Daniel R. Schwartz

From the Maccabees to Masada: On Diasporan Historiography of the Second Temple Period

Around the time Prof. Oppenheimer invited me to this conference, I was preparing the introduction to my translation of II Maccabees, and had come to the part where I was going to characterize II Maccabees as a typical instance of diasporan historiography. I was thinking, first of all, about the comparison of such passages as I Macc 1:20–23 with II Macc 5:15–16, which both describe Antiochus IV Epiphanes' robbery of the Temple of Jerusalem:

I Macc 1:20–23: He went up against Israel and came to Jerusalem with a strong force. He arrogantly entered the sanctuary and took the golden altar, the lampstand for the light, and all its utensils. He took also the table for the bread of the Presence, the cups for drink offerings, the bowls, the golden censers, the curtain, the crowns, and the gold decoration on the front of the temple; he stripped it all off. He took the silver and the gold, and the costly utensils... (Revised Standard Version)

II Macc 5:15–16: Not content with this (i.e., slaughter and enslavement), Antiochus dared to enter the most holy temple in all the world, guided by Menelaus, who had become a traitor both to the laws and to his country. He took the holy vessels with his polluted hands, and swept away with profane hands the votive offerings which other kings had made to enhance the glory and honor of the place. (RSV)

Here II Maccabees offers two obvious and standard contrasts between Palestinian works and diasporan ones, as well as two more subtle ones. The obvious ones are, first, its short and vague allusion to "holy vessels" which, in contrast to the detailed list in I Maccabees, exemplifies a diasporan lack of interest in the sacrificial cult; and, second, its emphasis on the benevolence of Gentile kings, which illustrates a familiar and necessary theme of Diaspora historiography (contrast I Macc 1:1–10, where all Gentile kings are simply wicked). As for the two more subtle points, it seems, as I will suggest below, that II Maccabees' emphasis – here and elsewhere – on the individual Jewish traitor, and its characterization of such a traitor as one not only to his country but also to its laws, are especially characteristic of diasporan works. And, of course, there are also other aspects of II Maccabees, not illustrated in the passage cited here, which seem quite clearly to be typically diasporan; thus, for example, the lionization of martyrs.

So, to return: at this point of my introduction to II Maccabees I left a footnote for bibliography about the general category of diaspora historiography, assuming

I would find, in the standard works on Jewish historiography in general or on ancient Jewish historiography in particular, some relevant discussion which I could cite. In fact, however, after much work in the library, and numerous conversations with colleagues, I was quite surprised to discover that the category, as such, seems not to have been developed – although I will be grateful to anyone who can correct that impression. While there is of course much literature on historiography produced in the diaspora, I have found no attempt to characterize it as such and to see what that *means*. What I did find, however, is that much of what I see as typically *galuti* in literature of the Second Temple period reminds my colleagues of things they see in medieval and modern Jewish historiography – a fact which reinforces my impression, that such a genre is indeed a real and useful category, perhaps, in fact, one which we take for granted, but which it might be worthwhile to spell out. So I decided to seize the opportunity of Prof. Oppenheimer's invitation and make a stab at such an approach.

To clarify what is new here, we should point out that this approach comes in the wake of an earlier one. Namely, it used to be thought that a cultural category, "Hellenism", corresponded to a geographical category, so "Hellenistic Judaism" was "Diasporan Judaism", i.e., Judaism in lands outside of Palestine, especially from regions to its west. Thus, for our most relevant example, Schürer – beginning with the second (1886–1890) edition of his handbook, which was the first to include a survey of Jewish literature – divided it between "Die palästinensisch-jüdische Literatur" (§ 32) and "Die hellenistisch-jüdische Literatur" (§ 33). But already Schürer himself, as others of his generation, emphasized that the categories were not precise and mutually exclusive: "Es hat palästinensisches Judenthum auch ausserhalb Palästina's gegeben, wie umgekehrt auch hellenistisches Judenthum in Palästina" (p. 576)¹. Nevertheless, he viewed the distinction as generally correct, and it maintained itself for decades; one book after another built on this same distinction. More recently however, and especially due to the work of Martin Hengel, the notion that the contrast of Hellenism and Palestine is a useful and appropriate way of organizing the literature of the Second Temple period has become even more doubtful. Hence, the revised English Schürer replaced it with a new one, one which distinguishes "Jewish Literature Composed in Hebrew or Aramaic" (§ 32) from "Jewish Literature Composed in Greek" (§ 33).

