

FOR SIR RONALD SYME

Reflections on Titus and Josephus

Zvi Yavetz

IN a well-known passage in the Babylonian *Talmud*¹ (*Sabbath 33b*) Rabbi Judah is quoted as having praised the deeds of the Romans in Judaea. He spoke with appreciation of the marketplaces built by the Romans, of their bridges and their bath installations. A modern study on Roman provincial administration, intending to emphasize the benefits of Roman rule, could easily use a quotation of this kind in order to prove that the story of fostering peace and progress in backward provinces is not based only on Roman propaganda. Provincials themselves appreciated the benefits of the *pax romana*.

Rabbi Simeon Ben Jochai, however, grossly contradicted the opinion expressed by Rabbi Judah (*ibid.*):² "All they have instituted, they (the Romans) have instituted only for their own needs. They have instituted marketplaces to place harlots in them, baths for their own pleasure, bridges to collect toll." Modern historians who criticize the writings of Asian and African history from a European or American point of view and who deplore the failure of the ancient Gauls, Illyrians or Cappadocians to write their own history could make use of this passage to prove the 'geistigen Widerstand' of the provincials to the Roman order. They would no doubt admit that a speech put by Tacitus in the mouth of Calgacus or of a Civilis cannot replace authentic, vernacular documents (the historical accuracy of the acts of the pagan martyrs cannot be considered as above suspicion), but the saying of Rabbi Simeon appears genuine.

I dare say that had many local histories written by educated provincials been at our disposal, the general picture of the relation between Rome and conquered countries would hardly have been changed. Many valuable details could be added to our knowledge: how poor and unintelligible would Jewish history be had Book V of Tacitus' *Histories* been our only source for the period from the exodus from Egypt to the destruction of the Second Temple? But the basic

¹ The story does not appear in the Jerusalem *Talmud*.

² Cf. Tac. *Agr.* 21.

and obvious fact will remain unchallenged, that all over the provinces Rome had her supporters as well as her opponents.³

Rome's image in the *Talmud* and the *Midrashim* is a fascinating topic. Kraus⁴ has conveniently collected the relevant passages from the paradigmatic literature concerning the atmosphere towards Rome prevailing in Judaea in the third and fourth centuries. The general picture is not surprising. Basically Rome is considered a wicked empire. "As this pit is unfathomable, so is the wickedness of this kingdom unfathomable" (*Bereshit Rabba* 2.4, p.17 Theodor). Rome is compared with a pig, the Roman emperor is usually depicted as a dog⁵—not congenial animals in Jewish tradition. Rome's wealth is proverbial (*Avot de Rabbi Nathan* 28.43 Theodor), but so is her avarice. Jews would have subscribed without hesitation to Tacitus' remark (*Agr.* 12), *ego facilius crediderim naturam margaritis deesse quam nobis avaritiam*. As a matter of fact Rome owes her wealth to robbery. Her cruelty in extorting taxes and customs of all sorts is often severely condemned (*Agr.* 31). But at one and the same time a certain respect towards Rome's power and dignity by which she governs the world is also discernible (*Shmot Rabba* 20.11). Rome is praised by Rabbi Shimeon Ben Lakish for maintaining law, order and public security (*Bereshit Rabba* 9.3 and *Avoda Zara* 2.2). The passage in *Pirkei Avot* 3.2, "Pray for the peace of the ruling power, since but for fear of it, men would have swallowed up each other alive," is of special significance. Its historical origin has still to be clarified, but it seems that it dates after the destruction of the Second Temple.⁶

³ For expression of hatred against Roman rule (*iustum odium imperii nostri*) see e.g. Cic. *Prov.Cons.* 6; *De Imp.Cn.Pomp.* 65, *quanto in odio simus apud exterarum nationes*; Luc. *Phars.* 7.284, *Romanos odere omnes dominosque gravantur*; Just. *Epit.* 28.2, 29.2, 38 (6-7); Vell.Pat. 2.27.2, *raptorem Italiae libertatis lupos*; Liv. 3.66.4; Sall. *Jug.* 81, *lubidinem imperitandi, . . . quisque opulentissimus videatur, ita Romanis hostem fore*; Caes. *Gall.* 7.38.8, 77.15; Tac. *Agr.* 30. On the other hand, see Polyb. 21.23.1-10 for a Rome fighting for the liberty of Greece or for a magnificent accretion of strength to her friends. Rome reverencing holy places, Joseph. *BJ* 5.363 and esp. Agrippa's famous speeches at *BJ* 2.345ff. For an analysis of these passages see H. Fuchs, *Der geistige Widerstand gegen Rom in der antiken Welt* (Berlin 1938).

⁴ S. Kraus, *Persia and Rome in the Talmud and in the Midrashim* [Hebrew] (Jerusalem 1948). I owe the references to him.

⁵ *ibid.* pp. 68 and 104.

⁶ This passage is not analysed in B. Dinur, "The Historical Significance of *Pirkei Avot*" [Hebrew], *Zion* 35 (1970) 1; for further remarks about the passage see G. Alon, *Studies in Jewish History* [Hebrew] I (Tel Aviv 1967) 44, nn.73 and 74. One is reminded of *Jeremiah* 29.7, "And seek the peace of the city whither I have caused you to be carried away captives, and pray unto the Lord for it. For in the place thereof shall ye have peace."

The *Talmud* and the *Midrashim* can be relied upon as sound historical sources for the first century only after a detailed and minutiose scrutiny. Such a method has led some scholars to extremely interesting results, especially by comparing the Jerusalem and Babylonian *Talmud*.⁷

The history of Judaeo-Roman relations based on such a critical method, however, still remains to be written. Be the result as it may, the fact cannot be ignored that even the *Talmud* and the *Midrashim* contain hints about positive aspects of Roman government for some parts of the population. But as far as Titus is concerned, the verdict is unanimously negative. The emperor who destroyed the Temple of Jerusalem is hardly ever mentioned in Jewish sources without the epithet 'Harasha' (the villain).⁸ Surprisingly little, however, is to be found about him in the *Talmud* and the *Midrashim*, and some passages may be quoted for illustration (*Gitṭin* 56b):⁹

"Titus . . . said, *Where is their God, the rock in whom they trusted?* This was the wicked Titus who blasphemed and insulted Heaven. What did he do? He took a harlot by the hand and entered the Holy of Holies and spread out a scroll of the Law and committed a sin on it. He then took a sword and slashed the curtain. Miraculously blood spurted out, and he thought that he had slain himself. . . . Abba Ḥanan said: . . . Titus further took the curtain and shaped it like a basket and brought all the vessels of the Sanctuary and put them in it, and then put them on board a ship to go in triumph with them in his city . . . A gale sprang up at sea which threatened to wreck him. He said: Apparently the power of the God of these people is only over water . . . If he is really mighty, let him come up on the dry land and fight with me. A voice went forth from heaven saying: Sinner, son of sinner, . . . I have a tiny creature in my world called a gnat . . . Go up on the dry land and make war with it. When he landed the gnat came and entered his nose, and it knocked against his brain for seven years. One day as he was passing a blacksmith's it heard the noise of the

⁷ E.g. Alon, *loc.cit.*; Y. Efron, *Shimon ben Shattah and King Yanaeus: In memorium G. Alon* [Hebrew] (Tel Aviv 1970) 69 n.6 for further bibliography, and lately the magisterial article by Y. Baer, "Jerusalem in the Days of the Great Rebellion" [Hebrew], *Zion* 37 (1972) 127-90, though a different approach to the sources is suggested here.

