

Rhetorical and Strategic Meaning of “Envy” (φθόνος) in Josephus. Examples of Korah and John of Gischala

Wojciech Bejda

Uniwersytet Pomorski w Słupsku,

22A, ul. Krzysztofa Arciszewskiego, Słupsk, 76-200, Poland; wojciech.bejda@upsl.edu.pl

For citation: Bejda W. Rhetorical and Strategic Meaning of “Envy” (φθόνος) in Josephus. Examples of Korah and John of Gischala. *Philologia Classica* 2024, 19 (1), 19–36.

<https://doi.org/10.21638/spbu20.2024.102>

The aim of this article is to analyse the theme of envy and its complexity in Josephus’ works in rhetorical and strategic sense rather than just as a literary topos. The paper focuses on two cases motivated by envy: Korah’s rebellion against Moses and the conflict between Josephus and John of Gischala. In these two cases, both the characteristics of envious persons and the richest descriptions of their sinister activities appear. The idea of Korah’s envy was not based on the Bible or the Second Temple literature or traditions but on Josephus’ own experiences from the period of his short-term command in Galilee (December 66 — July 67) when he was in conflict with envious John of Gischala. Thanks to this procedure, he was able to create the self-apologetic impression that his fate and that of Moses were intertwined because they had opponents with similar characteristics who were motivated by the same vice. Moreover, Josephus in both narratives follows the specific sequence according to which the envy leads to a “plot” (ἐπιβουλή), then to “false accusations” (διαβολή) and finally to a “sedition” (στάσις). He strategically used the theme of envy for his own apology to condemn his enemy, John of Gischala. The envy he felt disclosed the character of a person who was worse than Josephus in terms of personality traits. Josephus instead appears before the readers as a stoic sage who is free from weakness such as envy. At the same time the author draws attention to his own well-deserved success, thus the presence of envy becomes an indicator of his achievements. He conceals his own negative actions during his command in Galilee and tries to direct the audience’s attention to a specific arrangement of events that will lead to blaming his opponent.

Keywords: Josephus, Korah, Moses, John of Gischala, conceptions of envy.

“It is clear he is envious because I am a better citizen than he is.”
 δῆλός ἐστι φθονῶν <...> τούτου βελτίων εἰμι πολίτης. (Lys. 24. 3)

1. Introduction

Envy (φθόνος) played an important role in Josephus’ writings.¹ One can see both the personal perspective, as Josephus himself experienced jealousy, and the presence of this vice in relation to outstanding individuals from the history of his nation.² This was expe-

¹ The similar designation βασκανία will not be discussed, as it does not appear in the context of either Korah or John of Gischala. Regarding the mutual dependence of φθόνος and βασκανία, see Nikolaou 1969, 19–20.

² According to Feldman 1998, 199, Josephus had to experience the power of its effect on his own life when people motivated by envy took hostile actions against him.

rienced by, e. g., Patriarch Joseph, Moses, Daniel and his companions, John Hyrcanus.³ However, despite the recognition of the importance of jealousy in Josephus' writings, there is no attempt to explain its presence as something more than a popular, and at the same time cursory, literary and rhetorical topos.⁴ Treating the subject of envy in his works only as a topos restricts the a priori interpretative possibilities, leaving the topic to be treated rather perfunctorily. Also Steve Mason's statement that the addenda on envy indicates that he "has reformulated the biblical narrative so as to thematize envy", although provides a good starting point for further research, failed to produce fruitful efforts.⁵

The paper analyses two cases of envious people: Korah and John of Gischala. The narratives of these two characters provide the most extensive descriptions of the characters of envious people and the consequences of their actions. Feldman remarked that "Josephus claims to have been envied by John of Gischala (*BJ* 2.614; *Vit.* 84–85), so much so that one may, in reading his version of the Korah episode, draw an equation, in effect, between John and Korah and between Josephus and Moses", but he did not examine the problem of envy felt by Korah and John in detail.⁶ However, he and other scholars focused mainly on the personality and behaviour of the adversaries, which is in a sense natural due to their dominant role in the analysed fragments. These scholars did not read much into the meaning of this flaw, nor did they consider it in a wider context