This is definitely a simpler distinction, and one which avoids such anomalies as dealing with Josephus and Justus in the chapter on Jewish literature which isn't Palestinian, or – only slightly less anomalously – dealing with Judith and Ben Sira

¹ So too, a few years earlier: "...so müssen wir uns hüten, den Gegensatz des Palästinischen und des Hellenistischen zu überspannen [...] man war einander weder so unbekannt noch so feindselig als dies bisweilen dargestellt worden ist". *Carl Siegfried, Der jüdische Hellenismus*, in: *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie* 15 (1875) 483. This article by Siegfried (465–489) was written apropos of the appearance of *Jakob Freudenthal, Alexander Polyhistor und die von ihm erhaltenen Reste jüdischer und samaritanischer Geschichtswerke* (Hellenistische Studien, 1–2; Breslau 1875), where 128–130 similarly emphasize that Hellenism was widespread even among nationalist Jews in Palestine of the Hasmonaean period.

in the chapter on Jewish literature which isn't Hellenistic. But this solution also entails a loss, for the original Schürer at least tried to characterize types of Judaism and, accordingly, to categorize ancient Jewish literature according to some meaningful categories. The new Schürer gives a categorization which can more responsibly be defended, but how meaningful is it?

But we can't return to Schürer's original typology, for it has eroded completely. He defined his types quite clearly:

Wir verstehen unter der palästinensisch-jüdischen Literatur diejenige, welche im Wesentlichen (aber auch nur im Wesentlichen) den Standpunkt des pharisäischen Judenthums vertritt, wie es in Palästina sich ausgebildet hat; unter der hellenistisch-jüdischen diejenige, welche entweder in der Form oder im Inhalt in irgendwie bemerkenswerther Weise hellenistische Beeinflussung zeigt. (p. 576)

We have already noted the erosion of the notion that Hellenism was found among Jews only outside of Palestine; to this we may add the erosion of the notions that Pharisaic Judaism was untouched "in any remarkable fashion" by Hellenism and that Pharisaic Judaism may be assumed to be characteristic of Palestinian Jews in general². Moreover, it has also become unfashionable, or unrespectable, to portray Pharisaic Judaism in such an un-Christian way as Schürer did in his chapter on "Das Leben unter dem Gesetze", so there is no longer much Christian profit in holding onto the notion of a Pharisaic monopoly on Palestine³. That chapter too, now called "Life and the Law", was heavily rewritten in the new Schürer, and I submit that the change goes hand in hand with the other one, which prefers to divide up the literature according to language rather than anything having to do with its essence.

Perhaps that is good enough for a handbook. But recent developments in our notions concerning Hellenism and Pharisaism should not lead us to abandon all efforts to categorize our literature in meaningful ways. Indeed, that quest has not been abandoned, and has proceeded on several fronts; especially Qumran scholars seem concerned to devote much attention to categorizing their texts, perhaps because they are so numerous. Insofar as historiography is concerned, however, not too much progress has been made. Thus, for example, about thirty-five years ago my late teacher, Menahem Stern, began a study of Josephus' historical writing by stating that all of Jewish historiography of the Second Temple period may be divided among those works, such as I Maccabees, which continued the biblical tradition, and those others such as II Maccabees and Josephus, which imitated Hellenistic models; twenty years later, in what remains today the standard survey of Jewish historiography in our period, Harold Attridge began precisely the same

² For an especially seminal contribution to the erosion of all three views, see *Morton Smith*, *Palestinian Judaism in the First Century*, in: *Israel: Its Role in Civilization* (ed. *Moshe Davis*; New York 1956) 67–81. On the twentieth century vicissitudes of the notion of Pharisaic hegemony, see *Daniel R. Schwartz*, *MMT, Josephus and the Pharisees*, in: *Reading 4QMMT: New Perspectives on Qumran Law and History* (SBL Symposium Series 2, ed. *John Kampen* and *Moshe J. Bernstein*; Atlanta 1996) 67–74.

³ See the literature cited *ibid.* 68, n. 3.

way⁴. Indeed, this is a categorization which is both more defensible than the Hellenistic-Palestinian one and yet more meaningful than the one according to language. However, the question of biblical or non-biblical models is not a simple one, for however biblicalizing I Maccabees may be, it is nevertheless true – as C.L.W. Grimm pointed out well over a century ago – that “in einem nicht unwesentlichen Punkt” I Maccabees differs from biblical historiography, namely, in that God is hardly involved in its story⁵. If you believe God’s involvement in the story is the *sine qua non* of biblical historiography, then just how biblical is I Maccabees? And what then shall we say of II Maccabees, where God is involved – at times very graphically – everywhere you look⁶?

