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CHAPTER I

JOSEPHUS: HIS LIFE, HIS TIME AND HIS WORKS

If the works of Josephus had nothing more to recommend them than their rhetorical excellence, they probably would never have survived to this day. If they depended on their historical content for preservation, they would have disappeared long ago with countless other relatively unimportant chronicles of small groups of people. For, as this study will indicate, the rhetoric of Josephus, while interesting, was largely derivative and seldom brilliant; his historicity was seldom penetrating and largely tendentious.

What little we have of the works of Josephus has survived through a circumstance the author himself could not have imagined, namely, the emergence of Christianity. In Chapter III, Book 18 of The Antiquities of the Jews, there appears a reference to the historical figure of Jesus Christ. Whether this reference is genuine, or whether, as certain modern researchers have suggested, it is a late interpolation, is not within the scope of

this study. The fact remains that without the reference, The Antiquities, and indeed the other works of Josephus, would probably have been relegated to the limbo which enveloped the works of much more important, but lamentably pagan authors. The Jewish Wars, which is the subject of this study, undoubtedly survived also because it treated of the period immediately before and after the life of Christ and set the historical stage for his earthly appearance.

Equally important is the fact that The Jewish Wars contains information complementary to the Gospels and provided corroboration for the Gospels in early times. While no writer that I can find on record has made this observation, I believe that the doleful course of the Jewish wars and their tragic outcome must have gladdened the hearts of early Christians who read Josephus' narrative as the account of divine retribution visited on the Jews for having rejected Jesus Christ. This attitude seems to have been reflected as late as the sixteenth century in the title of the translation of Josephus' work made by Johann Boemus: The Fardel Facions.² And finally, it seems to me that the early Christians might have felt themselves akin to the Jews, at least spiritually, and retained not only The Jewish War, but also Against Apion in

their corpus of literature for the purpose of apology.

The Jews themselves would have nothing of Josephus. Although his work, *The Jewish War*, appeared first in the Aramaic language, the original version has not survived. His work, *Against Apion*, a powerful polemic against an early anti-Semite, has not been preserved through any Jewish channel. In fact, while translations of the works of Josephus have appeared in Yiddish and in modern Hebrew\(^3\) and essays about him have been published by the Jewish Publication society of Philadelphia, he is considered a renegade and a traitor by most Jewish writers,\(^4\) a view that apparently cannot be lightly refuted.

The attitude of the Jews toward Josephus, coupled with the attitude of the Romans, seems to have occasioned the writing of *The Jewish War*, although it was commissioned by Vespasian who intended it as a warning to the people of the East of the uselessness of revolt.\(^5\) It is in the first place an apology for himself. A certain Justus of Tiberias had written a history of the

---


Jewish wars sometimes before 75 A.D., the historical date of the history written by Josephus. In his version Justus accused Josephus of hostility to Rome, of having been party to the revolt in Galilee and of having invented his descent from the Hasmonaean house. Josephus seems to have been compelled to refute these charges. The Jewish War is in the second place an apology for his people who were being stigmatized as cowards by the victors of the bitter struggle. It is in the third place an affirmation of his own dubious role in the conflict: loyalty to his own people on a higher conceptual level than mere nationalism.

But whatever his motivation, whatever the reasons for the preservation of his work, whatever his literary excellence, we are indebted to Josephus for an eye-witness report of a momentous event in human history. To quote Graetz:

Jeremiah, uttering his lamentations amidst the ruins of Jerusalem, fitly ends the first period of Jewish history; while Flavius Josephus, writing the story of his people in the quiet of Caesar's palace, concludes the second period.

Because The Jewish War is, for the most part, an eye-witness report of a major historical event, I have chosen it for rhetorical study. While, as has already been observed, the rhe-


toric is not so exceptional that it warrants attention per se, it is important because it is a journalistic-type of a report written at a time when the style of a work was considered of equal value with its content. The ideal of non quid sed quo modo is certainly not exemplified in an outstanding manner in The Jewish War; nevertheless there is enough evidence in Josephus' style to indicate that he was not entirely indifferent to the ideal.

As will be shown, Josephus had a Jewish education; he came to the study of Greek and Latin lately, and it must have been a considerable effort for him to compose anything in those languages. Anyone who has had any experience trying to learn Hebrew after adolescence can appreciate the difficulty of the converse of the problem. Josephus had to deal with not only a new syntax and an entirely different vocabulary (with absolutely no points of similarity in sound or concept) but also with an entirely new system of writing. Because he realized his limitations in Greek, Josephus admits that he hired two Greek secretaries\(^8\) who are probably responsible for whatever rhetorical polish appears in his works.

There does appear a conscious effort to incorporate some rhetorical conventions in his work, and it is to analyze that effort that we devote this study. The analysis is worth while, I

---

believe, because of the large number of journalistic reports of World War II now appearing which completely lack rhetorical polish. Arranged in chronological or psychological structure, many of these reports aspire to telegraphic statement of fact only. Selection of fact has become paramount, while the art of eloquent statement has been devalued. Modern readers and writers, schooled in the terse economical style of the newspaper story, are unprepared to appreciate the beauty of telling a story well, with technique and grace, yet with marked effect.

Josephus as a historian is not a Herodotus, nor a Thucydides. He is neither a Tacitus nor a Suetonius. Yet he wrote under the influence of the great historians of antiquity, and for that reason I believe he is significant as a historian for the purpose of this study. To trace the sources of his rhetoric and to show its similarity to that of other ancient historians is a project outside the scope of this analysis; but the fact that it can be done readily indicates that Josephus is valuable as a storehouse of rhetorical practice as applied to historical narrative.

If we agree with Montaigne that le style, c'est l'homme, we may well begin a study of the rhetoric of Josephus with a study of Josephus himself. Fortunately, the facts of his life have been transmitted to us by the author himself in an autobiography; important additional data are also to be found in The Jewish War.
Our author was born Joseph ben Matthias ha-kohen in Jerusalem in the year 38 A.D. of a priestly family, related to the royal Hasmonaean house on his mother's side. The Hasmonaean house was the descendant of Judas Maccabee, the hero of the struggle against the Seleucid empire in the second century B.C., and it was considered the royal house of Judaea although it had been, at the time of Josephus, supplanted by the Idumenaean house of Herod.

Josephus and his brother Matthias received a careful education and were taught the tenets of the Law while very young. Josephus says that his father's house was frequented by learned rabbis who wondered at his precocious intelligence. At the age of 16, Josephus became a disciple of the hermit Vanus, apparently an Essene, and he followed his teacher into the desert. There he lived on wild fruit and bathed daily in cold water, according to the requirements of the Essenes.

To understand thoroughly the political and religious loyalties of Josephus, it is necessary to digress, at this first mention of a Jewish sect, to explain the religious environment in which Josephus matured. The struggle against the Seleucid em-

9 Josephus, *Vita*, 5.
10 Ibid. 2.
11 Ibid. 9.
12 Ibid. 11.
pire under the leadership of the Maccabees threw the Jews, who up to that time were a jealously parochial people, in contact with various foreign nations, sometimes as friends, at other times as enemies. These contacts had a maturing effect on the Jews, and they gradually came to re-examine the basic concepts of their religious philosophy in the light of a more universal experience. While part of their struggle against the Syrians was to hold fast to their national traits and to their monotheism, they inevitably began to adopt foreign views and practices which appeared to blend harmoniously with their own. The Hasmonaeans, the champions of Judaism, began to build colonnades, such as the "Xystum"; they began to coin money in the Greek fashion. John Hyrcanus, the most brilliant of the Hasmonaeans, erected a mausoleum in the Greek style at Modin, his family's native town. Meanwhile, important movements occurred in the religious life of the people. As their religious consciousness shone with a clearer light on wider fields of human relationships, it advanced from the narrow tradition by which it had been circumscribed. And that advance produced three major sects: the Essenes (Hasidim) who withdrew

---

13 Graetz, Geschichte des Juden, II, 14.

entirely from public life and sought in desert places the meditation and religious worship that was no longer possible in contemporary living; the Pharisees (*Pherushim*) who insisted on applying the standard of traditional religion to all private and public undertakings; and the Sadducees (*Zadukim*) who realized the difficulty of reconciling the Law with practical events and devoted themselves to the interests of the nation without forsaking religion entirely.\(^{15}\) The Sadducees included, generally, the military and diplomatic leaders and a party of priests.\(^{16}\) Indeed, it was the difference in viewpoint between the Sadducees and the Pharisees that may have produced the final faction-fight that made the city of Jerusalem vulnerable to the enemy in 70 A.D.

The Pharisees were not a party in the strict sense of the word, since the mass of Jews inclined toward Pharisaism in practice. To them the Torah was a guide, as the prophet Ezra had proclaimed, but a guide is useless unless its guidance is understood and those who would obey its directions are aware of what those directions are and have some means of finding an answer when they are in doubt.\(^{16a}\) It is said of Ezra himself (ch. vii,

\(^{15}\) Graetz, *Geschichte des Juden*, II, 17.

\(^{16}\) Ibid. 21.

\(^{16a}\) Ibid.
10): "For Ezra had directed his heart to inquire in the law of the Lord and do it and teach in Israel the statutes and ordinances therein". The word that is used to indicate the meaning that is translated as inquire is Darash. But Darash in Hebrew obviously doesn't mean inquire, in the sense of asking or looking into, especially when used with es-torah; on the contrary, it apparently means to interpret, and the act of interpreting is Midrash.17 the name of a commentary on the Torah that exists to this day.

Ezra was called the Scribe (Sopher, ch. vii, 12), and the period after him is known as the period of the Sopherim. Apparently, however, the Scribes were more than writers or editors of the Sacred Texts; in the Tanhuma text of the Midrash (jelammedenu portion) there appears a precise identification of the Sopherim with the Great Synagogue, an authoritative collegium that preceded the Synhedrin.18

Although the authority of the Sopherim had vanished by the time of the founding of the Synhedrin in 196 B.C., the principles of the Sopherim and their literature must have survived. We find the Pharisees, in a new situation, propagating their philosophy and theology, both based on a single cardinal principle: the necessity of preserving Judaism according to the laws and

17 Herford, R. Trevors, The Pharisees, New York, 1924
20.
18 Ibid. 22.
customs of their fathers. They argued that the fate of man and nation depended on the will of God and that everything happened by divine will. The results of human endeavors lay outside the range of human calculation. Man was responsible only for his moral conduct and for the individual way he followed.\textsuperscript{19} The Sadducees deplored the impracticality of the view, while the Essenes exaggerated it. The Sadducees insisted that such a view as the Pharisees held eliminated Divine Justice in this life. The Pharisees placed the operation of Divine Justice in the life after death, a concept the Sadducees did not hold.\textsuperscript{20} But the chief philosophic disagreement between the Sadducees and the Pharisees was the latter's strict adherence to forms, rituals and traditions that were not specifically prescribed in the Law. Again quoting Graetz:

But this devotion to outward forms and ceremonials by no means excluded the religion of the heart. The Pharisees were acknowledged to be moral, chaste, temperate and benevolent. In their administration of justice, they allowed mercy to prevail, and judged the accused not from the point of view of moral depravity but from that of human weakness. The following maxim was given Joshua, the son of Perachia, one of the leaders of the sect, who with his companion, Matthia of Arbela, lived in the time of Hyrcanus: Take a teacher, win a friend and judge every man from the presumption of innocence.\textsuperscript{21}

\textsuperscript{19} Graetz, \textit{Geschichte des Juden}, II, 18.

\textsuperscript{20} Ibid. 21.

\textsuperscript{21} Ibid. 20.
The pious priests, the civil and religious magistrates, who were often combined in the same person, and the teachers of the Law were usually members of the Pharisaic sect. They owed their influence to their knowledge of the Law and the application they made of it to the affairs of daily life.22

The Sadducees, on the other hand, who bore witness that the Pharisees "denied themselves in this world, but would hardly receive a reward in a future world",24 were diametrically opposed to the Pharisees in temperament. The Sadducees included the Judaean aristocracy, the generals and the statesmen who had acquired wealth at home or abroad, the diplomats and soldiers who had come to a freer thought through intercourse with foreign peoples.25 They pursued a national-political policy along with a loose interpretation of oral tradition and a close obedience to the letter of the Law. Theirs was an eye-for-an-eye type of justice; they held the Levitical injunctions of cleanliness and purification almost in neglect.26 Despite this ritualistic attitude of the Sadducees, the majority of the people inclined away from them, probably because of their leanings toward the Romans as the instruments of peace with mild subjugation, and toward the Phari-

22 Ibid.
23 Ibid.
25 Ibid. 21.
26 Ibid. 22.
The Essene sect, sprung from the religious fanaticism that developed as a reaction to the tyranny and persecution of the Seleucid empire, was a higher form of Pharisaism. It was completely without political content. The Essenes were ultra-strict in their observance not only of the law, but also of the oral and written tradition. To them to move a bowl on the Sabbath was nothing but desecration; they neglected the calls of nature on the holy days and took special care to avoid all defilement. They lived the life of a Nazarite in the desert and avoided contact with anyone of lesser austerity for fear of defilement.

In order to adhere to their rigid code of holiness, which they hoped would lead them toward inward sanctity and consecration, they were compelled to live apart from the rest of the community. However, it is significant that the revolutionists and zealots seem to have had some contact with the Essene sect.

Why Josephus studied with an Essene can only be conjectured. His family must have been Sadducean in sympathy, having connections with the Hasmonaean house and with the high priesthood; Josephus himself showed Sadducean sympathy when he betrayed...
the Galilean revolt to the Romans and later when he tried to induce the defenders of Jerusalem to surrender.

Nevertheless, he tells us that he spent three years with his Essene mentor, after which he returned to Jerusalem. At the age of 26, he was appointed to a mission to the Empress Poppea at Rome on behalf of two imprisoned Pharisees. He succeeded in obtaining their freedom, and the empress, who was well disposed toward Jews, made him a favorite of hers, loading him with gifts before his return to Jerusalem.

Whatever his religious training, we can imagine the impression the court of Nero made on the young Josephus. We know that he never believed the small Jewish nation could ever hope to gain independence from the mighty Roman empire by recourse to arms. Indeed, when he returned to his native city, Josephus found the zealots preparing for a revolution, which must have seemed a madman's project to him. At first Josephus was alarmed for his safety and took refuge with the pro-Romanists, apparently the

30 Josephus, Vita, 12.
31 Ibid. 13.
32 Ibid. 16.
33 Ibid. 17.
Sadducees, in the Temple. But when the moderate party, under the Pharisee Eleaser, the son of Simon, assumed control of the revolution, he came out of hiding. Then Josephus pretended a desire for national independence, probably to conceal his Roman proclivity and to make himself eligible for a post of responsibility in the revolt through which he could more easily betray the movement. He tells us that at this very time he was secretly rejoicing because he had heard of the advance of the Roman general Cestus and an army, which, he thought, would put an end to the insane struggle in its very beginning. But when Cestus retreated, Josephus and his party had to retire and revise their strategy.

Shortly after this event, Josephus was entrusted with the governorship of the important province of Galilee by the Synhedrin, which seems to have assumed control of the revolt. There are several possible explanations of this turn of events. It is likely that the friend of Josephus, the former high priest, Joshua, the son of Gamala, who carried great weight in the Synhedrin, urged his appointment. Josephus' pretence may have led

34 Ibid. 20.
35 Ibid. 22.
36 Ibid.
37 Ibid. 23.
38 Ibid. 28-29.
the revolutionists to regard him as a zealot. It may also be conjectured that Josephus was acting as agent of Agrippa, the ruler of Judaea, who was able to act in a way which he could not have pursued as a vassal of Rome.\textsuperscript{39} Certainly the defeat of Cestus and his retreat before a band of poorly armed zealots must have shaken the faith of the staunchest pro-Roman Jews and led them to believe that, although complete independence was impossible, a well-controlled revolt might result in territorial, commercial and economic concessions. Here again we see the fine hand of Sadducean aristocracy.

Josephus had two assistants in his governorship: Joaser and Judah.\textsuperscript{40} Not much is said of them, and what is said seems contradictory. At first Josephus' conduct was energetic and decisive. He called a legislative body, consisting of seventy important men of the district. He appointed seven judges in each city and officers of the law in different parts of Galilee.\textsuperscript{41} He raised an army of a hundred thousand men and armed and drilled them in the Roman fashion. He created a corps of cavalry and maintained them at his own expense.\textsuperscript{42}

\textsuperscript{39} Ibid. 30.

\textsuperscript{40} Graetz, \textit{Geschichte des Juden}, II, 278.

\textsuperscript{41} Josephus, \textit{Vita}, 29.

\textsuperscript{42} Josephus, \textit{Bellum Judaicum}, II, 577-582.
He even hired a personal bodyguard of 500 mercenary soldiers who were disciplined to obey a sign from him. He began to fortify a number of important cities in upper and lower Galilee and stocked them with provisions. He seems to have seriously prepared for a siege against the Roman legions, apparently intending to hold the rich province and its provisions for the revolutionary government.

As soon as he arrived in Galilee, inspired either by his own ardor or by orders from the Synhedrin, Josephus ordered the destruction of the palace inhabited by his own ancestor, Herod, during the time of Augustus, where images of animals were worshipped in direct defiance of the Law. In order to carry out this project, Josephus invited the most distinguished men of Tiberias to meet him at Bthmaon, but during the discussion of the plans a zealot, Jesus ben Sapphia, set fire to the palace and divided the spoils among his own followers. Josephus thereupon hurried into the town of Tiberias and gathered up what remained of the plunder and handed it over into the custody of Agrippa's officers.

A persistent annoyance to Josephus in his work as governor of Galilee was John of Gischala, a local patriot of unfail-

43 Ibid. 583.
ing energy and of some intellectual superiority. Their first
difference arose over a large quantity of corn that had been col-
lected by the Romans in upper Galilee. John wanted to carry it off
and sell it, using the proceeds to fortify Giachala. Josephus at
first prevented him from doing so, but his coadjutors, Joaser and
Judah, finally persuaded him to grant John the proper authoriza-
tion. Next, a band of youths from the village of Dabaritta, near
Mount Tabor, waylaid and plundered the wife of one of the king's
agents, who was travelling through the country. They brought the
precious metals and rich garments they had taken from her to Jo-
sephus at Tarichea. Josephus pretended that he was going to see
that the booty went to the Synhedrin at Jerusalem, but actually
he intended to return it to the king. When his ruse became known,
the people of the villages in the vicinity of Tarichea became an-
gry. Led by Jesus ben Sapphia, crowds of them began to assemble
in Tarichea to denounce his treachery. Jesus came leading the
crowd with a copy of the Law in his arms and exhorted the people
to punish the traitor. Josephus' headquarters were surrounded by
a furious mob, but he saved himself by an ingenious trick. He
tore his clothes, poured ashes over his head, hung a sword around
his neck and appeared in the arena of Tarichea as a suppliant. As
soon as he could gain a hearing, he told the assembled multitude

45 Ibid. 70.
that he intended neither to return the booty to the king nor to send it to Jerusalem. He had intended to use the money that would come from the sale of it to fortify Tarichea. Beguiled by this story, the Taricheans turned their anger against Josephus' attackers, while he himself quietly slipped back to his own headquarters. Soon, however, he was again besieged by a crowd of the country people who were not taken unawares by this falsehood. Josephus appeared on the roof of his house and, in a conciliatory manner, asked the ringleaders of the mob to come inside for a consultation. Once he got them inside, he had them seized, whipped, maimed and thrown out into the street. Their followers, thinking Josephus had a large force of men concealed in his headquarters, soon dispersed in terror.46

From the time of this incident, a united defense of Galilee was no longer possible. On the one side were the moderate inhabitants of the cities, some of which were notoriously pro-Roman, who adhered to Josephus; on the other side were the country folk who accepted John of Gischala as their leader and who were eager for an "all out" prosecution of the war.

