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ABSTRACT Josephus lived and wrote in multilingual settings in Judaea as well as in Rome. While relatively few Latinisms have been found in his works, he had an obvious need to provide Greek terminology for Roman institutions. Often he simply adopted the then current translations. Yet in several instances there were multiple possibilities and one finds different usages in Josephus. This study concentrates on some of these cases and seeks to understand them, through source criticism and other means. In particular, it examines peculiar references to consuls in dating formulas, the terminology for ‘freedmen’ and its meanings, various ways to refer to the Emperor Augustus, and the adaptations of military terminology. Discovering some of the nuances of expression and learning to pay attention to them may help us to better understand the linguistic and cultural interactions Josephus was involved in, as well as the milieu in which his works were composed.

Josephus functions in many ways as a bridge between cultures. It is, of course, well known that he tried to inform hearers or readers in different linguistic settings. He claims that he first wrote an account of the war against Rome in his mother tongue (τῇ πατρίῳ γλώσσῃ BJ 1.3), apparently Aramaic, for τοῖς ἄνω βαρβάροις (‘the upper or inland barbarians’) as he expresses it (ibid.). Later he provided another – presumably revised and enlarged – version of events in what is known as the Greek Bellum Judaicum.¹

¹ We cannot here deal with the question of whether or in what way the Slavonic version of the Bellum may or may not reflect a Greek draft version. Such a position has been argued most recently by E. Nodet, ‘Sur la version slavone de la « Guerre », in H.St.J. Thackeray, Flavius Josèphe l’homme et l’historien, adapted from the English by E. Nodet (Paris: Cerf, 2000), pp. 129–247), who sums up his findings: ‘[la version slavone] dérive d’une forme grecque de l’ouvrage, antérieure au texte grec usuel’ (p. 129). On the other hand, in a very detailed Habilitationsschrift, Hansack has given numerous examples where personal names in the Slavonic version follow a Greek text no different from Niese’s. He concludes: ‘Die Frage, ob die s. Version auf der Grundlage einer eigenen gr. Redaktion des Urtextes entstanden ist und somit die Rekonstruktion des Urtextes ermöglicht, oder ob sie – wenn auch mit Abweichungen – die (Standard-)Version Nieses wiedergibt, kann man heute als gelöst
How much the style in this composition and in his later works was his own or was dependent on his sources or his assistants would not easily find a simple or definitive answer. While claiming to have mastered Greek grammar, he admits that his Greek pronunciation remained defective, because he continued customarily speaking his native language (πάτριος συνήθεια AJ 20.263). This might be a cheap excuse for his foreign-accented Greek – which would, of course, have little bearing on his competence or lack thereof in Greek grammar. But if indeed Josephus, even at the time he completed the Antiquitates in the 90s, continued to regularly speak Aramaic more than Greek or Latin, this fact will tell us something about the circles in which he socialized. It would seem that he remained integrated in an Aramaic-speaking Jewish community in Rome, although he is very parsimonious with information about his later life. While Josephus mentions a tax exemption for his property in Judaea (Vita 429), he also refers to continued benefits received from the emperors and their family. Taken together, these two assertions would not go counter to the common assumption that he continued to stay in Rome rather than in Judaea. Absolute certainty about where Josephus wrote his major works between the 70s and the early 90s CE seems impossible to attain on the basis of his explicit statements.

If we assume with the majority of scholars that he remained in Rome for most of the time after his arrival there in 71 CE, the question of his knowledge and use of Latin arises. As is well known, in the city of Rome a whole bilingual or Greek-speaking subculture existed. As one among many possible examples, one may take the famous funerary monument betrachten. Nachdem jetzt ein Überblick über das gesamte Material vorliegt, ist an einer Abstammung vom gr. Standardtext nicht mehr zu zweifeln (E. Hansack, Die altrussische Version des »Jüdischen Krieges«: Untersuchungen zur Integration der Namen, Heidelberg: Winter, 1999, p. 481).

2. As is well known, in his latest work Josephus admits that in the Bellum he had used ‘certain collaborators for the sake of the Greek’ (χρησάμενός τισι πρὸς τὴν Ἑλληνίδα φωνὴν συνεργοῖς, Απιόν 1.50).


of Q. Sulpicius Maximus, an eleven-year-old boy who won a prize in the Greek poetry contest during the *certamen Capitolinum* in 94 CE, and whose premature death is recorded in a beautifully carved Latin inscription, which also includes the entire Greek poem, the poetic merits of which are debatable. In this context the question arises how Josephus dealt with Latin terminology and what influences of Latin vocabulary and syntax we can discern in his works. In particular, I should like to inquire what his terminology for Roman institutions may teach us about his sources, or conversely, whether source-theories might be helpful in analysing his terminology. The groundbreaking and systematic work of Hugh Mason remains fundamental, but our inquiry will evidence some of its shortcomings as well. Here we can present only a few case studies that often lead to ambiguous results, yet it seems best not to pretend to certainty where none exists.

**Political and legal terminology**

"ὑπατεύω"

Obviously, Josephus on numerous occasions in his narrative as well as in quoted documents refers to consuls. This is not the place to discuss the term "ὑπατος" or related nouns, but I should like to devote some attention to the verbal form "ὑπατεύω." Mason correctly states that "Josephus uses the participle in formulae for dates, the singular "ὑπατεύοντος" with two names in *Ant*. 14.4, 389, 487, and the plural "ὑπατευόντων" in *AJ* 14.66." What needs to be emphasized, however, is the fact that these are the only four occurrences of the verb in the entire Josephan corpus, and that the dating formulae in question are of a quite distinctive nature. Both singular and plural constructions are found in Greek — and in Shakespearean English.