⁸ D. Spiegel, *Die Kaiser Titus und Hadrian im Talmud und Midrasch* (Wien 1906), is a worthless compilation. For the original version of the stories in earlier Palestinian sources, see the important remarks of Efron, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.7) 69ff.

⁹ From the English transl. of *The Babylonian Talmud, Seder Nashim IV*, ed. I. Epstein, transl. M. Simon (London 1936) 259-60.

hammer and stopped. He said: I see there is a remedy. So every day they brought a blacksmith who hammered before him. If he was a non-Jew, they gave him four $\zeta\upsilon\zeta$, if he was a Jew they said, It is enough that you see the suffering of your enemy. This went on for thirty days, but then the creature got used to it . . . When [Titus] died he said: Burn me and scatter my ashes over the seven seas so that the God of the Jews should not find me and bring me to trial."¹⁰

The moral purpose of these stories is clear: Titus who deliberately polluted the sanctuary is punished because of his arrogance against the God of the Jews. Jews can be defeated in this world, and whoever harasses Israel becomes a famous man, but vengeance is taken on him in the other world. The persecutors of Israel are but the scourge of God's wrath and they ought not to regard their deeds as an achievement of their own.

Historically these stories are practically worthless. Josephus remains the only serious non-Roman source to be compared with Suetonius' biography and some scattered remarks in Tacitus. Three problems will be discussed in the following pages:

- (a) How is Titus represented in Josephus' *Bellum Judaicum*?
- (b) Is his character (as depicted by Josephus) in keeping with the general tendency of Josephus' works?
- (c) Having affixed his *imprimatur* to the *Bellum Judaicum*, could Titus be really interested in such publicity?

I

Three major qualities of Titus are in the limelight as long as he was under the command of his father in Judaea:¹¹ *political astuteness and diplomatic skill* are stressed in connection with his mission to Galba and in his dealings with Mucianus;¹² *remarkable organizational talent and distinction in military operations*¹³ are continuously emphasized.

Titus' personality as commander-in-chief of the forces in Judaea after Vespasian left for Rome (5.39) could be described in one sentence: He was above all always and everywhere present at the side of

¹⁰ Some scholars interpret Titus' illness psychologically as *Trübsinn* and melancholy which affected him after the eruption of Vesuvius and the pestilence in Campania. See n.62 *infra*.

¹¹ All references from Josephus, unless otherwise stated, are to *Bellum Judaicum*.

¹² 4.498, 4.32; cf. Tac. *Hist.* 2.77. Cf. M. Fortina, *Un generale Romano del I secolo dell'impero: C. Licinio Muciano* (Novara 1955) esp. p.10.

¹³ e.g. 5.52, 53, 61; 3.485–503; 4.70; 4.112–20.

all (5.310).¹⁴ His courage was in no dispute and his personal example made his troops follow him without hesitation.¹⁵ He is described as an ideal army commander who plans carefully all his operations, leaving no detail unchecked.¹⁶ Titus is an extremely severe and demanding officer. His frequent exhortations to his soldiers—free compositions of Josephus as they may be—appear natural against this background (e.g. 3.472–84).¹⁷

Titus is not a tyrannical commander who endears himself to the *gregarius miles* by neglecting his fellow officers.¹⁸ On the contrary, he consults rather often with the high commanders in his army (5.491; 6.132; 6.237). They are loyal to him just as the common soldiers are and do not try to snatch victory from him (3.298–300).

It is perhaps to Josephus' credit that nowhere does he make an effort to hide Titus' ruthlessness, but he almost invariably tries to attenuate the harsh impression by means of an indulgent sentence: He spared no male in Galilean Japho, but women and infants were spared, though sold into slavery (3.304). In Jotapata the Romans gave no quarter to anyone and thrust the inhabitants down the steep slopes of the citadel in a general massacre (3.329). In Tarichaea there was a great slaughter without discrimination, but at the last moment Titus stopped the massacre (3.501). And in front of the walls of Jerusalem Titus ordered the crucifixion of prisoners of war. But he did it only hoping that the spectacle might lead others to surrender in dismay (5.289–450).

Syrians disembowelled two thousand Jews who escaped after having swallowed gold coins to prevent discovery by the Zealots. Titus stopped the massacre (5.421, 552, 556). He did not oppose the killing of more than 2,500 Jews by wild beasts in Caesarea Philippi after the destruction of the Temple (7.23, 37–39). But when prisoners were scourged and subjected to torture of every description before being killed, he felt pity for them (5.450). He did not, however, stop the cruelties.

¹⁴ Cf. Tac. *Hist.* 5.1, *cuncta explorans paratusque decernere*, or the phrase *quod semper, quod ubique quod ab omnibus*.

¹⁵ 3.324, 497; 5.82–83, 89, 97, 288, 340, 487, 510.

¹⁶ 5.106, 130, 292, 303; 5.258; 6.163; 6.134, 154; 7.18; 5.121, 486, 553–55; 5.316; 6.142.

¹⁷ For a detailed analysis of Titus' speeches see W. Weber, *Josephus und Vespasian* (Stuttgart 1921) 219ff. Cf. Tac. *Hist.* 5.1, *comitate et adloquiis officia provocans*.

¹⁸ This coincides with Tac. *Hist.* 5.1, *in agmine gregario militi mixtus, incorrupto ducis honore*; Suet. *Tit.* 8.2, *maiestate salva nec minus aequitate*. See also p. 428 below.

Josephus' story of the burning of the Temple is well known. According to him (6.165) the Jews and not Titus started to burn the Temple. In the well-known war council Titus explicitly opposed the idea of burning the sanctuary (6.236–43). But things went out of control, and one of the soldiers, not waiting for orders but moved by some supernatural impulse (*δαιμονίῳ ὄρμη*) (6.252), snatched a branch from the burning timber and flung the fiery missile through the door. After having achieved the victory and before returning to Italy Titus revisited the ruins of Jerusalem. He contrasted the sorry scene of desolation before his eyes with the former splendour of the city, and calling to mind the grandeur of its ruined buildings and their pristine beauty, he commiserated its destruction (7.111).

No wonder that some scholars can discern only hypocrisy in Titus' behaviour.¹⁹ And indeed examples of hypocrisy are not missing in Josephus' writings. The soldier who set the temple on fire against the explicit wish of the commander was never punished. To mention just another minor case: when Arabs, Syrians and some Roman soldiers cut open suppliant Jews in order to search their intestines for gold coins, Titus reprimanded them but inflicted no capital punishment for disobedience; but when some Jews stole horses from Roman soldiers, he put a soldier to death for negligence (6.155). Massacring Jews (without having been ordered to do so) was not crime enough to receive the death penalty.

But Titus' hypocrisy is a minor issue; the major problem is whether Josephus should be believed at all. Bernays,²⁰ analysing the story of the destruction of the Temple (6.237–66), reached the conclusion that Sulpicius Severus' version (*Chron.* 2.30.6) should be accepted. Some members of Titus' staff suggested sparing the Temple, but Titus himself ordered the sanctuary to be burned down:

Etenim nonnullis videbatur aedem sacratam ultra omnia mortalia illustrem, non oportere deleri, quae servata, modestiae Romanae testimonium, diruta, perennem crudelitatis notam praeberet. At contra alii, et Titus ipse, evertendum templum, in primis censebant . . .