As soon as he was sure of the division of the people, John and his brother Simon, with a hundred well-chosen followers,

46 Ibid. 126-144. Josephus, Bellum Judaicum, II, 519-613.
appealed to the Synhedrin at Jerusalem to denounce Josephus. 47 The dissidents asked that Josephus be recalled. Simon ben Gamaliel, the president of the Synhedrin, who was a friend of John and who had no faith in the sincerity of Josephus, and Ananus, the former high priest, supported the case of John. It was decreed that four envoys be sent to Galilee with orders to compel Josephus to lay down his office and return to Jerusalem. 48 The larger Galilean communities, such as Sephoris, Tiberias and Gabara, were instructed by the Synhedrin to offer assistance to John against Josephus, who was not to be considered as other than an enemy of his country. 49

But Josephus did not yield his post so easily; nor did he appear to disobey the Synhedrin whence he derived his original powers. His father, who lived at Jerusalem at the time, kept him informed of the action of the Synhedrin, and he was able to take precautionary measures. 50 When the envoys arrived in Galilee, Josephus assured them that he was quite ready to surrender his office and return peaceably to Jerusalem. Nonetheless, he seemed to be in active preparation for the revolt and puzzled the envoys by the evasive answers he gave them. Secretly he was inciting

47 Josephus, Vita, 189.
49 Ibid. 203
50 Ibid. 204
hatred of the envoys among the city inhabitants of the area, and it often appeared that they were in danger of being injured by Josephus' partisans. On the advice of John of Gischala, the envoys sent secret messengers to every inhabited place in Galilee declaring Josephus an outlaw and all his measures void. Hearing of this, Josephus sent his own men to intercept the secret messengers and to bring them to him. Inviting his own partisans, he explained that he was the victim of a plot and lashed them into a frenzy of rage that would have resulted in the lynching of the messengers if Josephus had not assumed a generous protective attitude. He organized a delegation of his own followers to go to Jerusalem to explain the Synhedrin that he was doing his duty well and that the envoys were really obstructionists.

Meanwhile, the envoys who were at the time in upper Galilee realized that Josephus had stymied them in that section of the province, and they moved down to Tiberias. Again Josephus stole a march on them. The envoys commanded the people of that city to observe a day of fasting and humiliation, when prayer would be offered for Divine Help. The people answered this call

51 Ibid. 205-207
52 Ibid. 216-231. Josephus, Bellum Judaicum, II, 631
by convening in large numbers in a synagogue of Tiberias. Although everyone was supposed to be unarmed, Josephus and his followers all had weapons concealed under their garments. After the prayers, when an angry discussion ensued, the partisans of Josephus fell on their opponents. The people of the town sided with Josephus, and the fracas ended with a decisive victory for our author. In the meantime, Josephus had dispatched his own delegation to the Synhedrin to plead his cause. His messengers made such a favorable impression that the envoys of the Synhedrin were recalled, and Josephus was properly reinstated as governor of Galilee. This move was occasioned by popular pressure or by official pressure on the Synhedrin. For to show his contempt for that body, Josephus returned the envoys, who had been sent to depose him, to the Synhedrin trussed up in the very chains meant for him.

When the Roman legions finally appeared in Galilee, a bulwark against foreign invasion of Judaea as well as a rich source of supply, the people of the province were divided among themselves and debilitated by the struggle between the pro-Romans and the anti-Romans in their own ranks. While some of the fort-

55 Ibid. 309.
56 Ibid. 316-332.
fications were indeed strengthened by Josephus, he had failed to organize the defense of the area into a unified, mutually supporting system. In the five months from November, 66, to March, 67, in which he had been governor of Galilee, he had cancelled out the gains produced in the first four months of the rebellion by the defeat of the army of Cestus. While it has never been remarked, I think it is a significant indication of the treachery of Josephus that Vespasian began his campaign against the Jews in Galilee, instead of striking directly at the capital of the revolt, Jerusalem.57

With an army of about 58,000 men, Vespasian set out on his campaign from Antioch.58 Abhorring direct action against the emotional and political center of the revolutionary movement, he reduced the cities of northern Galilee first; each time he engaged the enemy Josephus was defeated, although at Gabara and Jotapata the people fought valiantly.59 Josephus had come to Jotapata from Tiberias in order to take command of the defense of that city. When he realized that the city would be taken, he attempted to slip out.60 However, the population prevented him from doing so. When the Romans entered the city, Josephus and forty of his officers took refuge in a cave or sewer that had only one exit. The

57 Josephus, Bellum Judaicum, III, 30.
58 Ibid. 29 and 64-69.
59 Ibid.
60 Ibid. 193.
Romans demanded their surrender, which Josephus was prepared to give had he not been prevented by the forty officers. As a ruse, he agreed to their plan to commit suicide, each by the hand of another, the last man killing himself. Somehow Josephus managed to be the last man. With one other surviving officer, he surrendered himself to the Romans, walking out over the corpses of thirty-nine patriotic Jewish soldiers who had been true to their agreement.61

Josephus was received with honor by the Romans,62 being considered an adversary in name only. He was given a robe of dignity; Titus was his companion, and he was permitted to select a wife from the captive women.63

After the surrender of Josephus, the remaining fortified places in Galilee fell with varying ease. Tiberias and Joppa capitulated after light or no resistance; Gamala, Mount Tabor and Gischala were held to the bitter end and cost the Romans dearly.64

Meanwhile, refugees from Galilee began to pour into Jerusalem, the population of which was divided into parties who favored the zealots and those who favored a negotiated peace with the Romans.65 Realizing the chiefs of state were men friendly to

61 Ibid. 391.
62 Ibid. V, 414.
63 Ibid.
64 Ibid. III.
64 Details from Ibid. IV, V, VI, and VII.
the Romans, the zealots tried to break the power of the moderate party before Jerusalem would be betrayed. They started by divesting the high priest of his office and by replacing him with an unknown country rabbi, Phineas ben Samuel. Anan, a leader of the moderate party, urged the citizens of Jerusalem to rebel at this act and drive the zealots from the city. That was the beginning of a civil war within the walls of Jerusalem. At first the moderate party succeeded in driving the zealots into the second wall of the citadel, the Mount of the Temple. However, when it was rumored that Anan intended to ask the assistance of the Romans, John of Gischala brought up his army and attacked the moderates from outside the city. After a brief action, the moderates were defeated and the zealots instituted a reign of terror that made victims of Anan and Joshua ben Gamala, president of the Synhedrin, as well as others who were considered pro-Roman or aristocratic. Eventually, however, the remnants of the moderate party enleagued themselves with an Idumaean bandit, Simon bar-Giora, who entered the city and attacked the zealots with great vigor. Nevertheless, the zealots retained control of the city.

While this action was going on, the dynamics of the Roman empire were moving to make Vespasian emperor. Nero was followed by Calba, Otho and Vitellius; finally, in December, 69, Vespasian was acclaimed emperor, and he left the Near East to return to Rome, leaving the prosecution of the Jewish war to his son,
Titus, the friend of Josephus.

Titus, with an army that had grown to about eighty thousand men, took up the siege of Jerusalem in February, 70, four years after the outbreak of the revolt. On his staff, in addition to the regular military officers, were three prominent Jews: Tiberius Alexander, son of the alabarch and governor of Egypt; King Agrippa; and our author, Josephus. In the camp was also the beautiful Jewish princess, Berenice.

Titus passed the spring preparing for the siege and calling on the inhabitants of Jerusalem to surrender in return for lenient treatment. But, in the face of the enemy, the warring groups inside the city united, at least superficially. The elders and chiefs of the government sent out calls to outlying provinces for support, which soon came. Never before had the walls of Jerusalem been so well defended. Titus began his siege operations in March or April, 70, during the Passover festival. The fighting was determined and bitter on both sides. Although Titus had the advantage of famine, Josephus' persuasive eloquence and techniques of unusual cruelty, he was unable to effect a quick capitulation of the city. Finally, on the tenth day of the Jewish month of Ab (September 26, 70 A.D.), by a curious coincidence
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the traditional date of the destruction of the first temple, the
Roman soldiers succeeded in penetrating the Holy of Holies, desecrating it and burning it to the ground. Even with the Temple
lost, the resistance of John of Gischala and Simon bar-Giora
continued for several months.

In their triumph, Vespasian and his sons Titus and
Domitian led the surviving leaders of the revolt John and Simon.
Josephus witnessed the humiliation of his own people from the
safety of the emperor's favor. He was raised to the citizenship of Roma and there lived out his days in ease and comfort,
under the name of Flavius Josephus. Collecting all the facts of
the long struggle of his people against Rome, he wrote The Jewish
War first in Aramaic and then in Greek.

He died at an unrecorded date.

68 Ibid. V, 422, 428.
69 Ibid. I, 3.
CHAPTER II

PRINCIPLES OF CLASSICAL RHETORIC

To evaluate correctly the rhetoric of Josephus, we must begin by examining the standards of rhetorical practice that were accepted by our author and by his secretaries who wrote Greek for him. For the purpose of establishing the principles of ancient rhetoric, I propose to examine the works of authorities, highly regarded by antiquity, whose writings, presumably, were widely accepted. They include Aristotle, Longinus, and Quintilian.

We need not concern ourselves with pre-Aristotelian rhetoricians. Our knowledge of them is fragmentary and doubtful, and they dealt, for the most part, with legal and political oratory. The science of rhetoric began, according to Cicero,¹ who quotes a lost work of Aristotle, in Sicily, when, after the expulsion of the "tyrants" (467 B.C.), citizens, who returned from exile imposed on them by their former rulers, instituted civil suits to regain their confiscated property. In their legal dif-

difficulties, the returned exiles required the assistance of speechwriters. Two of these professionals, namely Corax and Tisias, were so successful that they drew up handbooks giving a set of rules and a system for dealing with problems that were likely to come up in court.

Rhetoric was developed by professional sophists, a jaundiced picture of whom is given by Plato in his *Gorgias* and *Phaedrus*. In the *Gorgias* he calls rhetoricians "artificers of persuasion"; in the *Phaedrus* he refers to rhetoric as a "winning of men's souls by means of words". In the latter dialogue, Plato speaks of words as things of beauty and expresses the rhetorical concept that every discourse should be like a living thing, with body, head and feet of its own, and with all its members adapted to each other and to the whole.

Aristotle's definition of rhetoric is much less ethical and more practical. He calls rhetoric "the power of observing about each thing every possible persuasion." His "Handbook on Rhetoric" is divided into three books, the first two of which are


4 Ibid. 264 C.

concerned with the types of oratory and what to say in order to create a desired impression on the judges. Book III deals specifically with the "how" of discourse: "it is not enough to know what must be said, but it is necessary to know even this: how it must be said."

In regard to style, Aristotle considers its chief merit clarity, for unless words are used in their proper sense, nobody will understand the orator. In addition, the style must be appropriate to the subject, not mean nor too lofty.

The style should be removed from complaces, but that removal should be artfully concealed and done naturally. In prose it is proper to use metaphors, which are common in everyday speech, but they should be suitable to the discourse. If they are used for ornament, the metaphors should be taken from better things in the same class; if they are to be used for censure, they should be taken from worse things in the same class. Metaphors should be well-sounding, plausible and inoffensive to the senses.

Coldness of style is caused by use of compound words, excessive use of uncommon words, use of long, inept and too frequent epithets, and inappropriate metaphors.\textsuperscript{12} The simile is a kind of metaphor, but it is less useful in prose since there is something intrinsically poetic about it.\textsuperscript{13} The very foundation of style is purity, which depends on five rules: (1) the proper use of connectives, (2) the employment of special, not generic terms, (3) the avoidance of ambiguous terms unless the writer deliberately intends the opposite, (4) the keeping of genders distinct, as laid down by Protagoras, and (5) the observance of the proper use of number.\textsuperscript{14}

While Aristotle wrote primarily about spoken orations, he noted that "what is written should be easy to read or easy to speak, which are the same thing."\textsuperscript{15}

To achieve dignity of style, the orator is admonished to use definitions instead of proper names, to use the reverse for

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{12} Ibid. iii, 1, 2, 3, 4.
\item \textsuperscript{13} Ibid. iv, 1, 2.
\item \textsuperscript{14} Ibid. v, 1-6.
\item \textsuperscript{15} Ibid. 6.
\end{itemize}
Illustration by metaphors and similes is recommended providing it avoids the poetical. Use of the plural for the singular, the avoidance of joining one article to several terms, the use of repeated connectives (polysyndeton) and the use of negative epithets to describe anything—all contribute to a dignified style.

Propriety of style depends on its being appropriate to the subject. It is interesting to observe that Aristotle recommends compound words, a number of epithets and foreign words as appropriate to emotional oratory: "for such is the language of emotional, enthusiastic orators, and it is clear that the hearers accept what they say in a sympathetic spirit".

The form of diction, according to Aristotle, must be neither metrical nor entirely without rhythm. For if it is metrical, the attention of the hearers will be distracted from the mean-
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If it is without that rhythm, it is unlimited, whereas it ought to be limited, but not by metre; for that which is unlimited is unpleasant and unknowable. Now all things are limited by number, and the number belonging to the form of diction is rhythm, of which the metres are divisions.

Aristotle distinguishes these rhythms: the heroic, which is too dignified for oratory and lacks the harmony of ordinary conversations; the iambic, which is too ordinary; the trochaic, which is too much like comic dance and trips along; the paean, which he accepts for use at the beginning and end of orations.

Style, Aristotle, believed, must be either continuous and united by connecting particles, or periodic, like the antistrophes of the ancient poets.

By a continuous style I mean that which has no end in itself and only stops when the sense is complete. It is unpleasant because it is endless. . . . By period, I mean mean a sentence that has a beginning and an end in itself and a magnitude that can be easily grasped. What is written in this style is pleasant and easy to learn.

The period must end with the sense and not be cut off abruptly. It may contain only one clause or several clauses.

---

25 Ibid. viii, 1.
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27 Ibid. 4, 5.
28 Ibid. ix, 1.
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period is divided by disjunctives or antitheses. Parisosis prevails when the clauses are equal; paramoiosis is similarity of sound either at the beginning of the sentence (homoeokatarkton) or at the end of the sentence (homoeoteleuton). All these devices may occur in the same complex or periodic sentence.

Having discussed these questions of technique, Aristotle next turned to the system of producing clever and popular maxims. To achieve the desired effect, he recommends the use of metaphors, similes, actualizations and antitheses. Actualization consists of representing inanimate objects in a state of animation. Apophthegms, riddles, paradoxes, jokes, puns, proverbs, hyperbole and the like are all valuable to make a style clever and pleasant.

The remainder of Aristotle's work on rhetoric is devoted to the arrangement of the speech and classification of style. Aristotle himself was keenly aware of the difference between the spoken and the written composition. In the twelfth chapter of Book III of Rhetoric, he wrote:
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But we must not lose sight of the fact that a different style is suitable to each kind of rhetoric. That of written compositions is not the same kind as that of debate; nor in the latter is that of public speaking the same as that of the law courts. But it is necessary to be acquainted with both; for the one requires a knowledge of good Greek, while the other prevents the necessity of keeping silent when we wish to communicate something to others, which happens to those who do not know how to write.

To paraphrase W. Rhys Roberts, this recognition of the written word is remarkable in an age when thoughts were transmitted from mouth to ear rather than from hand to eye.39

In this early statement of the principles of rhetoric, we have at once the culmination of classical Greek rhetoric and a starting point for the ancient writers on the subject who lived after Aristotle. We have the principles set forth in elemental clarity and with a force that has not diminished to the present day. When we apply Aristotle’s precepts to the work of Josephus, we must again remember that the Jewish writer was a stranger to the concepts of Greek rhetoric, and the two secretaries, who he said assisted him, may have lacked some of the inspiration to give his work the rhetorical polish engendered by true inspiration. Nevertheless, we shall see traces of Aristotle’s principles in The Jewish War, and we can appreciate that the writer was aware of what Aristotle wrote.

Turning now to Longinus, we read a writer of rhetoric who, if we accept the chronology advanced by Andrew Lang, was approximately contemporary with Josephus. In Longinus we find an excellent link between the concepts of Aristotle and the fine oratorical development of Quintilian. We find a writer and a thinker who, while not completely original, has a profound experience in the plethora of existing ancient literature, and he has pondered at length the qualities that made one work good and another not good. His discourse, although mainly devoted to oratorical compositions, has application to historical narratives and other forms of prose literature. He is, therefore, a legitimate object of inquiry in this analysis of the rhetoric of Josephus.

Longinus spoke to the world of Josephus—and indeed to our own contemporary world—with the voice of a man who has lived close to the eternal verities of literature. To cite Lang's excellent essay:

He may have suffered, as we suffer, from critics who, of all the world's literature, know only 'the last thing out', and who take that as a standard of the past, to them unfamiliar, and for the hidden future. As we are told that excellence is not of the great past, but of the present, not in the classical masters, but in modern Muscovites, Portugese, or American young women, so the author of the Treatise may have been troubled by Asiatic eloquence, now

---

long forgotten, by names of which not a shadow survives. He, on the other hand, has a right to be heard because he has practiced a long familiarity with what is old and good. His mind has ever been in contact with masterpieces, as the mind of a critic should be, as the mind of a reviewer seldom is, for the reviewer has to hurry up and down inspecting new literary adventures. Not among their experiments will he find a touchstone of excellence, a test of greatness, and that test will seldom be applied to contemporary performances. What is the test, after all, of the Sublime, by which our author means the truly great, the best and most passionate thoughts, nature's most high and rare inspiration, expressed in chosen words? He replies that 'a just judgment of style is the final fruit of long experience. Such has to be travelled in the realms of gold'. \[41\]

Indeed, in his definition of the characteristics of the Sublime, by which he means the highest excellence in literature, Longinus says:

If then, any work, on being repeated submitted to the judgment of an acute and cultivated critic, fails to dispose his mind to lofty ideas; if the thought which is suggested does not extend beyond what is actually expressed; and if, the longer you read it the less you think of it—there can be here no sublimity, when the effect is not sustained beyond the mere act of perusal. But when a passage is pregnant with suggestion, when it is hard, nay impossible to distract the attention from it, and when it takes a strong and lasting hold on the memory, then we may be sure that we have lighted on the true Sublime. In general, we may regard those words as truly noble and sublime which always please and please all readers. For then the same book always produces the same impression on all who read it, whatever be the difference in their respective pursuits, their manner of life, and their aspirations, their ages or their languages.

\[41\] Ibid. xx.
such a harmony of opposites gives irresistible authority to a favorable verdict.\textsuperscript{42}

Longinus lists five principle sources from which sublimity derives. They are: grandeur of thought, a vigorous treatment of the passions, a "certain artifice" in the use of tropes, dignified expression and majesty and elevation of structure.\textsuperscript{43} Grandeur of thought and vigorous treatment of the passions are, of course, not matters of rhetorical treatment; they belong to the natural talents of the writer and are promoted by the proper use of rhetorical figures of speech and thought. Of the acquired faculties rather than the natural endowments, the "certain artifices" and the dignified expression are perhaps the only ones that an ancient or modern writer can consciously add to his technique of writing in order to improve the sublimity of his expression.

The first of these figures of speech which Longinus recommends is the figure of adjuration or apostrophe. The oath must be used at the right time, in the right manner and with the right motive to produce the emphatic effect the writer desires; else it remains nothing more than a simple, ineffective oath. In connection with this thought on the correct employment of figures of thought and speech, Longinus warns against the inept use of these devices.\textsuperscript{44} He points out that "the use of figures has a pe-

\textsuperscript{43} Ibid. XVI, 2.
\textsuperscript{44} Ibid. 1.
cular tendency to rouse suspicion of dishonesty, and to create an impression of treachery, scheming and false reasoning; especially if the person addressed be a judge or a military potentate or any of those who sit in high places."\textsuperscript{45} With these words in mind, we can better understand why Josephus, perhaps, made such limited use of tropes. He was, after all, writing not only to a military despot, but also to the people who had conquered his own people. He could take pains that his apologies for his own people should sound absolutely sincere. While it is possible to explain the comparative lack of tropes in Josephus as a deficiency of rhetorical skill, it can also be understood as an intended avoidance of them in order to create an impression of rugged austerity as regards the truth.

Along with the figure of adjuration or apostrophe, Longinus recommends questions and interrogations as devices for reproducing a moment of passion.\textsuperscript{46} Next, the removal of connecting particles (asyndeton) is suggested to give a lively impression of one who, through distress of mind, at once halts and hurries in his speech.\textsuperscript{47} "But nothing is so conducive to energy as a combination of different figures, when two or three uniting their resources mutually contribute to the vigor, cogency and the beauty

\textsuperscript{45} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{46} Ibid. XVIII.