---

5. This inscription (CIL VI 33976; SEG 46 [1996] 1338) has been frequently published and commented upon. See Kathleen Coleman, *Q. Sulpicius Maximus, Poet, Eleven Years Old* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, forthcoming).

6. For the usage in an inscription, see OGIS 532.2 (in reference to Augustus’ 12th consulship). The verb recurs over 50 times in Dionysius of Halicarnassus. Later, it is frequent in Plutarch, Appian, and above all in Cassius Dio, but not in other authors.


8. H.W. Smyth, *Greek Grammar* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1956), §966c. For an example of the singular "ὑπατεύοντος" in reference to the two consuls of 392 BCE, see Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Ant. Rom.* 1.74.5. In Josephus, the verb appears in the plural only in the one case where it is followed immediately by the names of the two consuls. In the other three cases, where the singular is used, additional information precedes the names of the consuls, or at least the second name.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Accession of Hyrcanus II</th>
<th>Pompey’s Conquest of Jerusalem</th>
<th>Herod’s Accession</th>
<th>Herod’s Conquest of Jerusalem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Παραλαβόντος γὰρ τὴν βασιλείαν ὑπὸ Ἰερουσαλήμ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ ἐπιτής ὁμοιότητος.</td>
<td>καὶ γὰρ ἀλούσης τῆς πόλεως καὶ οἷς ἦν ᾗ Ἰερουσαλήμ παραλαμβάνει τυχών αὐτῆς.</td>
<td>Τοῦτο τὸ πάθος συνέβη τῇ ἱεροσολυμιτῶν πόλει.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Month/day</td>
<td>περὶ τρίτον μῆνα τῇ τῆς νηστείας ἡμέρᾳ</td>
<td>[τῷ τρίτῳ μηνὶ τῇ ἑορτῇ τῆς νηστείας.]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>τῷ τρίτῳ ἔτει</td>
<td>[ἐπὶ τῆς ἑκατοστῆς ὁλυμπιάδος]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympiad</td>
<td>τῆς ἑβδόμης ἐκθεσίας καὶ ἑβδομηκοστῆς πρὸς ταῖς ἑκατον ὀλυμπιάδος,</td>
<td>κατὰ ἑνάτην καὶ ἑβδομηκοστὴν καὶ ἑκατοστὴν ὀλυμπιάδα</td>
<td>[ἐπὶ τῆς ἑκατοστῆς ὁγδοηκοστῆς καὶ πέμπτης ὀλυμπιάδος]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consular date</td>
<td>ὑπατεύοντος Ἐρωταῖον καὶ Κυίντου Ορτησίου καὶ Κυίντου Μετέλλου, δός δὴ καὶ Κρητικὸς ἐπεκαλεῖτο,</td>
<td>ὑπατεύοντος Γαίου 'Αντωνίου καὶ Μάρκου Τυλίου Κικέρωνος</td>
<td>ὑπατεύοντος ἐν Ῥώμῃ Μάρκου Ἀγρίππα καὶ Κανιδίου Γάλλου Καλβίνου τῷ δεύτερῳ καὶ Γαίου Ἀσινίου Πωλίωνος.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympiad</td>
<td>ἑκατοστῆς ὀλυμπιάδος</td>
<td>ἑκατοστῆς ὀγδοηκοστῆς καὶ τετάρτης ὀλυμπιάδος</td>
<td>ἑκατοστῆς πέμπτης ὀλυμπιάδος</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Month/day | [περὶ τρίτον μῆνα τῆς νηστείας ἡμέρᾳ] | τῷ τρίτῳ μηνὶ τῇ ἑορτῇ τῆς νηστείας, ὥσπερ ἐκ περιτροπῆς τῆς γενομένης ἐπὶ Πομπηίου τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις συμφοράς,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>For when Hyrcanus assumed royal power</th>
<th>And indeed when the city was conquered</th>
<th>And in this way he succeeded to the kingship, receiving it</th>
<th>This calamity happened to the city of the Jerusalemites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Month/day</td>
<td>about the third month on the day of the fast</td>
<td>[in the third month, on the feast of the fast,]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>in the third year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympiad of the hundred and seventy-seventh Olympiad</td>
<td>in the hundred and seventy-ninth Olympiad</td>
<td>in the hundred and eighty-fourth Olympiad</td>
<td>[in the hundred and eighty-fifth Olympiad,]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consular date</td>
<td>Consuls of the Romans being Quintus Hortensius and Quintus Metellus, who was also surnamed Creticus</td>
<td>while Gaius Antonius and Marcus Tullius Cicero were consuls</td>
<td>while Gnaeus Domitius Calvinus for the second time and Gaius Asinius Pollio were consuls,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[of the hundred and seventy-seventh Olympiad]</td>
<td>[in the hundred and seventy-ninth Olympiad]</td>
<td>[in the hundred and eighty-fourth Olympiad]</td>
<td>in the hundred and eighty-fifth Olympiad,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Month/day</td>
<td>[about the third month on the day of the fast]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Era dates</td>
<td>Ol. 177,3 = 70–69 BCE</td>
<td>Ol. 179 = 64–60 BCE</td>
<td>Ol. 184 = 44–40 BCE</td>
<td>Ol. 185 = 40–36 BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cos. 69 BCE</td>
<td>Cos. 63 BCE</td>
<td>Cos. 40 BCE</td>
<td>Cos. 37 BCE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An attentive synoptic reading shows that Josephus in the *Antiquitates* adds indications of high priestly succession and other dates precisely at historic turning points. He also adds consular dates synchronized with Olympiad dates at four key points. Here, as presumably in other cases, a ‘vertical’ synopsis, giving parallels within the *Antiquitates*, is quite revealing as the example in the table above shows.