This passage is believed to depend on Tacitus²¹ and should therefore

¹⁹ Alon, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.6) I.206ff.

²⁰ Jacob Bernays, "Ueber die Chronik des Sulpicius Severus," in *Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, ed. H. Usener, II (Berlin 1885, repr. Hildesheim 1971) 159–81.

²¹ The passage *quo plenius Judaeorum et Christianorum religio tolleretur . . .* is generally believed to be a later Christian interpolation. On the destruction of the Temple in the

be accepted as truthful. Tacitus, according to Bernays, had no obligations towards the Flavians, did not have to flatter them, and told things as they were. Bernays compared this passage with other Latin sources (Val.Flac. 1.13; Sil.Ital. 3.600, 605, 607, 629; Suet. *Tit.* 5) and confirmed his view that it was Titus personally who should be blamed for the destruction of the Temple. Many others followed Bernays in principle but added new arguments. Montefiore does not think that Sulpicius Severus necessarily depended on Tacitus and suggested Marcus Antonius—a former procurator of Judaea known to have written of the Jews—as a more plausible source. On the other hand he believes that Titus might have given orders for the Temple to remain intact in the knowledge that they could not be carried out. The officers must have smiled at Titus' orders.²²

Alon approaches the problem differently. First of all Josephus seems to contradict himself: in 7.1 he says explicitly that it was Titus who ordered the whole city and the Temple to be razed to the ground. Moreover, at *Antiquitates Judaicae* 20.250 he says that Titus captured and set fire to the city and the Temple. The story in *Bellum Judaicum* 6.254 that Titus ran to the burning Temple in order to arrest the conflagration is pure invention. Alon believes that there is enough internal evidence in Josephus to prove that Titus intended to destroy not only the Temple but the Jews as a nation. He executed deliberately all the priests (6.322), gave his troops permission to burn and sack the city of Jerusalem (6.353), and did not punish any of his soldiers who killed indiscriminately whomever they encountered (6.404). Eventually he stopped the massacre, but there was hardly anyone left to be worth killing (6.414); and last but not least, Vespasian ordered the destruction of the Temple of Onias in Egypt three years later (7.421).²³

Gospels, see *Mark* 13.2; *Matthew* 24.2; *Luke* 21.6. For the impact of the destruction of the Temple on Christianity see S. G. F. Brandon, *The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church* (London 1957), and (by the same author) *Jesus and the Zealots* (Manchester 1967) with a valuable bibliography; C. H. Dodd, "The Fall of Jerusalem and the 'Abomination of Desolation'," *JRS* 37 (1947) 47.

²² H. Montefiore, "Sulpicius Severus and Titus' Council of War," *Historia* 11 (1962) 156. Cf. I. M. Valeton, "Hierosolyma capta," *Mnemosyne* 27 (1899) 78. See Alon, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.6) 206, for further bibliography.

²³ It is a deplorable fact that Ingomar Weiler did not know of Alon's important paper in Hebrew (*Hebraica non leguntur*). In his article "Titus und die Zerstörung des Tempels von Jerusalem: Absicht oder Zufall?" *Klio* 50 (1968) 139, Weiler analysed correctly the contradictions in Josephus, and his conclusions in this respect are not different from Alon's. There is, however, no evidence in the sources for his idea on p.154 that Josephus produced a

In short, one is easily convinced that Josephus was capable of lying. His lies are innumerable.²⁴ But in this case Bernays' and Alon's arguments, some of which are debatable, still fail to disclose Josephus' motive for not telling the truth. Did he try to endear Titus to the Jews by telling them that the Temple was destroyed against the professed wish and order of Titus? This can hardly be the case, because all other cruelties of Titus are known mainly from the same opus; and even if Josephus had proved that Titus was not to be blamed for the destruction of the Temple, his general image could hardly improve.²⁵

I doubt whether Josephus ever intended to depict Titus as the friend of the Jewish nation. On the other hand, did he seek to glorify Titus in the eyes of Romans or other gentiles? It was hardly necessary to wait till the downfall of the Flavians to disclose a well-kept 'state secret' that Titus ordered the destruction of the Temple. Cruelty towards barbarians was never considered to be a vice in Rome: *jus apud cives, modestiam apud socios* (Tac. *Ann.* 1.9) was the general rule of behaviour in Rome; *parcere subiectis et debellare superbos* was a virtue. This is precisely how Josephus would have liked to depict Titus: a true Roman who would punish the rebels without pity but would do his utmost to spare the peace-loving population, agricultural labourers whose only concern was the prospects of the crops (4.84–92). In a well-known passage Josephus admits that he intended first of all to impress Vespasian and Titus, then many Romans who had taken part in the campaign, and eventually Jews versed in Greek learning (*Contr.Ap.* 1.51).

This leads us towards an answer to another question. Who did Josephus expect to accept this characterization of Titus? In the article

new version of his book in A.D. 75. According to Weiler, Titus wanted to impress Agrippa and Berenice, who visited Rome in 75, that the Temple was destroyed in spite of his orders, and Josephus tried to please his master. Hence the contradictions. One wonders whether Weiler's disregard of J. A. Crook's article in *AJP* 72 (1951) 162 is *Absicht oder Zufall*.

²⁴ H. Drexler, "Untersuchungen zu Josephus und zur Geschichte des jüdischen Aufstandes 66–70," *Klio* 19 (1925) 284.

²⁵ There is no evidence for H. Graetz's suggestion in *Geschichte der Juden* III (Leipzig 1863) 403 n.1 that Titus may have wished to stay his hand over the destruction of the Temple in order to please Berenice. Montefiore, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.22) 160, rightly remarks that Titus' affair with Berenice does not stand or fall with the safety of the Temple. See however, E. Mireaux, *La reine Berenice* (Paris 1961). The best analysis of the problem so far remains Crook's excellent article, *loc.cit.* (*supra* n.23).

referred to above,²⁶ Baer refutes by means of an exacting critical analysis many of Josephus' stories. We need not recount each of them individually, but Baer's most convincing argument is worth repeating.

Josephus reduced the extent of the internal conflict in Judaea to one between peace-lovers and warmongers and ignored its much deeper significance, namely that it was a clash between two fundamentally different approaches to Roman domination: the readiness to compromise and submit in order to preserve peace at all costs *versus* the determination to protect social and religious traditions. Writing for gentiles, he suppressed any religious problems which he thought might be unintelligible for his readers. Instead, he described the constitution of Jerusalem in terms of a democracy tempered with aristocratic elements after the pattern of Isocrates and Aristotle and referred to the nomination of the High Priest by lot in Greek terms only, disregarding the true Jewish ancestral practices. In Baer's view, any attempt to depict the conflict between High Priests and rural priests as merely a struggle between social classes and to divorce it from its profound religious milieu is a gross over-simplification of the truth (p.147).²⁷ In this direction his elaborations are illuminating. It seems to me, however, that Baer overdoes his search for *topoi* taken from Greek literature in Josephus' historical writing; e.g. while rejecting Thackeray's contention²⁸ that John of Gischala's figure is modelled on Sallust's Catilina he maintains that the real prototype is the Cleon of Thucydides and of Aristophanes' comedies.²⁹ The Idumeans of Jerusalem bear a striking resemblance to Thracians in Greek literature;³⁰ the struggle between the wealthy and the poor in the besieged Jerusalem echoes Lysias' account of the reign of the Thirty Tyrants in Athens; and the situation in Jerusalem after the fall of the Galilee reflects that in Athens after the disaster.