\textsuperscript{47} Ibid. XIX.
of a speech." On the other hand, use of connectives destroys the untrammeled rush of thought, and Longinus implies that a certain dignity and pace are added.

To produce the effect of violent passion in a literary work Longinus offers the figures of hyperbaton, the transposition of words and thoughts from their usual order for the sake of emphasis; the juxtaposition of different cases; the detail of particulars and the use of climax and contrast; the use of words which, though singular in form, are found to be plural in meaning, and vice versa; the use of the historical present; the use of the dramatic "you"; the interjection of a direct quotation; and finally, the moderate, well-considered use of periphrasis.

One of the monumental statements Longinus makes under the heading of dignified expression is regarding appropriate lan-
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To say that the choice of striking and appropriate words has a marvelous power and an enthralling charm for the reader, that this is the main object of pursuit with all orators and writers, that it is this, and this alone, which causes the works of literature to exhibit the glowing perfections of the finest statues, their grandeur, their beauty, their mellowness, their dignity, their energy, their power, and all their other graces, and that it is this which endows the facts with vocal soul: to say all this would, I fear, be, to the initiated, an impertinence. Indeed, we may say with strict truth that beautiful words are the very light of thought.  

One of the devices used to kindle the "very light of thought" is the metaphor, including the simile, both of which Longinus would have used judiciously.  

Like Aristotle, Longinus fervently recommends fitting passages concerning majestic actions into phraeology that reflects in its metre the grandeur of the thought. For this purpose he points to the dactylic measure as the noblest and most magnificent of all. On the other hand, "nothing so much degrades a style as an effeminate movement in the language, such as is produced by pyrrhics and trochees and dichorees falling in time together into a regular dance measure." Continuing to describe the elements that remove a literary style from sublimity, Longinus draws this
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neat distinction between over-compressed and over-extended phraseology:

To cut your words too short is to prune away their sense, but to be concise is to be direct. On the other hand, we know that a style becomes lifeless by over-extension; I mean by being relaxed to an unreasonable length.61

Longinus concludes the constructive part of his treatise with an admonition not to use words of varying tone in the same passage.62

Before leaving Longinus, it is worthwhile, I believe, to mention the previous passage in which Longinus decides that a literary composition of great sublimity, accompanied by some faults, is to be preferred to a composition that never stumbles, never requires correction. Comparing Demosthenes with Hyperides, Homer with Apollonius and Eratosthenes, Pindar with Bacchylides, and Sophocles with Io of Chios, Longinus avers that not the number, but the loftiness of the author's merits should be the standard of criticism. "He who makes no slips must be satisfied with negative approbation, but he who is sublime commands positive reverence."63 And again: "To sum the whole: whatever is useful or needful lies easily within man's reach; but he keeps his homage for what is astounding."64

61 Ibid. XLII.
62 Ibid. XXXIII.
63 Ibid. XXXVI, 3, 4.
64 Ibid. XXXV, 3, 4.
In such a critical environment did Josephus write. In Longinus we can see a frame of mind that would permit departure from the rhetorical school principles, providing the composition was *per se* excellent. Here was no carping concentration on niceties of style, no intense attention to the devices of literature to the exclusion of the meaning of literature. On the other hand, Longinus recognized that rhetorical devices and figures of thought and speech augmented and enhanced a noble thought. If we measure Josephus by the standard that Longinus furnishes us, we can understand both his deficiencies of rhetoric and his sometimes slavish adherence to the rhetorical rules of the school. Josephus could rely on the grandeur of his narrative—for what narrative could be more sublime than the death struggle of an entire nation? At the same time he felt constrained to follow the example of the great historians of antiquity, such as Herodotus, Polybius, Thucydides and other, attempting to give his composition the smooth polish and elegance the ancient reader of history would expect.

When one reads Quintilian after reading Longinus, one cannot escape the impression that Quintilian is the reverse of the same coin of which Longinus was the obverse. Rhetoric to Longinus was the elegance and grace of a well-composed piece of literature. To Quintilian rhetoric was a practical tool of persuasion that affected men's minds. While Longinus' attitude toward
literary style led to a fine tradition of literary criticism and aesthetic sensitivity, the attitude of Quintilian tended toward more vigorous, useful applications of the art. There is also another important difference: Longinus' approach to the study of rhetoric and literary style was essentially a contemplative one; Quintilian's view of the matter was formed by actual practice in courtrooms and in the forum. This difference may in part account for the detailed description of the technique of oratorical rhetoric which we find in the Institutio Oratoria, compared with the general outlines found in On the Sublime. The former is a handbook prepared to educate the practicing orator; the latter is for the meditative man who sits in his study and evaluates the merit of literary works.

The value of Quintilian in our analysis of the rhetoric of Josephus is that he indicates the rhetorical expectation of the Roman people for whom Josephus was writing. From reading Quintilian, we can imagine more easily what Josephus' readers expected of him; we can guess the currents of rhetorical theory that prevailed when he wrote his works. By a combination of Aristotle, Longinus and Quintilian, we have a fairly complete background to begin our analysis.

Quintilian, despite his enthusiasm for rhetoric, was well aware of the dangers of an over-developed style. On the preface of the XVIII book, he warned that a too great cultivation
of style might serve only to emasculate the subject. 65 Similarly, "maiori animo agredienda eloquentia est, quae si toto corpore valet, unguis polire et capillum reponere non estimabit ad suam curam pertinere." 66 He does, however, praise an ornamented style when used appropriately. 67

Like Aristotle, Quintilian's first rhetorical requisite was clearness, which means in the first place that the orator says what he means so that he is understood without resorting to obscenity, sordid language or the jargon of the streets. 68 Quintilian points out that obscurity results from obsolete words, colloquial and technical language, difficult constructions and combinations of words, short sentences, immoderate use of hyperbaton, long parentheses, ambiguity, verbosity and double meanings. 69

It is not enough that the orator speak clearly, but he must speak with style. Quintilian gives us this definition of style:

igitur, quem Graeci 'phrasin' vocant, Latine dicimus elocutionem. La spectatur verbis aut singulis aut conjunctis.
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In singulis intuendum est ut sint Latina, perspicua, ornata, ad id quod efficere volumus accommodata; in conjun-
tia, ut emendata, ut colocata, ut figurata.

He recognizes Cicero as his authority for what is acceptable in style, namely, that it be appropriate to the subject. An orna-
ted style is not only a useful tool of persuasion but also "nec fortibus modo, sed etiam fulgentibus armis proeliatur". Quintilian defines the ornamental style as follows:

Ornatum id quod perspicuo ac probili plus est. Eius primi sunt gradus in ea quod vellis concipiendo et ex-
primendo, tertius, qui haec nitidiora faciat, quod proprie dixeris cultum.

Ornament in style increases the interest in the subject matter because it makes listening to the oration a pleasure, and also it helps the orator to say more than his words means. But the ornamentation must be "virilis et fortis et sanctus nec effem-
inetem, levitatem et fuco ementitum colorem amet, sanguine et viri-
bus niteat." It must also be appropriate and utilitarian.
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The ornamented style must use euphonius words, 78 onomatopoeia, 79 and must avoid obscene words. 80 Sentences and paragraphs must avoid double entendre and accidental indecent meaning, undignified expressions, meagerness of expression, tautology, monotony of expression, bombast, periphrasis and pleonasm, perverse affectation, faulty use of figures and faulty collocation of words. 81 To heighten a style Quintilian recommends the use of vivid expression, similes, brachylogy, and emphatic expressions where appropriate. 82 To make a style forceful he offers sublimity in exaggerated denunciation, imagination, vigor, repetition of sentiments, bitterness, pungency and a finish that produces a completeness of effect. 83

Four factors, says Quintilian, serve to elevate or depress a subject: amplification, comparison, augmentation, ratiocination and accumulation. 84 Style is also ornamented by the use
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of sententiae or maxims, of which the enthymeme is the best; epiphonema or exclamations attached to a close of a statement; noema or inferred meanings; clausulae or periods. In succeeding chapters we shall see how extensive was Josephus' use of these devices, especially in the digressions he made to describe places and events that had practically no direct bearing on the narrative and in the speeches he attributed to the personae of his history.

Perhaps the greatest value Quintilian's handbook has for us is its listing and description of technical devices, or tropes, common among ancient rhetors. Quintilian defines a trope as an artistic alteration of a word or phrase from its proper meaning to another meaning. As tropes he lists metaphors, including transference from one living thing to another, from one inanimate thing to another, from an inanimate thing to a living thing, and from an animate thing to an inanimate thing; synecdoche, or the description of a whole object by one of its parts or vice versa; metonymy, or the substitution of one name for another; antonomasia, or the substitution of something for its proper name; onomatopoeia; metalepsis (he says it is unimportant since it is
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rarely used);

epithet; allegory; paraphrase, or the use of a number of words to describe a thing that can be described by a single word; hyperbaton; anastrophe, or the reversal of word order; and by perbole, or a "fitting straining of the truth" (decens veri superjectio).

Being a careful professor, Quintilian made a distinction between tropes and figures, a distinction he admitted was not universally recognized in his own time. The word "trope", he said, is applied to the transference of expressions from their natural and principal signification to another; a figure, on the other hand, is when language is given a conformation other than that which is obvious and ordinary.

Even under the category of figures Quintilian makes a further distinction between figures of thought and figures of speech. Figures of thought pertain mainly to the organization of the subject matter into the most emphatic, most effective order. Figures of speech refer only to the devices of expression that
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give additional brilliance to the thought of the orator. Both types of figures, in the opinion of Quintilian, were necessary to deliver a truly telling speech. 97

Briefly the emphatic figures of thought that Quintilian lists are:

Rhetorical Question 98
Communication, or taking the opponent or judge into consultation 99
Anticipation of objection 100
Concession, or leaving some things to the judgement of opponents or jurors 101
Impersonation 102
Apostrophe 103
Vivid Illustration 104
Detailed description 105

He also recommends irony; antiphrasis; apopopsis, or interruption in thought to indicate passion or anger; imitations, compar-
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ions; and extracting hidden meanings from phrases. 106

Among the figures of speech, Quintilian suggested repetition in all its forms as the most emphatic and most artful of the devices, providing, of course, it be used sparingly and appropriately. 107 He suggested parenthetical expressions; 108 beginning a number of clauses with the same word; 109 antithetical comparisons; 110 correspondences between the middle and opening of a colon, between the middle and end, and between the end and the beginning of a colon; 111 repetition of the same word with different meaning; 112 repetition of whole clauses at the beginning and end of a colon; 115 repetition of the same word with different case endings; 113 repetition of small details; 114 repetition of the
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first word of one clause as the last word of the previous clause; correspondence in the beginning of successive sentences; correspondence in the conclusions of several sentences; and pleonasms.

Also for the sake of emphasis, Quintilian suggested grouping together several phrases having the same meaning, under which device he included asyndeton and polysyndeton and gradation, a device which heaps effect on effect, using one statement as a springboard to another (cf. Demosthenes, de Corona, 179).

And finally, in order to achieve subtlety, elegance and a heightened style, Quintilian offered omission of obvious words; apoeugmenon, or the completion of a number of clauses with the same word; paronomasia; antanaklasia; parison;
Thus, briefly, does Quintilian list and describe the technique of stylistic ornamentation. He is obviously drawing from the Greek rhetors and sophists as well as from that fountainhead of Roman oratorical principle, Cicero. And just as obviously does Quintilian appear ready to discard all the principles of rhetoric when they do not apply aptly to the situation at hand. It can only be imagined whether or not Josephus read Quintilian's work. But he and his secretaries, whoever they were, were keenly aware of the same rhetorical principle and practice that Quintilian expounded. Even a casual reading of The Jewish War reveals evidence that it was organized and written on a school model for a history (a point which need not concern us here); it is only logical to assume, therefore, that a writer who was so much influenced.
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by the school, who was so derivative in his method of organization, would be just as influenced and just as derivative in his method of expression.

In this chapter we have tried to discern the rhetorical atmosphere in which Josephus wrote. In succeeding chapters we shall proceed to the main work of this study, namely, to analyse The Jewish War in terms of rhetorical principles and techniques we have seen expressed by Aristotle, Longinus and Quintilian. But before we turn to that task, we must first glance at the modern equivalent of the rhetoric we have been considering. In so doing we can evaluate Josephus by a double standard; his own and ours.
CHAPTER III
PRINCIPLES OF MODERN RHETORIC

In the last chapter we have seen how the principles of rhetoric, starting as techniques of oratorical persuasion, also became devices of literary polish and embellishment. In the time between antiquity and the present day the principles first articulated by Aristotle and then confirmed by such professors as Longinus and Quintilian have been modified only by the temper of the age and by the medium to which they are applied. For with the extension of the modes of communication the channels through which the mind of men was reached has changed in an important manner. And that change had a profound effect on the application of rhetoric, namely, the continual attrition of the art until only a bare skeletal framework remains on which modern writers can hang their compositions.

In antiquity literature was designed to be heard. The ear was able to detect the rhythm and metre of words in a way impossible for the eye—unless it is a well-trained eye. In such a situation the techniques of rhetoric, in addition to carrying persuasion, also gave beauty, variety and interest to the language. Tropes could be easily recognized by their sound, and the elegance
of the tropes lent sublimity to the entire composition. The organization of the material of the composition and the selection of details were then, as now, functions of the intellect of the man writing the composition; the use of language was a function of his acquired skill in making his thoughts as psychologically impressive as possible. For the ancient writer, particularly one who composed for persuasion, had only one opportunity to convey his ideas to his audience and to mold the minds of his hearers to the pattern he desired. He was therefore compelled to make each word a telling one, each sentence an impressive one. Naturally, this circumstance developed an effective rhetorical style.

But the invention of the printing press, in the fifteenth century, engendered two phenomena that changed the ancient situation. In the first place, an increasing number of people learned to read and the eye assumed the burden of education which the ear had previously carried for most people. When that happened, the sound of words became less important in relation to their meanings. Only in courts, in assemblies and in political campaign oratory was the art of rhetoric of great importance. In literature meant for entertainment or for information, the meaning of the thought overshadowed the sound of the words in which it was expressed. In such cases where literary polish was desired, the writers harkened back, indeed, to the old rhetorical principles, but the effect seemed artificial and in many cases pompous, as in the instance of Edward Gibbon's *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman*
Empire, whose notoriously rolling periods often obscure the thought the author hoped to convey.

Not every principle of rhetoric, however, was entirely eclipsed in the advent of the written word over the spoken word. Unity and coherence of argument remained desirable in every composition; lucidity of language and emphatic statement are still ideals cherished by modern writers. But these ambitions are also attainable by untutored authors, inspired by the importance of what they want to say.

In the second place, even when more people were able to read, fewer people were educated. Whatever their relations, the invention of the printing press, political democracy and mass education occurred in rapid historical succession. The phenomenon of mass education and its consequences are perhaps best expressed by the English historian, Arnold Toynbee:

When universal education was first inaugurated, it was greeted by the liberal opinion of the day as a triumph of justice and enlightenment which might be expected to usher in a new era of happiness and well-being for mankind. But these expectations can now be seen to have left out of account the presence of several stumbling blocks on this broad road to the millenium, and in this matter, as so often happens, it has been the unforeseen factors that have proved the most important.

One stumbling block has been the inevitable impoverishment in the results of education when the process is made available for "the masses" at the cost of being divorced from its traditional cultural background. The good intentions of Democracy have no magic power to perform the miracle of loaves and fishes. Our massed produced intellectual pabulum lacks savour and vitamins. A second stumbling block has been the utilitarian spirit in which the fruits of
education are apt to be turned to account when they are brought within the reach of everybody. Under a social regime in which education is confined to those who have either and inherited right to it as a social privilege or have proved a right to it by their exceptional gifts of industry and intelligence, education is either a pearl cast before swine or else a pearl of great price which the finder buys at the cost of all he has. In neither case is it a means to an end: an instrument of worldly ambition or of frivolous amusement. The possibility of turning education to account as a means of amusement of the masses—and of profit for enterprising persons by whom the amusement is purveyed—has arisen since the introduction of universal elementary education; and this new possibility has conjured up a third stumbling block which is the greatest of all. The bread of universal education is no sooner cast upon the waters than a shoal of sharks arises from the depths and devours the children's bread under the educator's eyes. In the educational history of England the dates speak for themselves. The edifice of universal elementary education was, roughly speaking, completed by Forster's Act in 1870; and the Yellow Press was invented some twenty years later—as soon, that is, as the first generation of children from the national schools had acquired sufficient purchasing power—by a stroke of irresponsible genius which had divined that the educational philanthropist's labour of love could be made to yield a royal profit to the press lord. 1

Part of the savour and vitamins lacking in the "impoverished intellectual pabulum" is undoubtedly an appreciation of elegant rhetoric. In the mad chase for frivolous amusement, which often means the same as lurid fact, the first impediment cast by the wayside for the sake of lightness is the kind of sublimity that Longinus considered so important. In the billions of words

published in newspapers in the United States and abroad one could search vainly for any evidence of rhetorical brilliance, and if it be found at all, it will be found in that section of the newspaper read least frequently, namely, the editorial opinion columns. Even in magazines and books rhetorical amplification is kept to a minimum, not only because space costs money, but also because readers no longer appreciate it.

The status of rhetoric in the modern world is not completely dark. We still have inspirational oratory, some political oratory and an occasional popular writer, such as Toynbee himself, who achieves both wide circulation and a lofty style. In addition, we have a kind of persuasive writing peculiar to our own culture, a writing which utilizes some of the techniques of rhetoric even though its practitioners seldom acknowledge their debt. With the advent of radio we have experienced a partial return to communication through the ear, and the spoken "commercial message" which pays for radio and television entertainment, in its most effective form employs some of the principles of ancient rhetoric. The "commercial message" must persuade to accomplish its purpose. It must of necessity use the language devices that achieve persuasion.

Such, then, has been the fate of rhetoric since antiquity. If we were to compare the narrative of Josephus with that of a comparable modern writer, such as U.S. Grant or Dwight D. Eisenhower, we might find that Josephus made much greater use of
rhetoric than did our contemporary warriors. But we must remember that Josephus wrote his history not to inform his own people of what happened, but to justify himself and his people to their conquerors. This difference of purpose makes it unnecessary for Eisenhower, for example, to take anything but a charitable attitude toward his allies and his enemies alike. In recounting the events of his command, Eisenhower can assume the existence of a universal attitude of approval and acclamation. In relating the events of the Jewish war, Josephus was faced with an almost universal hostility. Eisenhower has no need for the persuasion that Josephus hoped to accomplish.

Nevertheless, Eisenhower, as any modern writer, used certain present-day principles of rhetoric, impoverished and skeletal as they are. He (or his "ghost-writers", if he used any) employed inescapable techniques of composition that are generally taught in modern schools as conducive to the ideals of good writing. These techniques, some of which are as much inherent in subject matter today as they were when Josephus wrote, are not peculiar to this age or to the English language. In their essential nature they are universal and timeless.

The first of these principles of rhetoric, to which contemporary writers usually subscribe is that the composition must be a unity. To cite a modern textbook on rhetoric:

It (the law of unity) forbids, for example, to write about television and abolishing restrictions on voting in the
The principle of unity is, of course, as self-evident in modern prose as in ancient literature. But where there are devices commonly used in ancient literature, as we shall see when we analyse Josephus' work for unity, the effect is achieved in modern literature mostly by selection of subject-matter and details. This selection in a narrative must conform to Aristotle's dictum that a "whole" is constructed with a beginning, middle and end. The series of actions must constitute a complete occurrence, when taken in their entirety. An action that does not relate to the entire episode in some way is therefore irrelevant and must be excluded from the series.

The reason for the modern insistence upon unity depends on the ideal of creating a single, desired impression, as well as on the avoidance of confusion.²

To create a single impression the writer must limit himself to a single hero (which happened to be the entire Jewish people for Josephus), a single time period and a single attitude.