The indication of the particular event precedes Olympiad and consular dating every time in about the same form. In the fourth example, consular dating precedes the indication of the Olympiad. In the conquest of Jerusalem by Pompey and Herod, each time a mysterious fast day in the third month is indicated. As pointed out above, these are the only four times Josephus uses the verb ὑπατεύω, whereas everywhere else, about 19 times in *AJ* 14.190–264 alone, he uses the noun ὑπάτος. Especially in the last two cases, presented below, the chronological indications with their synchronisms appear as additions in a text that otherwise follows the *Bellum* very closely, as can readily be seen in our synoptic presentation. It is highly unlikely that the chronological data were present in the source of the *Bellum* and were dropped in the *Bellum*, only to be reinserted in the *Antiquitates*.

In the following synopsis, the verbal parallels between *Bellum* and *Antiquitates*, with only minor stylistic variations, are extraordinarily close. Generally, Josephus pays much more attention to variation, whether he relies on biblical or extra-biblical sources or on his own earlier works. The close parallelism is, however, somewhat more widespread in the final sections of *AJ* 14. Thus also the last example, given below, offers the chronological information as a clearly distinguishable insert. The only subtle but substantial difference between the two accounts lies in the change from Jerusalem as Herod’s πατρίς (hometown) in *BJ* 1.356 to πόλις (city) in *AJ* 14.486, perhaps intended as a hint at his non-Jerusalemite origin.

Since all four synchronisms are internally coherent, but in two cases do not fit the events to which they are attached (*AJ* 14.4, 389), it appears that

---

9. In his earlier work, Josephus himself dates the city’s fall to the third month of the siege, not of the year (*BJ* 1.149). Cassius Dio refers the event to the day of Kronos, evidently the Sabbath (*Historia Romana* 49.22.4 = Stern, GLA*J*J no. 414).

10. In this section of his work, the noun is used not only in the quoted documents but also in introductory material presumably composed by Josephus (*AJ* 14.217).
285 After the meeting of the Senate was adjourned, Antony and Caesar left with Herod between them. The consuls and the other magistrates preceded them in order to offer a sacrifice and to deposit the decree in the Capitol. On the first day of Herod’s reign, Antony entertained [him] with a banquet.

286 During this time Antigonus was besieging those who were in Masada.

Josephus here used an independent chronological source.¹¹ Both ‘horizontal’ and ‘vertical’ synopses suggest the presence of a source that provided chronological data but not their relation to the actual events in Judaea.

356 οὕτως τε τὴν λοιπὴν ἐξωνησάμενος πατρίδα τὰς ὑποσχέσεις ἐπλήρωσεν· λαμπρῶς μὲν γὰρ ἕκαστον στρατιώτην, ἀναλόγως δὲ τοὺς ἡγεμόνας, βασιλικώτατα δὲ αὐτὸν ἐδωρήσατο Σόσσιον, ὡς μηδένα ἄπελθειν δεόμενον.

357 Σόσσιος δὲ χρυσοῦν ἀναθεὶς τῷ θεῷ στέφανον ἀνέζευξεν ἀπὸ Ἰεροσολύμων ἄγων δεσμώτην Ἀντίγονον Ἀντωνίῳ.

356 In this way he [Herod] bought off what remained of his hometown and kept his promises. Thus he rewarded each soldier magnificently, their leaders in proportion, and Sosius himself in a most royal way, with the result that no one went away without funds.

357 Sosius, however, dedicated a golden wreath to God and left Jerusalem, taking along Antigonus as a prisoner to Antony.

486 οὕτως τε τὴν λοιπὴν ἐξωνησάμενος πόλιν τὰς ὑποσχέσεις ἐπλήρωσεν· λαμπρῶς μὲν γὰρ ἕκαστον στρατιώτην, ἀναλόγως δὲ τοὺς ἡγεμόνας, βασιλικώτατα δὲ αὐτὸν ἐδωρήσατο Σόσσιον, ὡς πάντας ἀπελθεῖν χρημάτων εὐποροῦντας.

487 Τούτο τὸ πάθος συνέβη τῇ Ἰεροσολυμιτῶν πόλει ὑπατεύοντος ἐν Ῥώμῃ Μάρκου Ἀγρίππα καὶ Κανιδίου Γάλλου ἐπὶ τῆς ἑκατοστῆς ὀγδοηκοστῆς καὶ πέμπτης ὀλυμπιάδος τῷ τρίτῳ μηνὶ τῇ ἑορτῇ τῆς νηστείας, ὡσπερ ἐκ περιτροπῆς τῆς γενομένης ἐπὶ Πομπηίου τῶν Ἰουδαίων συμφορᾶς.