³ The list of people who experienced suffering and dangers due to envy indicate that this flaw played an important role in Josephus' writings. Patriarch Joseph: φθόνος ... και μίσος, Joseph. *AJ* 2.10. Gray 1993, 29, is of the opinion that it was due to the motif of envy that Patriarch Joseph was not a significant model for Josephus. The reason is that "the theme of envy is entirely restricted to the story of Joseph's early relations with his brothers and does not recur in the account of his later political career". Niehoff 1992, 93, presents another approach, according to which there are similarities between envy of Joseph's brothers and John of Gischala's envy of Josephus. Prophet Daniel: experiencing envy from people begrudging the position at the royal court: *AJ* 10.188–189, 194, 212–215; *Vit.* 423–429. Mason 1994, 177, notices that "since Josephus writes all of this as a Jew who is prospering in the Flavian court, having learned a good deal of Greek and Latin literature, who is now defending his ancestral traditions before the literary world, yet who runs into persistent accusations from those who 'envy' his success, we can hardly avoid the conclusion that his paraphrase of *Daniel* 1–6 reflects his own image"; see Daube 1977, 17–18; Gray 1993, 77–78; Feldman 1998, 644. John Hyrcanus: success followed by envy and rebellion, or rather, the narrative would bring readers' perception of John Hyrcanus closer to Josephus (πρὸς δὲ τὰς εὐπραγίας αὐτοῦ τε Ἰωάννου καὶ τῶν παιδῶν φθόνος ἐγείρει στάσιν τῶν ἐπιχαρίων, *BJ* 1.67). In his later work, Josephus developed this motif, enriching it with a characterisation of a deceitful accuser (κακοήθης ὢν φύσει καὶ στάσει χαίρων 'ἐπεὶ, *AJ* 13.291, cf. 13.288–292, 299); see Atkinson 2011, 23–24, who believes that "through a creative manipulation of the facts, Josephus presented both Hyrcanus and himself as tragic figures. Both were pious priests, formidable warriors, and prophets who were misunderstood by their own people", p. 24. This list is not exhaustive of all individual cases; see Rengstorf et al. 1983, s. v. φθονερός, φθονέω, φθόνος. Even Jews had to experience envy collectively as a nation; *AJ* 2.201; 15.130; *Ap.* 1.213, 222, 224–225; 2.147, see Barclay 2007, 129, n. 765, cf. p. 130, n. 772. Feldman 1998, 628, n. 1, points to the presence of envy as a result of success.

⁴ Steve Mason 2001, 225–227, noted that the theme of envy in Josephus' works engendered a kind of topos intended to emphasise that success shared by outstanding individuals breeds envy. It is difficult to question importance of the vice as a factor that actually determines human behaviour. According to the statements of Thucydides (2.45.1) and Demosthenes (18.315), envy is inherent in every living person — only the dead are exempt from it. Plutarch (*De inim. util.* 91e–92d) perceived envy as a natural feeling towards others' prosperity that must be overcome, see Walcot 1978, 34–36, 45–46, 50. It is not just a rhetorical ploy but a kind of pessimistic (though not always) perception of human nature.

⁵ Mason 2001, 227.

⁶ Feldman 1998, 200 (quotation with minor stylistic changes), cf. Feldman 2005, 109. However, a little later, Feldman 1998, 201, states that "(...) there can be little doubt that Josephus has recast the figure of Joab so as to parallel that of his archenemy John of Gischala (...). Indeed, Josephus uses much the same language in depicting Joab's envy of Abner as he uses of John's envy of him".

of sources, limiting themselves to only stating its presence in the narrative on the revolt against Moses and the intrigues of John of Gischala.⁷ Consequently, there is no study of φθόνος in Josephus' works.

As a result, unanswered questions about the problem of envy in Josephus' writings remain:

- Was Korah's envy Josephus' own invention, or did he use the traditions from the Second Temple Period and Palestinian traditions?
- Why did Josephus introduce the theme of envy into two particularly important narratives in his writings: the rebellion against Moses and his own struggles in Galilee?
- Why was envy intended to draw the reader's attention to the similar fates of Moses and Josephus?
- Did Josephus' follow a specific pattern to describe conduct of envious persons?
- What role did envy play as a source of hostility: a literary topos or a strategic concept conceived as an instrument of one's own apology?