---


³ Ibid. 30, 31.
Obviously, a writer cannot feel pride and contempt toward the same object at the same time. But such limitations can only exclude the irrelevant. The choice of details must be significant to the outcome or illustrative of the writer's feeling toward the subject and they must follow some pattern that leads logically to the outcome. Josephus often referred to events far from the immediate history of his people, but only when such events led to an important change in his narrative. He also referred to incidents or events that may have been concomitant with the events but not necessarily affecting them; in such cases the incidents serve to foster an emotional attitude he hoped would be created toward the event itself. As we shall see, Josephus was not above interpolating irrelevant data into his history, but these digressions were linked to the main course of his history. If we conclude that Josephus stretched the meaning of the ideal of unity, we shall also find that he had sufficient reason.

The second principle of rhetoric taught in modern schools is that a composition must be coherent, that is, it should "hang together". The parts of the composition "must be made to follow one another naturally and logically, and their relations to each other and to the whole of which they are parts must be made clear."4

4 Ibid. 32.
The problem of achieving this ideal in modern composition is primarily one of ordering the subject matter after it has been thoughtfully selected. This ordering is primarily a function of organizing the argument and is seldom carried over into style. In ancient composition, however, elements of a most diverse nature could be incorporated into a narrative by means of connecting sentences as well as connecting or "middle" thoughts. This cement, so to speak, of coherence, present in ancient composition, is generally lacking in good modern composition, which relies almost completely on the coherent effect obtained by the author's having his subject well-organized in his mind.

There are several modern formulae for obtaining coherence, some of which are of venerable antiquity. One of them is the "deductive order". In the technique of the deductive order the author states his objective at the beginning of his composition and adduces evidence to support his thesis. We shall see that Josephus used this method in *The Jewish War*; and almost every journalist who writes a news story for a newspaper uses the same method today. The method forces the writer to think out his objective with definiteness before he begins to write . . . it makes the composition particularly clear, particularly easy to grasp. The

5 Ibid. 34.
reader is immediately set at rest as to what the author is aiming at, and henceforward he has only to give his attention comfortably to details. It contributes greatly to emphasis by bringing into relief at the beginning of the composition its most important contents.

It should be remarked that the deductive method also allows a reader to note briefly the theme of the composition and disregard the details. Thus, a modern newspaper reader can keep himself au courant with events by reading only the headlines.

A second method of achieving coherence, which is widely employed in modern composition, is the "inductive order", the reverse of the previously discussed method. By the inductive order the author keeps his object concealed until the very end of his composition, after he has presented the evidence. Thus, he builds suspense, stimulates curiosity and delivers his point with a special force constructed by the weight of his arguments. In modern life we find the inductive method used most frequently in nominating speeches for candidates, special exhortatory essays, short stories and advertising copy.

Other patterns of organization of subject matter sometimes used in modern compositions are such mechanical methods as chronological sequence; "least to the greatest", according to which the author presents arguments of varying weight in order to

6 Ibid.
7 Ibid. 38.
build suspense and accomplish a pleasant forward motion in his thought; "agreeable to disagreeable"; "easy to hard", in order to bring the reader to a difficult subject without frightening him by its formidable character.\textsuperscript{8}

Although modern writers are generally loathe to use the stylistic devices which ancient writers employed to link the elements of their composition, connectives are frequently used by modern writers. There are, in addition to such expressions as "and", "furthermore", "moreover", "then", "however", "nevertheless" and the like, grammatical devices such as relative clauses, parallel constructions and as many of the rhetorical tricks as can be adapted from classical languages which are found to emphasise the natural coherence of the subject.

A third principle of modern rhetoric, and of ancient rhetoric too, is that the important thoughts of a composition be emphasised so that they stand out in the minds of the readers. In a highly inflected classical language, the problem was, in the very first instance, solved easily by placing the important words in the sentence at the very first position in the sentence. In modern English, with its rigid sentence order, this technique is generally not applicable, although certain skilled writers are able to emphasise words effectively within the grammatical limit-

\textsuperscript{8} Ibid. 39. cf. Dale Carnegie.
The emphasis of ideas in modern composition is not materially different from that in ancient compositions. It is primarily derived from the ability of the author to form a conception of his projected work clearly and definitely in his own mind before he starts to write. Speaking of forensic, George P. Baker stated the case thus:

Good emphasis, which is indispensable in correct argumentation, has largely been prepared for by keen brief-drawing. The whole analytical process of separating what is essential in a case from what is extraneous is a study of emphasis by selection; and when a student, in preparing his brief, considers whether an idea should be made a heading or a subheading, and how he must arrange his ideas in order to obtain climax, he again studies emphasis, for what is given a main position or is placed as final in climax is emphasised.

The position, which Professor Baker mentioned, is one of the most important aids to emphasis in modern composition, as it was in ancient composition. Psychologically, readers seem to remember most clearly what has been placed at the beginning of a work, or what is placed in climax. To place an important element at the beginning of a work an author may use a device called hysteron proteron (or in medias res), which has been successfully employed from the Iliad to any of the stories in the so-called "confession" magazines available on newsstands today.

Another common means of emphatic statement is through iteration. Sometimes the repetition is of a word, sometimes of a question or phrase, such as that cloying message, "Lucky Strike makes finer cigarettes! Yes, Lucky Strike makes finer cigarettes." But more often—and more adeptly—the iteration takes repetition of the same idea in a different form, with varied phraseology and new connotations. A corollary of the method of iteration is the method of increased proportion, that is, of keeping the idea before the mind of the reader for a longer period of time "by explaining it, by going more and more into detail with it, by illustrating or contrasting ideas." 10

Still another means of emphasis is to allude directly to the value of the idea with such pointed phrases as "This is the important point . . ." and the like. Modern writers, utilizing the advantages of varying type face—and even different colors of printing ink—can attain some of the emphasis the orator builds by inflection of his voice. But the practice is discouraged by printers who thereby force authors to construct their effects intellectually rather than mechanically.

And finally, emphasis is achieved by such strictly rhetorical techniques as heightened style, metaphor, simile, metonomy, epigrams and characterization. Even though the skilled use of

10 Thomas, Manchester, Scott, Composition for College Students, 49.
heightened style has become rather rare in modern prose, we still find some stirring examples of it in public oratory. Perhaps the most famous metaphor in modern oratory was the stirring admonition of William Jennings Bryan at the close of the Democratic national convention in 1896: "... we shall answer their demand for a gold standard by saying to them: You shall not press down upon the brow of labor this crown of thorns: you shall not crucify mankind upon a cross of gold." Nor have there been many public speeches that have equalled the following statement by Disraeli for truly adroit characterization simply by the use of rhetorical style:

I would put this issue to an English jury—which do you believe most likely to enter into an insane convention, a body of English gentlemen, honored by the favor and confidence of their fellow-subjects, managing your affairs for five years, I hope with prudence and not altogether without success, or a sophisticated rhetorician, inebriated with the exuberance of his own verbosity, and gifted with an egotistical imagination that can at all times command an interminable and inconsistent series of arguments to malign an opponent and glorify himself.  

It can hardly be denied that Disraeli's point, in the above citation, was emphatically taken, and it was probably well remembered by his audience.

The fourth principle of modern rhetoric is that the composition should be interesting. Here again we have a principle that applied in ancient rhetoric as well, a principle that at

first seems self-evident. But as self-evident as it seems, the principle nevertheless depends on a most elusive factor, the absence of which makes the difference between a critically acceptable piece of rhetoric and one that is not. That factor is style, which, in turn, depends on the writer's manipulation of the literary devices at his disposal. As Professor Baker puts it:

Style ... is really 'a thinking out into language', the visible expression of the inner thought. To be what it should, a style must express the thought clearly, not merely for the speaker, but for the audience addressed; and it must phrase the thought not as anyone might phrase it, but so that it reveals the speaker's individuality. Style depends, then, primarily upon thought; secondly on imagination, which produces in the speaker sympathetic understanding of conditions, events and emotions treated, and chooses the right word to reproduce the idea or emotion, not merely for the thinker but for his audience, and finally on an agreeable, accurate, copious and responsive vocabulary.12

The first requisite of an interesting composition is that it be clear, both to the writer and to the reader, for an obscurely written composition will hold the attention of nobody. This requirement means, first, that the subject be well-defined and brightly illuminated in the writer's mind before he starts writing it. Second, the subject must be expressed in concrete terms that have easy reference to data in the reader's experience. William A. Orchard, copy editor of Batten, Barton, Durstine and Osborne, one of the largest and most successful advertising agencies in the

12 Ibid. 369.
country, offers this advice to beginning copywriters:

Steer clear of the pompous word, the high-sounding phrase. If you mean "dandruff", don't say "intolerable scalp conditions". If you mean "cracked plaster", don't talk of "household blemishes". . . . Anybody who writes copy for a living knows that the concrete, specific word is basic to copywriting . . . . the academic atmosphere has encouraged (the) use of big words . . . . The man with the higher education is apt to suggest words like "gratuitous" for "free". He'll say "inefficacious" for "useless" and "interrogate" for "ask". He'll come up with "endeavor" for "try", "termination" for "end", "facilitate" for "help".13

A concrete, clear style alone does not produce interest in the composition. Examples, illustrations, illustrative digressions, comparison, contrasts and an appropriate amount of detail—all contribute to the interest a writer can build for what he has to say. " . . . an exposition without it (this kind of material) is like a house without windows, dark and cold, unattractive, comfortless."14

With respect to the factors that make a composition interesting, ancient rhetoric differs in no way from modern rhetoric. If the techniques are different, the ideals are the same. If the tempo of modern civilization no longer has the patience to enjoy the niceties of style that adorned ancient compositions, we can nevertheless appreciate the lack of them in our "streamlined"

14 Thomas, Manchester, Scott, Composition for College Students, 53.
To summarize: we have noted the essential difference between modern literary composition and that which prevailed in antiquity. We have alluded to the differences in the modes of communication as having had a decisive bearing on the development of style, and we have suggested that mass education has had an effect on the appreciation of rhetorical luster.

We pointed out that in modern rhetorical practice there are four cardinal principles that also have validity when applied to literary works which were admired in antiquity. They are: the principles of unity, of coherence, of emphasis and of interest.

While the foregoing discussion of ancient and modern rhetoric does not begin to explore the subject, it does serve to establish certain universal principles by which we may analyze Josephus' *The Jewish War*. And it is to this task we now turn.
CHAPTER IV

UNITY IN THE JEWISH WAR

The first demand of composition, ancient and modern is that the material presented to the reader or listener be a unified whole. Experience has demonstrated that the human mind can focus on only one idea at a time; to present more than one idea for consideration is to diminish the effect of all. However, in an historical narrative many ideas, many descriptions, many narratives and many personalities must be presented. The task of the historian, therefore, becomes one of assembling his material in such a way that there seem to be an essential unity, even if one does not in fact exist. This essential unity may be teleological, as it is found, most recently, in the Study of History by Arnold Toynbee, where the goal of events which are described explains and justifies the events themselves; or it may be dialectical, as it is found in the histories of Hegel and the materialism of Marx, where the struggle of opposing forces comprises the central theme of social progress; or it may be social, as it is found in The Jewish War, where the central people to whom the events happen forms the nexus of the narrative.
There is, of course, a very real unity in any history. The causal relationship of one event to another serves to hold the entire composition together. Such a relationship, however, depends on the interpretation of the historian; what may seem to one historian to be a causal relationship may seem to another to be nothing more than a coincidence. Nevertheless, it is characteristic of men to find causality in events, some of which occur antecedently in time and space to others.

Josephus, following the example of Thucydides, opens his history with a statement of his identity, his feelings in the matter of the Jewish war and his purpose:

I have no intention of rivalling those who extol the Roman power by exaggerating the deeds of my compatriots. I shall faithfully recount the actions of both combatants; but in my reflections on the events, I cannot conceal my private sentiments nor refuse to give my personal sympathies scope to bewail my country's misfortune. 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.¹

The above quotation and the one that precedes it:

They (other historians) desire to represent the Romans as a great nation, and yet they continually deprecate and disparage the actions of the Jews.²

¹ Josephus, Bellum Judaicum, I, 9-10.
² Ibid. 7.
Having set up his purpose in the proemium, Josephus goes on to prove his argument in the narrative, which continues for seven books. At the end of the seventh book, he concludes with a courtesy to accepted rhetorical style. His epilogue is brief, formal and factual:

Here we close this history, which we promised to relate with perfect accuracy for the information of those who wish to learn how this war was waged by the Romans against the Jews. Of its style, my readers must be left to judge; but as concerning truth, I would not hesitate boldly to assert that throughout the entire narrative, this has been my single aim.

As an entire work, therefore, we must conclude that The Jewish War has not only essential unity, but also a formal unity in terms of classical practice. But in the course of the narrative, Josephus makes use of orations, after the practice of Herodotus, Thucydides and other classical historians. Some of these orations certainly reflect the practices of the rhetorical schools of his time. However, we don't fail to recognize the similarity between his orations and other orations in antiquity. This does not mean to say that Josephus arbitrarily inserted school orations in his text for the sake of rhetorical polish.

---

3 Ibid. VI, 454, 455.
He did it for the purpose of graphically and interestingly informing his readers of the events and of the reasons for the events from different points of view. While the orations are of a school-type and might be expected to follow slavishly the school doctrine as to form and unity, that is to say, the triple division of proemium, argument, and epilogue, our author used some liberty in composing them. Each oration does not follow a set pattern, but deviates from the rhetorical formalism of structure in order to gain the impression the author desired. Thus, in Herod's indictment of his son, Antipater, before Varus, we have an exordium, or proemium:

That you, Varus, and every honest judge will condemn Antipater as an abandoned criminal, I am fully persuaded. What I fear is that my fate may also appear hateful to you and that you may judge me deserving of every calamity for having begotten such sons. And yet you ought rather to pity me for having been the most devoted of fathers to such abominable wretches.

Then follows the argument, which, instead of being a point by point statement of the case, as would be expected in a judicial or forensic speech, is an impassioned recital of all the benefits that Herod had conferred on Antipater and the poor response the latter had made for such favors. He concluded with an epilogue,

---

5 Publius Quintilius Varus, legatus of Syria, 6 - 4 B.C.
6 Josephus, Bellum Judaicum, I, 622.
however, that maintains the formal unity of the speech, even if the intrinsic unity is somewhat abridged. Herod says in summation:

When I recall, Varus, his knavery and hypocrisy on each occasion, I can scarcely believe I am alive and marvel how I escaped so deep a schemer. But some evil genius is bent on desolating my house and raising up against me one after another of those who are nearest to my heart. I may weep over my unjust destiny; I may groan in spirit over my forlorn state, but no one shall escape who thirsts for my blood, no, not even though conviction should extend to all my children.7

As though realizing the impassioned nature of this speech, Josephus says that Herod signaled to Nicolas, one of his friends, to give the evidence.8 But before he could proceed, Antipater, the accused, cried out this neatly formed proemium:

You, father, have made my defense yourself. For, how could I be a parricide, I who, as you admit, have ever served as your protector? You call my filial piety imposture and hypocrisy. How could I, cunning in all else, have been so senseless as not to perceive that, while it was difficult to conceal from man the concoction of so atrocious a crime, it was impossible to hide it from the Judge in heaven, who sees all, who is present everywhere?9

Then he continues to refute his father's accusations, arguing that the same events that brought utility to his father brought condemnation to himself. Insofar as we could expect a son to be

7 Ibid., 628
8 Ibid., 629
9 Ibid., 630
distraught by the terrible accusation leveled against him by his father, we might expect him to leave off the epilogue, which is indeed missing from this speech, and conclude with a pathetic, convincing demand for death if the defendant is in fact a parricide.

The formal unity of Josephus' oratorical composition is perhaps better illustrated in the speeches designed to persuade the reason, either for waging war or for concluding a peace, to exhort the esprit de corps of troops, or to drive to suicide. In these cases, Josephus is following the time-tested example of such orators and historians as Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Herodian, Dion Cassius, Thucydides and Demosthenes. For example, in the oration of Vespasian to his troops, the general begins his proemium with a maxim:

You have slain myriads of Jews, but yourself have paid but a trifling contribution to the deity. As it is a mark of vulgarity to be over-elated by success, so it is unmanly to be downcast in adversity; for the transition from one to the other is rapid, and the best soldier is he who merits good fortune with sobriety, to the end that he may remain cheerful when contending with reverses. 10

The remainder of the statement adds evidence to underwrite the truth of the maxim by what has recently transpired when the Jews nearly wiped out his army by drawing them into a trap in the

10 Ibid. IV, 42.
center of the town of Gamala. 11

Titus also begins an oration to exhort his troops with a maxim:

Fellow soldiers, to deliver an oration inciting to enterprises involving no risk is to cast a direct slur on the persons addressed, while it assuredly convicts him who delivers it of unmanliness. Exhortation, in my opinion, is needed only for hazardous affairs; since in other circumstances men may be expected to act of their own accord. That the scaling of this wall is arduous, I, therefore, myself grant you at the outset; but that to contend with difficulties is best becoming to those who aspire to heroism, that it is glorious to die with renown, and that the gallantry of those who lead the way will not go unrewarded--on these points I would now dwell. 12

Titus continues to amplify this theme, describing at some length the difficulties of the Jews who fight from desperation, the disgrace of allowing the Jews to defeat the Romans, the glory of a hero's death, and briefly on the rewards in store for the valorous, both surviving and fallen.

Josephus uses an exclamation in the proemium of an ardent speech delivered by Ananus, the high priest, against the party of the zealots.

Well would it have been for me to die before seeing the house of God laden with such abominations and its unapproachable and hallowed places crowded with the feet of murderers. 13

11 Ibid. 43 - 49.
12 Ibid. VI, 34 - 37.
13 Ibid. IV, 163.
after which he lists the misdeeds of the zealots.

Enthymemes are also used, as in the speech delivered by Jesus, the high priest, to the Idumaeans for the purpose of dissuading them from helping the party of the zealots:

Among the many and manifold disorders which this city has witnessed, nothing has astonished me more than the decree of fortune by which even the most unexpected things cooperate to aid the wicked. Here, for instance, are you, come to assist those most abandoned of men against us, with such alacrity as was hardly to be looked upon even had the mother city summoned you to meet a barbarian invasion. Had I seen your ranks composed of men like those who invited you, I should not have thought such ardor unreasonable; for nothing unites men's affections as congeniality of characters. 14

It should be noticed that in this instance Josephus cleverly incorporated two maxims at the same time that he uses an enthymeme. One maxim introduces the enthymeme; the other explains it. The three figures form a very telling proemium to the argument in which Jesus explains the nature of the zealots, refutes the charges that have been leveled against his own party and describes the three courses of action open to the Idumaeans.

Another example of the use of the enthymeme in the proemium to unify the entire oration is found in the speech of Agrippa when he tried to dissuade the Jews from going to war with the Romans:

14 Ibid. 238/9.
If I saw you all eager for war with the Romans, instead of seeing that the most honest and single-minded members of the community are determined to preserve the peace, I should not have presented myself before you, nor ventured to offer advice: for any speech in support of the right policy is thrown away when the audience unanimously favors the worse.\(^\text{15}\)

The rest of the orations in *The Jewish War* lack exordia, some because they were delivered before battles and were intended to focus the mind of the listener on the subject matter as quickly as possible, some because they related to speeches which had already been made and which therefore acted in place of exordia.

But the simple presence or absence of a proemium or exordium does not in itself establish or destroy the unity of an oration. Having stated his purpose for making the speech—having erected the framework of the oratorical structure he is about to complete—the orator must use his material so that in fact, as well as in spirit, he works toward a single goal. How Josephus does this is perhaps best demonstrated by the reasoned, unimpassioned speech of King Agrippa, cited above, when he tried to avert the Jewish war. In this speech Josephus unifies and summarizes the argument in an enthymeme:

If your object (in going to war) is to have revenge for injustice, what good is it to extol liberty. If, on the other hand, it is servitude you find intolerable, to complain of your rulers is superfluous. Were they the

\(^{15}\) Ibid. II, 345.
most considerate of men, your complaint against them would be equally disgraceful.16

Having described the motives, Agrippa then takes them up one at a time, refuting each in its turn, and by each refutation, his own arguments are confirmed:

Consider these arguments apart and how weak, on other grounds, are your reasons for going to war; and the first of the charges against the procurators. The powers that be should be conciliated by flattery, not irritated.17

And secondly:

Passing to your present passion for liberty, I say that it comes too late. The time is past when you ought to have striven never to lose it. For servitude is a painful experience and a struggle to avoid it once for all is just; but the man who having accepted the yoke then tries to cast it off is a contumacious slave, not a lover of liberty.18

Passing from refutation to positive statement, Agrippa next points out that even people who have cherished liberty, such as the Athenians, Macedonians, and the barbarians of the northwest, have had to bow to the Romans because they lacked the power to cope with the organized military might of the legions.19 And the Jews, he continues, are in a peculiar position where, lacking native military ability (sic), lacking powerful allies and lacking

16 Ibid. 349.
17 Ibid. 350.
18 Ibid. 355.
19 Ibid. 358 - 387.
accumulated resources, even their God was on the side of the Romans who must have had divine assistance to build such a powerful empire.20

The other speeches composed by Josephus for his historical characters might be similarly analysed to demonstrate the rather tight logical unity of his argument. But I believe his technique and his ability are adequately shown without a more extended discussion of other speeches.