488 καὶ γὰρ ὑπ’ ἐκείνου τῇ αὐτῇ ἡμέρᾳ μετὰ ἔτη εἰκοσιεπτά. Sosius, however, dedicated a golden wreath to God and left Jerusalem, taking along Antigonus as a prisoner to Antony.

486 In this way he [Herod] bought off what remained of the city and kept his promises. Thus he rewarded each soldier magnificently, their leaders in proportion, and Sosius himself in a most royal way, with the result that everyone left with plenty of funds.

487 This calamity happened to the city of the Jerusalemites while in Rome Marcus Agrippa and Caninius Gallus were consuls, in the hundred and eighty-fifth Olympiad, in the third month, on the feast of the fast, as if it were a recurrence of the misfortune that had happened to the Judeans under Pompeius; 488 for they were conquered by the former [Sosius or Herod] on the same day, after twenty-seven years.

Sosius, however, dedicated a golden wreath to God and left Jerusalem, taking along Antigonus as a prisoner to Antony.
The death of Alexandra and the accession of Hyrcanus II are generally dated 67, not 69 BCE. Herod’s designation as king is usually dated very late in 40 BCE, after the official end of the 184th Olympiad in the summer of that year. The choice to highlight these four events—two accessions and two conquests of Jerusalem—was certainly made by an author deeply concerned about these events in particular. Yet the dating scheme seems imported. As Mason notes, the verb ὑπατεύω first appears in Posidonius. Although this fact does not allow us to assert that it was coined by him, it is unlikely to have been much older. The verb is sometimes used in inscriptions. Dionysius of Halicarnassus regularly provides synchronisms between Olympiads and consulships. His formulation varies, however, coming close to Josephus only in one instance. The derivation of Josephus’ date (69 BCE) from the chronological work of Castor, suggested as a possibility by Schürer–Vermes–Millar, must be excluded because whereas Castor’s work stopped at 61/0 BCE, Josephus in AJ 14 evidently also used the same source for the dating formulae concerning events of 40 and 37 BCE. So far this source remains elusive, but it may have consisted of chronological tables not unlike Castor’s work. In any event, this seems to me one of the clearer examples where one may recognize that at times Josephus adopted not only the substance but also the style of a particular source. While in the past Josephus has often not been given sufficient credit for his own literary achievement, this example may help us avoid the opposite mistake of neglecting the question of his dependence on sources entirely.

ἀπελεύθερος and ἐξελεύθερος

The term ἀπελεύθερος for a freed slave is fairly widely attested in Greek prose and poetry before the Common Era. Josephus uses this term quite

---

14. Mason, Greek Terms (as in n. 7), p. 169.
15. For a short list see Mason, Greek Terms (as in n. 7), p. 95.
17. Ant. Rom. 2.25.7, cf. 1.74.4.
18. Schürer–Vermes–Millar, History, 1.201 n. 1; cf. 1.43.
19. Ps.-Xen. Ath. Pol. 1.10; Plato, Leg. 915a, 930d; Sophocles, TrGF 314.199. Among the vast
frequently, both in the *Bellum* (8 times) and in the *Antiquitates* (22 times), but never in his other works. Yet the distribution of the term is somewhat peculiar, especially in the *Antiquitates*, where it recurs only once before Book 14, and 13 times in Book 18 alone. It is nowhere included in his paraphrase of the Pentateuch, even though he discusses the provisions of Exod. 21:1–11 regarding the rights to freedom for male and female slaves (*AJ* 4.273). The only instance where a cognate of ἀπελεύθερος is used in the LXX is absent from the *Antiquitates*.20

The first instance in the *Antiquitates* where Josephus uses the term is in the case of Ziba (Σιβᾶς), here styled as ὁ ἀπελεύθερος Σαούλου (*AJ* 7.263). Neither the biblical accounts21 nor Josephus mention any formal manumission, although Josephus introduced this man, without giving him a name, as one of Saul’s freedmen (τινὸς ἡλευθερωμένου μὲν ὑπὸ Σαούλου *AJ* 7.112).22 This person’s title is quite elusive. In 2 Samuel he is first introduced ‘Now there was a servant (הַבָּל) of the house of Saul whose name was Ziba’ (2 Sam. 9:2). Later he is referred to as נער שאול (‘Saul’s servant’ 2 Sam. 9:9). The LXX translates the terms עבד and נער as παῖς and παιδάριον respectively. Although the precise meaning is difficult to establish, it is clear that Ziba, with 15 sons and 20 servants of his own (2 Sam. 9:10; 19:18), was more than a simple slave or servant. It appears that he was a trusted and powerful steward of Saul and his family,23 who switched loyalties to David, with limited success.

---

20. This is in reference to sexual relations with a female slave who has not been given her freedom (Lev. 19:20).
22. Nodet comments that Josephus ‘suppose ce serviteur affranchi, de manière qu’il ait une personnalité juridique et puisse être légalement propriétaire’ (on *AJ* 7.112). While the legal dimension may be present, the question is not so much about the legal possession of goods but about how an individual, whom 2 Samuel here as elsewhere calls an עבד or נער, can become so powerful.
Josephus attributes different titles to him. In accordance with 2 Sam. 9:12, he states that David turned over Ziba himself, as well as his household, to Saul’s grandson Mephiboshet. Consequently, he is called Mephiboshet’s servant (Σιβᾶς ὁ τοῦ Μεμφιβόσθου δοῦλος). However, he in turn received as a gift from David all that had been given to Mephiboshet, when the latter was suspected of treason (AJ 7.205–6). Subsequently, when Ziba comes to David’s assistance — with his 15 sons and 20 servants — he is called Saul’s freedman (Σιβᾶς δὲ ὁ ἀπελεύθερος Σαούλου AJ 7.263). When Mephiboshet later speaks to David to clear himself of the unwarranted accusations against him, Ziba is given the title ἐπίτροπος (‘procurator’) of Mephiboshet (AJ 7.267).