It is not impossible to apply Baer's method even to the character of Titus himself, and to show that its delineation by Josephus is but the outcome of a Graeco-Roman literary commonplace concerning a successful military commander. There are many points of similarity between what Josephus said about him with respect to relations

²⁶ See n.7 *supra*.

²⁷ For Baer's general concept of history see *Israel Baamim* [Hebrew] (Jerusalem 1955), and his important article in *Molad* 1964, "The Mishna and History" [Hebrew] pp.308-23.

²⁸ H. St. J. Thackeray, *Josephus the Man and the Historian* (New York 1929) 119.

²⁹ Baer, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.7) 141.

³⁰ Baer, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.7) 152.

between soldier and commander and what Livy and Cornelius Nepos say about great generals. And the scene in which he surveys the ruins of Jerusalem is strongly reminiscent of Scipio Aemilianus' inspection of Carthage which he had razed to the ground (App. *Pun.* 132).

Such a method, however, may sometime reduce history to the utmost absurdities. Some tyrants in various Greek cities seem to have borne similar features. This may be accepted as a plain historical fact, and it would be a waste of time to seek an *Urquelle* of all the stories about them. There were likewise similar phenomena in the stasis of 411 B.C. in Athens and the one of A.D. 69 in Rome. But just for this reason one is not justified in tracing back all accounts of stasis in our sources to a *topos*. It would be much sounder to assume that similar circumstances in different places and in different periods engender similar phenomena.

It is a fact that Josephus misleads his readers by using Greek terminology for Jewish problems. For this his Greek assistants may be partly blamed. The Aramaic version being lost, the truth will never be known, but not all the facts related in Josephus are to be disbelieved.

I do not intend to defend Josephus' overall veracity. On the contrary, I believe that he belongs among those historians whose procedure was well described by Churchill: "Give me the facts, Ashley, and I will twist them the way I want to suit my argument."³¹ He did so especially when he tried to defend himself. It is possible for a modern historian to find out which argument suited Josephus best and hence disclose why and in which direction he twisted some basic facts. This cannot be achieved by analysing literary *topoi* and using rigid philological methods. It is possible to analyse whether the description of Titus in Josephus' writings fits into his general framework and purpose. This method will certainly not disclose the whole truth, but it may help to clarify some obscure points. And this leads to a second question: Is Titus' character in keeping with the general tendency of Josephus' works?

II

After having dealt at some length with the Roman army (3.70ff) Josephus states that it was not his major intention to extol the Romans.

³¹ M. Ashley, *Churchill as Historian* (London 1968) 18.

Nevertheless, he makes it clear now and again that there was nothing greater than the Roman army (3.70), that God was on the Roman side (5.369, 412), and to scorn meaner masters might be indeed legitimate, but not those to whom the universe was subject (5.365–66).

It seems that Josephus did not reach the firm conclusion—that war against Rome was futile—only in his old age when he wrote his *vita* (17–20) in order to defend himself against Justus of Tiberias. This must have been his genuine view from the days of his early manhood, when at the age of 26 he visited Rome and was impressed by her grandeur.³² He never believed in Rome's collapse, not even during the year of the four emperors, and never wagered on the Parthians (7.78, 79, cf. Tac. *Hist.* 4.54). His attitude to the war was ambivalent from the very beginning. When he accepted the command in the Galilee³³ he hardly believed in a Jewish victory. This must have been his biggest fault: to lead people in a cause in which he never believed without serious doubts. And I think that his split personality should be interpreted against this background.³⁴

In 3.108 he declares the purposes of his work: (a) to console those who were conquered by the Romans (*i.e.* the Jews); (b) to deter others who may be tempted to revolt. By 'others' he could have had in mind not only other Jews but also gentiles in Asia Minor who might have hoped for Parthian help (*e.g.* 1.6, 2.388 etc.).

But the real undercurrent in his whole work is that Jews and Romans are two great nations.³⁵ War between these two nations was not inevitable and peaceful co-existence was a real possibility, if wild extremists on both sides—Zealots on one hand and greedy procurators on the other—had not dragged the two nations into an unnecessary clash. There were good and bad people on both sides (*e.g.* 3.335, 4.60 etc.). But the strongest strictures are reserved for those Jews who insisted on fighting against the Romans to the bitter end.

³² Cf. R. J. Shutt, *Studies in Josephus* (London 1961) 3.

³³ I cannot discuss here the problem whether it was Josephus' mission to pacify the Galilee (*Vit.* 29) or to organize further resistance against Rome (*BJ* 2.562ff).

³⁴ This is in agreement mainly with Thackeray, *loc.cit.* (*supra* n.28), and A. Momigliano in *CAH X* (1934) 884. For a different view of Josephus' *Vita* see M. Gelzer, *Hermes* 80 (1952) 67–90.

³⁵ When in 6.13 Josephus praises the fortitude of soul of the Jews that could surmount faction, famine and other calamities, he is sincere. I do not think that he praises the Jews only to enhance the achievement of the Roman victory even more. This is Weber's (*op.cit.* [*supra* n.7] 211) view: Josephus' aim was "die Besiegten als gross, die Sieger als um so mächtiger zu erweisen."

Jews were plagued by war, tyranny and faction (4.397).³⁶ Titus himself asserted that the Jewish people owed its ruin to civil strife, and that the Jewish tyrants brought down upon the holy Temple the unwilling hands of the Romans (1.10). The Romans may well be found to have been the upholders of our laws. The real enemy was within the walls of besieged Jerusalem (4.184). Civil war paved the way to famine. The city was converted into a desolate no-man's-land for domestic warfare, and almost all the corn which might have sufficed for many years of siege was destroyed (5.25, 26). Dreary and famine-stricken, the city was exposed to daily atrocities (5.429ff). Jews suffered nothing worse at the hands of the Romans than what they inflicted upon each other. It was sedition that subdued the city, and all the tragedy may be ascribed to her own people (5.527). Such explanations were not alien to Jewish minds. Talmudic legends (e.g. *Gitṭin* 55b–56a) may illustrate the point.

But of course not all Jews were seditious. There were some excellent people too, who were not allowed to handle the difficult situation. Such a man was Ananus, the senior of the chief priests, a man of profound sanity, who might have possibly saved the city of Jerusalem had he escaped the hands of the extremists (4.151).³⁷ Josephus would have liked to appear in Jewish history as another Ananus who unfortunately recognized the hopeless circumstances at an early stage.³⁸ He knew that no one would listen to his advice, and had he remained in Jerusalem and fought for his ideas, his fate could have been similar to that of Ananus.

Josephus was aware of the fact that after his defection some people accused him as a coward, others as a traitor, and throughout the city there was general indignation and curses heaped upon “his devoted head” (3.432–39). He could not hope to be compared with a Jeremiah (5.391) or a Jehohachim (6.105). Jews were never prepared to compare a renegade who acted as an adviser of moderation in Titus' headquarters with a Jeremiah who preached for moderation within the be-

³⁶ On the implication of Greek terms in the writings of Josephus, see Baer, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.7) *passim*.