We can turn now to the third classic division of a unified oratorical composition, namely, the epilogue. Ideally, the epilogue does more than sum up: it is a call to action, to act on the conviction the orator hopes he has persuaded in the mind of his listener. That Josephus was also a master of this technique is indicated from the following examples:

(concluding an exhortation to his disconsolate army, Herod says:)

Let us each go into action not to defend wife or children or country at stake, but to avenge our envoys. They will conduct the campaign better than we who are alive. I myself will bear the brunt of the battle, if I have you obedient at my back; for, be assured, your courage is irresistible, if you do not by some reckless action bring injury upon yourself.21

(King Agrippa, in the speech cited above, concludes:)

20 Ibid. 396.
21 Ibid. 379.
Take pity, then, if not on your children and your wives, at least on your mother city and its sacred precincts. Spare the Temple and preserve for yourself the sanctuary of the holy places; for the Romans, once masters of these, will refrain their hands no more, seeing that their forbearance in the past met only with ingratitude. As for me, I call your sanctuary and God's holy angels and our common country to witness, that I have kept back nothing which could conduce to your preservation; as to you; if you decide correctly, you will enjoy the blessings of peace. 22

(Vespasian, in the speech cited above, concludes:)

... for so will you avenge the dead and punish those who slew them. For my part, it shall be my endeavor, as in this so in every engagement, to face the enemy at your head and to be the last to retire. 23

(likewise Ananus, in the speech cited above, ends with:)

Only let us face them and their doom is sealed. And, if the venture has its attendant risks, it were a noble end to die at the sacred portals and to sacrifice our lives if not for our wives and children, yet for God and for the sanctuary. But I will support you both with head and with hand. ... 24

(and Josephus himself, in a long, scholarly speech calculated to encourage the Jews to surrender the city of Jerusalem to the Romans, finishes in this vein:)

Oh, iron hearted men, fling away your weapons, take compassion on your country even now tottering to its fall. ... I know that I have a mother, a wife, a not ignoble family, and an ancient and illustrious house involved in these perils; and maybe you think that it is on their

22 Ibid. 400.
23 Ibid. IV, 47 - 49.
24 Ibid. 190 - 192.
account that my advice is offered. Slay them, take my blood as the price of your own salvation. I too am prepared to die, if my death will lead to your learning wisdom. 25

I have purposely chosen these five epilogues to give evidence, in passing, of a somewhat disappointing lack of originality of which Josephus is guilty. Apparently the doctrine of his rhetorical instructor was that a proper epilogue consisted of two things: one, an exhortation by the orator; the other, a statement by the orator that he was willing to accept sacrifice for the common weal or that he would be the leader in the battle. This is the only way I can account for the uniformity of the epilogues.

One more remarkable epilogue should be cited for its use of enthymemes to sum up an argument. The speech, beginning in Book III, colon 362, in which Josephus discusses the problem of suicide, echoes the formulae of the schools—a discussion of which formulae has no place here. The epilogue, however, is a masterpiece of succinct, dramatic statement.

We shall do well, then, comrades, to listen to reason and not to add to our human calamities the crime of impiety toward our creator. If our lives are offered to us, let us live: there is nothing dishonorable in accepting this offer from those who have had so many proofs of our valor; if they think fit to kill us, death at the hands of the conquerer is honorable. But, for my part, I shall never pass over to the enemy's

25 Ibid. V, 416 - 419.
ranks, to prove a traitor to myself; I should indeed be far more senseless than deserters who go over to the enemy for safety, whereas I should be going to destruction—my own destruction. I pray, however, that the Romans may prove faithless; if after pledging their word, they put me to death, I shall die content, for I shall carry with me consolation, better than victory, that their triumph has been sullied by perjury.26

It seems pitiful to me that the author of such a noble, honorable thought behaved so treacherously in fact. Here again we have the dual ideas in the epilogue— that the trapped soldiers should surrender rather than commit suicide, and that he himself, their leader, would never defect to the Romans.

From the evidence presented above, it is clear that Josephus followed traditional classical doctrine concerning the unity of written and spoken compositions. In the overall pattern of the work, he has a proemium, a narrative body and an epilogue. In the orations which he put into the mouths of his historical characters, he likewise clings to the pattern, for the most part, of proemium, argument and epilogue, although some orations, delivered under impassioned circumstances, may lack one of these three parts in its usual form.

In addition to the formal rhetorical unity of the work, Josephus' history also has an essential unity derived from the singleness of the nation whose war he was describing and from the

26 Ibid. III, 379 - 382.
singleness of purpose for which the work was written.

Having sufficiently, it seems to me, described, albeit briefly, the unity with which Josephus informed not only the broad pattern of the War, but also the orations contained in his narrative, we can now turn our attention to the problem of coherence—how Josephus attached one part to another to form the unified, organic entity.
CHAPTER V

COHERENCE IN THE JEWISH WAR

Like the problem of unity, the problem of coherence in a historical narrative is at the same time simple and difficult of solution. On the one hand, the problem does not actually exist for the writer because of the essential coherence that results from the relation of the events of the history. On the other hand, a history is more than the narration of a simple series of events. Its effectiveness requires the introduction of a great deal of collateral material--information as to customs, laws, morals, manners and background of the central characters. The reader's sustained interest demands that some human material be injected into the narrative. To rely on essential coherence of a historical narrative would reduce it to a cold recital of dull, hard facts, set forth in more or less chronological order; yet to include a large variety of interesting material requires the use of several rhetorical techniques to achieve a coherent whole, whereby all parts of the narrative hang together.

Josephus' solution of the problem of coherence was not always facile or adept. As we shall see, a certain clumsy
construction of transitions is most apparent where the material attached to the main stream of the narrative is most remote. So we are introduced to a discussion of the so-called philosophical sects of the Jews by means of an allusion to Judas of Galilee.\(^1\) Although this particular Judas\(^2\) is a significant figure in the history, as we learn from the New Testament,\(^3\) he is dismissed at this point with a mere statement that he founded a sect that was different from the principle Jewish sects, which Josephus proceeds to describe.

Another apparently gauche interjection of interesting, but non-essential information occurs in the speech of Agrippa. The orator, beginning his figure with a paraleipsis, describes the military and naval strength required to police a once savage area. The strength is not important to the speech, and the information, coming at this point, does not contribute to the effectiveness of the speech.

Constructively, Josephus makes use of previously mentioned personalities and places in order to convey a sense of continuity and coherence in his narrative. Introducing a new military operation in the siege of Jerusalem, he writes:

---

2 Another is mentioned in II, 56, son of Ezechias.
3 *Acts V*, 37.
At this period a certain Menahem, son of Judas, surnamed the Galilaean—the redoubtable doctor who in the old days, under Quirinius, had upbraided the Jews for recognizing the Romans as masters when they already had God—took his intimate friends off with him to Masada...

And then in the last book of the work, describing the attack on the last Jewish fortress, Josephus writes:

This fortress was called Masada; and the Sicarii (sic) who had occupied it had at their head a man of influence named Eleazer. He was descended from the Judas, who, as we have previously stated, induced multitudes of Jews to refuse to enroll themselves when Quirinius was sent as censor to Judaea.

In at least two-instances, we may detect a very subtle psychological device which Josephus uses to force coherence of his narrative in the mind of his reader. He suggests reflection of past events and the possible course of future events, thus abstracting the principle of the action and giving his readers a pattern to which they can fit the narrative. In each case, it is interesting to note that the Greek verb he uses has the stem νό:

Тαστα τις ἢννοσον εἰρήσει τον μὲν θεὸν ἄνθρωπων ἐνδόμενον.

Anyone reflecting on these things would find that God cherished mankind.

5 Josephus, Bellum Judaicum, II, 433.
6 Ibid. VII, 253.
7 Ibid. VI, 310.
"You think," he said, "Vespasian, that you have taken only an important prisoner in the person of Josephus, but I have come to you as a harbinger of more important things."

In addition to these structural devices to achieve coherence, Josephus makes full use of phrases that relate a new element to the element just finished. This technique is, of course, very obvious, but it serves the author's reason for inserting the new element and performs as a middle term between the old and the new. The following examples are typical.

8 Θν καταστροφῆν Ἀξιόν ἀφηγήσασθαι. 9

9 The story of their downfall is worth relating, and will show how great was the decline from their father's good fortune.

10 Αξίον δὲ ἀντιθεται τὸν κιν Εὐαρεστοῦ τῆς Σπαρτᾶτης. 10

10 As a contrast to the conduct of this Spartan may fitly be mentioned that of Euarestus of Cos.

11 Αξίον δὲ μνημής ἡγούμην κατ' τὸ τῆς γυναικος αὐτοῦ βλαφής ὑπάρχ. 11

11 I think mention may also be fitly made of the dream of his wife Glaphyra.

8 Ibid. III, 400.
9 Ibid. I, 69.
10 Ibid. I, 532.
11 Ibid. II, 114.
On this occasion one Jew who made his mark deserves record and remembrance.

It is impossible adequately to describe the multitude of these spectacles and their magnificence under every conceivable aspect.

In other places Josephus works for coherence by announcing at the beginning of the episode what he is going to tell and why. In the first instance cited below, he utilizes paraleipsis to make the transitional term more emphatic. (Notice the suggestion of obligation in the language.)

But why tell of the shameless resort to inanimate articles of food induced by the famine, seeing that I am here about to describe an act unparalleled in the history, whether of Greeks or barbarians, and as horrible to relate as it is incredible to hear!

Of these a brief account must be given in order to render my narrative of subsequent events more intelligible.

12 Ibid. III, 229.
13 Ibid. VII, 132.
14 Ibid. VI, 199-201.
15 Ibid. VII, 42.
In order to close each episode, particularly those in which military events were described or in which many people were killed, Josephus simply tabulates the losses to one side or the other and sometimes to both. He varies this technique occasionally by merely recording the date on which the event occurred. This device serves to establish boundary stones between one element and the next and relates each element to the entire time continuum during which the events transpired or to the entire body of people to whom the events befell. In each case, the device unifies the episode and relates the episode to the entire narrative. The following examples will indicate the technique.

\[\text{Iou\dasson \mu\nu \delta\nu \nupe\roj\nuan \rho\uupsilon\iota \kappa\alpha \delta\iota\sigma\chi\varepsilon\lambda\iota\omicron}\]

Twelve thousand Jews perished, but of the Romans there were very few dead, but many injured.

\[\text{Tostou \mu\nu \ek\epsilon\epsilon\nu\nu\iota \tau\iota \nu\nu\rho\alpha\chi\kappa\varepsilon\mu\varsigma \tau\iota \tau\epsilon\omicron\varsigma, \\ap\epsilon\theta\a\nu\omicron \delta\ \sigma\nu \tau\omicron\sigma \epsilon\mu\beta \pi\tau\iota \nu\pi\varsigma \pi\lambda\epsilon\\lambda\omega\varsigma \kappa\rho\omicron\sigma\tau\epsilon\omicron\nu \nu\epsilon\sigma\omicron\delta\sigma\iota\omicron\nu \epsilon\pi\tau\alpha\mu\nu\sigma\varsigma\iota\omicron\omicron\iota\nu.}^{17}\]

Such was the end of the naval battle. The dead, including those who fell in the previous defense of the town, numbered six thousand, seven hundred.

---

16 Ibid. I, 151.
17 Ibid. III, 531.
Méritos kai diáxeloi twn eugewv neów ou'tos kai fáshénasan. 18

Thus died twelve thousand noble youths.

Kai to méν ἐν χερσεν ἀβτόν διαφθαρέν μέριοι πεντα-
κιοχελιοι, το δὲ ριασθεν ἀφηθεν εἰς τὸν Ἰορδάνην
πλῆθος ἐκουσάς ἀπειρον ἤν, ἐλάσων δὲ περὶ διαχιλτοὺς
καὶ διακοσσόνς, λέγα τε παμπλήθες ὅνων τε καὶ προβατών
καὶ καρπήν καὶ βοῶν. 19

Fifteen thousand perished by the hands of the enemy,
while the number of those who were driven to fling them-
sewes into the Jordan of their own accord was incalculable;
about two thousand two hundred were captured together
with vast spoils of asses, sheep, camels and oxen.

Not a few of them (the Romans) fell and many were wounded,
but of those from Jotapata only six men died, but more
than three hundred wounded were brought back to town.

The slain, whether in the city or in the previous ac-
tion, amounted in all to fifteen thousand; the captives
numbered two thousand one hundred thirty. This disaster
befell the Gaalilaeans on the twenty-fifth of the month
of Daesius.

18 Ibid. IV, 333.
19 Ibid. 435.
20 Ibid. III, 281.
21 Ibid. 306.
They were captured on the eighth of the month of Gorpiaeus. (September 26, 67)

Thus, on the twenty-third day of the month of Hyperberetaeus, Gamala was taken, after a revolt which began on the twenty-fourth of Gorpiaeus. (November 10 and October 12, 67)

The Romans, having thus on the fifteenth day (of the stige), being in the seventh of the month of Artemisius, became masters of the first wall, razed a large part of it along with the northern quarter of the city, previously destroyed by Cestius. May 25, 70)

These events took place on the third of the month of Panemus. (July 22, 70)

Thus was Jerusalem taken in the second year of the reign of Vespasian on the eighth of the month of Gorpiaeus. (September 26, 70)

22 Ibid. 542.
23 Ibid. IV, 83.
24 Ibid. V, 302.
25 Ibid. VI, 67.
26 Ibid. 435.
Thus the war brought a quick decision for Moesia.

A frequently used device to conclude an episode while binding all the parts of it together is the demonstrative pronoun ὁιοστος, referring to what was described in the preceding text. The following instances are typical.

ἔνα μὲν δὴ τῶν Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ Ἀριστοβουλοῦ φονέων τοιούτων περιέρχεται.

Such was the single finish of the murderers of Alexander and Aristobolus.

καὶ τὰ μὲν περὶ Ἀρδην κοιοστον ἔσχεν περος. 29

And such was the end for Herod.

καὶ μὲν δὴ περὶ Σοδομίτην μυθευομένα τοιατήν ἔχει πεστὶν ἀπὸ τῆς οφέως. 30

The myths about Sodom receive such credence from visible evidence.

καὶ τὰ μὲν Ἰουδασειν τότε τοιατήν ἐἰχε κατοστασιν. 31

And the affairs of the Jews were then in this condition.

27 Ibid. VII, 95.
28 Ibid. I, 581.
29 Ibid. 673.
30 Ibid. IV, 485.
31 Ibid. VII, 318.
And such was the catastrophe that overtook the Samaritans.

Such was the force of the catapult.

Occasionally Josephus used \( \omega \upsilon \tau \omega \varsigma \), as we have seen in VII, 95, supra, and sometimes \( \dot{o} \tau \tau \varepsilon \) in order to effect a succinct, yet effectively cohesive summary.

And thus punishment for Alexander and Aristobolus overcame him.

The effects of their frenzy were thus felt throughout all Judaea.

Jotapata was thus very strongly held.

Such was the nature of the place.

32 Ibid. III, 315.
33 Ibid. 246.
34 Ibid. I, 531.
36 Ibid. III, 160.
37 Ibid. 521.
In this fashion was the temple constructed.

Thus did he (Phasel) die.

Thus all Galilee was conquered, preparing the Romans, with much exercise, for Jerusalem.

In some of the citations, above, Josephus includes the particle οὖν. In at least three instances, this particle carries the entire weight of summary.

Thus he (Herod) corrected them (his wills) with these corrections.

Thus Joppa was taken by the Romans a second time.

After the state of the Romans received Vespasian thusly, it immediately bestowed great honors on him.

---

38 Ibid. VII, 432.
40 Ibid. IV, 120.
41 Ibid. I, 646.
42 Ibid. III, 428.
43 Ibid. VII, 74.
From the evidence adduced above, we can see that Josephus was well aware of the problem of relating one part of his narrative to the other. He attempted to solve the problem on the one hand by structural cross-references that reinforced the natural, essential coherence of any historical account, and, on the other, by asking the reader on at least two occasions to review the events already familiar to him. Josephus also had recourse to devices of language, so ready at hand in Greek, that linked one episode in his story to the next and that, in summarizing a preceding episode, bound it together and indicated its position in the entire story. While he indeed incorporated many and diverse elements in his narrative, Josephus never gave the impression that there is really extraneous or irrelevant material in the story, despite the somewhat tenuous link he may have been forced to use.

No mention has been made of Josephus' employment of connectives to effect coherence, nor of adverbs, such as ἐπείκια τότε, and the like. These are natural concomitants of the Greek language, and it can be seen from the examples presented above that our author made easy, fluent use of them to build a coherent narrative.

Thus, using the devices of language and rhetoric that were at hand, plus some structural management of his narrative, Josephus solved the problem of coherence, in terms of both ancient and modern rhetoric. We must therefore judge his history to be as
coherent and unified as all elements of the work are adequately linked, one to the other, and as the work offers a single object for the attention of the reader and strives, despite a large diversity of material, for a single emotional effect.

But a unified, coherent narrative does not always gain the attention of the reader. The narrative must, above all, be interesting. Let us now see how Josephus made *The Jewish War* interesting.
CHAPTER VI

THE PROBLEM OF INTEREST IN THE JEWISH WAR

In changing a history from a simple, raw chronicle of events into a readable narrative that will give pleasure, instruction and possibly inspiration to the reader, the historian must display whatever ability he has as a literary craftsman. Almost anyone can tell a story; it may be a unified, coherent narrative that relates a series of events tending toward a dominant conclusion, or it may be a verbal potpourri that rambles over a number of happenings that seem significant to the mind of the author, as, for example, the bedtime "story" told by a small child. If it is the former, its unity and coherence, without any conscious effort to promote interest, will make a certain demand on the attention of the audience or reader because of the interest inherent in the events related. But that interest is of a transient nature.

It has become a truism that "there is nothing so dull as yesterday's newspaper" (except to a student of history). In a child's "story", however, the personalized narration of events will hold his audience's enrapt attention and may be repeated by them for several days—even until the child is old enough to put a stop to it.
From these two examples we can understand that whatever of personal expression the historian inserts into his narrative determines the lasting interest it will win from his audience. If the historian is dull, unable to perceive the dramatic value of events, his narrative must perforce be dull; if he is unable to express what he sees in language that voices the movement or serenity of the event, his narrative will be monotonous. If he cannot write concretely and vividly, his narrative will be obscure and difficult to read or hear. Conversely, if he can command language so that he varies his treatment of events; if he writes concretely and vividly; if he writes with a self-conscious artistry, he cannot help but evoke the lasting interest of his readers. He will inject into his work the difference between a photograph and a portrait, one being an unimaginative reproduction of what was seen, the other a reproduction plus the personal reaction of the author, giving the work an ever-fresh interpretation.

One cannot read more than a few paragraphs of *The Jewish War* before it is apparent that Josephus was no mere annalist. While he wrote of a subject that had a vital interest to Jews and Christians alike, he embellished his narrative with such literary artistry that his account of the war is of universal interest. Although his artistry is never of the very highest order, it is considerable and such as to suggest the influence which his contemporary critical opinion may have exercised on him.
That Josephus recognized the literary excellence of other authors—or that he remembered well the lessons of the schools of rhetoric—is indicated by his frequent use of models from Homer, Greek poetry, Vergil and the Greek historians Thucydides, Xenophon, and Herodotus. The similarity of the domestic troubles of Herod (I, 431 ff.) to a Greek drama has already been remarked by Thackeray. But in addition to these models, Josephus successfully used devices of his own, some of which were conventional, others of which engendered his own innate literary craftsmanship.