In the only occurrence of ἀπελεύθερος in Josephus’ biblical paraphrase, the emphasis, then, does not rest on the manumission of a servant, but on the status of a powerful steward, whose role model seems to be not enfranchised slaves in the Greek world, but some liberti in the service of the emperors in Rome.

The earliest occurrence of ἀπελεύθερος in the Bellum (and beyond the biblical paraphrase in the Antiquitates) is a reference to Demetrius of Gadara, the very wealthy and influential freedman of Pompey the Great, known from various sources. According to Josephus, Pompey had Demetrius’ hometown rebuilt in order to please him (BJ 1.155 || AJ 14.75).

Next come references to two unnamed freedmen of Herod’s brother Pheroras (BJ 1.582 || AJ 17.61), who accuse Antipater of having poisoned their master, and to Bathyllus, a freedman of Antipater, who, under torture, confirms their story (BJ 1.601 || AJ 17.79). A further instance, where again

24. AJ 7.115. In 1 Chron. 8:34 and 9:40 Mephiboshet is called Merib-baal, perhaps the more original form of the name, but this question is beyond our concern here.
25. On this title in Josephus, see below.
28. Demetrius of Gadara is said to have been richer than Pompey himself (Seneca, Tranq. 8.6), to have paid for Pompey’s theatre out of his own funds (Dio 39.38.6), and to have had extraordinary influence over his patron (Plut. Pomp. 40.1–5). Cicero thought he was a person who had privileged information about Pompey’s plans (Cicero Att. 4.11 [Shackleton Bailey 86] 1). Unfortunately, the various bits of information about him are tantalizingly fragmentary. See Treggiari, Freedmen (as in n. 19), pp. 184–5.
29. Several women in the poisoning incident are called ἐλεύθεραι (BJ 1.584, 585 || AJ 17.64); Thackeray translated the phrase θεραπαίνας τε καί τινας τῶν ἐλευθέρων as ‘women-servants and some ladies above that rank’ (LCL, BJ), whereas Marcus (LCL, Ant.) translated the last term as ‘freedwomen’. The 1996 LSJ Revised Supplement has deleted the only reference to ἐλεύθερα as ‘freedwoman’ from
both the *Bellum* and the *Antiquitates* use the term, is in reference to Herod’s will, in which he assigns [about] five hundred talents to Augustus’ wife (called Julia in the *Antiquitates*), and to his children, friends, and freedmen (*BJ* 1.646 || *AJ* 17.146). During Herod’s funeral procession, only the *Bellum* mentions freedmen – in addition to servants (οἰκέται) – carrying spices (*BJ* 1.673 || *AJ* 17.199).

In both accounts (*BJ* 2.101 || *AJ* 17.324) a Roman freedman is mentioned in Sidon. He appears to have been a person of some means because an impostor, who managed to pass himself off as Herod’s son Alexander, was raised in his household (τραφεὶς δὲ ἐν Σιδῶνι παρά τῷ Ἡρώδει ἀπελευθέρῳ *BJ* 2.101). The impostor is unmasked by Augustus with the aid of a certain Celadus (*BJ* 2.106 || *AJ* 17.332), who is called one of his ἐξελευθέροι in the *Antiquitates*.

The *Bellum* further speaks of the role of Nero’s ‘freedmen’. Some of them, especially Nymphidius [Sabinus] and [Ofonius?] Tigellinus, are considered scoundrels (called τοῖς τε ἀναξίοις τῶν ἐξελευθέρων), while others (referred to as τῶν πιστῶν ἀπελευθέρων) are deemed faithful (*BJ* 4.492–493). The use of these two different terms in the same paragraph is somewhat puzzling. It is difficult to decide whether Josephus wants to make a distinction between ἀπελευθέροι and ἐξελευθέροι as such. I see basically three possibilities: (a) for Josephus, the two terms were synonymous, but were used side-by-side in order to avoid repetition; (b) Josephus was aware of the distinctions between the two terms – which may be the case because, if my understanding is correct, Nymphidius was not technically a freedman, but was the son of a freedwoman born after her manumission; (c) Josephus used ἐξελευθέρος in a more negative sense than ἀπελευθέρος, but such a distinction would be evident only in this one instance. Therefore, it may be best to consider the use of the two terms for the most part as a stylistic variation. The proximity of the Roman ἀπελευθέρος in Sidon (*AJ* 17.324) and the imperial ἐξελευθέρος Celadus (*AJ* 17.332) points in the same direction.

---

30. In the *Bellum*, Celadus is the one who exposes the impostor; in the *Antiquitates*, it is Augustus himself.

Only one further reference to one of the ἀπελεύθεροι is found in the *Bellum*. This is a man whom Titus puts in charge of guarding the prisoners in the Jerusalem Temple immediately after its conquest (*BJ* 6.416). In the further account in the *Antiquitates*, we learn of Ida, a freedwoman of Mundus. She is mentioned because of her fatal role in the Paulina affair (*AJ* 18.69). All later references to ἀπελεύθεροι in the *Antiquitates* explicitly concern either imperial freedmen, or freedmen of Agrippa I and his circle.32 In the *Vita*, only one ἐξελεύθερος appears briefly as a messenger (*Vita* 48, 51), before he is executed.