³⁷ For Ananus' character see 4.315–20; on 4.163 see Baer, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.7) 147 n.77 and 149 n.84, and his interpretation of it as typical literary theft.

³⁸ The possibility that many years later Josephus changed his view about Ananus (*Vita* 194ff and *AJ* 20.199ff) is discussed and refuted by J. Efron, “The Sanhedrin, Vision and Reality” [Hebrew], *Doron* [Festschrift Katz] (Tel Aviv 1967) 167–204, esp. 201ff.

sieged walls of Jerusalem.³⁹ Josephus had to resign himself to the hatred of his people whenever he appeared outside the walls (5.547), but he would have loved to be remembered as another Ananus who did everything for the public welfare and not for his private interests (4.320). Had gentle men like Josephus and Ananus survived to lead the Jewish nation in the tragic days of 66–70, an understanding between Jews and Romans would certainly have been reached. They would have found a congenial counterpart in the Roman camp—Titus.⁴⁰

Josephus is convinced by the clemency of the Romans towards alien races, by Titus' anxiety to save the Temple (1.27), and by the fact that the burning of the Temple happened contrary to Caesar's wishes (1.28). In 1.10 we read that throughout the war Titus commiserated the populace who were at the mercy of the revolutionaries and often of his own accord deferred the capture of the city by protracting the siege to give the culprits time for repentance.

It is this conception that made Josephus describe Titus as he did. Personal ties, of course, should not be underestimated. Titus was his benefactor, and Josephus owed him a great deal.⁴¹ He was given Roman citizenship, and with a pension assigned to him he could start to write the *History of the Jewish War*, *Περὶ τοῦ Ἰουδαϊκοῦ πολέμου*, a title clearly showing his original point of view.⁴² Roman official sources were put at his disposal, and the general purpose of a book written in such an atmosphere is obvious. Titus could expect little less than a panegyric (4.597).

Josephus' description of Titus' cruelty and ruthlessness, however, must be taken up again. According to Josephus, these were forced upon him and he committed them reluctantly (5.442–44, 455; 6.118–124, 128, 215–16). The real villains were the Jewish extremists. They divorced soul from body, and all remorse from evil was extinct (5.526). There is no word of understanding for the rebels. The fact that many of them had already been defeated once (in the Galilee) and that they might have known the Roman custom to treat more

³⁹ H. Graetz, *Geschichte der Juden* III.2 (Leipzig 1906) 558.

⁴⁰ For a different interpretation see Weber, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.17) 215: "Führer treten aus dem Haufen der Juden nicht hervor. Titus wird selbst mit diesen jüdischen Massen konfrontiert, die ungegliedert hauptlos, ihr Werk tun."

⁴¹ For Titus' pleadings to save Josephus' life and liberty see 3.397, 408; 4.628; Titus repressing outbursts against Josephus, *Vit.* 416–17; *cf. Ap.* 1.48; sending a rescuing party 5.542, *cf.* 5.261; gifts and favours, *Vit.* 418–23; protection in Rome, *ibid.* 428–29.

⁴² Thackeray, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.28).

ruthlessly those who had been defeated twice⁴³ did not occur to him. On the contrary, he believed that they left Titus no other choice⁴⁴ and many times mistook his humanity for weakness (5.335: cf. 6.324; 5.340; 5.419; 6.356). They regarded Titus' overtures as due to his inability to be really harsh, and indeed Titus razes to the ground enemy fortifications only after long and stubborn fighting and only then when he can show no mercy (5.347). Only after having been double-crossed by the ruses of his enemy, he loses his patience and exerts his tremendous power to its fullest extent (5.319–30, 333). But even then he does it reluctantly, and the *topos* πάλιν πρὸς πόλεμον ἄκων ἐχώρει (6.130) appears *ad nauseam* in the *Bellum Judaicum*. All that because Titus was a man with innate love for human beings, τὸ φιλόανθρωπον φύσει (6.324 and 357).

Such a characterization of Titus could hardly convince a Jew between the years A.D. 70–80. But Josephus never intended to convince them and—as said before—he did not hope to be able to do so. He read Titus' memoirs (*Vita* 358) and keeping in mind his potential readers (*Contr. Ap.* 1.51) decided out of personal gratitude to delineate his saviour as a man imbued with ἐπιείκεια and μεγαλοφροσύνη (*AJ* 12.128).

It is difficult to assess exact Latin equivalents for Greek philosophical terms.⁴⁵ It is doubtful whether Josephus or his assistants knew exactly the differences and nuances of ἐπιείκεια, πραότης, φιλανθρωπία, but it is plausible to assume that they would have hoped a Roman reader would translate τὸ φιλόανθρωπον φύσει by *natura clemens*.

Clementia was a typical *Herrschaftertugend*, a virtue of rulers and an important one: *maxime tamen decora imperatoribus* (*Sen. De Clem.* 1.5.2), for in rulers it has an especial comeliness inasmuch as with them it finds more to save. *Clementia* is that which restrains the mind

⁴³ Tac. *Ann.* 3.45.4, *intolerantior servitus iterum victis*. It seems to have been customary for Roman generals not to negotiate for peace except with people who have surrendered: Liv. 40.25.

⁴⁴ Sulpicius Severus, however, denies the fact that Jews were given opportunities of peaceful surrender: *Nulla neque pacis neque deditionis copia dabatur* (*Chron.* 2.30.3); cf. Cass. Dio 66(65).5.3, who says that at first Titus offered immunity to the besieged, but when he saw that some of the prisoners of war defected and harassed the Roman troops, he no longer received Jewish deserters.

⁴⁵ M. Fuhrmann, "Die Alleinherrschaft und das Problem der Gerechtigkeit," *Gymnasium* 70 (1963) 481ff.; H. Dahlmann, "Clementia Caesaris," *Njbb* 10 (1934) 17; M. Treu, "Clementia Caesaris," *MusHelv* 5 (1948) 197; T. Adam, *Clementia Principis* (Stuttgart 1970); S. Weinstock, *Divus Julius* (Oxford 1971) 233ff; esp. Diod. 32.4.1; Polyb. 5.10.1.

from vengeance when it has the power to take it, or leniency of a superior towards an inferior in fixing a punishment (*De Clem.* 2.3.1)—*lenitas superioris adversus inferiorem in constituendis poenis*.⁴⁶

A decree of an emperor in those days could decide what nations should utterly be destroyed, which banished, which should receive the gift of liberty, which have it taken from them, what kings should become slaves and whose heads should be adorned with royal honour, what cities should fall and which should rise (*ibid.* 1.1.2). *Clementia* and *miser cordia* are by no means identical. Pity is a vice: *miser cordia vitium est animorum nimis miseria paventium* (*De Clem.* 2.6.4). Pity is a weakness of the mind that is overmuch perturbed by suffering, and if anyone requires it from a *sapiens*, that is very much like requiring him to wail and moan at the funeral of strangers.

One should not remit a punishment one ought to exact (2.7.3). To pardon (*ignoscere*) is to fail to punish one whom you judge worthy of punishment that is due (2.7.3).⁴⁷ *Clementia* has also freedom in decision (*liberum arbitrium habet*), but pardoning should not be too common. When distinction between the good and the bad is removed the result is confusion and epidemic vice (1.2.2). Therefore *clementia* should not be indiscriminate or general. It is as much cruelty to pardon all as to pardon none. *Nec promiscuam habere ac vulgarem clementiam oportet nec abscissam. Nam tam omnibus ignoscere crudelitas quam nulli.*

As a matter of fact, *clementia* rather corresponds to *severitas* just as *miser cordia* corresponds to *crudelitas*. A tyrant punishes because he finds pleasure in torturing innocent people. This is *saevitia*. Kings punish only for a reason and by necessity (1.11.4).