The most concerted effort in recent years to discuss the genres of Jewish historiography in our period is that of Gregory Sterling: focusing on Josephus and Luke-Acts, he posited the genre “apologetic historiography”⁷. Indeed, this is quite a useful category, just as his book is quite a useful one. However, “apologetic” is quite a broad term; we could not use it, for example, to say anything useful about the obvious differences between I and II Maccabees, for each is an apology for something, be it the Hasmonean dynasty or Judaism. Nor, even, could it be used to say something about the differences between Josephus’ *War* and his *Antiquities*, for both are equally apologetic on behalf of the Jewish people. But there are important differences between First and Second Maccabees, and between Josephus’ *War* and his *Antiquities*, and to a large extent they may, I believe, be captured by their analysis as diasporan or non-diasporan works. What we must do, basically, is return to the fundamental political sense of these terms, instead of using them – as Schürer did – as cultural terms. We need to think about the meaning, for historiography, of the difference between writing in, and for, Jewish communities which enjoy sovereignty and those which do not.

There is, of course, no problem in defining First and Second Maccabees as, respectively, Palestinian and diasporan works. The notion, however, that Josephus’ *War* is to be viewed as essentially Palestinian, as opposed to *Antiquities* which is to be viewed as diasporan, will certainly surprise some people, and, therefore, it is in need of justification. After all, everyone knows that *War* is a very Hellenistic

⁴ Menahem Stern, *Josephus’ Way of Writing History* (1963), in: *idem*, *Studies in Jewish History: The Second Temple Period* (ed. Moshe Amit, Isaiah Gafni and Moshe David Herr; Jerusalem 1991) 408 (in Hebrew); Harold W. Attridge, *Historiography*, in: *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (*Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum* 2/2, ed. Michael E. Stone; Assen, Philadelphia 1984) 157.

⁵ Carl Ludwig Wilibald Grimm, *Das erste Buch der Maccabäer. Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zu den Apokryphen des Alten Testaments* 3 (Leipzig 1853) xvii-xviii. I have developed this topic in the paper mentioned in the next note.

⁶ See my article *On Something Biblical about II Maccabees*, in: *Biblical Perspectives: Early Use and Interpretation of the Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Proceedings of the 1996 Orion Center Conference, Jerusalem; ed. Esther G. Chazon and Michael E. Stone; Leiden 1998) 223-232.

⁷ Gregory E. Sterling, *Historiography and Self-Definition: Josephus, Luke-Acts and Apologetic Historiography* (*Supplements to Novum Testamentum* 64; Leiden 1992).

book; indeed, one of the view scholars to compare *War* and II Maccabees in detail, Giorgio Jossa, took it to be obvious and natural that *War* shows much more Greek influence than II Maccabees⁸. Again, it is usually, and correctly, noted that *Antiquities* is dedicated to defending the Jewish people against its detractors, as is also *Contra Apionem* – Josephus' other major work of the nineties. And this even expresses itself, at times, in the form of anti-Herodian rewriting in the *Antiquities*, writing which necessarily redounds to the glory of the Hasmoneans⁹, the Jewish national line which Herod nearly eradicated but from which, on the other hand, Josephus of the nineties was now claiming descent (*Vita* 1–5; *Ant.* 16.187). How, then, could one claim that *War* is Palestinian and *Antiquities* – diasporan?

To begin with, let us recall, on the negative side, that we have rejected the notion that the alternative Hellenistic/non-Hellenistic is equivalent to diasporan/non-diasporan. And as for *Antiquities* and *Contra Apionem* being pro-Jewish, or even nationalistic, no reader of Second or Third Maccabees, or of Philo's *Legatio* or *In Flaccum*, could suppose that those adjectives cannot apply to diasporan historiography. And on the positive side, let us also recall that *War* was written by a Judean general within a decade of his capture, and was originally written in Aramaic; *Antiquities*, in contrast, was composed in Greek by a Jew who had lived in the imperial capital for two decades.

Next, we should recall that *Antiquities* has already been shown, in various ways, to be diasporan. Take, for example, Isaiah Gafni's analysis of the way Josephus, in *Antiquities*, rewrote I Maccabees so as to move the accent to *dying* for Judaism, in trying times, instead of *fighting* for it¹⁰. Dying for their religion is something Jews can do anywhere; fighting is something which goes hand and hand with a Jewish state. By emphasizing Jewish martyrs, *Antiquities* is like II Maccabees; I Maccabees, in contrast, lionizes those who fought for Judaism, while those who died for it, passively, are certainly pious but they don't bring salvation. Thus, for example, the martyrs who get most of two chapters (6–7) in II Maccabees get only four verses in I Maccabees, where they serve as a foil, at the end of Chapter 1 (vv. 60–63), for the salvation which begins with the appearance of the Hasmoneans at the beginning of Chapter 2. Similarly, while II Maccabees frequently underlines the sanctity of the Sabbath and intimates that warfare is forbidden upon it (5:25–26; 8:26; 12:38; 15:2–3), in I Maccabees it is the naive, if pious, who refuse to fight on the Sabbath and therefore die (I Macc 2:32–38), while the Hasmonean warriors realistically decide to fight in self-defense on the Sabbath (ibid. vv. 39–41).