Cassius Dio, in at least one instance, seems to use the two terms as synonyms. Interestingly enough, it is the case of Demetrius (of Gadara), Pompey’s above-mentioned freedman, who paid for building his patron’s theatre, and is once called Δημήτριος τίς ἀπελευθηρος αὐτοῦ, and in the following sentence ἐξελεύθερος αὐτοῦ (Cassius Dio 39.38.6 Boissevain). Elsewhere, Dio refers to the freedmen of Octavian as ἐξελεύθεροι (52.25.5). Other authors, by contrast, clearly distinguish these terms.33

Uncertainty about the distinction between the two terms was perceived already in antiquity. In a passage in Athenaeus (*Deipnosophistae* 3.115b), Ulpian brought up the question: ‘How does *apeleutheros* differ from *exeleutheros*? It was decided, however, to postpone this question for the present.’34 A definite answer to this question seems as inappropriate now as it was impossible then.

From the distribution of the occurrence of these terms in Josephus, as well as from the specific information furnished in the texts, it is clear, however,

---

32. D.R. Schwartz, *Agrippa I* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1990), pp. 9–10, considers the frequent references to freedmen (and to a freedwoman) in *AJ* 18 an indication of a particular source, a *Vita* of Agrippa. Be that as it may, the references outside Agrippa’s life and even those in the David account point to a much broader question.

33. See P. Cartledge, ‘Freedmen’, *Brill’s New Pauly*, vol. 5, col. 539: ‘According to Harpocration, the latter [i.e. ἐξελεύθερος] referred not to those born as slaves, but to the freeborn sons of slaves.’ Such a view seems to be contradicted by Appian (*BC* 1.33), who calls someone not the son of a free citizen (ὁ λευθερός) but of an ἐξελεύθερος (‘freedman’). In analogy to Harpocration, Suetonius claims there had been an old distinction between *libertus* and *libertinus*, apparently long obsolete by his time, as one can gather from the assertion that (the Emperor Claudius did not know that) temporibus *Appi et deinceps aliquamdiu libertinos dictos non ipos, qui manu emitterentur, sed ingenuos ex his procreatos (‘in the time of Appius and for some time afterwards the term *libertini* designated, not those who were themselves manumitted, but their freeborn children’, Suetonius, *Claud*. 24.1; Rolfe, LCL). See Treggiari, *Freedmen* (as in n. 19), p. 229.

34. Gulick (Athenaeus, LCL) comments that there is no difference, but that ἀπελευθηρος is more common (pointing to Eustath. 1751.2).
that the ἀπελεύθεροι in Josephus are not just any freed slaves. They are essentially liberti, either imperial or upper-class freedmen (only one freedwoman) of a distinctively Roman type. They are not just any freed slaves, certainly not slaves freed according to biblical or Greek custom. It is most telling in this regard that Josephus would anachronistically impose such a role even on Ziba, Saul’s steward. This seems to be one easily overlooked instance that may help us appreciate the Roman context of Josephus’ writings.

ἐπίτροπος

As has been mentioned, Ziba is once given the title of ἐπίτροπος (AJ 7.267), again a title that appears strongly influenced by Roman usage. In this context it is instructive to read side-by-side the articles ‘Epitropos’ and ‘Procurator’ in Brill’s New Pauly.35 Whoever needs information about the meaning(s) of ἐπίτροπος in Josephus will find the article on ‘Procurator’ much more profitable than the one on ‘Epitropos’. A warning is in order about the ambiguous character of this term until the second century, especially until the time of the emperor Claudius.36 One simple example might suffice. When Augustus appoints Herod to be Συρίας ὅλης ἐπίτροπος (BJ 1.399), we might consider this as a straightforward translation of totius Syriae procurator. Yet, we have no knowledge of Rome appointing a client king to be procurator of a province or an extensive territory.37 Matters get even more complicated when the result (or purpose?) of this appointment is stated ὡς μηδὲν ἐξεῖναι δίχα τῆς ἐκείνου συμβολίας τοῖς ἐπιτρόποις διοικεῖν, tentatively translated as: ‘so that the procurators were not allowed to take administrative action (?) without obtaining the latter’s consent’ (BJ 1.399). Thackeray noted the difficulty and translated: ‘for the (Roman) procurators were forbidden to take any measures without his concurrence’. But, if anything, in this instance Herod becomes

---

36. See Anthony A. Barrett, ‘Herod, Augustus, and the Special Relationship: The Significance of the Procuratorship’, in D.M. Jacobson and N. Kokkinos (eds), Herod and Augustus: Papers Presented at the IJS Conference, 21–23 June 2005 (Leiden: Brill, 2009), p. 298: ‘The concept of procurator was until the second century so flexible that in the early years of the principate it is perhaps misleading to speak of its “technical meaning”.’ See also pp. 287–9.
37. For extensive discussion and confirmation of this point, see Barrett, ‘Herod, Augustus, and the Special Relationship’, pp. 282–5.
a ‘Roman’ procurator, although perhaps as a private agent of Augustus.38 At that time, the term was still used in a generic sense, often in reference to private agents rather than to public officials. The fact remains that we have an ἐπίτροπος of all of Syria with some form of authority over several unspecified ἐπίτροποι. Here the translation – and the intended meaning – of the term evidently presents problems that have to be viewed in the context of the development of Roman administration in the early principate.39