One of the most successful devices he used to create interest—and indeed the best device any author can use—was vivid description. How he used it, with what creative imagination and verve can be demonstrated by the following examples, which remain vivid even after translation:

Some of the incidents of that night will give an idea of the power of this engine. One of the men standing on the wall beside Josephus had his head carried away by the stone, and his skull was shot, as from a sling, to a distance of three furlongs; a woman with child was struck on the belly just as she was leaving her house at day-break, and the babe in her womb was flung to half a furlong away. So mighty was the force of these stone projectors. More alarming even than the engines was their whirring drone, more frightful than the missiles the crash. Then there was the thud of the dead falling one after another from the wall. Fearful shrieks of the women within the town mingled with the moans of the dying victims without. The whole surrounding area


2 Ibid.
in front of the fighting line ran with blood, and the piles of corpses formed a path to the summit of the wall. The echo from the mountains around added to the horrible din; in short nothing that can terrify ear or eye was wanting on that dreadful night.  

There was great slaughter on either side, and the bodies and armor of the fallen were trampled down and crushed by the combatants. And always, in whichever direction rolled the veering tide of war, were heard the cheers of the victors, the wailings of the routed. Room for flight there was none, nor for pursuit; dubious turns of the scale and shifting position were the sole incidents in the confused contest. Those in front had either to kill or be killed, there being no retreat; for those in rear of either army pressed their comrades forward, leaving no intervening space between the combatants.

The impetuosity of the legionaries, when they joined the fray, neither exhortation nor threat could restrain; passion was for all the only leader. Crushed together about the entrances, many were trampled down by their comrades; many stumbling on the still hot and smouldering ruins of the porticoes, suffered the fate of the vanquished. As they drew nearer to the sanctuary, they pretended not even to hear Caesar's orders and shouted to those in front of them to throw in the firebrands. The insurgents, for their part, were not powerless to help; on all sides was carnage and flight. Most of the slain were civilians, weak and unarmed people, each butchered where he was caught. Around the altar a pile of corpses was accumulating; down the steps of the sanctuary flowed a stream of blood, and the bodies of the victims killed above went sliding to the bottom.

The city, being on all sides beset by these battling conspirators and their rabble, between them the people, like some huge carcass, was torn in pieces. Old men and women in their helplessness prayed for the coming

---

3 *Josephus, Bellum Judaicum*, III, 245-251.
of the Romans and eagerly looked for the external war to liberate them from their internal miseries. Loyal citizens, for their part, were in dire despondency and alarm, having no opportunity for planning any change of policy, no hope of coming to terms or of flight, if they had a will; for watch was kept everywhere, and the brigand chiefs, divided on all else, put to death as their common enemies any in favour of peace with the Romans or suspected of an intention to desert, and were unanimous only in slaughtering those deserving of deliverance. The shouts of the combatants rang incessantly by day and night, but more harrowing were the mourners' terrified lamentations. Their calamities provided, indeed, perpetual cause for grief, but consternation locked their wailings within their breasts, and while fear suppressed all outward emotion, they were tortured with stifled groans. No regard for the living was any longer paid by their relations, no thought was taken of the burial of the dead--negligences due to personal despair; for those who took no part in sedition lost interest in everything, momentarily expecting certain destruction. The rival parties, meanwhile, were at grips, trampling over the dead bodies that were piled upon each other, the frenzy inhaled from the corpses at their feet increasing their savagery; and ever inventing some new instrument of mutual destruction and unsparingly putting every plan into practice, they left untried no method of outrage or brutality.

Josephus is equally vivid, if not so imaginative in his descriptions of regions, personalities and sects.

Galilee, with its two divisions known as Upper and Lower Galilee, is enveloped by Phoenicia and Syria. Its western frontiers are the outlying territory of Ptolemais and Carmel, a mountain once belonging to Galilee and not to Tyre; adjacent to Carmel is Gaba, the "city of Cavalry", so called from the cavalry who, on their discharge from King Herod, settled in this town. On the south the country is bounded by Samaria and the territory of Scythopolis up the waters of Jordan; and on the east by the territory of Hippose, Gadar, and Gaulanitis, the

6 Ibid. V, 27-36.
frontier-line of Agrippa’s kingdom; on the north Tyre and its dependent district mark its limits. Lower Galilee extends in length from Tiberias to Chabulon, which is not far from Ptolemais on the coast; in breadth, from a village in the Great Plain called Xaloth to Bersabe. At this point begins Upper Galilee, which extends in breadth to the village of Baca, the frontier of Tyrian territory; in length, it reaches from the village of Thella, near the Jordan, to Meroth.

Within the palace once grew a plant of rue, of an amazing size; indeed, in height and thickness no fig tree surpassed it. Tradition said that it lasted from the times of Herod; and it would probably have continued for ages, had it not been cut down by the Jews who took possession of the place. In the ravine which encloses the town on the north, there is a place called Baaras, which produces a root bearing the same name. Flame-coloured and towards evening emitting a brilliant light, it eludes the grasp of persons who approach it with the intention of plucking it, as it shrinks up and can only be made to stand still by pouring on it certain secretions of the human body. Yet even then to touch it is fatal unless one succeeds in carrying off the root itself, suspended from the hand. Another innocuous mode of capturing it is as follows: they dig all around it, leaving but a minute portion of the root covered; they then tie a dog to it, and the animal rushing to follow the person who tied him easily pulls it up, but instantly dies—a vicarious victim, as it were, for him who intended to remove the plant, since after this none need fear to handle it. With all these attendant risks, it possesses one virtue for which it is prized; for the so-called demons—in other words, the spirits of wicked men which enter the living and kill them unless aid is forthcoming—are promptly expelled by this root, if merely applied to the patients. In this same region flow hot springs, in taste differing widely from each other, some being bitter, while others have no lack of sweetness. Many springs of cold water also gush up, nor are these confined to the low-lying ground where all are on one level; but—what is still more remarkable—hard by may be seen a cave of no great depth and screened by a projecting rock, above which protrude—as it were—two breasts, a little distance apart, one yielding cold water, and the other

7 Ibid. III, 35-40.
extremely hot. These, when mixed, provide a most delightful bath, possessing general medicinal properties, but particularly restorative to the sinews. 

There are also sulphur and alum mines in the district.

While Josephus was thus directing affairs in Galilee, there appeared on the scene an intriguer, a native of Gischala, named John, son of Levi, the most unscrupulous and crafty of all who have ever gained notoriety by such infamous means. Poor at the opening of his career, his penury had for long thwarted his malicious designs; a ready liar and clever in obtaining credit for his lies, he made a merit of deceit and practiced it upon his most intimate friends; while affecting humanity, the prospect of lucre made him the most sanguinary of men; always full of high ambitions, his hopes were fed on the basest of knaveries. For he was a brigand who at the outset practiced his trade alone, but afterwards found for his daring deeds accomplices, whose numbers, small at first, grew with his success. He was, moreover, careful never to take into partnership anyone likely to befall an easy prey to an assailant, but selected good, strapping fellows, with stout hearts and military experience. He ended by mustering a band of four hundred men, for the most part fugitives from the region of Tyre and the villages of that neighborhood. With their help he plundered the whole of Galilee and harried the masses, whose minds were already distracted by the impending war.

The Essenes have a reputation for cultivating peculiar sanctity. Of Jewish birth, they show a greater attachment to each other than do the other sects. They shun pleasure as a vice and regard temperance and control of the passions as a special virtue. Marriage they disdain, but they adopt other men's children, while yet pliable and docile, and teach them and regard them as their own kin, according to their own principles. They do not, indeed, on principle condemn wedlock and propagation thereby of the race, but they wish to protect themselves against women's wantonness, being persuaded that none of the sex keeps her plighted troth to one man.

8 Ibid. VII, 178-189.
9 Ibid. III, 35-40.
10 Ibid. II, 120-121.
A valuable device making for clear, concrete expression and hence for interest in a narrative is comparison, or simile. Josephus uses similes and metaphors richly and appropriately. To explain an idea that may be unfamiliar to his readers or to enrich his description, he may draw from six main categories of situations that were likely to be familiar to the ancient reader. He usually introduces these comparisons with such words as: ὁπερ, ὡς, οἷα, ὅτι, ἐκεῖν, παραπλήσιος, ἐστιν, ἔστι, ἢδεν, εἰκάζειν, ὅροιος, κ.τ.λ.

The following examples will indicate his use of comparisons and the categories from which they are drawn.

**FROM THE HUMAN BODY, MEDICINE AND THE LIKE**

ἐν γαρ ταῖς βασιλείσσας ὁπερ ἐν μεγάλοις φόραιν δεὶ τὸ μέρος φλεγμαίνειν ὑπὸ τοῦ μέρους, ὁπερ ἀποκοπεῖν μὲν οὐ δύναται, θεραπεῖν δὲ προστερον.**11

For in some kingdoms, as in corpulent individuals, there is always some member becoming inflamed from the weight which it supported; yet what was needed was not amputation but some milder method of cure.

κατεστραμένων δὲ καὶ τοστῶν ὁπερ ἐν νοσοῦντι σώματι καλὸν ἐτερον μέρος ἐφελγαίνειν.**12

No sooner were these disorders reduced than the inflammation, as in a sick man's body, broke out in another part.

---

11 Ibid. I, 507.
12 Ibid. II, 264.
... on the contrary, as though they had been born with weapons in their hands, they never have a truce from training, never wait for emergencies to arise.

καὶ καθάπερ ἐνε σφυρατὴ πάση τῆς φωλαγγίας ἰουδαίων ἀνωθέντες ἡνή τοῦ πείχους ἐπεραίνον, 14

... with its united mass, like one solid body, they pushed the Jews before them and were even now mounting the ramparts.

Πανταχόθεν δὲ τῆς πόλεως πολέμουμενης ὑπὸ τῶν ἐπιρουσῶν καὶ συγκλονῶν μέσος ὅ δῆμος ὦσμερ μεγα σώρα διεσχαράσετο. 15

The city now being on all sides beset by these battling conspirators and their rabble, between them the people, like some huge carcass, was torn in pieces.

μετέχεις ὡς ἄν χρῆ ἀπὸ τῆς ἐνδέκας περισυμενοι καὶ ὤσμερ δηρωπαίοτες . . .

For they arrived swollen with hunger, like persons afflicted with dropsy . . .

οὐχέτι γὰρ ἐἶναι νεμεσθαί, καθάπερ δὲ συμπερικοτες αὐθεὶς ὥς τὰς χρεῖας εξηγοῦν. 17

For they no longer let them graze, but went forth on their errands clinging to them as though man and beast were by nature inseparable.

13 Ibid. III, 72.
14 Ibid. 270.
15 Ibid. V, 27.
16 Ibid. 549.
17 Ibid. VI, 155.
You held, be it granted, Nero's indolence in contempt, and like fractures or ruptures, remained for a time malignantly quiescent, only to show your true character on the outbreak of a more serious malady.

The madness of the Sicarii further attacked, like a disease, the cities around Cyrene.

FROM PUBLIC AND PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS

... then hearing of the situation in Judaea, he snatched what seemed a heaven-sent opportunity.

... emanating from the finest ether, these souls become entangled, as it were, in the prison-house of the body ...

... they wallowed in the city as though it were a brothel, and polluted the whole of it with their impure deeds.

18 Ibid. 337.
19 Ibid. VII, 437.
20 Ibid. I, 127
21 Ibid. II, 154.
22 Ibid. IV, 562.
so that in possession of all conveniences it seemed a town...

... discharging the Jews upon them as though from out a prison...

... like a lenient master of a household, punishing the incorrigible and preserving the rest for myself.

They were unable to fight the Romans on equal terms, since they were, so to speak, in a prison.

But now the entire nation had been shut up by fate as though in a prison . . .
The whole city, moreover, was filled like a temple with garlands and incense.

FROM NATURE

This accusation struck Herod like a thunderbolt.

... thought of the sacred ties of nature and the constancy of affection which she instills even into the beasts.

... like the circling of a wild beast, always turning toward its tormentor.

Nothing is more redoubtable than despair, and their impetuosity, deprived of an objective, will be extinguished, like fire for lack of fuel.

... the topography is like a camel, whence it is named.
We witnessed even this; when as from a herd of dumb cattle, one prize victim after another was dragged to the slaughter.

And turning to meet the lash, even as the beast may be seen to turn, ward off those that smite you?

... they fell upon and butchered the people as though they had been a herd of unclean animals.

... and rushed, like the most savage of beasts, upon the blade.

... and like a raving animal, deprived of other food, at length preyed upon its own flesh.

... their rush seemed like that of wild animals.

35 Ibid. IV, 170.
36 Ibid. 174.
37 Ibid. 326.
38 Ibid. 425.
39 Ibid. V, 4.
40 Ibid. 85.
There is, in fact, established a law, as supreme among the beasts as among men: yield to the stronger... 

... like dogs they maul the carcass of the people...

... and like the untameable reptiles, you spat your venom on those who caressed you.

... just as a forest can be seen to be completely stripped in the wake of locusts...

... like the wounded of the beasts when they do not catch their tormentors.

FROM THE THEATER AND ATHLETICS

... therefore, he trained his soldiers like athletes for the fray.

41 Ibid. V, 367.
42 Ibid. 526.
43 Ibid. VI, 336.
44 Ibid. IV, 536.
46 Ibid. 91.
As in a theater they were eager to make a hazardous display of their arms and might.

They sat behind walls as spectators of good and expedient operations.

At any rate, dragging their reluctant victim from the country, they dressed up for his assumed part like on the stage.

It was like a battle on the stage.

---

47 Ibid. IV, 368. (cf. 336.)
48 Ibid. V, 73.
49 Ibid. 513.
50 Ibid. IV, 156.
51 Ibid. VI, 146.
52 Ibid. I, 448.
Herod, drugged by these calumnies, recalled his son by Doris, Antipater, to serve as a bulwark against his other sons, and began to honor him in every way.

καὶ πυκνάζοντες ὁσπέρ φαλαγγά ταῖς ναῦσι ἐκαλυπτοῦντο ...

... and closing up the ships one to the other like a phalanx.

καὶ οὐκέτι ἦν δοῦλων μόνων οὕτως ληστῶν στρατὸς, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐπιρρήτων οὐκ ἄλλην ὑπὸ πρὸς βασιλέα πεθαρχὲς. 

... and no longer was it an army of only slaves and brigands, but of many freemen, disciplined as to a king.

FROM NAVAL AFFAIRS

τοσοῦτον ὁσπέρ τελευταία θυέλλα χείρασομένους τοὺς νεανίσκους ἐπεράτισεν.

This was, as it were, the final hurricane that submerged the tempest-tossed youths.

ἐὰν ἐτι ἐν ὥρμῳ τῷ σκάφῳ, προσκεπτεσθαί τὸν μελλόντα χεῖρων μηδε ἐς μέσας ταῖς θυέλλαις ἀπολουμένους ἀναχθῆναι.

... while the ship is still in port, to foresee the approaching storm and not put out in the midst of a hurricane to meet your doom.

ὥσπερ βαπτιζομένης νεὰς ἀπενηχόντο.

... they deserted (their city) as swimmers abandon a sinking ship.

53 Ibid. III, 469.
54 Ibid. IV, 510.
55 Ibid. I, 535.
56 Ibid. II, 396.
57 Ibid. 556.
... nor to desert his friends nor to leap into the storm from the ship on which he had embarked in a calm.

... as I consider the pilot most cowardly, who, fearing a storm, deliberately sinks his ship before the storm.

In addition to concrete a vivid expression, aptly illustrated, Josephus ornamented his language with most of the tropes at the disposal of the ancient author. At the same time that our author was making the expression of his narrative more interesting to his readers, he was also making it more emphatic. For by the ornamentation of certain terms, he was simultaneously lending emphasis to those terms. Therefore, an analysis of the technique of embellishing expression must also be an analysis of the technique of forceful, emphatic expression.

Following are some of the figures that Josephus used to make his narrative more interesting to read or hear.

**CYCLICAL EXPRESSION**

By Caesar he was beloved after Agrippa, by Agrippa after Caesar.

58 Ibid. III, 195.
59 Ibid. 368
60 Ibid. I, 400.
I will now open my narrative with the events named at the beginning of the foregoing summary.

... καθαρεί το σώμα της ψυχής ἀλλοτρίων, οὕτως καὶ τὴν χειρὰ τοῦ σώματος. 62

... as the body was unnaturally (severed) from the soul, so the hand should be separated from the body.

καὶ ἀπὸ μὲν τῶν ζῶντων ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀνηρίμενους, ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν νεκρῶν ἐπὶ τοὺς ζῶντας τὰς ὀργὰς μετέφερον. 63

... they shifted their fury from the living to the slain, and from the dead to the living.

καὶ φέρει βασάνον ἀμηνή τας τοῦ λῃστρίχου πυρὸς δαμάνος ἀναφέρουσα. 64

And the memory of it is harrowing, recalling as it does the ravages of the brigand’s fire.

καὶ ἐπιέεστο σφήκε τὴν μὲν πολὺν αὐτῇ, τὸν δὲ ναὸν τῇ πολεῖ. 65

And he caused the city to be saved for himself, and the temple for the city.

δ' ὅπο Σέρμωνος γυμνὸς πρὸς Ἰωάννην ἀνεπέμπετο, 66 καὶ τὸν δὲ Ἰωάννου σεσυλημένον δ Σέρμων μετελάβανεν.

One who had been fleeced by Simon was passed on to John, and he who had been plundered by John was taken over by Simon.

61 Ibid. 30.
62 Ibid. III, 379.
63 Ibid. IV, 384.
64 Ibid. V, 182.
65 Ibid. 334.
66 Ibid. 440.
PERIPHRASIS*

ὅπερ ἔχειν τα βατά (I, 383.)
οὗ ὑφ' ἀληφ πάντεσ (II, 365, cf. II, 380.)
ἡ ἐκπεινωσ δεξιάν (II, 380.)
ἐπιδώσω τὴν ἐραυνόσ ψυχήν (II, 201.)
οὐ διαφεδυνταὶ τὸν μέγαν ὀφθαλμὸν αὐτοῦ κατ' τὴν ἀνάχητον δεξιάν. (I, 378, cf. III, 473.)

ANTITHESIS IN THE SAME COLA

WITHOUT PARANOMASIA

τελος ἀεὶ τὸν κακον αὖθες ἀρχή (II, 440, cf. VI, 9; VI, 403; I, 105.)
δακροὶ πρὸς θέρσοι (III, 523; V, 178; I, 8;)
γυμνήτες διασταὶ (III, 477.)
ἔπετε πρὸς πέγοις (III, 15, cf. III, 477.)
ἔμαυτες νεκροὶ (IV, 384.)
ἐν κακοῖς διαθύν (V, 2, cf. VII, 270.)
τῷ κόμφῳ λιμῷ (V, 521, cf. IV, 464; V, 549.)
tοῖς κοιναῖς ταὶ ᾠδαὶ (IV, 226.)
ἀλλαφυλοῦ . . . οἴκεσος (IV, 275.)
γηραῖος ὁν νεανικάτερον (I, 52, cf. IV, 133.)
ἀλθραῖος φανεράτερον (II, 625.)

*Because of the plethora of material and because translation does not explain the significance in the analysis of the following Greek language tropes, references will be given immediately after the citation and translation will be omitted. Unless otherwise indicated all references are to Josephus' Bellum Judaicum.
πολέμιος ἀντὶ φελῶν (I, 202.)

ἀντὶ κηδεμόνας δεσπότης καὶ βασιλέως τυφάννος (I, 202.)

όνομα βασιλέως ἔχων ἔρημος ἐξουσίας (I, 209.)

ὅπερ μὴ ῥεπορώναν καθορισμένοι (III, 241, cf. I, 354.)

λόγῳ ἔργα (V, 457, cf. VII, 323.)

μιᾶ τοῦ Φίλοσοφοῦ καθημερινάς (I, 622, cf. I, 596.)

ἐξομήν . . . ἕνδον (V, 211, cf. II, 85; V, 98; V, 28.)