⁸ Giorgio Jossa, La storiografia giudeo-ellenistica: Il secondo libro dei Maccabei e la Guerra giudaica di Flavio Giuseppe, in: La storiografia della Bibbia (Atti della XXVIII Settimana Biblica; Bologna 1986) 93–102 (p. 94: "Ma l'influenza greca è evidente in entrambi, in Flavio Giuseppe naturalmente molto più che nel libro dei Maccabei.").

⁹ See Gideon Fuks, Josephus and the Hasmoneans, in: Journal of Jewish Studies 41 (1980) 166–176. Cf. Daniel R. Schwartz, Josephus on Hyrcanus II, in: Josephus and the History of the Greco-Roman Period (Studia Post-Biblica 41, (ed.) Fausto Parente and Joseph Sievers; Leiden 1994) 210–232.

¹⁰ Isaiah M. Gafni, Josephus and I Maccabees, in: Josephus, the Bible, and History (ed. Louis H. Feldman and Gobei Hata; Detroit 1989) 124–125.

Similarly, it seems that Josephus, in *Antiquities*, strove to separate religion and state in a way which, while typical of the diaspora, did not at all fit the realities of the Judaea, which he was describing – and which he correctly depicted in *War*¹¹. Thus, time and time again in *Antiquities* 20 he describes religious figures who apparently pose no real threat to Roman rule, but are nevertheless pursued and stamped out, with Josephus' approval, by the Roman governors. In the parallels in *War*, in contrast, the real threat to the state, posed by this religious figures, was spelled out; Josephus sanitized – that is, diasporized – the stories for *Antiquities*.

Next, reverting again to the *Antiquities* rewriting of I Maccabees, for *what* do Jews fight and die? Here again, Gafni has pointed the way, underlining the way the law is played up in Josephus' rewriting of I Maccabees¹². Where I Maccabees doesn't mention it, or mentions something else, Josephus speaks of the *law*. Now this, at first glance, need not be diasporan; the Torah is always the hallmark of Judaism. Nevertheless, it is the case that it is more prominent in *Antiquities* than it is in the *War* – just as it is more prominent in II Maccabees than in I Maccabees, including in the passage with which we began, which, as we noted, characterizes Menelaus as a traitor not only to his country but also to the laws (cf. Paul in Acts 28:17). Indeed, it has been shown that II Maccabees takes care to portray the laws of Judaism as if they were those of a Jewish city¹³. Jews πολιτεύεσθαι according to the laws of Judaism, according to this book (6:1; 11:25), which is positively bracketed by the notion of Jerusalem as the Jews' city (3:1; 15:37), as they do according to III Maccabees (3:4), just as Philo and *Antiquities* time and time again consider the Jews' laws as their πολιτεία¹⁴. But in his recent work on Josephus' view of Jewish law, Bernd Schroeder has emphasized the relative marginality of Jewish law in *War*, as opposed to Josephus' later works¹⁵. Correspondingly, a check of the concordance reveals that πολιτεία is used in *War* only three times and none of them with reference to the Jewish religion; πολιτεύμα is used in *Antiquities* and *Against Apion* but never in *War*; and πολιτεύω – twenty-six times in *Antiquities*, thrice in *Vita*, but only once in *War*, in a passage where the text is in fact doubtful (1.513)¹⁶. In the two decades or so between *War* and his other three books, Josephus learned to talk like a diasporan Jew.

¹¹ For this paragraph, see Daniel R. Schwartz, *Studies in the Jewish Background of Christianity* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 60, Tübingen 1992) 29–34.

¹² See Gafni, (above, n. 10) 121–123.

¹³ See B. Renaud, *La loi et les lois dans les livres des Maccabées*, in: *Revue biblique* 68 (1961) 55–67; D. R. Schwartz, *Scripta Classica Israelica* 17 (1998) 250–251.

¹⁴ On their usage, see Aryeh Kasher, *The Jews of Hellenistic and Roman Egypt* (Texte und Studien zum Antiken Judentum 7, Tübingen 1985) 358–364.

¹⁵ Bernd Schröder, *Die "väterlichen Gesetze": Flavius Josephus als Vermittler von Halachah an Griechen und Römer* (Texte und Studien zum Antiken Judentum 53, Tübingen 1996) 52, 128, 152–156.

¹⁶ Karl Heinrich Rengstorff (ed.), *A Complete Concordance to Flavius Josephus*, 3 (Leiden 1979) 474–476.