2. Korah's Envy. Biblical Narrative in Josephus' Work

According to Josephus, the first example of hostility motivated by envy in the history of Israel was Korah's rebellion. The leader was an aristocratic priest who wanted to reclaim the high-priestly dignity from Aaron, the brother of Moses (*AJ* 4.11–66). The very assumption that it was possible to take action against Moses' leadership suggests to some extent that his opponent could not have been an honourable man because Josephus presents Moses in *Antiquities* as an obvious ideal of a leader who was also a lawmaker inspired by God's wisdom, a prophet, and the best possible commander.⁸ Therefore, his authority in Jewish society was practically unquestionable.

The gravity of Korah's rebellion against Moses is emphasised by Josephus in a few ways: compositionally — as he places it at the beginning of the fourth book, while in the *Book of Numbers*, it is discussed only in the middle of the narrative, and volumetrically — as he gives this event nearly four times more space than the Hebrew text (or three times more space than the *Septuagint*). Consequently, as Feldman observed, the *Antiquities* allots “the tremendous amount of space” to this theme.⁹ This tendency is derived from the willingness to present confrontation between Moses and Korah as a conflict of two great leaders. One of the themes used by Josephus is “the danger of envy, and the consequences of political rebellion”.¹⁰ Korah feels “envy” (φθόνος) of the power that Moses has, which is manifested by his brother Aaron holding the office of the high priest (*AJ* 4.14–19). The author ascribes a leading role to this vice in the actions of the usurper against Moses.

The result of Korah's envy is the “plot” (ἐπιβουλή, 4.16), or the conspiracy with 250 aristocrat-priests against Moses and his brother. When the open revolt breaks out,

⁷ Feldman 1998, 198–203; cf. Feldman 2006, 475–479. Both publications have a good general introduction to the discussion on envy and review of cases of envious and envied persons in Josephus' works. Cf. Feldman 2005, 101; van Henten 2018, 134; Pichon 2004, 124–126.

⁸ The best leader and unrivalled prophet: *AJ* 4.329; lawgiver: *Ap.* 2.163–165, see Spilsbury 1998, 101; Petitfils 2014, 202. Moses' virtues are extensively discussed by Feldman 1992, 290–326; Feldman 1993, 7–48; Feldman 2007, 235–357.

⁹ *AJ* 4.11–58; 16: *Nb* 16:1–35, see Feldman 2005, 91.

¹⁰ Feldman 2005, 91–92; Feldman 2004, 333, n. 22.

Korah proclaims “false accusations” against Moses that the latter aimed to hold power over people in a “tyrannical fashion” (τυράννων δὲ τρόπον, 16, cf. 22). Somewhat naturally, the accusations of tyrannical tendencies are accompanied by allegations that Moses “was insolent” (ἐξυβρίζω, 16) and was preparing a “plot” (ἐπιβουλή, 16–18).

As Josephus emphasises, these “slanders” (διαβολή, 21, 24, 34, 50) were intended to trick people so that they would take away Moses’ power over the Israelites and Aaron’s high priesthood and give them to Korah and his supporters (20–21). It seems that the accusations made by Korah against Moses are, in reality, made by Josephus against Korah. Even though Korah accused the lawmaker of “insolence”, he was driven to it because he felt superior to Moses due to his wealth and senior status (14, 16, 19). In Korah’s mind, Moses was also “dealing basely” (κακουργέω, 17, 28, 36, 43; cf. κακούργος, 36; κακία, 50) by seeking a way to take over power. However, it was the Levite who desired honours for himself.

Korah’s envy, which derived from his bad personality and pushed him to false accusations and conspiracy, resulted in “sedition” (στάσις).¹¹ However, unlike in the Greek polis of the 5th and 4th centuries B. C., this was not a common phenomenon.¹² Josephus emphasises, that it was the sedition without a parallel whether among Greeks or barbarians (12).¹³ However, due to Moses’ intervention, it did not happen.

Josephus enriched his paraphrase of Biblical story with Greek ideas and terms. The narrative thus became not only more attractive for readers but also helped to portray Korah as much more wicked, whose motivation was base. Moses, on the other hand, was presented as his innocent victim of noble character. To effectively achieve the intended effect of contrasting both characters the Jewish author seems to follow the sequence of events resulting from Korah’s envy. The vice helps to form a plot; conspirators use slanders against a good leader, which leads to sedition.

The *Book of Numbers* informs us only of who the conspirators were and what accusations they made against Moses. There are no indications that the allegations against Moses were false and unfounded.¹⁴ There is also no information about the psychological motivations of the rebels, thus giving the authors from the period of the Second Temple ample

¹¹ Van Henten 2018, 132, indicates that the consequences of the rebellion against Moses in Josephus’ work are presented “in strongly rhetorical terms”.

