present context: under normal circumstances, the rising sun is anything but pale. Hübner claims that Manilius alludes to an astrological system, subsequently attested in the ninth-century Persian astrologer Abu Maʿshar, which associated different 'temples' with different colours.[12] Yet, even if one ignores the gap of eight centuries that divides the two authors, in Manilius both 'green' (*uiridis*) and 'yellow' (*fuluo*) belong in the first 'temple', whereas Abu Maʿshar links the first 'temple' with blue colour and only the adjacent 'temples' with green (the second and the twelfth) and yellow (the third and the eleventh).[13] Besides, Manilius simply does not supply enough evidence to detect in his use of colour terms any sort of astrological system. If *uiridis* is corrupt, what has it replaced? I have considered *nitidus*, but in view of line 942 it is unlikely; we need a term for 'red', I suggest: when the sun only emerges from under the horizon (*enatat*), it is red, but then it gradually becomes yellower as it rises higher (942 *fuluo paulatim accenditur igni*). Out of a number of synonyms, *rutilus* is the likeliest: it could easily have produced *uiridis* (possibly by way of *uirilis*),[14] and it can be paralleled (note, for instance, Sil. *Pun.* 1.577–8 *rutilus primis sonipes hinnitibus altos | afflarat montes*, of the Dawn's horse, and especially 12.648 *attollens rutilantem lampada Titan*).

Wolfson College, Oxford BORIS KAYACHEV
boriskayachev@gmail.com
doi:10.1017/S0009838821000653

'BRIGANDS' AND 'TYRANTS' IN JOSEPHUS' *BELLVM IVDAICVM**

ABSTRACT

This article argues against the long-enduring practice of Josephan scholarship to treat the terms τύραννος *('tyrant') and* λῃστής *('brigand') as a collocation, or as undistinguished terms of invective employed by Josephus against various Jewish antagonists in his* Bellum Judaicum *(=* BJ*). Towards this aim, the article first examines the frequency in which these two terms appear together throughout the text of the* BJ*, before turning to a critical examination of particular passages that feature the terms, in order to prove that they are, in fact, not used as undistinguished terms of invective but as terms pertaining to two*

sense; and has to feel through to the connotations of χλωρός (cf. LSJ *s.v.* II) to find a phrase that comes alive.' Cf. further J. André, *Etude sur les termes de couleur dans la langue latine* (Paris, 1949), 186.

[12] See W. Hübner, 'Manilius als Astrologe und Dichter', *ANRW* 2.32.1 (1984), 126–320, at 145. S. Feraboli and R. Scarcia, *Manilio: Il poema degli astri (Astronomica)*, 2 vols. (Milan, 2001), 1.366 follow Hübner's interpretation.

[13] See W. Hübner, *Die Eigenschaften der Tierkreiszeichen in der Antike: Ihre Darstellung und Verwendung unter Besonderer Berücksichtigung des Manilius* (Wiesbaden, 1982), 295–9 and 361.

[14] Note that Manilius speaks about Saturn's *uires*, astrological 'influences', at line 938, immediately before our passage (I owe this point to the anonymous reviewer). But *rutilus* and *uiridis* can look sufficiently similar in minuscule for one to be corrupted into the other directly (*ru* → *ui*, *t* → *r*, *l* → *d*), especially as scribes (as indeed most practised readers) would normally read words as whole units, rather than deciphering them letter by letter. According to A.E. Housman, *M. Manilii Astronomicon liber quintus* (Cambridge, 1937[2]), xviii, 'The archetype need not have been older than the 10th century' (i.e. it will have been written in minuscule).

* This article is adapted from a section of my Ph.D. dissertation entitled 'Josephus' tyrants and the aristocratic ethos at Rome' (Diss., Hebrew University, December 2019).