As an example of this difference between Josephus' two works, let us take his accounts of Pompey's conquest of the Temple in 63 BCE. In *War* 1.145–147, Josephus reports that Pompey's troops found it difficult to build siegeworks, due to Jewish opposition, and indeed might never have succeeded, had they not taken advantage of the Jewish abstention from manual work on the Sabbath “due to religious scruples” (διὰ τὴν θρησκείαν). Then, in § 148, the Romans are said to have been full of admiration for the way the Jews persevered in their θρησκεία despite the weapons flying about. Finally, in § 150 (after the Romans broke into the Temple courts), the priests are said to have been killed while continuing their θρησκεία, for they put the θεραπεία of the Deity above their own salvation. That is, *War* bespeaks a view of the cult not as an aspect of Law (which is never mentioned in this narrative) but, rather, as independently important.

In the parallel at *Ant.* 14.63, in contrast, it is the Jewish law (νόμος) which forbids fighting on the Sabbath; in § 65 the priests' perseverance in the sacrificial cult is presented as evidence of the Jews' piety (εὐσέβεια) and observance of their laws (τῶν νόμων); and § 67 says that the priests thought it was better to suffer beside the altar than to violate any of the νόμια. Thus, just as *War* has no reference here to νόμος or νόμια or anything similar, so too *Antiquities* has no θρησκεία or θεραπεία. The contrast is one of the first of those with which we began, between I Maccabees and II Maccabees. And it is the same contrast which one finds in the Mishnah between the words of Simon the Just at the outset of the first chapter of Avot, and those of Simon ben Gamaliel at the close of that chapter: the former, as Palestinian as one can be (a high priest!), counts the Temple cult among the pillars of the world, while the latter already evinces a diasporan point of view¹⁷ and envisions a Jewish world based on portable values only (law, truth and peace).

To return to Josephus on 63 BCE: these parallel accounts also illustrate another point about diasporan historiography. At *Ant.* 14.70, Josephus says that in the carnage when the Romans entered the Temple, some Jews were slain by the Romans, others by each other. The latter, in context, sounds like it refers either to the result of confusion – a frequent motif in battle scenes – or to mutual killing à la Masada, so as to avoid death at Roman hands or enslavement. In his note to the Loeb edition here, however, Ralph Marcus clarified otherwise: “That is, by Jews of the opposite faction, as we are told in *B.J.* i.150.” Indeed, where *Antiquities* has ὑπ' ἀλλήλων ἀνηροῦντο, *War* has ὑπὸ τῶν ὁμοφύλων ἀντιστασιαστών ἀνηροῦντο.

Now, historically speaking, it is not so clear that Marcus is right. His note presumes that what *War* says is true and that Josephus has deviated from that truth, in *Antiquities*, whether due to sloppy writing or, perhaps, so as to avoid the nasty truth¹⁸. In fact, however, it often seems that *Antiquities* hews closely to Josephus'

¹⁷ This is a good example of the point that one can be diasporan even in Palestine; what matters is sovereignty (or the illusion of it). Cf. *Schwartz*, (above, n. 11) 42, n. 38.

¹⁸ For an obvious case of a similar move, in this context, note how the diasporan Josippon (ch. 36; ed. *Flusser*, 158) simply skipped Hegesippus' whole account of this episode (ch. 1.16; ed. *Ussani*, 27), which – as might be expected from a Christian work – had developed, even more than Josephus' *War* here, the theme of Jews being killed by their Jewish enemies.

original source (here, Nicolas – cited in 14.68), while Josephus' assistants, who helped him in preparing *War* (see *Against Apion* 1.50), spiced the source up; hence, perhaps they – and not historical truth – are at the bottom of the fraternal murder mentioned in *War*¹⁹. But this historical issue isn't our problem now. What is important is that, one way or another, the *War* story here fits in with a general characteristic of that work, as emphasized especially by Tessa Rajak²⁰: the portrayal of Jewish history as one shot through with inner-Jewish civil dissension, *stasis* between parties of Jews. *Antiquities* does not; the *stasis* in this period is between two *individuals*: Hyrcanus II and Aristobulus II²¹.

Now this contrast corresponds perfectly to a major difference between I Maccabees and II Maccabees. For the Palestinian work portrays its Jewish villains as being organized and numerous (I Macc 1:11–15, 43). Indeed, the Hasmoneans begin their career by killing a Jewish renegade (I Macc 2:23–24), and follow up their successes against the Greeks by striking down sinners and lawless men, forcibly circumcising Jewish boys (i.e., against the wishes of their parents), hunting down “arrogant men”, etc. (vv. 44–47). In II Maccabees, however, we hear of no such party; the Jewish villains of II Maccabees are – as noted above in connection with II Macc 5:16 – wicked *individuals* (Simon, Jason, Menelaus, Lysimachus, Alcimus), and – with only a few exceptions (4:40; 5:5) – one must work quite hard, between the lines, to discover that they had supporters²². Rather, the trouble-makers are portrayed as self-seeking *individuals*: “one Simon” (3:4) who argues with the good Onias, “one Alcimus” (14:3) who is thinking only of his own career; note that while I Macc 7:5 has Alcimus leading a whole delegation, II Macc 14 has him all alone. Anyone who, like me, spent decades of his life living in Diaspora communities where everyone was very concerned to put up a unified front, and other decades in a Jewish state, where party politics are our bread and butter during all our waking hours, will have, I'm sure, no difficulty in recognizing this difference too as one which is characteristic of the difference between diasporan and Judaeon historiography.