τοῦ δὲ τῶν ὀκλησμῶν σφαλερὸς τὸ μετὰ ἱσυχίας κατάφθωμα (IV, 372)

ἐρωτική ψυχή ἐν λεπτῷ σώματι (VI, 55.)

διαφέρει διαφέρει διαφόρως (VII, 419.)

τοῦ παθεῖν τὸ διαθεῖναι (V, 513.)

ἑαλωμένων νεκρικάστων (VI, 352.)

πρὸς ἱλαν ἐκουσίας (II, 264.)

προκείμενα εὐπορίηθε (V, 127.)

τὸ παρὸν πτάσθαι ἐς τὸ μέλλον (V, 127, cf. V, 66.)

ANTITHESIS IN THE SAME COLA

WITH PARANOMASIA

προτροπῇ τοῦ δισταρεῖν (VI, 37.)

εὐποροὶ διστάροι (II, 427.)

ἐκθεροφτεὶς ἀθυμεῖν (VI, 393.)

ἐπειρέως ἑπειροῦ (II, 47.)

φανέρως ἑφανεῖν (V, 497.)

ἀνατευγὸς ἀναγάγεται (I, 59.)
αναστικοί αἰτίοι (V, 104, cf. V, 355; IV, 543.)
κατ᾽ ἀλλοφυλίαν τοὺς πρὸς δρομόους (IV, 16.)
δία δύναμες προδρόμων (I, 612.)
oi ῥή καθορμένοι εἰς τοὺς καθορμένους (III, 286.)
στρατηγοῦσμενοι πρὸς ἀστρατηγήτους (III, 477.)

ANTITHESIS NOT IN THE SAME COLA

WITHOUT PARANOASIA

ἄλλοφυλος . . . οἶκεος (II, 472, cf. V, 643; V, 15; V, 18;)

φανέρας . . . λαθραία (IV, 331, cf. I, 350; III, I; I, 589; I, 287; I 263; II, 351; III, 474;)

θέλοντες . . . δυνάμενοι (VI, 89.)

ἐν χερσαίν . . . εἰς τα μέλλοντα (I, 483, cf. VI, 127; VI, 190;

πανταχὸς . . . οδόμος (I, 65.)

to πλεῖοτον . . . ἐν δλίγῃ (VI, 144, cf. VI, 128.)

κρεπττῶν . . . μίταθαι (I, 57, cf. I, 382.)

οτέσις . . . δύνα (V, 444.)

κολακεδείν . . . ρίσης (I, 542.)

εὖνοι . . . ἔχθος (III, 410.)

οἱ ταπείνωτεροι . . . οἱ ἐν διώματι (V, 439.)

ἐπιστήμη . . . τόλμα (V, 280.)

νεόλ . . . γηραῖος (IV, 128.)

ἐνεστις νέκνες . . . ἀπεγνώνσις σωτηρίας (VI, 4.)

θερμότεροι . . . δοφαλεστεροι (V, 491, cf. IV, 292.)
προφήτετ . . . το δ' ἀλήθες (I, 254, cf. I, 276; II, 15; IV, 412; II, 26; VII, 256; I, 288; VI, 128; I, 9; V, 593; I, 282; II, 299; IV, 154.)

εὐποροὶ . . . πέντες (IV, 379.)
ἐνδόν . . . ἐξώθην (III, 79, cf. I, 420; V, 338.)
κατὰ χειρὰ . . . πόρρωθεν (I, 332.)
πέρας . . . ἀρχὴ (VII, 157.)
δραπα . . . πᾶσχειν (II, 472, cf. III, 152; V 256; et c.)
χειρὶ . . . γνώμη (II, 258.)

χειρὶ . . . λόγψ (I, 494.)
ἀγαθὸς . . . κακὸς (VI, 364.)
δαίμονιος . . . ἀνθρώπινος (I, 373.)
σκυθρωπὸς . . . δέκατος (V, 257.)
κατ' ἀνδρα . . . ὅλας πόλεις (II, 278.)

ὄρμα . . . ἄκοψ (V, 487.)
ἐρημὸς . . . πλῆρης (II, 504.)
ὁνομα . . . ὀνόματι (IV, 637.)

τὸ σχῆμα . . . τῷ φρόνημα ρασίλεις (I, 387, 517, 478, 561.)
ἐκοντετ . . . ἐξ ἐπιτάγματος (I, 473, cf. IV, 421.)
ANTITHESIS NOT IN THE SAME COLA

WITHOUT PARANOMASIA

BY ARSIS AND THESIS

κτήμα δρετῆς, οὐ δόρον τύχης (III, 72.)
οὐκ ἰππεσταλμένον, ἀλλ' οἰρωγαί διακρύσσοι (II, 6.)
οὐκ ἐπιγράμμα, ἀλλ' ἐνσάματα (II, 28.)
οὐκ βασιλεά, ἀλλ' τυφανῶν (II, 84, cf. II, 208.)
οὐκ παρατυχόντες, ἀλλ' ἀκοφ συλλέγοντες (I, 1.)
οὐκ ἐπ' εὐνοοῦ, ἀλλ' κατὰ δεός (I, 196.)
οὐκ ἔλεος, ἀλλ' ὁργή (IV, 540, cf. V, 433.)
οὐκ πιθανὸς οὐδ' ἐν ἀνάγκης ἐσχεδιασμένης (I, 439.)

ANTITHESIS NOT IN THE SAME COLA

WITH PARANOMASIA

ἀπερή... προερή (VII, 213.)
ἀφαιρήσεθαι... προαιρήσεθαι (II, 264.)
ἐξεθεν... ἐνδοθεν (I, 338, cf. VII, 281; III, 248.)
ἀχάριστος... ἀθαρσίστετεν (I, 214.)
ἐφαντέω... ἐφαντέω VI, 47-8.)
ἀνοικοί... μετὰ ὀπλων (I, 75.)
ἐξοδος... ἐξοδος (V, 423, cf. IV, 236.)
ἐβγενή... δι' ἐγενέσθαι (I, 522.)
ἐνεργοῦς... ἔργουν (II, 392.)
ἀνέργεια... ἔργα (IV, 582.)
μὴ δὲ δουλεύαν ... μετ' οὐκετίας (VII, 177.)

δέκατος ... ἄδικος (V, 407.)

ἀπόνοια ... πρόνοια (V, 121, cf. V, 316.)

ἐκατὼ ... ἀκαπνόν (III, 359.)

ἀδέρμαντοι ... ἀετοάραντοι (VII, 369.)

ἐβράντες ... μὴ ἐστίνατες (V, 425.)

προσκύνη ... μὴ προσκύνη (IV, 364.)

ἄρεις ἐκάντα (V, 520.)

ἀποστάτη ... παράντιστατος (I, 612.)

ἄτίκτοι ... οὐκ άτίκτοι (I, 591.)

τέχνη διέξθε ... ἀτυχεστάτων (I, 665.)

ἄδηλος ... πράξατος (II, 396.)

CHIASMUS

πολεμήσας τα πρώτα κατ τοῖς δεύτεροις παρατυχάν (I, 3.)

φρούρα ἕρμην τῶν οὕτως δυσμάχων, κατ τοσοφόρων
ἀψηφομένων εν τάγμα. (II, 375, cf. III, 477; VII, 260;
VII, 324; VI, 107; I, 517; III, 371
III, 249; I, 589; V, 44; I, 35.)

ANTIMETABOLE

ἄνειλος ἑξακτώς ὁ μὴ βουλόμενος ὅταν ἀπὶ κατ ὁ βουλόμενος
ὅταν μὴ ἀπὶ. (III, 365.)
PARANOMASIA

λοιμάς καὶ λίμος (I, 376, cf. IV, 361.)
λοιμάςης φθοράν, αὖθις δὲ καὶ λίμον ἀκόλουθον (VI, 421.)
φέλον ... φθολον (VII, 327.)
μένων ... εὑρένης (VII, 328.)
kολαμέθειν ἀξίων ... κολάσεως (II, 276.)
tφ λαφ καὶ τφ ναφ (VI, 309.)
χρεάς ... χρεάν (VI, 49.)
έτερας συμφοράς τέρας (I, 377.)

ETYMOLOGICAL FIGURES

διουργαί λιουργησάτωσαν (VII, 386.)
kατακλήσειν εν τοῖς πταθρασίν (IV, 42.)
νίκαν νίκην (I, 540.)
πληγην ἐπληγησαν (IV, 70.)
εὐτακτέραν ἐτετάκτο (I, 348.)
ἀπειρος πεπειραμένοι (VII, 67.)
συντελόν πολυτελές (VII, 96.)
γενεαλογοσα εὐγενεῖαν (I, 476.)
teλέω ἐντολάς (II, 495.)

ALLITERATION

παθασαθαι πρὸ κολέρου παρεκδουν (VI, 345.)
kατὰ χείρα καὶ χρήμασιν (I, 4.)
παραδόντες ποτὲ πυρὶ καλὰν (II, 358.)
πάσι πανταχοῦ παρατυχάνων (V, 310.)
Josephus also used paromoeosis and parisosis, sometimes in conjunction with homoeoteleuton, to create an elegant style, viz:

οδ περισκόπεσθε την ἰσμαγν νηεμονικαν;
οδ μετρήστε την εαυτῶν ἀσθενειαν;

Do you not shut your eyes to the rule of the Romans? Do you not measure your own weakness?

... navigating the land and trodding the sea ...

These availed for a short time, and after buoying us up with hope, they proved the beginning of greater disasters.
This our laws bid us; this our wives and children implore us.

And, finally, Josephus wooed elegance of expression with what is still a favorite rhetorical element of modern writers, anastrophe. The following examples of this verbal sequence will demonstrate his use of the technique. Notice that while arousing interest and displaying elegance, this trope also carries a certain emphasis with it:

The soldier studied to please his decurion, the decurion the centurian, while the emulation of the tribunes extended to the staff officers, and in the rivalry between the officers, Caesar was the umpire.

Herod, the son of Antipater, brought up Sossius, and Sossius brought up the Roman army.

I shudder at recounting the works of God to unworthy ears, yet listen that you may learn that you are warring not only against the Romans, but God himself.

Wishing to save the Jews for the Romans, the temple and the mother city for the Jews.
He rarely suffered reverses in war, and he was not the cause of the reverses (he did suffer).

... that it was fitting for the ruler of a brilliant kingdom to support one that was wronged, and Hyrcanus was!

How could you not be ashamed to be surpassed when your chief leads the way to danger, and I will lead, know that well! ... 

The above examples will indicate the rhetorical devices Josephus used to attain interest. They by no means represent all of Josephus' attempt to embellish his narrative with elegance, but they are significant of his close adherence to the conventional methods (and even to some of the stereotyped, trite formulae) of his day on the one hand, and of his instinctive, astute feeling for elegance on the other, as though he were carried away by the importance of his subject. We have seen that he was a master of clear, concrete expression—even though he may have been prone to exaggeration; we have seen that he could turn a pretty phrase to give his narrative the polish demanded by classical readers; but to appreciate the entire effect of his effort to arouse interest, we must read long passages of his prose.

Having analyzed Josephus' solution of the problem of
making his narrative interesting, we can turn now to the last of the requirements of an enduring literary work, namely, that it be emphatic. We shall consider next how Josephus emphasized the elements he desired his readers or hearers to remember.
CHAPTER VII

THE PROBLEM OF EMPHASIS IN THE JEWISH WAR

No writer can expect his readers or listeners to remember all the material he includes in his narrative. Therefore, he must strive to make the important elements, the elements he wishes to be remembered, emphatic.

Josephus attained emphasis to a certain degree when he caused his narrative to be a coherent unity. He increased that emphasis when he used concrete, vivid expression to make his narrative interesting, and he heightened it still further when he used certain tropes to make his discourse elegant.

In analysing Josephus' methods of creating emphasis, we must distinguish between structural methods and language methods. From the point of view of structure, the reader will remember most vividly that which struck his consciousness first or was held before his attention longest. Thus, one of the ways to emphasize an important thought is to place it in first position in the book, essay or representation. In the structure of a history, the historian must adhere to chronology, more or less, and his license to maneuver events for the sake of emphasis is limited. (In the
sentence, on the other hand, there is no difficulty in placing the most important element first, especially in such highly inflected languages as Greek and Latin.) Therefore, in order to achieve greater emphasis for an idea or for an event, a historian must devote greater attention to important events—the events he wishes to be remembered most clearly. We can see how Josephus accomplished this by examining the material covered by each book of his history.

Book I of The Jewish War provides all the background material to the event Josephus describes. It covers the period from 170 B.C. to 4 B.C., using 673 sentences. Book II covers a period of seventy years from 4 B.C. to Vespasian's invasion of Galilee in 66 A.D., using 654 sentences. Book II also includes lengthy digressions on Jewish philosophical sects. Book III deals only with the campaign in Galilee, from 66 to 67 A.D., using 542 sentences. Book IV, with 663 sentences, describes the campaign in Judaea up to the siege of Jerusalem. The main element of the viewpoint of Josephus and doubtless from that of the Romans, the siege of Jerusalem, is described in great detail in Books V and VI, 567 and 442 sentences, respectively. And, finally, Book VII, describes the "mopping up operations" of the Roman army and the last, futile resistance of the Jews. Thus we see that Josephus used two books to cover events transpiring during 236 years, five books to describe the period of the actual war, a time space of five
ears at the most, and one book to tie up all his loose ends.

In addition to giving important events great proportion, Josephus could and did use a heightened style for description of important events. We have seen his use of concrete and vivid expression in the preceding chapter on interest. We have already remarked his use of prosopoeia in discussing the unity and coherence found in the speeches he puts into the mouths of historical characters. We might further add that Josephus' prosopoeial speeches smack more than a little of speeches found in other men's histories; particularly, Josephus' rather long dissertation on suicide found at the end of Book III reads more like an exercise current in a rhetorical school. However, questions of origin have nothing to do with the subject of this paper. And since we must accept Josephus' veracity for a great number of events, it would be futile to suggest that he might be guilty of hyperbole for the sake of emphasis. Nevertheless, the reader wonders if our author was truly as devoted to Truth as he claims in Book I.

Apart from structural emphasis, there remain the figures of language that lend emphasis to their terms. The essential element in these emphatic figures is repetition, whether of idea or sound or word (except in the case of asyndeton, where the absence of repetition engenders the desired effect).

The most frequently used of the repetitive figures are dualisms, combinations of two or more words, expressing more or
less the same meaning. In some cases, the dualisms are tautologies that enrich and adorn the discourse, making it therefore more emphatic. In other cases, the elements of the dualism have slightly differing, sometimes complementary meanings, which serve to combine and fill out the thought in the author's mind. How Josephus used dualisms can be seen from these few representative examples.

SUBSTANTIVES

κατάπληξις κατ' μετάνοια (II, 127.)
ἐκπληξίς κατ' ὅσο (III, 1, 237; II, 553.)
ἀθυρεία κατ' κατάπληξις (III, 188.)
ὁμοίως κατ' ὅσο (I, 58.)
ὁσο κατ' ᾽ακελασ (II, 296.)
ὁσο κατ' ἀπεινάστης (II, 300.)
ἀμοτής κατ' ὅργη (IV, 535.)
πέστις κατ' ὅσο (I, 485.)
κάματος κατ' ὅσο (V, 284.)
κάματος κατ' ὑπνος (III, 327.)
ἀγανάκτησις κατ' βλασφημία (III, 439.)
ἀνακριτή κατ' ὅσο (II, 269.)
κάματος κατ' κατάπληξις (VI, 244.)
ομισχή κατ' ὅσο (VI, 119.)
κάματος κατ' ταλαντωρία (VI, 151.)
ἐπίκουρεια κατ' ὅσο (II, 134.)
θάρσα καὶ οἶκτος (II, 198.)
βάσανος καὶ λίθη (VII, 418.)
ήμερσης καὶ κοινωνία (VII, 264.)
κρώτος καὶ χαρά (VI, 403.)
φρόνησις καὶ παιδεία (VII, 399.)
ἀγκάτεια καὶ σύνεσις (IV, 373.)
ἄλη καὶ σύνεσις (III, 11.)
προθυσία καὶ σύνεσις (II, 569.)
προθυσία καὶ λαμπρότης (VII, 63.)
προθυσία καὶ δακρυα (I, III.)
φράκη καὶ κατὰκοστάς (VI, 120.)
κατηφεία καὶ σιγή (VI, 98.)
tὰ βῆματα καὶ τὰ αὐθαίρες (VI, 172.)
χερσες καὶ τῶρη (III, 152.)
φρόνημα καὶ χερσες (I, 589.)
ὀπλα καὶ ρία (III, 188.)

ADJECTIVES

περάδη καὶ δύσρατα (I, 368.)
αἰκατα καὶ δυσφωνα (I, 1.)
ἀμέσω καὶ χρησιμωτέρα (I, 407.)
νεβῆ καὶ κατακόσμητερον (I, 203.)
ραφές καὶ χαλέπος (I, 483.)
ἀναίδες γκροτί καὶ ραπτομενή τῶς κόρας (I, 490.)
άκληρφ καὶ ταλαιπώρφ (II, 295.)
καθαπλητατον καὶ ειλικρινεστατον (II, 345.)
δι᾽ ἐπιχωρίων καὶ συνηθῶν (II, 570.)
ἐνεργος καὶ καρποφόρος (III, 44.)
ἐπιμος δὲ καὶ τραχεὰ (III, 44.)
γνώριμον καὶ συνήθη παλαι (III, 346.)
λυσίτελης καὶ σφροφόρος (IV, 177.)
βλασῖν καὶ θερήφανος (VI, 172.)
μεγάλης καὶ δυσδιαθέτου (φροντίδος) (VII, 241.)
ἀνανδρος καὶ φίλοψυχος (VII, 378.)

ADVERBS

καλῶς καὶ ἐλευθερῶς (ἀποθανενγ) (VII, 375.)
παραλόγως καὶ μεγάλως (IV, 49.)
ἡσυχὴ καὶ μετὰ κόσμου (III, 93.)
διοσχέρως καὶ κατὰ κράτος (I, 21.)
ἀθάρη καὶ μετ᾽ ἀποστολῆς (II, 277.)
ἀθάρη καὶ μετ᾽ αἴδους (II, 351.)

VERBS

χειρας ἔρεγε καὶ κατηντῖβελε τὸν παρδα (I, 58.)
ἐνθυρησεὶ τὸ παράστημα καὶ κατακουσίει τῆς ἱκεσίας (I, 59.)
ἀπειλοῦτοι καὶ βίαζον (I, 82.)
µῆτρ᾽ ἄνοιξεν φονερός γενέσθαι καὶ προσφαλάσθαι (I, 75.)
eὐσεβετερον εἶναι καὶ τοὺς νόρους ἀκρίβεστερον ἀφηγεσθαι (I, 111.)
διέκειν καὶ πατάγειν (I, 111.)

τὴν ἀρχὴν ἀνακτησόμενος καὶ διαφυλάξας (I, 226.)

ομιτερεῖν καὶ συναλγεῖν (I, 518.)

ἄρχομεν καὶ παυσόμενοι (II, 131.)

ἐκκοντο καὶ διέφεβον (II, 312.)

ἐπάνω καὶ διηπέλαυν (II, 608.)

κατασοφορεῖσθαι καὶ ἐπάνω τὴν ψυχήν ἔχειν (III, 1.)

μεταλλεύμενος καὶ προθεραπεύσας (II, 7.)

ἐπιστρέφον καὶ ἀνήρρου (III, 17.)

διέκειται καὶ μεταπέθειν (III, 61.)

φιλοφρονοῦμενος καὶ περίεις (III, 408.)

ἐνηργεί δὲ τούτως εἰς τὴν ἀπόστασιν καὶ συνεκρότειν ταιευθεῖαι καὶ συμφυλάσσειν (IV, 123.)

καθελέν καὶ θάπτειν (IV, 317.)

ἀναφερόμενος καὶ δεσπόνους (IV, 311.)

βλασφημεῖτε καὶ βαλλεῖτε (V, 393.)

ἀξορολογοῦμενος καὶ μετανοοῦσιν (V, 415.)

ἀλοφράτο καὶ κατεστρωμένον (VI, 7.)

κορπάζων καὶ ἐπισκόπτων (VI, 174.)

λοιδοροῦσα καὶ καταφωνή (VI, 203.)