© The Author(s), 2021. Published by Cambridge University Press on behalf of The Classical Association.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838821000689 Published online by Cambridge University Press

distinct classes of people: renegade aristocrats vying with their peers for absolute power (the 'tyrants') and their gangs of foot soldiers comprising men from the lower classes (the 'brigands'). The article concludes that Josephus used these terms in this manner in order to convey to his readership, which largely consisted of Roman aristocrats, that the ringleaders of the Judaean revolt which raged between A.D. 66–73 were akin to renegades who periodically wreaked havoc on Rome's own aristocracy, often with devastating consequences for class and country alike.

Keywords: Judaean War; λῃστής; τύραννος; στάσις; Josephus; Simon bar Giora; John of Gischala; Year of the Four Emperors

Scholars have long assumed that, when Josephus, in his *Bellum Judaicum* (henceforth *BJ*), acrimoniously refers to the leaders of the first Jewish revolt against Rome—John of Gischala, Simon bar Giora and the Zealot chieftains—as 'brigands' (λῃσταί) and 'tyrants' (τύραννοι), he deploys these monikers as undifferentiated terms of abuse. So Jan Willem van Henten refers to them as part of a 'semantic field', while Neil Faulkner and Per Bilde assume that Josephus essentially conflated the terms.[1] Faulkner states that, while we learn from the Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament much about 'the revolutionary millenarianism of the poor', 'Josephus hardly ever refers to the ideology of the masses. The gaps in his analysis are filled with abuse—the *stasiastai* are simply "deceivers", "brigands", and "tyrants"'.[2] Similarly, Bilde writes that 'he [*sc.* Josephus] describes the role of the Jewish people in the War as the innocent, defenceless tool of those who were actually guilty, the Jewish "tyrants", "bandits" and rebels, in brief, the Jewish war party'.[3]

However, although these and other scholars give the impression that Josephus uses the terms 'brigand' and 'tyrant' alongside one another as if they were a standard collocation and applies them to the same people, in fact neither point is true. First, concerning the proximity of these two terms to one another, examination of the data shows that there are thirty-seven occurrences of λῃστής in the *BJ*,[4] of which:

- twenty-one are at least 20 paragraphs distant from the closest passage containing the word τύραννος; many of these are further than 60 paragraphs away.
- six are between 11 and 20 paragraphs distant from an occurrence of τύραννος.
- six are between 6 and 10 paragraphs distant from an occurrence of τύραννος.
- only four are within 5 paragraphs of an occurrence of τύραννος.[5]

[1] For 'semantic fields', see J.W. van Henten, 'Rebellion under Herod the Great and Archelaus: prominent motifs and narrative function', in M. Popović (ed.), *The Jewish Revolt against Rome: Interdisciplinary Perspectives* (Leiden, 2011), 241–70, at 242.

[2] N. Faulkner, *Apocalypse: The Great Jewish Revolt against Rome, A.D. 66–73* (Stroud, 2011[2]), 135.

[3] P. Bilde, *Flavius Josephus between Jerusalem and Rome: His Life, his Works and their Importance* (Sheffield, 1988), 74. See also T. Rajak, *Josephus: The Historian and his Society* (Philadelphia, 1983), 86.

[4] These data do not include: (1) the case of *BJ* 1.202/204, because in those passages, although adjacent, the two terms refer to people who are clearly differentiated from each other (a ruler in Jerusalem and rebels in the Galilee) in separate, unrelated episodes; (2) Josephus' use of the adjective λῃστρικός, since—apart from *BJ* 1.11, discussed at the end of this section—the closest it appears to τύραννος is 19 paragraphs away (*BJ* 2.65/84), and even there λῃστρικός is not used of people but of a type of warfare.

[5] These results were derived via quantitative analysis, working in tandem with Rengstorf's concordance: K.H. Rengstorf, *The Complete Concordance to Flavius Josephus: Study Edition*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838821000689 Published online by Cambridge University Press

That is, only a little more than a quarter of the occurrences of λῃστής appear within 10 paragraphs of τύραννος, and fewer than a ninth within 5; in more than half of the cases, more than 20 paragraphs separate the two terms. That means that, even before we examine what Josephus actually wrote and meant by the terms, it is wrong to think they are usually collocated.

