judaistische Studien 4)*, edited by Kalms Jürgen U. and Folker Siegert, 209-221. Münster: Lit, 1999.
- Labbé, Gilbert. *L'affirmation de la puissance romaine en Judée (63 a. C.–136 p. C.)*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2012.
- Lanfranchi, Pierluigi. "Flavio Giuseppe personaggio della Guerra Giudaica" *Acme* 53, (2000): 125-162.
- Lanfranchi, Pierluigi. "Μαίνετε τὸν ναόν: il motivo della contaminazione del Tempio nella 'Guerra giudaica' di Flavio Giuseppe". *Materia giudaica* 6, (2001): 249-257.
- Lorenzini, Francesca. "I Sommi sacerdoti e la theokratía: una guida legittima per la nazione giudaica. Dal Levitico (21, 10-15) al Contro Apione (II. 164-166) di Flavio Giuseppe". In *L'ideale di regalità teocratica nel pensiero ebraico e classico*, edited by Arnaldo Marcone and Carla Noce, 25-39. Napoli: ESI, 2023.
- Lorenzini, Francesca. "Sull'exkursus giudaico di Tacito (Hist. 5, 4-5). Un confronto con Filone d'Alessandria e Flavio Giuseppe". *Hormos* 16, (2024): 241-262.
- Mader, Gottfried. *Josephus and the Politics of Historiography. Apologetic and Impression Management in the Bellum Judaicum*. Leiden: Brill, 2000. <https://doi.org/10.1163/9789047400233>.
- Maier, Johann. "Guerra santa? Il diritto di guerra nella tradizione giudaica". In *Guerra santa, guerra e pace dal Vicino Oriente antico alle tradizioni ebraica, cristiana e islamica: Atti del convegno internazionale Ravenna 11 maggio – Bertinoro 12 – 13 maggio 2004*, edited by Mauro Perani, 117-130. Florence: Giuntina, 2005.
- Mason, Steve. "Of audience and meanings: reading Josephus' *Bellum Judaicum* in the context of a Flavian audience". In *Josephus and the Jewish History in Flavian Rome and Beyond*, edited by Sievers

- Joseph and Gaia Lembi, 71-100. Leiden: Brill, 2005. [https://doi.org/10.1163/9789047415527\\_008](https://doi.org/10.1163/9789047415527_008).
- Mason, Steve. "Pollution and Purification in Josephus's Judean War". In *Purity, Holiness, and Identity in Judaism and Christianity*, edited by Ehrlich Carl S. and Anders Runesson and Eileen Schuller, 181-208. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.
- Mason, Steve. *A History of the Jewish War: AD 66–74*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016. <https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9781139020718>.
- Mason, Steve. "Josephus's Judean War". In *A Companion to Josephus*, edited by Chapman Honora H. and Zuleika Rodgers, 89-108. Chichester: Wiley Blackwell, 2016. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118325162.ch1>.
- Mason, Steve. "When Suffering Meets Passion: Pathos in Josephus' Judean War and Its Context". In *Jews and Christians in the Roman World. From Historical Method to Cases*, edited by Steve Mason, 187-209. Leiden: Brill, 2023. [https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004545960\\_010](https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004545960_010).
- McLaren, James S. "Going to war against Rome: the motivation of the Jewish rebels". In *The Jewish revolt against Rome: interdisciplinary perspectives*, edited by Mladen Popović, 129-153. Leiden: Brill, 2011. [https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004216693\\_007](https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004216693_007).
- Nagy, Viktor Kókai. "The Speech of Josephus at the Walls of Jerusalem". *Biblische Notizen* 161, (2014): 141-167.
- Nikiprowetzky, Valentin. "Josephus and the Revolutionary Parties". In *Josephus, the Bible, and history*, edited by Feldman Louis H. and Gohei Hata, 216-236. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1989. [https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004671805\\_014](https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004671805_014).
- Nodet, Etienne. "Josephus' Attempt to Reorganize Judaism from Rome". In *Making History: Josephus And Historical Method*, edited by Zuleika Rodgers, 103-125. Leiden: Brill, 2007. <https://doi.org/10.1163/ej.9789004150089.i-471.39>.