μετάφρον εἶναι καὶ κραδαίνεσθαι (VII, 79.)

ἀγωνεῖς καὶ φέροντες (VII, 91.)

διαντόν καὶ δέχομενος (VII, 119.)
οὔτε ... οὔτε
οὔτε ἀποκρυπτόμενος οὔτε προστθετερ (I, 26.)
μήτε οἰκετήν μήτε θεράπαιν (I, 585.)
οὔτε ἀρπαγή οὔτε αἰκεια (II, 277.)
οθ διὰ φρονημάτων μαλακταν οδόθ δι' ἀγέβεα (II, 373.)
oύτε νηπίων οὔτε αἰδῶς γερστων (II, 496.)
oύτε δειλα οὔτε λαπανόρθα (III, 42.)
oύτε νυκτωρ οὔτε μεθ' ἡμέραν (III, 62.)
oύτε ἑμμαυσαυς οὔτε λουδαγους (III, 276.)
oύτε φελῶς οὔτ' ἔλεος (III, 329.)
oύτε ἀσθαλευ οὔτε πρέπον (IV, 33.)
μήτε πορχή μήτε πράξιν (IV, 214.)
μήτε κλαζεν μήτε θάπτειν (IV, 331.)
oύτε ἔλεγχοις οὔτε τεκμήριον (IV, 336.)
oύτε φυγής οὔτε διαξέως (VI, 144.)
oύτε παπανεσθε οὔτ' ἀπειλη (VI, 257.)
oὔτ' ἐνουθετησαμεν οὔτ' ἐκκυσαμεν (VI, 335.)
oύτε φονεσειν οὔτε διαπράξειν (VII, 1.)
mήτε μελαθαλ μήτε ἀναφεβαι (VII, 342.)

η ... η
η μερφεας η κατηγορεας (I, 30.)
η μετεως η δες (II, 478.)
η βελος ἐφθανεν η σχεδα κατελαμβανεν (III, 527.)
η πεσειν η συναναχασειν (IV, 98.)
If we regard tautological and complementary dualisms as the lower end of the scale of complexity of the repetitive figures that Josephus used for emphasis, we must think of such figures as anadiplosis, anaphora, antistrophe, epanodos and the like as the higher end of the scale. These more complicated figures he uses with more reserve, and, correlative, with more telling, more dramatic effect. The following representative examples will demonstrate Josephus' employment of these figures.

**ANADIPLOYSIS**

καλὸν, καλὸν, καλὸν, ές ἔτι ἐν ὄρμῃ τὸ σκάφος προσκέπτεσθαι τὸν θελοντα Χειρώνα. (II, 396.)

It were well, my friends, it were well, while the vessel is still in port, to foresee the approaching storm.

φέρετε οὖν τούτων, φέρετε πατούμενα βλέποντες κατ' τὰ ἄγια ... (IV, 171.)

Endure then, yes, endure seeing the sanctuary trampled ... 

θεός ἄρα, θεός αὐτὸς ἐπάγει μετὰ ψυμάχων καθάρσιον ἀρτί πῆρ καὶ τὴν ποιεῖν μιαρᾶται γέροντας πόλιν ἀναρίσκει. (VI, 110.)

God it is, then, God Himself, with the Romans, brought fire as a purge to His temple and exterminated a city so laden with pollution.

**ANAPHORA**

ἐξῆς τοῦ μοι, σώμα ἀναδόθησθον, τὴν βάσιν καὶ ἔπιασθαν κατάκουτον ψυχὴν καθεδρίς; ἐξῆς τοῦ στὸν αὐτὸς ἐπισπεύνω κατὰ μέρος τοῦρον αἱρα; (I, 84.)

How long, most shameless body, wilt thou detain the soul that is sentenced to a brother's and a mother's vengeance? How long shall I make these drop-by-drop libations of my blood?
Where is my scoundrel of a son-in-law? he shouted. Where shall I set eyes on the person of this parricide?

Perhaps nothing had been discovered, perhaps even if anything had been discovered, he might mend matters by effrontery and guile.

This is the man who, in former days, when Alexander was alive, advised me to beware of him and not to trust my life to all men's hands; this is he who conducted me to my couch and looked around to see that no assassin was concealed; this is he who dispensed my hours of slumber...

Here I am to meet my accusers; here I am, the "parricide" who has traversed sea and land, and nowhere been molested.

For I stand condemned before God and before you, father. But condemned though I am, I entreat you not to rely on admissions extracted by the torture of others.
I call the gods of my fathers to witness ... I call my army to witness (that it is not I who forces you to pollute these precincts).

While famine coursed through her intestines and marrow and the fire of rage was even more consuming than the famine.

... in which lay vast sums of money, vast piles of raiment and other valuables.

Saying many things about their cruelty and impiety, counselling many things for their safety ... .

Thus Jerusalem was taken in the second year (of the reign of Vespasian), having been captured five times before . . .

Glorious indeed it was (he said) to bring to a close a war of such long duration; (for they could never have prayed for any happier when they entered upon it). But a yet more glorious and brilliant tribute was theirs, that their leaders . . .

What ties of friendship, what ties of kinship . . .
And where now is that great city? ... What has become of her that was believed to have been founded by God?

Which of us, taking these things to heart, could bear to behold the sun, (even could he live secure from peril?) who is such an enemy of his fatherland, or who is cowardly or fond of life, that he does not regret living still today?

Wretched will be the young whose vigorous frames can sustain many tortures, wretched the more advanced in years whose age is incapable of bearing such calamities.

This our laws enjoin, this our wives and children implore of us.

ANTISTROPHHE

She ruled others, but the Pharisees ruled her.

And he gave the daughter of Aristobulus to Antipater himself and his own son to the daughter of Phororas.

... a ready liar and clever in obtaining credit for his lies.
... if they would agree who was the enemy against whom its provision was necessary, instead of furiously attacking the man who provided it.

What bitter tyranny! But why do I blame the tyrants?

proclaiming liberty for the slaves, rewards for the free.

It was built without iron, nor did iron ever touch it.

The revolt captured the city; the Romans took over the revolt.

Not the kingdom, but the honor of royalty I leave my sons.

For myself, I believe that in this hour my father and I and you are all on trial; it will be seen whether he is worthy of his past successes, whether I am worthy to be his son, and you to be my soldiers.
... οὐκ εἴρηκαίν ποτέ ἐμφατοι τῷ Ἱεροσολύμων τεῖχος οὐ περὶ ταῖς Γαλιλαίων καὶ τὰς κατοχαθέντες καὶ πρὸς τοὺς ἄλλους τεῖχεσι κατατρέφαντες τοὺς θηράνας. (IV, 127.)

... the Romans would never surmount the walls of Jerusalem, after having found such difficulty with the villages of Galilee and worn out their engines against their walls.

We cannot justly leave the analysis of Josephus' use of repetitive figures for emphasis without remarking on his use of two or more words in one sentence that have a common part. This device, as will be seen in the following examples, serves to lay particular emphasis on certain words which are usually related in meaning, or at least in the structure of the sentence.

ἀνανιράκτουσ . . . ἀρνόντως (V, 383.)
ἀκαταίτατος . . . ἀκρίτος (IV, 169.)
ἀνείρησα . . . ἀνανόρησα (VII, 67.)
συμπολιορκοῦσαί . . . συμπολιορκῶ (II, 73.)
συμβουλοῦσ . . . συμβάντος (I, 389.)
φιλόφουλοι . . . φιλοθέαται (IV, 175.)
φιλοτέκνος . . . φιλοδήλας (I, 589.)
δύσηριτος . . . δυσήλευθε (II, 92.)
διενεκασθαι . . . διαφέρενταί (VII, 207.)
ἐποιεῖν . . . ἐπάγειν (I, 297.)
ἀντιβοῦν . . . ἀντολοφόρεσθαι (IV, 309.)
προσελθεῖν . . . προσελθεῖτεν (IV, 64.)
προορᾶν . . . προφητεῖσθαι (I, 69 and 430.)
Since we believe the war arising between the Jews and the Romans is the greatest, not only of our own times, but even of which we have heard, either of city against city, or of people rising against people.
Having posted many ambuscades in many places in the hills...

Replying that it rested with him who conferred the honor to fix the measure of the honor, he was then appointed procurator of all Judaea.

... of Herod, who urged him to kill the schemer, but not to abandon himself to the schemes.

He counted on borrowing from him the amount of the ransom and holding the son of the ransomed prisoner as a pledge.

Our enemies conquered us, who were conquerors in the first battle.

To Alexander, that he, the son of one princess and the husband of another, should allow the son of a commoner to succeed to the throne.

... that it wasn't right for him, the parent of three children who were present, to vote for the destruction of the children of another.
I offer you a tribunal and a judge for this timely visitor, Varus.

Who sees all and is everywhere present.

They would be regarded as starters of hostilities unless they promptly revealed the true aggressor.

Consider the walls of the Britons, you who would rely on the walls of Jerusalem.

It is possible either not to revolt in the first place, or having revolted, to return promptly to our allegiance.

If our city had indeed been fated to be betrayed, only our accusers would dare this, to whose enterprises only this one fell deed was lacking, betrayal.

You say you are tyranny-stricken, and you apply the stigma of despotism to the victims of your own tyranny.
Seeing a common danger, both parties thought to prepare a common defense.

... thinking the Romans would never again dare to invade the city, or, if they did, they would be defeated.

And he saw that to guard such a number (of prisoners) was the imprisonment of those who did the guarding.

He pointed out that it would be difficult to throw up earthworks because of the lack of material and even more difficult to guard against sallies.

To incite to enterprises involving no risk is an insult to those who are incited.

Polysyndeton and asyndeton, the repetitive use of a connective word, and its absence, respectively, Josephus uses rarely. The dignified pace afforded a thought by abundant use of connectives seems to have no value for our author, and when he does use polysyndeton it is with the monotony of a man counting on his fingers the points he wishes to make. On the other hand, his use of asyndeton seems almost accidental, so infrequently and awkwardly does he use the figure. The following examples point out the fact.
A place oppressed by neither rain nor snow nor heat.

Neither the Cyrenians, the race of the Spartans, nor the Marmaridae, that race that stretches to the regions of drought, nor Syrtes, whose very name strikes terror, Nasamons, Maurians, Numidians in their countless hosts, none have checked the valor of the Romans.

It is impossible to describe adequately . . . either in works of art or in diversity of riches or in rarity of natural objects.

For arms and ramparts and fortresses . . . and a spirit undaunted by risks to be run on behalf of liberty.
ASYNDETON

ἀλλ' ἀμαθαίνοις ἀκριβοὶς ὅδεις ἔδοξε θεὸς τοὺς ἀδεμένοις. (IV, 169.)

But unimpeached, uncondemned, not a man helped them in their bondage.

τὸς ὅξον ὁδεῖν προςπαθοῦσαν πατέρας ἠρφύν ἀναιρέστους ἀκινδύνους, οὐς ὁ θεὸς αὐτῇ νεκροὺς ἔγεν. (V, 383.)

But who does not know . . . that our fathers were sent without bloodshed, without risk, whom God led out as keepers of the shrine for himself.

Also less frequently Josephus uses figures of language that depend not on repetition for emphasis, but on the understanding of words which are not themselves repetitive or emphatic. In this category belong such figures as oxymoron, irony and litotes. The following citations are typical of figures of this type found in Josephus' The Jewish War, when they are found at all.

OXYMORON

κανὴς δρονοτας κατηρακτόντο. (V, 72.)

They started a fell agreement.

tὸ σῶμα κεκραγέν αὐτὸς σιμπαφντος (I, 197.)

His body cried aloud, were he to hold his peace.

βασιλεῶς ἄμηρος. (I, 355.)

King of a wilderness.

ἐκεῖνοι στρατηγησουσί τοῦ κολέρου τῶν γέντων ἄρεινον. (I, 379.)

They (the dead) will conduct the campaign better than the living.
IRONY

This is my buckler, my bodyguard!

There may be some who believe the war will be fought under special conditions.

Much liberty we have now!

Forsooth, we were hurrying to slaughter.

LITOTES

οδη άσπρος (I, 241.)
οδη άκρονυμος (IV, 368.)
οδη άντιτος (VI, 170.)
οδη άγνωστος (V, 261.)
οδη άπρονήτος (III, 31.)
οδη άγέννης (VI, 49.)
οδη άνάητος (VII, 380.)
οδη άλογος (IV, 240.)
οδη άκαρπηστάτος (IV, 338.)
οδη άθεατος (V, 212.)
οδ μέτριος (IV, 125.)
οδ άναίμως (II, 495.)
οδ μέτριος (II, 631.)
And, finally, Josephus uses dramatic figures for emphasis relatively seldom. When he does, the figure is often cumbersome and clumsy or sounds very much like an oratorical exercise. The following examples are typical.
EXCLAMATIONS

Oh, wretched me ... what a fatal journey, what great chance I offered for envy!

Τέ τυλίκωστον, ἐν τῇ προεστοτῇ πόλις, πενονθος ὑπὸ ἀμαθίας; (L. 149)

What misery equal to that, most wretched of cities, has thou suffered at the hands of the Romans?

RHETORICAL QUESTIONS

Enough rhetorical questions have already been cited in connection with other emphatic figures to indicate that Josephus did use them and to suggest how he used them, i.e., mainly in judicial or deliberative orations (cf. I, 84; I, 500; II, 361; IV, 166; VII, 266; VII, 355: and VII, 378, supra). But it will not be amiss to translate more extended passages to demonstrate what power he puts into rhetorical questions.

"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, and when did God who 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 enraged? Will you not recall your fathers' superhuman exploits and what mighty wars this place has quelled for us in days of old?"

1 Josephus, Bellum Judaicum, V, 377.
Why need I mention more? But, pray, who enlisted the Romans against our country? Was it not the impiety of the inhabitants? Whence did our servitude arise? Was it not from party strife among our forefathers, when the madness of Aristobolus and Hyrcanus and their mutual dissensions brought Pompey against the city, and God subjected to the Romans who were unworthy of liberty? ... Or know we not the fate of Antigonus, son of Aristobolus, in whose reign God again smote the people for their offenses by the capture of this city; when Herod, son of Antipater, brought up Sossius, and Sossius a Roman army, by whom they were for six months invested and besieged until in retribution for their sins they were captured and the city was sacked by the enemy? 2

The rare use of a rhetorical question not in discourse is combined with paraleipsis:

But why tell of the shameless resort to inanimate articles of food induced by the famine, seeing that I am here about to describe an act unparalleled in the history, whether of Greeks or barbarians and as horrible to relate as it is incredible to hear. 3

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

And again, what motive could have instigated me against you? Aspiration to the throne? But I reigned already. Suspicion of your hatred? But was I not beloved? Had I other reasons to fear you? Nay, by preserving you I inspired fear in others. Was it lack of money? Who had more at his disposal than I? Even had I been the most ferocious beast, must I have not been reclaimed by your benefactions, father? 4

What is it which inspires you with confidence to defy the Romans? "It is hard to serve," you will tell me. How much harder for Greeks ... 5

2 Ibid. V, 395-298.
3 Ibid. VI, 199.
5 Ibid. II, 364.
"No, it is slavery we fear," I shall be told. Much liberty we enjoy at present! "It is noble to destroy oneself," another will say. Not so, I retort, but most ignoble. . . .

Pray, what nation beyond the limits of our empire would prefer Jews to Romans? On physical strength, perhaps? Yet, you are aware that the Germans are our slaves. On the solidity of their walls? But what wall could be a greater obstacle than the ocean, encompassed by which the Britons yet do homage to Roman arms? On the determination of spirit and the astuteness of your generals? Yet, you knew that even Carthaginians were defeated.  

**PARALEIPSIS**

To narrate their enormities in detail is impossible; but to put it briefly, no other city ever endured such miseries, nor since the world began has there ever been a generation more prolific in crime. . . .

But why need I severally to recount the calamities? Why, indeed, when Mannaeus, son of Lazarus, who sought refuge in those days with Titus, reported that there were carried out, through a single gate, which had been entrusted to him, 115,880 corpses between the fourteenth of the month of Xanthicus . . . and the new moon of Panemus?

Particular note should be taken of Josephus' combination of a rhetorical question with a paraleipsis and his use of the rhetorical question as an answer to a rhetorical question. In this manner he succeeds in making even more dramatic a dramatic effect.

---

In summary, then, we have seen that Josephus emphasizes those elements of his narrative which he wished to be remembered by selection and by structural manipulation, i.e., by placing important points in psychologically important positions. At the same time, he uses two types of figures of language to emphasize individual ideas or individual words whose importance is relatively secondary to the main elements of his narrative. One of these types, based on repetition, includes dualisms, anaphora, antistrophe, anadiplosis, epanodos, polysyndeton (and its opposite, asyndeton), and the like. The other type, based on peculiar understanding of the words of the figure, include oxymoron, irony, litotes, and the like, all of which contribute to a heightened style.

The dramatic figures of expression, bearing with them emphasis through passionate articulation, Josephus uses in a very trite and half-embarrassed manner. They include rhetorical questions, exclamations, questions and answers, and paraleipsis. These dramatic figures are used mostly in prosopoeial speeches, with the exception of paraleipsis, which Josephus occasionally employs in straight narrative in moments of great emotion.

But however he does it, Josephus does manage to achieve emphatic expression, thus fulfilling the last canon of good composition, both ancient and modern.
CHAPTER VIII

CONCLUSION

With the foregoing observations on Josephus' solution of the problem of emphasis in *The Jewish War*, we conclude our analysis of his rhetoric in that work. We have examined the life and times of the author and found that, although born and educated in a predominantly Jewish environment, he showed an early proclivity for Hellenistic civilization, as exemplified by the Roman empire. Politically, that proclivity manifested itself in military betrayal to the Romans during the Galilean campaign; intellectually, that proclivity enabled Josephus to become his people's foremost apologist in his own time--and for some time thereafter.

Inquiring further into the attitudes of the audience for whom Josephus wrote *The Jewish War*, we examined the rhetorical ideals of Aristotle, Longinus and Quintilian, as the authors who established or expressed the attitudes current with Josephus' Hellenistic contemporaries. For purposes of comparison, we looked briefly at the modern ideals of rhetoric and agreed to a four-fold canon according to which we could examine and analyse Josephus' rhetoric in *The Jewish War*. Thereupon, we attempted to analyze
his rhetoric in terms of unity, coherence, interest and emphasis, remarking, in each case, what methods and techniques he used to achieve each quality.

This study is, of course, incomplete and eclectic because of its narrow limitations. Even this short treatment of his rhetoric reveals countless interesting by-paths that must await exploration for the present. In terms of rhetoric, the foregoing analysis also omits statistical considerations that would prove conclusively Josephus' preference for certain devices. No attempt has been made to prove similarities between Josephus' phraseology and that used by other classical writers, except in the case of Thucydides and Sallust. But such investigations are somewhat afield from the single purpose of this paper.

How, finally, shall we evaluate Josephus? As already noted, in the first chapter, he used Greek secretaries, and his prose, therefore, is almost certainly not his own, except in concept. We have seen that there is very little brilliant rhetoric in The Jewish War. What there is comes in flashes, as though reflecting the brilliance of the idea Josephus may have expressed originally in Aramaic. On the other hand, the rhetoric can be considered workman-like, often academic, often trite. Frequently especially in the prosopoeial speeches, Josephus reveals his indebtedness to the schools of rhetoric for his tropes.

The important point to remember for our purpose is this: Josephus did use rhetoric in composing his narrative; he did
ouch a journalistic account that could have easily remained a simple chronology, with an attendant loss of effect, of course, in language that elevated it from a dull recitation of facts to an inspired, and therefore inspiring, narration of meaningful episodes.

Not only did Josephus have something to say, but he (or his secretaries) knew how to say it artfully. If a reader, who appreciates literary craftsmanship, had never heard of the Jews and their war against the Romans, he would nevertheless find value in Josephus' work. For the student of history who appreciates rhetorical art The Jewish War has a value far more enduring than accounts of greater wars by more important generals, the title of whose works many readers remember with difficulty only six months after date of publication.

Because Josephus did write a unified, coherent work with carefully wrought elements of interest and emphasis, The Jewish War, despite the undistinguished quality of its rhetoric, has a poignant appeal as a literary composition that places it among the works of literature worthy of survival.
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