Second, examination of the passages in which Josephus does use the two terms in some proximity shows clearly that he distinguishes between them. Of the thirty-eight times[6] in which λῃστής/λῃσταί appears in the *BJ*, only twice might it be thought to refer to any of Josephus' 'tyrants'. Once Josephus appears to refer to the Zealot leader, Menachem, as a 'brigand', but it seems that this is not really the case. What Josephus writes is as follows (*BJ* 2.433–4):

κἀν τούτῳ Μανάημός τις, υἱὸς Ἰούδα τοῦ καλουμένου Γαλιλαίου, σοφιστὴς δεινότατος, ὁ καὶ ἐπὶ Κυρηνίου ποτὲ Ἰουδαίους ὀνειδίσας ὅτι Ῥωμαίοις ὑπετάσσοντο μετὰ τὸν θεόν, ἀναλαβὼν τοὺς γνωρίμους ἀνεχώρησεν εἰς Μασάδαν, ἔνθα τὴν Ἡρώδου τοῦ βασιλέως ὁπλοθήκην ἀναρρήξας καὶ πρὸς τοῖς δημόταις ἑτέρους λῃστὰς καθοπλίσας, τούτοις τε χρώμενος δορυφόροις, οἷα δὴ βασιλεὺς ἐπάνεισιν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα καὶ γενόμενος ἡγεμὼν τῆς στάσεως διέτασσεν τὴν πολιορκίαν.

At this period a certain Menachem, son of Judas surnamed the Galilean—that redoubtable doctor who in old days, under Quirinius, had upbraided the Jews for recognizing the Romans as masters when they already had God—took his intimate friends off with him to Masada, where he broke into King Herod's armoury and provided arms both for his fellow-townsmen and for other brigands; then, with these men as his bodyguard, he returned like a veritable king to Jerusalem, became the leader of the revolution and directed the siege of the palace.[7]

Here it is clear that Josephus is characterizing not Menachem but rather his fellow-townsmen as 'brigands'; he is their leader.[8] That leaves only one passage in the *BJ* in which a rebel leader is actually termed a 'brigand', namely 2.587:

For he [*sc.* John of Gischala] was a brigand, who at the outset practised his trade alone (μονότροπος), but afterwards found for his daring deeds accomplices, whose numbers, small at first, grew with his success.

Given the frequency with which Josephus uses λῃστής in the *BJ*, one exceptional passage, in which it refers to someone known otherwise as a 'tyrant', does not pose much of a problem to my argument. Note, however, that the quoted passage comes in the course of Josephus' chronological survey of John's career, which begins by referring to him as having had a penurious origin and having been a loner. Only later (as the next lines report) did he gather followers. That is, this passage does not relate to the distinction between leaders ('tyrants') and followers ('brigands') seen in *BJ* 2.433–4,

(Leiden, 2002). The Concordance refers to words according to their paragraphs (as opposed to 'passages') in B. Niese, *Flavii Josephi opera*, 7 vols. (Berlin, 1885–95).

[6] See n. 4 above.

[7] All translations are from the Loeb Classical Library edition of Josephus' *BJ* (H.St.J. Thackeray, *Josephus. The Jewish War*, 3 vols. [London and New York, 1927–8]), with my own comments appearing in square brackets within Thackeray's translation.