For us – to revert to antiquity – what is important here is to note that *Antiquities*, for all its usual dependence upon I Maccabees, has no parallels to the above-mentioned passages in I Maccabees 1 which show there were numerous Hellenizers. Rather, in a passage (12.237–241) which is very reminiscent of II Maccabees, it focuses on only a few high priests. Correspondingly, where

¹⁹ For this frequent phenomenon, which implies the later account is closer to the source than the earlier one is, see Daniel R. Schwartz, On Drama and Authenticity in Philo and Josephus, in: *Scripta Classica Israelica* 10 (1989/90) 121–128.

²⁰ Tessa Rajak, *Josephus: The Historian and His Society* (London 1983) 91–96. See, for example, §§ 10, 24, 27 of the prologue to *War*, along with the very first word of the body of the book (1.31 – στάσεως).

²¹ See especially Josephus' editorializing in *Ant.* 14.77.

²² See, for example, the enigmatic reference in II Macc 10:15 to refugees from Jerusalem. Some would correct 14:14 so as to find another reference to such Jewish opponents of the Hasmoneans, but it seems that the parallel in the very next verse confirms that the reference here is indeed to non-Jews.

I Maccabees 1:43 says “many of Israel” acquiesced to the royal decrees against Judaism, *Ant.* 12.255 has only “some” doing so willingly, adding at length that “the worthiest people and those of noble soul” did not, since they – as the priests of 14.67 – “held their ancestral customs of greater account than the punishment with which he threatened them...” (trans. Marcus²³). And, again, in its version of I Macc 2:47, concerning forcible circumcision, *Antiquities* makes it clear that force was required not to overcome Jewish, parental, opposition, but, rather, in order to drive out “the officers who had been appointed to prevent this” (*Ant.* 12.278)²⁴. These (Seleucid?) “officers” are Josephus’ contribution. I Maccabees mentioned none, leaving only Jewish parents blocking the way to circumcising Jewish children.

Some of the other aspects of diasporan historiography are more briefly summarized. Thus, for example, it is typical of diasporan historiography to claim that Gentile kings are really fair and benevolent toward the Jews – witness their dedications to the Temple underlined by II Macc 5:16 (as already 3:1–3, the very beginning of the book). Hence, whatever persecutions arise are only the result of misunderstanding, or of the machinations of some underlings or wicked counselors who manage to mislead the king. Thus, Philo has Sejanus misleading Tiberius into persecuting the Jews, and makes Gaius’ Egyptian and Ascalonite counselors responsible for his order to erect an idol in the Temple of Jerusalem (*Legatio* 159–161, 203–205). Or three examples from II–III Maccabees: the only reason the good king Antiochus Epiphanes acquitted Menelaus and condemned the good Jews of Jerusalem was because Menelaus bribed Ptolemy Dorymenes to lead Antiochus astray (4:45–47), just as the author of III Maccabees allows Philopator to claim that it was his wicked advisors who misled him into persecuting the Jews (6:23–24; 7:3), and just as – back in II Maccabees again – it was only Antiochus’ *mistaken* impression that Judaea had rebelled which brought him to attack Jerusalem (5:11). Similarly, although Josephus recounts the Caesarea dispute in great detail in both *War* and *Antiquities*, it is only in *Antiquities* that he claims that Nero would have punished Felix had not the Syrians of Caesarea bribed a Greek official at Nero’s court to influence the emperor (*Ant.* 20.183–184; cf. *War* 2.284), just as it is only in *Antiquities* (13.294–295) that Josephus claimed that John Hyrcanus I’s troubles with his Jewish subjects arose as a result of a misunderstanding. According to *War*, dealing here with an event which is definitely within the book’s purview and is treated in detail, Nero ruled against the Jews without any interference (2.284), just as the Jewish “open war” against Hyrcanus and his sons resulted simply from Jewish envy due to their successes (1.67). Josephus, in *War*, had no compunctions about describing groups of Jews as envious troublemakers, just as the author of I Maccabees had no problem telling us about numerous wicked Jews.

²³ Except that I substituted “ancestral” for Marcus’ “their country’s” – πατρίων ἐθνῶν.

²⁴ Trans. Marcus in Loeb edition. The Greek doesn’t actually mention “officers”, but τοὺς καθεσταμένους definitely implies them. See, for example, *Hannah Cotton*, The Guardianship of Jesus Son of Babatha..., in: *Journal of Roman Studies* 83 (1993) 95, n. 9.