Seneca's *De Clementia*⁴⁸ is dedicated to a young Nero, reluctant to sign a death sentence for two brigands and exclaiming, *Vellem litteras nescirem* (2.1.2). Vespasian was anxious to save Helvidius' life, although he banished him and later ordered his death. This is what Suetonius

⁴⁶ R. Syme, *Tacitus I* (Oxford 1958) 414 n.4; in Republican days Cicero extolled his own *lenitas* and *miser cordia*, and Sallust did not use the term *clementia* in relation to Caesar. Moreover, Caesar himself (in a letter to Oppius) condemning the cruelty of others emphasizes his own *lenitas* (but not his *clementia*), *ut quam lenissimum me praeberem et Pompeium darem operam ut reconciliarem* (Cic. Att. 9.7c), and Cato preferred suicide to Caesar's *clementia* (Plut. *Cat.Min.* 72.2).

⁴⁷ In Cicero *clementia* is *ignoscere* = *poenam sceleris praetermittere* and is not one of the four cardinal virtues: *prudentia*, *iustitia*, *fortitudo* and *temperantia* (*De inv.* 2.159–64). See Adam *op.cit.* (*supra* n.45) 85.

⁴⁸ On *clementia* and its relationship to *iustitia* see T. Adam, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.45) 98ff.

tells us, and he adds that Vespasian never took pleasure in the death of anyone but even wept and sighed over those who suffered merited punishment (Suet. *Vesp.* 15).

This is precisely how Titus behaved in Judaea. He punished the rebels because he had to do so, but he did it reluctantly. He tried to make them surrender; they refused and made it impossible for Titus to say like Augustus (*Res Gestae* 3), *Externas gentes, quibus tuto ignosci potuit, conservare quam excidere malui*. The Jewish rebels never asked for *venia*, and Titus had to act like a true Roman: prove that *severitas* and *clementia* are both virtues. Having dealt elsewhere at some length with the strong concern of Roman politicians and emperors about their public reputation,⁴⁹ I need not repeat the details here.⁵⁰ Suffice it to say that highest and lowest admired rulers for their *clementia* (*De Clem.* 1.1.9). Augustus' merciful behaviour towards Lepidus made him popular and beloved, and he preserved his reputation for many years after his death (1.10.1).⁵¹

Titus probably did not know the Stoic theory concerning *clementia*. But it was commonplace in those days in Rome that *clementia* makes rulers not only more honoured but also safer (*De Clem.* 1.11.4). And it was impossible to imagine anything more seemly for a ruler than the quality of *clementia* (1.19.1): *Excogitare nemo quicquam poterit quod magis decorum regenti sit, quam clementia*.⁵²

Josephus must have understood that it would do no harm to his benefactor Titus, designated to succeed Vespasian, if he should build up his public reputation as a man imbued with *clementia* even towards an enemy like the Jews. As a matter of fact it was precisely during the years when the *Bellum Judaicum* was written and published that Titus badly needed a trumpeter⁵³ for his *clementia*. Bad tongues spread malicious rumours in Rome which might have incriminated Titus even with his father's death (Cass.Dio 66.17.1). This leads to our last question.

⁴⁹ Z. Yavetz, *Plebs and Princeps* (Oxford 1969) 133, and HSCP 78 (1974) 37–65.

⁵⁰ See especially Sen. *Clem.* 1.8.1, 8.6, 9.6, 15.5.

⁵¹ For Titus' moderation praised many years after his death see Philostr. VA 6.29. I have not been able to consult F. Grosso, "La morte di Tito," in *Ἀντίσωρον* U.E. Paoli oblatum (Genoa 1956) 137–62.

⁵² Fundamental still is M. P. Charlesworth, "The Virtues of a Roman Emperor," *Proc BritAc* 23 (1937); H.-G. Simon, *Historische Interpretation zur Reichsprägung der Kaiser Vespasian und Titus* (Diss. Marburg 1952); and recently H. Gesche, "Datierung und Deutung der CLEMENTIAE-MODERATIONI-Dupondien des Tiberius," *JbNG* 21 (1971) 37–80.

⁵³ e.g. Cic. *Fam.* 16.21.2, *te buccinatorem fore existimationis meae*.

III

A literary analysis of Titus' biography by Suetonius may lead to the conclusion that it is the sort of panegyric to be encountered in the fragment of the Germanicus *vita* incorporated in the Caligula *vita* (1–7).⁵⁴ There are, however, some passages in the biography which are far from being panegyric. It is even stated that Titus incurred such odium that hardly anyone ever came to the throne with so evil a reputation or so much against the desires of all.⁵⁵

Rumour was a decisive factor in forming public opinion, and it hardly mattered whether it was based on truth or not.⁵⁶ Titus' case is a good example. Before he came to the throne he was blamed for his cruelty (*saevitia*, Suet. *Tit.* 7.1), which is a typical quality of tyrants. He was secondly suspected of *luxuria* since he protracted his revels until the middle of the night with the most prodigal of his friends. His *libido* was notorious because of his passion for Berenice, and it was said (*ferebatur*) that he promised her marriage. He was also suspected of greed (*rapacitas*), and it was well known that in cases which came before his father he put a price on his influence and accepted bribes. In short, people not only thought but openly declared that he would be a second Nero: *Denique propalam alium Neronem et opinabatur et praedicabant* (Suet. *Tit.* 7.1).⁵⁷

Chronologically this description fits the period A.D. 71–79. After Titus' return from the East he became Vespasian's partner and protector: *Neque ex eo destitit participem atque etiam tutorem imperii agere* (Suet. *Tit.* 6.1). He took part in his father's triumph, became his colleague in tribunician power, assumed command of the praetorian guard, became censor in 73 and held seven consulships.⁵⁸ It was dur-

⁵⁴ F. Leo, *Die griechisch-römische Biographie I* (Leipzig 1901, repr. Hildesheim 1965) 9. For a different view see W. Steidle, *Sueton und die antike Biographie (Zetemata 1, München 1963)* 106. See also G. Luck, "Über Suetons Divus Titus," *RhM* 107 (1964) 63, who sees the same relationship between Vespasian and Titus as between Augustus and Germanicus.

⁵⁵ Suet. *Tit.* 6.2. On the murder of Caecina see Suet. *ibid.*; Cass. Dio 66(65).3.16.3; 66.10.2a. On Eprius Marcellus *PIR*² E 84; on A. Caecina Alienus *PIR*² C 99.

⁵⁶ *HSCP* 78 (1974) 37ff, and especially my paper "Forte an dolo principis" in *Studies dedicated to C. E. Stevens* (Oxford 1975) 181ff.

⁵⁷ For Vespasian's efforts to disconnect himself from the Neronian tradition, see especially M. P. Charlesworth, "Flaviana," *JRS* 27 (1937) 54ff. Is it an accident that just when Titus became anti-Neronian a false Nero appeared? Cass. Dio 66.19.3b; cf. F. Millar, *A Study in Cassius Dio* (Oxford 1964) 214ff.