[8] Apropos of this passage we might also relate briefly to another passage about Masada: *BJ* 4.504, where Josephus, according to Thackeray's translation, reports that Simon bar Giora once 'joined the brigands who had seized Masada' (πρὸς τοὺς κατειληφότας τὴν Μασάδαν λῃστὰς παραγίνεται). However, all that παραγίνομαι means is that Simon came to them; as the story shows, at first they refused to accept him, and even later, when he gained their confidence, he was allowed only 'to accompany them' (§506).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838821000689 Published online by Cambridge University Press

which this article will continue to develop. Rather, Josephus makes his usage concerning John clear when he reports, a few paragraphs later (§593), that John (who has in the meantime become a leader) 'directed his band of brigands (τοῖς μὲν ὑφ' ἑαυτὸν λησταῖς προσέταξεν) to push their raids more vigorously than ever'. John is the commander; his followers are 'brigands'.[9]

Having shown that Josephus does not use 'brigand' of his 'tyrants', let us now turn to the few passages in which the two terms do appear in some proximity to one another. The first to consider is *BJ* 2.271–6:

διαδεξάμενος δὲ παρὰ τούτου τὴν ἐπιτροπὴν ὁ Φῆστος τὸ μάλιστα λυμαινόμενον τὴν χώραν ἐπεξῆει· τῶν γοῦν λῃστῶν συνέλαβέν τε πλείστους καὶ διέφθειρεν οὐκ ὀλίγους. ἀλλ' οὐχ ὁ μετὰ Φῆστον Ἀλβῖνος τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον ἐξηγήσατο τῶν πραγμάτων … καὶ χρήμασιν μὲν οἱ δυνατοὶ τὸν Ἀλβῖνον προσελάμβανον ὥστε τοῦ στασιάζειν αὐτοῖς παρέχειν ἄδειαν, τοῦ δημοτικοῦ δὲ τὸ μὴ χαῖρον ἡσυχίᾳ πρὸς τοὺς Ἀλβίνου κοινωνοὺς ἀπέκλινεν. ἕκαστος δὲ τῶν πονηρῶν ἴδιον στῖφος ὑπεζωσμένος αὐτὸς μὲν ὥσπερ ἀρχιλῃστὴς ἢ τύραννος προανεῖχεν ἐκ τοῦ λόχου, τοῖς δορυφοροῦσι δὲ πρὸς ἁρπαγὰς τῶν μετρίων κατεχρῆτο … καθόλου δὲ ἡ μὲν παρρησία πάντων περικέκοπτο, τυραννὶς δ' ἦν διὰ πλειόνων, καὶ τὰ σπέρματα τῆς μελλούσης ἁλώσεως ἔκτοτε τῇ πόλει κατεβάλλετο.

Festus, who succeeded Felix as procurator, proceeded to attack the principal plague of the country: he captured large numbers of brigands and put not a few to death. The administration of Albinus, who followed Festus, was of another order; there was no form of villainy which he omitted to practise … the influential men among their numbers secured from Albinus, by means of bribes, immunity for their seditious practices, while of the populace all who were dissatisfied with peace joined hands with the governor's accomplices. Each ruffian, with his own band of followers grouped around him, towered above his company like a *brigand* chief or a *tyrant*, employing his bodyguard to plunder peaceable citizens … In short, none could now speak his mind, with *tyrants* on every side; and from this date were sown in the city the seeds of its impending fall.[10]

It is in this passage that the terms 'brigand' and 'tyrant' are most closely associated, and it is clear, just as in *BJ* 2.433–4 concerning Menachem, discussed above, that Josephus distinguishes between the two terms. Tyrants can be 'brigand chiefs', but 'brigands' refers only to the rank-and-file followers and to the foot soldiers of the 'tyrants', not to the tyrants themselves. The latter are a different class of people altogether, much like the Roman tyrant was typically an aristocrat belonging to a totally different class of people from his followers, most of whom were simple legionaries from the lower classes. He may have been their chief, but he was not 'one of them'. This comports well with the English equivalents offered by Rengstorf in his entry for λῃστής ('robber, bandit, irregular, guerrilla, rebel, *member of an insurrectionary group or movement*'), in contrast to those he lists for τύραννος ('absolute ruler, autocrat, despot, tyrant; *of the leaders of the rebellious groups in the war against Rome*: despot, usurper, tyrant').[11] There is no overlap between those two lists of meanings.