Finally, note that diasporan historiography is always interested in claiming that respectable Gentiles, just as their kings, respect the Jews. Thus, according to II Maccabees (4:35–36, 49), the Greeks of Antioch are terribly upset at the murder of Onias III and the Tyrians are upset at the maltreatment of the Jerusalemites, just as III Maccabees (3:8–10) has the Greeks of Alexandria upset at the way Ptolemy IV mistreats his Jewish subjects; correspondingly, while the Palestinian I Maccabees (3:41) has Gentile merchants flocking to join the invading Syrian army in the hope of getting Jewish slaves for cheap, II Maccabees (8:11) has them coming only upon the invitation of the Syrian general, Nicanor, who is the book's arch-villain. So too, Josephus, in *Antiquities*, is fond of pointing out Roman protection of the Jews; note the many documents collected in Books 14 and 16. Now, whatever the provenance of those documents²⁵, it is clear that Josephus' long account of Herod's successful intervention on behalf of the Jews of Ionia, found in *Ant.* 16.27–65, derives from the history of Nicolas of Damascus, who, as Herod's spokesman, played the central role in that story. And the point of the story is Roman defense of Jews against Greek hostility. Although he very obviously had Nicolas' work in front of him when writing *War*, Josephus skipped this story entirely, indicating how little he cared, then, about the status of Jewish communities in the diaspora, and how little he cared, then, to claim Roman benevolence. By the time he was writing *Antiquities*, and especially *Contra Apionem*, he was even happy to point out Greek malevolence, on the assumption that Roman scorn for the Greeks would make such Greek malevolence redound to the Jews' favor²⁶.

Before concluding, I would revert to terms used at the outset of this paper and ask what the use of categorizing works as diasporan or non-diasporan is. I see two possible applications. First, in coming to evaluate historical questions we must be aware that a given claim, in one or the other of our sources, is to be understood as part of a larger complex of values. Focusing on "diasporan" vs. "non-diasporan" may bring us to see such larger complexes more clearly. Thus, for example, if we want to know whether the Jewish rebellions against Antiochus Epiphanes and John Hyrcanus derived from mere misunderstandings or from deepseated problems, or whether Jews killed priests of the opposing party in the midst of their ministrations at the altar in the summer of 63 BCE, or whether an unbribed Nero would or would not have ruled in favor of the Greeks of Caesarea, it is important to evaluate Josephus' evidence in light of this criterion.

The second use of the diasporan criterion is composition-critical. Namely, focusing on this criterion can sensitize us to contexts within our sources, which at

²⁵ See *Miriam Pucci Ben Zeev*, Greek and Roman Documents from Republican Times in the *Antiquities*: What Was Josephus' Source?, in: *Scripta Classica Israelica* 13 (1994) 46–59.

²⁶ On Josephus' Roman and anti-Greek posturing in *Against Apion*, see esp. *Martin Goodman*, Josephus as a Roman Citizen, in: *Parente, Sievers* (above, n. 9) 334–335; *idem*, The Roman Identity of Roman Jews, in: *The Jews in the Hellenistic-Roman World: Studies in Memory of Menahem Stern* (ed. *Isaiah M. Gafni, Aharon Oppenheimer and Daniel R. Schwartz*; Jerusalem 1996) 89*–93*.

times may turn out to bear witness to an involved editing process. Thus, for example, everyone knows that II Macc 10:1–8, on the dedication of the Temple and proclamation of the Hanukkah festival, sticks out like a sore thumb, interrupting between the death of Antiochus IV at the end of ch. 9 and “this, then, was the death of Antiochus” in 10:9. Moreover, it is evident that the cultic interest of these eight verses, which focus on the details of the Temple and its purification, is a crass departure from the usual in II Maccabees, which usually ignores such details; recall, for example, the contrast between the long and detailed list of Temple equipment in I Macc 1:21–23 and the mere “holy vessels” of II Macc 5:16. Hence, it is often suggested that these eight verses be viewed as secondary. The perspective emphasized in this paper buttresses this suggestion. For it can sensitize us to such issues as the way Gentiles are referred to, and hence lead us to note that it is only in this passage, but twice in it, that II Maccabees calls non-Jews ἁλλόφυλοι (vv. 2,5), just as there is nothing else in the book which comes close to the characterization of Gentiles, in v. 4, as “blasphemous and barbarous peoples”. Just as much as the interest in the Temple cult, which we expect from a Jerusalemite and not from Jason of Cyrene or his (Alexandrian?) epitomator, such a way of referring to non-Jews is to be expected of Jews who talk among themselves: “goyyim”, not “Gentiles”. Indeed, ἁλλόφυλοι are as frequent in I Maccabees as is interest in the Temple cult.