Αὐγούστος / Σεβαστός

In speaking about Augustus, Josephus uses both the transcription Αὐγούστος40 and the translation Σεβαστός in the Bellum, but only Σεβαστός (about 19 times) in the Antiquitates. In contemporary literature – as well as in inscriptions – Αὐγούστος is quite rare.41 The translation of Augustus as Σεβαστός appears to be very early, if not immediate, because Herod gave the name of Sebaste to the refounded city of Samaria in Augustus’ honour, shortly after Octavian took on the new title.42 From an early date, the translation had official status

39. Perhaps Josephus himself perceived the problem, for in the parallel passage in AJ 15.360 he uses less specific language, saying only that (Augustus) ‘associated him (αὐτὸν Marcus, LCL) or it (αὐτήν [Niese following P] = Zenodorus’ territory) with the procurators of Syria instructing them to obtain Herod’s permission for all their actions’. I am grateful to Professor W. Eck for helpful comments on these passages. See his ‘Die Benennung von römischen Amtsträgern und politisch-militärisch-administrativen Funktionen bei Flavius Josephus – Probleme der korrekten Identifizierung’, Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 166 (2008), pp. 218–26. See also the conclusions in Barrett, ‘Herod, Augustus, and the Special Relationship’, pp. 298–300.
40. BJ 1.20, 2.168, 215.
41. Strabo uses the transcribed Latin form Αὐγούστος only in place-names. In Plutarch it always refers to the month of August. The record in Luke/Acts is somewhat similar to that of the Bellum. Luke 2:1 uses Αὐγούστος. In Acts 25:21, 25, however, in a less formal context we twice encounter Σεβαστός. Cassius Dio always (over 500 times!) prefers the Latin transcription Αὐγούστος, except in one dubious fragmentary passage. This usage is quite common after the second century, but Herodian and others continue to employ Σεβαστός. Cassius Dio (53.16) consciously distances himself from such usage, which he considers too Greek: πάντα γὰρ τὰ ἐντιμότατα καὶ τὰ ἱερώτατα αὔγουστα προσαγορεύεται. ἐξ οὗπερ καὶ σεβαστὸν αὐτὸν καὶ ἱερότατα πως ὀνόματα, ἐξ ὃσον τινὰ σεβαστόν, ἀπὸ τὸ σεβάζεσθαι, προσεῖπον. ‘La remarque qu’il fait à propos de sebaτσός, utilisé par « ceux qui traduisent en grec », comme s’il ne faisait pas partie de ces gens, est fort significative’ (M.-L. Freyburger-Galland, ‘Dion Cassius et l’étymologie: Auctoritas et Augustus’, Revue des Études Grecques 105 (1992), pp. 237–46 at p. 240).
as evidenced by many Roman inscriptions, including Augustus’ *Res Gestae*. In Greek literature, this term seems to be attested for the first time, in reference to the goddess Fides, in the *Roman Antiquities* of Dionysius of Halicarnassus (2.75.3), published about 7 BCE.\(^\text{43}\) Josephus uses the word fairly often in his account of the principate in the *Antiquitates*, but rarely in the *Bellum* (see below). His normal way of referring to Augustus is Καίσαρ.

Only three times does he use the form Αύ̓γουστος, and only in the first two books of the *Bellum*. The term first occurs in the prologue in reference to events after the death of Herod.\(^\text{44}\) The next occurrence follows almost immediately after the long excursus on the three Jewish Schools of Thought, again in a chronological note, but this time referring to events after the death of Augustus.\(^\text{45}\) The third and last instance of the term Αύ̓γουστος is found in a summary note about conditions at Agrippa I’s accession, with a proviso to record the transfer of powers on bronze tablets in the Capitol (*BJ* 2.215–16). On the basis of the distribution of these three occurrences and of their chronological and documentary context, one may suppose here the presence of a special source or sources. However, matters are never as simple as they seem at first sight. In the immediate context of the second occurrence at *BJ* 2.168, we also have a reference to the wife of Augustus (here Σεβαστός) in *BJ* 2.167. The only other instance of Σεβαστός in the *Bellum*, apart from place-names, also refers to her (*BJ* 5.562). Thus, we again have the possibility that Josephus alternated between the two Greek forms, but his preference for Αύ̓γουστος in chronological and documentary contexts in the *Bellum* does not seem accidental. It suggests that – at least in these instances – in his early work he stayed close to a Latin source, whereas in the *Antiquitates* he took greater care to avoid Latinisms.\(^\text{46}\)

---

\(^\text{43}\) Freyburger-Galland, ‘Dion Cassius’ (as in n. 41), p. 244.

\(^\text{44}\) μετὰ τὴν Ἱρώδου τελευτήν ... Αὐγούστου μὲν Ῥωμαίων ἡγεμονεύοντος (‘after Herod’s death, while Augustus was governing the Romans’ *BJ* 1.20).

\(^\text{45}\) μεταβάσης δὲ εἰς Τιβέριον ... τῆς Ῥωμαίων ἡγεμονίας μετὰ τὴν Αὐγούστου τελευτήν (‘when Roman rule [emperorship] passed to Tiberius after the death of Augustus’, *BJ* 2.168). The parallel passage in *AJ* 18.32 uses Καίσαρ.