In Josephus' *BJ*, up until this early and general reference to 'tyrants' in 2.271–6, 'brigands', especially in Book 1, most often refers to bands of common robbers and bandits. On occasion, such as in the context of the 'brigands' dwelling in the caves at Arbel (1.304), there may be a hint of insurgency as well. And, in *BJ* 2.254, we are

[9] *Pace* S. Mason, *Flavius Josephus: Translation and Commentary, Volume 1B: Judean War 2* (Leiden, 2008), 39 n. 342: 'John of Gischala … is described as a "bandit" (*BJ* 2.587, 593)'.

[10] Here and below, italicized phrases in translations and dictionary definitions signal my emphasis.

[11] Rengstorf (n. 5).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838821000689 Published online by Cambridge University Press

introduced to the *sicarii*, who are said to comprise a 'new species of bandits' (λῃστῶν). But after *BJ* 2.271–6, 'brigand' seems increasingly to refer to the common foot soldiers or insurgents who collectively form the warbands that fight alongside or under the command of the 'tyrant' chieftain.[12] Often they are rank-and-file Zealots or *sicarii* who form a military pact or association with one of the 'tyrants' for a season, only to withdraw from the pact when they perceive that their temporary convergence of interests has dissipated.

There are only two other passages, apart from *BJ* 2.271–6, in which 'brigand' and 'tyrant' could be said to appear in close proximity to one another so as to constitute a 'semantic field' or perhaps a 'collocation'. But in these passages too proximity does not mean a confluence of meaning or overlap. The first is *BJ* 6.129, concerning a harangue Titus addresses to John:

> This message from Caesar being transmitted through Josephus, the *brigands* and their *tyrant*, attributing his exhortations rather to cowardice than goodwill, treated them with contempt.

Here there are many 'brigands' but only one 'tyrant', namely their leader, John.

The other instance comes at *BJ* 6.323–6, in the context of the final negotiations of the defeated rebels:

> (323) οἱ δὲ περὶ τοὺς τυράννους ὡς τῷ τε πολέμῳ πάντοθεν ἐκρατοῦντο καὶ περιτετειχισμένοις διαφυγεῖν οὐδαμόθεν ἦν, προκαλοῦνται τὸν Τίτον εἰς λόγους. (324) ὁ δὲ καὶ διὰ τὸ φιλάνθρωπον φύσει τὸ γοῦν ἄστυ περισῶσαι προαιρούμενος καὶ τῶν φίλων ἐναγόντων, ἤδη γὰρ μετριάζειν τοὺς λῃστὰς ὑπελάμβανον, ἵσταται κατὰ τὸ πρὸς δύσιν μέρος τοῦ ἔξωθεν ἱεροῦ· (325) ταύτῃ γὰρ ὑπὲρ τὸν ξυστὸν ἦσαν πύλαι, καὶ γέφυρα συνάπτουσα τῷ ἱερῷ τὴν ἄνω πόλιν· αὕτη τότε μέση τῶν τυράννων ἦν καὶ τοῦ Καίσαρος. (326) τὸ δὲ πλῆθος ἑκατέροις βύζην ἐφεστήκει, Ἰουδαῖοι μὲν περὶ Σίμωνα καὶ Ἰωάννην μετέωροι συγγνώμης ἐλπίδι, Ῥωμαῖοι δὲ Καίσαρι καραδοκοῦντες αὐτῶν τὴν ἀξίωσιν.
>
> (323) The tyrants and their followers, beaten on all sides in the war and surrounded by a wall preventing any possibility of escape, now invited Titus to a parley. (324) Anxious, with his innate humanity, at all events to save the town, and instigated by his friends, who supposed that the brigands had at length been brought to reason, Titus took up a position on the west of the outer court of the temple, (325) there being at this point gates opening above the Xystus and a bridge which connected the upper city with the temple and now parted the *tyrants* from Caesar. (326) The multitude stood in crowds on either side: the Jews, around Simon and John, excited by hopes of pardon, the Romans beside Caesar eagerly waiting to hear their claim.