- Nodet, Etienne. "On the Destruction of the Jerusalem Temple". In *Rethinking the Jewish War: Archeology, Society, Traditions*, edited by Anthony Giambrone, 236-249. Leuven: Peeters, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv1q26qtm.14>.
- Parente, Fausto. "The Impotence of Titus, or Josephus *Bellum Judaicum* as an Example of "Pathetic" Historiography". In *Josephus and the Jewish History in Flavian Rome and Beyond*, edited by Sievers Joseph and Gaia Lembi, 45-71. Leiden: Brill, 2005. [https://doi.org/10.1163/9789047415527\\_007](https://doi.org/10.1163/9789047415527_007).
- Pfeiffer, Stefan. "Der Hohepriester und die Vorstellung von der autonomia Judäas". *Latomus* 73, (2014): 968-987.



- Pitillas Salañer, Eduardo. "La guerra de los Judíos contra Roma y las luchas internas por el control de Jerusalén: las rivalidades frente al enemigo exterior". *Espacio, Tiempo y Forma, Serie II, Historia Antigua* 17-18, (2004-2005): 191-206. <https://doi.org/10.5944/etfii.17-18.2004.4424>.
- Pothou, Vassiliki. *Thukydides Second-Hand bei Flavius Josephus. Zur Rezeption Thukydideischer Motive im Bellum Judaicum*. Leiden: Brill, 2023. <https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004545878>.
- Price, Jonathan J. *Jerusalem under siege. The collapse of the Jewish State, 66-70 C.E.* Leiden: Brill, 1992. <https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004672482>.
- Price, Jonathan J. *Thucydides and internal war*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2001. <https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511483066>.
- Price, Jonathan J. "The Provincial Historian in Rome". In *Josephus and the Jewish History in Flavian Rome and Beyond*, edited by Sievers Joseph and Gaia Lembi, 101-121. Leiden: Brill, 2005. [https://doi.org/10.1163/9789047415527\\_009](https://doi.org/10.1163/9789047415527_009).
- Price, Jonathan J. "Some aspects of Josephus' theological interpretation of the Jewish War". In *The words of a wise man's mouth are gracious (Qob 10,12)*, edited by Mauro Perani, 109-120. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2005. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110901399.109>.
- Price, Jonathan J. "Josephus and the 'Law of history': a note". In *When West Met East. The encounter of Greece and Rome with the Jews, Egyptians and others*, edited by Schaps David M. and Uri Yiftach and Daniela Dueck, 8-20. Trieste: Edizioni Università di Trieste, 2016.
- Rajak, Tessa. *Josephus: The Historian and His Society*. Bristol: Bloomsbury Academic, 2002. <https://doi.org/10.5040/9781849669597>.
- Rappaport, Uriel. "Josephus Personality and the Credibility of his Narrative". In *Making History: Josephus And Historical Method*, edited by Zuleika Rodgers, 68-82. Leiden: Brill, 2007. <https://doi.org/10.1163/ej.9789004150089.i-471.24>.
- Rappaport, Uriel. "Who were the Sicarii?". In *The Jewish revolt against Rome: interdisciplinary perspectives*, edited by Mladen Popović, 323-342. Leiden: Brill, 2011. [https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004216693\\_013](https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004216693_013).
- Ravallese, Maurizio. *Le parole degli sconfitti. Ebrei e Romani nella Guerra Giudaica di Flavio Giuseppe*. Roma: Edizioni Quasar, 2023.
- Regev, Eyal. "Josephus, the Temple, and the Jewish War". In *Flavius Josephus history and interpretation*, edited by Mor Menahem and Pnina Stern and Jack Pastor, 279-293. Leiden: Brill, 2011. <https://doi.org/10.1163/ej.9789004191266.i-438.120>.
- Rives, James. "Flavian Religious Policy and the Destruction of the Jerusalem Temple". In *Flavius Josephus and Flavian Rome*, edited by Edmondson Jonathan and Steve Mason and James Rives, 145-167.

- Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199262120.003.0008>.
- Schwartz, Daniel R. "Josephus on the Jewish Constitution and Community". *Scripta Classica Israelica* 7, (1983-1984): 30- 52.
- Schwartz, Seth. *Josephus and Judaeae Politics*. Leiden: Brill, 1990. <https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004450882>.
- Shutt, Rowland James Heath. "The Concept of God in the Works of Flavius Josephus". *Journal of Jewish Studies* 31, (1980): 171-189. <https://doi.org/10.18647/959/jjs-1980>.
- Sievers, Joseph. "Religious Language in Josephus's Judean War". In *Rethinking the Jewish War: Archeology, Society, Traditions*, edited by Anthony Giambrone, 182-199. Leuven: Peeters, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv1q26qtm.12>.
- Smallwood, E. Mary. "High Priests and Politics in Roman Palestine". *The Journal of Theological Studies* 13, (1962): 14-34. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jts/xiii.1.14>.
- Spilisbury, Paul. "God and Israel in Josephus: A Patron-Client Relationship". In *Understanding Josephus. Seven Perspectives*, edited by Steve Mason, 172-194. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.
- Spilisbury, Paul. "Josephus on the burning of the Temple, the Flavian triumph, and the providence of God". *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers* 41, (2002): 306-327.
- Stern, Menahem. "Josephus and the Roman Empire as Reflected in The Jewish War". In *Josephus, Judaism, and Christianity*, edited by Feldman H. Louis and Gohei Hata, 71-80. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1987. [https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004671799\\_006](https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004671799_006).
- Thoma, Clemens. "The High Priesthood in the Judgment of Josephus". In *Josephus, the Bible, and history*, edited by Feldman H. Louis and Gohei Hata, 196-216. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1989. [https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004671805\\_013](https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004671805_013).
- Trampedach, Kai. "Die Hasmonäer und das Problem der Theokratie". In *Die Bibel als politisches Argument. Voraussetzungen und Folgen biblizistischer Herrschaftslegitimation in der Vormoderne*, edited by Trampedach Kai and Andreas Pečar, 37-65. München: De Gruyter Oldenbourg, 2007. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110650853-004>.
- Trampedach, Kai. "Schwierigkeiten mit der Theokratie. Warum die römische Herrschaft in Judäa scheiterte". In *Theokratie und theokratischer Diskurs. Die Rede von der Gottesherrschaft und ihre politisch-sozialen Auswirkungen im interkulturellen Vergleich*, edited by Trampedach Kai and Andreas Pečar, 117-142. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.

- Trampedach, Kai. "The High Priests and Rome: Why Cooperation Failed". *Between Cooperation and Hostility. Multiple Identities in Ancient Judaism and the Interaction with Foreign Powers*, edited by Albertz Rainer and Jacob Wöhrle, 251-265. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht Verlage, 2013. <https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666550515.251>.
- Tuval, Michael. *From Jerusalem Priest to Roman Jew. On Josephus and the Paradigms of Ancient Judaism*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013. <https://doi.org/10.1628/978-3-16-152495-0>.
- Vandenbergh, Marijn J. "Villains called Sicarii: a commonplace for rhetorical vituperation in the texts of Flavius Josephus". *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 47, (2016): 1-33. <https://doi.org/10.1163/15700631-12340462>.
- VanderKam, James C. *From Joshua to Caiaphas: High priests after the Exile*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress Press, 2004. <https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004495333>.
- Vidal-Naquet, Pierre. *Flavius Josèphe ou du bon usage de la trahison*. Paris: Les Éditions de Minuit, 1977.
- Wilker, Julia. "God is with Italy now. Pro-Roman Jews and the Jewish Revolt". In *Jewish Identity and Politics between the Maccabees and Bar Kokhba. Groups, Normativity, and Rituals*, edited by Benedikt Eckhardt, 157-187. Leiden: Brill, 2011. [https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004218512\\_010](https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004218512_010).