⁵⁸ See B. Grenzheuser, *Kaiser und Senat in der Zeit von Nero bis Nerva* (Muenster 1964) 86. M. McCrum and A. G. Woodhead, *Select Documents of the Flavian Emperors* (Cambridge

ing this period that he had to take upon himself the discharge of almost all the duties. And as usual, all his good deeds went to the credit of his father, while the dirty jobs which were assigned to him harmed his own reputation. Suetonius had to admit, however, that eventually his reputation turned to the highest praise, no fault was discovered in him any more, and people had good things to say about him. *At illi fama pro bono cessit conversaque est in maximas laudes* (Suet. Tit. 7.1).

It would not be wise to scorn Suetonius' chronology in all his biographies. True, he once confessed to write *neque per tempora sed per species* (Suet. Aug. 9.1). But in the biography of Titus this principle does not work, and Tacitus' testimony is decisive: *Laetam voluptatibus adulescentiam egit, suo quam patris imperio moderatior* (Tac. Hist. 2.2).

Our sources are unanimous in telling us that after Titus' accession to the throne he made an immense effort to change his image. Reappearance of Augustan types on Titus' coinage is conspicuous.⁵⁹ The new emperor would try to imitate the behaviour of the founder of the Principate. He would endeavour to gain the good will of the masses without humiliating the members of the upper classes. He would attend gladiatorial games and public baths—however preserving his dignity as well as observing justice: *Verum maiestate salva nec minus aequitate* (Suet. Tit. 8.2). Indeed his whole behaviour changed. His banquets were pleasant rather than extravagant (Suet. Tit. 7.2, *iucunda magis quam profusa*), and Dio emphasizes that he was frugal in money matters and made no unnecessary expenditures (66.19.3a; Zon. 11.18.16–18, p.55 Dindorf). No more *luxuria* and no more *libido* either. He sent Berenice away from Rome at once, against her will and against his own. He ceased to cherish dancers, put an end to his *rapacitas* and became famous for his *munificentia*. He took away nothing from any citizen, respected other people's property and, although many kept offering and promising him large sums, he accepted nothing from any citizen, city⁶⁰ or king (Cass.Dio 66.24.4). After the erup-

1961) 44ff. Cf. Weynand's fundamental article in *RE* 6 (1909) 2695–2729, and Simon, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.52). Titus was consul in 70, 72, 74, 75, 76, 77 and 79. For his consulates see A. Degraffi, *I fasti consolari dell'Impero Romano* (Rome 1952), with R. Syme, *JRS* 43 (1953) 148–61, and A. E. Gordon, "Vespasian and Titus as Consuls A.D. 70," *CP* 50 (1955) 194.

⁵⁹ K. H. Waters, "The Second Dynasty of Rome," *Phoenix* 17 (1963) 211.

⁶⁰ See for instance his letter to the city of Munigua (in Beatica) which borrowed money from a contractor (Servilius Pollio), failed to repay him, lost the case in court and appealed to the emperor. Titus wrote among other things: "I have preferred to pay regard to my indulgence rather than to your rashness and have excused the 50,000 sesterces . . . which

tion of Vesuvius he sent two ex-consuls to Campania to support the restoration of the region (Cass.Dio 66.23.5); the property of those who had lost their lives and had no heirs he applied to the rebuilding of the buried cities (Suet. *Tit.* 8.4). During the fire in Rome (in A.D. 80) he set aside all the ornaments of his villas for the public buildings and temples and put several men of the equestrian order in charge of the work. During the plague which affected Rome after the fire he made great efforts to diminish the force of the epidemic (Suet. *ibid.*). He gave most magnificent shows, and Dio gives a detailed description of some remarkable spectacles (66.25). He granted favours to many people, and when his officials warned him that he was promising more than he could perform, he said that it was not right for anyone to go away from an interview sorrowful (Suet. *Tit.* 8.1). And most important of all, no more *saevitia*: he banished the informers from Rome (Cass.Dio 66.19.3; cf. Suet. *Tit.* 8.5); never entertained cases on the charge of *maiestas* (Cass.Dio 66.19.1); put no senator to death, nor was anyone slain during his rule (*ib.* 19.1, cf. 18.1); and he was said to have sworn that he would rather be killed than kill, *sed periturum se potius perditurum adiurans* (Suet. *Tit.* 9.1). These points need no further elaboration. They have been exhaustively treated in various works by modern historians.⁶¹

Whether his personality went through a deep change remains a matter of conjecture. Psychologists should not be let loose on the dead (Namier).⁶² What is certain is that he succeeded in changing his

you plead: *sed ego malui cum indulgentia mea quam cum temeritati vestra loqui*" (*AEpigr* 1962, 288). On Titus defending the procedure in a trial against Hermias see C. H. Roberts, "Titus and Alexandria," *JRS* 39 (1949) 77. On the provincial setup in the days of Titus see W. Eck, *Senatoren von Vespasian bis Hadrian* (München 1970) 6.

⁶¹ Only the most important contributions may be briefly mentioned here: Crook, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.23) 162, which analyses the political factions in the days of the Flavians, is illuminating and still the most important. For Titus' connections in the east see E. G. Turner, "Tiberius Julius Alexander," *JRS* 44 (1954) 54. M. A. Levi, "La clemenza di Tito," *ParPass* 9 (1954) 288, and esp. p.292, seems to discern "una maggiore tendenza ad assumere impegni programmatici con l'Oriente," but when he became princeps he endeavoured "l'esclusione di ogni elemento interpretabile come filellenismo o politica orientalizzante." M. Hammond, "Composition of the Senate A.D. 68-235," *JRS* 47 (1957) 74-81, has shown that the process of replacement of Italian senators by provincials was slow and gradual and that under the Flavians the number of oriental senators was still insignificant. For the opposition of the philosophers see the stimulating article by J. M. C. Toynbee, "Dictators and Philosophers in the First Century A.D.," *G&R* 13 (1944) 43.

⁶² See e.g. A. Beulé, *Titus und seine Dynastie*, transl. E. Doehler (Halle 1875) 102, "Als Kronprinz: blutdürstig, habgierig, wollüstig"; p.106, "Als Kaiser: Die Nachgiebigkeit ging

public image⁶³ and in a short time endeared himself to all. Dio (66.18.4) doubts whether Titus would have remained as popular had he lived longer, and following him Syme⁶⁴ remarks sardonically, "The favourites of the Roman People died young." Popularity and long life were hardly compatible. Indeed, after his death people heaped such praise on him as they had never done when he was alive (Suet. *Tit.* 11).

One should accept without any doubt the fact that Titus' popularity with the soldiers aroused suspicions in various quarters in Rome (Suet. *Tit.* 5.2; Tac. *Hist.* 5.1). And many a senator might have remarked "*mihi caligae eius non placent*" (Cic. *ad Att.* 2.3.1). Stories about his savageries in Judaea were added to his successes as a *praefectus praetorio* of his father, and his enemies did not find it difficult to brand him as *saevus*. Before ascending the throne, Titus might have welcomed any effort to change his image into *clemens*. Josephus must have known the situation and as a faithful client understood the hint. He described Titus as a man imbued with *clementia* and hence his terminology τὸ φιλόανθρωπον φύσει (6.324). Titus' picture as it emerges from this work reflects much more prevalent attitudes in the society in which Josephus moved when writing it than any real historical person acting in Judaea.