In this case, the 'brigands' mentioned in §324 are identical with 'those around the tyrants' of §323, namely the followers of the 'tyrants'. The latter, called 'tyrants' at the end of §325, are named in §326, where they are poised vis-à-vis Titus, just as, in that scene, the Jewish 'brigands' are parallel to the Roman soldiers, each grouped alongside their leaders. Simon and John are no more brigands than Titus a simple legionnaire.

Lastly, already in Josephus' programmatic comments in the prologue to the *BJ* (§11), he asks his readers' indulgence for the way in which he takes sides and condemns 'the tyrants or their bands of brigands' (πρὸς τοὺς τυράννους ἢ τὸ λῃστρικὸν αὐτῶν). That formulation too demonstrates that the two terms are separate in Josephus' usage; just as

[12] For example in *BJ* 4.510: 'And now when he [*sc.* Simon] was becoming a terror to the towns, many men of standing were seduced by his strength and career of unbroken success into joining him; and his was no longer an army of mere serfs or brigands, but one including numerous citizen recruits, subservient to his command as to a king (βασιλεύς).'

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838821000689 Published online by Cambridge University Press

at *BJ* 6.129 (discussed above) a group of brigands can have its tyrant, so too here tyrants have their bands of brigands.

Josephus' 'tyrants' and 'brigands' refer to two entirely separate entities or classes of people: the former exclusively to the revolt's ringleaders; the latter to their common followers and foot soldiers. This distinction drew a parallel between the archetypal Roman tyrant who, more often than not, arose from within the ruling aristocracy, and his Jewish counterparts. In both cases, the 'tyrant' was of an entirely different class from his rank-and-file followers, most of whom were of lower social rank. Whether Judaea's rebel leaders were in fact renegade aristocrats is immaterial to this argument.[13] Josephus was communicating to his Roman contemporaries that his Jewish 'tyrants' were akin to their own. In so doing, he was placing the war between Rome and Judaea in the context not of a clash between warring peoples or ideologies but of a shared domestic socio-political malady that had, intermittently and with severe ramifications, plagued Rome itself, especially in the century leading up to, and including, the times of Josephus' Roman contemporaries.

The Hebrew University of Jerusalem STEVEN BEN-YISHAI
steve.benyishai@mail.huji.ac.il
doi:10.1017/S0009838821000689
© The Author(s), 2021. Published by Cambridge University Press on behalf of The Classical Association.

MARTIAL AND THE DOCTORS: OPHTHALMOLOGY AND UVULECTOMY IN EPIGRAM 10.56*

ABSTRACT

This short note attempts to shed light on some of the surgical procedures referred to in Martial's epigram 10.56 by consulting pertinent Graeco-Roman medical texts. A fuller understanding of one such intervention (treatment of infected/inflamed uvula) supports Martial's text as transmitted.

Keywords: doctors; blepharitis; cauterization; uvula; caustics

totis, Galle, iubes tibi me seruire diebus
et per Auentinum ter quarter ire tuum.
eximit aut reficit dentem Cascellius aegrum,
infestos oculis uris, Hygine, pilos;
non secat et tollit stillantem Fannius uuam,
tristia seruorum stigmata delet Eros:
enterocelarum fertur Podalirius Hermes:
qui sanet ruptos dic mihi, Galle, quis est?

Of the various professions cited in his *Epigrams*, Martial dwells prominently on healers. In all, *Epigrams* cite, or imply, a *medicus*, *medica*, *clinicus* or *chirurgus* around twenty

[13] M. Goodman, *The Ruling Class of Judaea: The Origins of the Jewish Revolt against Rome A.D. 66–70* (Cambridge, 1987), 201–6.

* I thank the anonymous referee for valuable suggestions for improvement.

© The Author(s), 2021. Published by Cambridge University Press on behalf of The Classical Association. This is an Open Access article, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution licence (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838821000689 Published online by Cambridge University Press