But to return to Josephus, here I will venture, finally, a suggestion that for him too, considerations such as ours may lead to composition-critical conclusions. And I will be adventurous enough to take quite a large and central example, namely, his account of the fall of Masada. This passage (*War* 7.252 ff.), one of the most famous in his work, is also quite a problematic one, in the context of *War*, for it expresses the wrong values. It portrays the Sicarii of Masada as heroes, although Josephus always condemns them terribly; and in particular it admires them for their fortitude in killing one another, although Josephus himself, at Jotapata, not only refused to do so but even brings long arguments in favor of that refusal (*War* 3.361–382) and considers it polluting to kill a fellow-Jew (§ 391). Indeed, as we have seen, underlining the Jews’ willingness to die for their religion is something typical of diasporan historiography. But diasporan historiography is something which we have found not so much in *War* as, especially, in Josephus’ works of the nineties.

Now, it is interesting that Thackeray – a great expert on Josephus’ style – remarked that the Greek of *War* 7 differs from that of the rest of the work, reminding him instead of that of *Antiquities*²⁷. More recently, Seth Schwartz argued that although the body of *War* was written in the seventies (as emerges esp. from *Vita* 361 ff. and *Against Apion* 1.50–51), at least the last sections of *War* 7 were written

²⁷ H. St. John Thackeray, “An Unrecorded ‘Aramaism’ in Josephus,” in: *Journal of Theological Studies* 30 (1928/29) 365; *idem*, *Josephus: The Man and the Historian* (New York 1929) 35. Unfortunately, Thackeray did not offer any details, so we cannot know if his impression related to all of Book 7 or, perhaps, to a part of it.

in the nineties, as is shown by the fact that they relate to the death of their villain, Catullus (governor of Lybia), who – assuming he is to be identified with L. Valerius Catullus Messalinus – died no earlier than 93 CE²⁸. To which we may add that the long and detailed table of contents supplied in *War* 1.19–29 stops short with Titus’ triumph, which is described in detail in 7.123–162 – just before the narrative returns to Judaea, to the cleaning-up operations which culminated with the long Masada affair²⁹. Interim summary: the latter half of *War* 7 is missing from the work’s table of contents and ends with a passage demonstrably added later than the rest of the work. This combines well with our opening point, that the story’s attitude to the Sicarii differs from that of the rest of *War*, and that its attitude toward religious self-sacrifice corresponds more to what we would expect from Josephus’ later works.

What is important, here, is that another two more of our “diasporan” criteria converge in this final section of *War* 7. First, Cohen has noted that while Josephus condemned rebels in *War* 4–6 for violating the norms of society and cult, in *War* 7 he introduces “halachic” formulations which are typical of *Antiquities*; note, for example, *War* 7.264³⁰. Second, we ourselves have shown that *War* 7 is similar to *Antiquities* but different from the rest of *War* in that it sanitizes/diasporizes a religious revolutionary, specifying that he and his followers were unarmed (7.440) and thus leaving the reader wondering why the Roman governor moved so forcefully against them. Thus, this story reflects a diasporan focus upon law and a diasporan concern to separate religion and state, just as *Antiquities* frequently does in contrast to *War*³¹. Given this accumulation of arguments, it seems that also the attitude toward self-sacrifice, with which we began, is to be understood as an expression of the point of view of the latter-day, diasporan, Josephus, and, therefore, joins the dossier of arguments for viewing the latter half of *War* 7 as secondary.

²⁸ Seth Schwartz, *The Composition and Publication of Josephus’ Bellum Iudaicum Book 7*, in: *Harvard Theological Review* 79 (1986) 373–386.

²⁹ True, just before the reference to the triumph, in this table of contents, Josephus refers to “how the Romans crushed the last remnants of the war and demolished the local fortresses [and] how Titus paraded the whole country and restored order” (*War* 1.29, trans. Thackeray in Loeb edition). It is not clear what this refers to; the only such stories in *War* 7 come after Titus’ triumph and he is not involved in them. In any case, it is difficult to imagine that these few words are meant to summarize such a long narrative as that on Masada, which takes up a full third of Book 7. Probably they refer only to §§ 163–218, which include the destruction of some fortresses and the restoration of order, although not by Titus. This section ends with a round summary, “Such, then, were Judaeon affairs at this time”, and no one would be surprised if the book ended here. All that comes after this point is a narrative on Commagene and the Scythians (§§ 219–251), which has little business in a book on the Jewish War but does have a Sitz im Leben in the nineties (see Schwartz, [above, n. 28] 379–382), the long Masada narrative, and some material on Egypt (§§ 407–455) which concludes with the Catullus story.

³⁰ Shaye J. D. Cohen, *Josephus in Galilee and Rome* (Columbia Studies in the Classical Tradition 8; Leiden 1979) 87–88.

³¹ See Schwartz, (above, n. 11) 30–32.