But is it really true that Titus was so anxious to see Josephus' book become the sole authority from which the world should learn the facts about the Jewish War? As a matter of fact, Titus affixed his own signature to them and ordered their publication (*Vit.* 361). It is of course true that Rome perpetuated Josephus' memory. His statue was erected in the city and his works placed in public libraries (Eus. *Hist.Eccl.* 3.9).

über in Schwäche, Großmut in verschwenderische Freigebigkeit, das Gehenlassen in Unbekümmertheit-Mildtätigkeit in Monogamie." Against his view: B. Wolff-Beckh, "Kaiser Titus und der jüdische Krieg, mit einem Nachwort von P. J. Möbius," *NJbb* 11 (1903) 449-79. But Dr Möbius leaves no illusions: the present source material does not enable a doctor to make a diagnosis of Titus' state of health: "Ein sicheres Urteil ist nicht möglich. Non liquet" (p.479). It is also worth mentioning that the elder Pliny did not think that fortune's *grandeur* made any change in Titus. It only enabled him to bestow all the benefits he desired (*HN praef.* 3).

⁶³ Suet. *Tit.* 1.1 thinks that this was not an easy task while he was emperor (*difficillimum est in imperio*) since during his father's rule he was hated. This statement can be doubted. With power in his hands and means of propaganda under his control it was probably not very difficult to achieve a better reputation

⁶⁴ Syme, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.46) I.45.

But some skepticism is warranted. History books, even if they appear to be works of propaganda, are taken less seriously by emperors or politicians in whose favour they have been written than by students or professors of history. Luce seems to exaggerate when he sums up an (in all other respects) excellent article on Livy with the words, "Instead of searching for Augustan allusions in Livian history, it might be more profitable to investigate to what extent Augustan policy was influenced by the Livian concept of the past."⁶⁵

History books were never a major means of propaganda. The Roman masses never read books, and it is doubtful whether Roman senators considered the opus of the Jewish historian a best seller. It seems that Josephus genuinely respected Titus and praised his benefactor on his own initiative. In the days of the republic Lucceius had to be reminded by Cicero (in a letter which did not blush) that the orator could not praise himself. He needed the services of another herald so as not to proclaim himself victor with his own voice (*Fam.* 5.12.8). But Titus was not Cicero. Neither was Josephus a Lucceius. It would be oversimplification to believe that Titus asked for a panegyric. Of course, he did not mind, just as Augustus may not have been totally indifferent to Livy's history. But Livy and Augustus were never intimate friends,⁶⁶ and the relationship between Josephus and the upper classes in Rome still remains to be studied.

It seems that Titus' simulatory gifts must have made it easy for him to act as a genuinely *clemens princeps*, and Josephus' panegyric was only of secondary importance.⁶⁷ It is doubtful whether a Roman emperor considered friendship with Josephus to be an asset. He was never awarded the official title of *amicus Caesaris*.⁶⁸ He was not among his *comites*. He must have been a member of the lower entourage,

⁶⁵ T. J. Luce, "The Dating of Livy's First Decade," *TAPA* 96 (1965) 240.

⁶⁶ An unpublished paper by E. Badian, read in a seminar at Tel Aviv University in 1972; compare P. G. Walsh, "Livy and Augustus," *ProcAfrCA* 4 (1961) 26ff; R. Syme, "Livy and Augustus," *HSCP* 64 (1959) 27-87.

⁶⁷ Suetonius was aware of Titus' ability to win in a short time the affection of all men and thinks that he managed to do so by nature, art and good fortune. Compare Luck, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.54), who replaces *fortuna* with *forma*. Another modern scholar (Weynand, *op.cit.* [*supra* n.58] 2728) has a different interpretation: "der rezeptiv veranlagte und geistig gewandte Titus eine Schauspielernatur war, die sich, wie er fremde Handschriften nachahmte, ohne Mühe in verschiedene Persönlichkeitsmasken stecken konnte und sich darin wohl fühlte."

⁶⁸ J. A. Crook, *Consilium Principis* (Oxford 1955) 48-52. On Titus' *amici* see Suet. *Tit.* 7 *versus* Cass. Dio 67.2.1.

in the same category as doctors and magicians, philosophers and buffoons.⁶⁹

In spite of his victory Titus never became 'Judaicus'—perhaps because of the religious connotation of the term;⁷⁰ and Tacitus in sketching the history of the Jews preferred other sources to Josephus. He might have read him but never quoted him.⁷¹ In Jewish tradition, his fate was similar. His name was never mentioned by Tanaim or Amoraim, and only Christian historians enhanced his reputation. For Hieronymus he was a *Graecus Livius*, for Cassiodorus a *paene secundus Livius*. For his Jewish redemption he had to wait for the Middle Ages. In spite of his efforts Josephus must have been a very lonely man in his old age.⁷²

TEL AVIV UNIVERSITY and THE INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY
July, 1975

⁶⁹ Cf. R. Syme, "Some Friends of the Caesars," *AJP* 77 (1956) 271; S. Townend, "Some Flavian Connections," *JRS* 51 (1961) 54.

⁷⁰ So, my colleague, Professor Y. Efron. Professor Christian Habicht has suggested another conjecture: The Jewish War was a *sedition*; from a Roman point of view Titus headed only a police action, and his victory did not lead to acquisition of new territories. If this were really so, is it not strange that Titus celebrated a triumph and that the victory over the Jews was not easily forgotten? Cass. Dio 66.7.2 states explicitly that all the honours that were fitting on the occasion of so magnificent a victory were offered to Vespasian and Titus. But neither got the title 'Judaicus'. In an inscription Titus is praised for having been the first to conquer Jerusalem—of course under the auspices of his father. See *CIL* VI 944= *ILS* 264: *Quod praeceptis patris consiliisque et auspiciis gentem Iudaeorum domuit et urbem Hierusolymam omnibus ante se ducibus regibus gentibus aut frustra petitam aut omnino intemptatam delevit*. Cf. Th. Mommsen, *Römische Geschichte* V (Berlin 1885) 538 n.1; H. Instinsky, "Der Ruhm des Titus," *Philologus* 97 (1948) 370. Moreover, Titus was associated with his father in the triumphal arch of the victory (Cass. Dio 65.12.1a), and the destruction of the Temple became the subject of official propaganda on the imperial coinage. For references see Montefiore, *op. cit.* (*supra* n.22) 161 n.2. For a completely different attitude to the quelling of the Pannonian revolt (A.D. 6–9) see K. Christ, "Antike Siegesprägungen," *Gymnasium* 64 (1957) 517–19. The question deserves further attention.

⁷¹ D. Timpe, "Römische Geschichte bei Flavius Josephus," *Historia* 9 (1960) 474, deals mainly with *AJ* Books 19 and 20. Cf. E. Norden, "Josephus und Tacitus über Jesus Christus und eine messianische Prophetie," *NJbb* 16 (1913) 637 (= *Zur Josephus-Forschung*, ed. A. Schalit [Wege d. Forsch. 84, Darmstadt 1973] 27).

⁷² An early draft of this paper was read at the Classical seminars of Columbia and Harvard Universities and completed while visiting the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton. I would like to express my thanks to Professors G. Bowersock, Chr. Habicht and J. F. Gilliam for discussing various topics with me.