\(^\text{46}\) Another case in point may be the Latinism Μάγνος. At *BJ* 1.127 Josephus uses the form Magnus in Greek transcription, rather than the common Greek rendering ὁ μέγας for Pompey’s attribute ‘the Great’; similarly, at *BJ* 3.409 (without the name Pompey). The form never occurs in the *Antiquitates*, except in the *Argumentum* (list of contents) that parallels *BJ* 1.127 (*AJ* 14.iv). One needs to be disabused, however, of the notion that Josephus once and for all abandoned such barbarisms in Greek, because the Latin form recurs twice in his latest work, at *Apion* 1.34 and 2.134.
Military terminology

τέλος

Among its many meanings, τέλος is also used as a technical term for a Roman legion. Both LSJ and Mason cite BJ 1.346 as an example.⁴⁷ The strength of a legion in the first century BCE was upward of 4,800 men. In 14 CE, Rome had a total of 25 legions. It is practically impossible that 11 legions, or over 50,000 foot soldiers (plus cavalry and auxiliaries) would have been involved in Herod’s siege of Jerusalem. Again, Thackeray seems to have noted the problem. Instead of ‘legions’ he translates ‘battalions’ — a military unit unknown at the time. The question is whether Josephus here simply exaggerates the number of troops available to Herod (and Sosius), or whether he uses imprecise or non-technical language. That τέλος here does not signify ‘legion’ tout court may be deduced from the fact that the term is qualified as τέλη πεζῶν (‘units of footsoldiers’).⁴⁸ It does not seem possible to discover what specific units, if any, Josephus may be referring to, but despite the presence of a Roman force under Sosius, these cannot be legions, as was correctly noted by Shatzman in his very detailed study of the question.⁴⁹ While his estimate of 50,000 troops⁵⁰ for the siege of Jerusalem in 37 BCE is still quite high, it is much lower than many earlier ones. What is of interest to us here, however, are not these figures but the fact that Josephus is fairly consistent in using τάγμα to designate a legion, whereas τέλος indicates a different — undefined or at least for us less defined — military unit (cf. AJ 15.114).

κινέω στρατόπεδον

The expression κινέω στρατόπεδον (‘to break camp’) is very rare in Greek. One instance of it is found in Xenophon (An. 6.4.27).⁵¹ The Latin counterpart, castra movere is of course quite common (120 times in the Thesaurus Linguae Latinae s.v. castrum). The Greek expression occurs in one incident in Josephus (parallel in BJ 1.297 and AJ 14.406). Despite the precedents in Xenophon

---

⁴⁷ LSJ s.v. I.10.a; Mason, Greek Terms (as in n. 7), pp. 92, 164.
⁴⁸ The parallel in AJ 14.469 has τέλη ὁπλιτικῷ.
⁵⁰ Shatzman, Armies (as in n. 49), pp. 161–2.
⁵¹ In Herodotus (Hdt. 9.54.2) the expression is used once, apparently meaning ‘to move an army’, without reference to a fixed camp.
(and Herodotus), the fact that Josephus is describing the action of a Roman commander (Silo), the technical use of this terminology in Roman contexts would suggest that Josephus is translating here an idiomatic Latin phrase into Greek rather than using a nearly unique Greek expression.\footnote{52}

Conclusions

While there are only very few instances in Josephus’ writings that suggest a Hebrew or Aramaic basis of his wording or syntax, there are indications of distinguishable patterns in his use of Latin terminology in his works.\footnote{53} While some of these different usages may be attributed to his fondness for stylistic variation, and may be due to the evolution of his style over a period of several decades, there remain instances that point to a different source or a different hand at work in redacting portions of his writings.\footnote{54} With great caution we may state that a tendency to avoid Latinisms is observable in the Antiquitates, but is less pronounced in the Contra Apionem. However, even in the Antiquitates, his concept of ‘freedman’ (and ‘freedwoman’?) seems to have been shaped by his Roman environment rather than by Greek precedents. Discovering some of these nuances and learning to pay attention to them may help us better to understand the linguistic and cultural interactions he was involved in, as well as the milieu in which his works were composed.

\footnote{52. See also Ward, Roman Greek (as in n. 4), p. 639 n. 37, with earlier bibliography.}

\footnote{53. Possible Latin influences in Josephus’ syntax have been studied by Ward, Roman Greek (as in n. 4), pp. 640–5, 647–9.}

\footnote{54. A separate problem is presented, of course, by the texts he cites as documents. For our purpose, one interesting example is the edict of Claudius reported in AJ 19.287–291. This document (whose authenticity is debated) includes an unusual combination of Latin tributaries. AJ 19.291 provides the only instance of μουνικίπιον (for municipium) in any extant literary text. Furthermore, κολωνία (for colonia) in the same sentence is a hapax in Josephus and very rare in literary texts, though common in inscriptions (see Mason, Greek Terms, as in n. 7, p. 109). In addition, the expression consul designatus is unusually rendered ὑπατος χειροτονηθείς instead of the common ὑπατος ἀποδεδειγμένος. This accumulation of unusual features does not by itself clarify Josephus’ role in the process, or prove forgery; conclusions are discussed in M. Pucci Ben Zeev, Jewish Rights in the Roman World (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), pp. 332–3. It does, however, point to the probability that a hand different from that in other parts of the Antiquitates was at work here.}