¹² In Aeneas Tacticus’ treatise, which is a reflection of the Greek polis’ internal problems in the mid-4th c. B. C., στάσις is mentioned as a frequent if not a common threat to stability (1.6–7; 2.1; 10.3, 25; 11.7–15; 17.1–6; 22.5–21; 23.3–6; 30.1), see Bengtson 1962, 458–468; Winterling 1991, 193–229. Gehrke 1985, 266, notes, “Qualität wie Quantität der inneren Kriege, ihre Intensität wie ihre Häufigkeit und Verbreitung kennzeichnen sie als ein wesentliches Phänomen der griechischen Geschichte”, cf. p. 258–261, 355. On the meaning of the civil war theme in Josephus’ works, see Mader 2000, 55–103.

¹³ The noun στάσις occurs a few more times in the same paragraph, which introduces the reader to the narrative on the rebellion and in the course of the subsequent story (AJ 4.13, 32, 36; cf. στασιάζω, 30).

¹⁴ Nb 16: 1–3. The narrative on the rebellion of Korah and some Levites was supposedly created in the postexile period and was to be a reflection of the conflict at that time between the tribes of Aaronites and Korahites over the right to manage the restoration of the temple, cf. Hutton 1992, 101b. A more extensive discussion on Lb 16 appears in Vassar 2007, 45–53. Enigmatic descriptions of Korah’s and other commanders’ actions against Moses have prompted scholars to justify Korah. For instance, Vassar states that “Korah is identified with the community in this story. In this identification, the rebellion of Korah becomes the rebellion of all”. This does not mean that the entire community wanted Moses’ and his brother’s position but that “Korah incarnates the disillusionment with Mosaic authority and therefore epitomizes the frustration with the leadership of Moses” (p. 52). Goodnick 2000, 179–181, believes that Korah was a pious Levite who was pushed into some of the Reubenite commanders’ pursuit of access to conducting worship, cf. Biale 2016, 16–17.

room for speculation and leading them to write the biblical narrative anew (in accordance with the authors' beliefs, personal experiences, and education and taking into account the views of potential readers).¹⁵

3. Reception of Korah's Envy in Jewish Literature (apart from Josephus' Works)

Korah's rebellion is of little interest in Second Temple period literature or rabbi writings. The first reference to the rebels' envy is in *Psalms* 106 — finally edited in the postexile period — which directly mentions that the rebels “were jealous” (ἠζήσαν) of Moses and Aaron.¹⁶ Korah is not mentioned there, but his intentions are taken over by Dathan and Abiram.

Ben Sira points to the feeling of “rivalry” (ζηλόω) of Dathan, Abiram and Korah, who rebelled with their men in “fury and wrath” (ἐν θυμῷ καὶ ὀργῇ, 45: 18) in the desert against Aaron.¹⁷ However, the author shifts the rebels' hostility from Moses to his brother with the aim of reflecting the situation of priests in his times when they had been the object of envy due to their significant social and economic position. Therefore, the tragic fate of Korah is intended to be a warning to potential usurpers of priests' authority.¹⁸

Philo of Alexandria, who interprets the *Pentateuch* in detail — including the events associated with Moses — gives less attention to the discussed event and does not even mention Korah's name (*Mos.* 2.276–287; *Praem.* 74–78).¹⁹ Philo is not interested in developing this theme, as he was not a priest and had no direct links with the temple. Nevertheless, his works include descriptions of Korah's rebellion against Moses. Philo points out that the conspirators “puffed with power” (φυσάω), which stems not from their ethical predisposition to hold priesthood but from their greater numbers (*Mos.* 2.276–277; *Praem.* 74). Notable here is a reference to ochlocracy, condemned by Philo, which — in his opinion — is the worst of the regimes.²⁰ The Levites (Philo does not mention the Reubenites) conspired collectively, gathering in large numbers (*Mos.* 2.278; *Praem.* 74). Later, Philo describes their activities more distinctively as “sedition” (στάσις, *Mos.* 2.283; cf. σύστασις, *Praem.* 75). The rebels unjustly accuse Moses of granting the office of a high priest to his brother and nephews because they are his relatives. Moreover, according to them, this nomination is based on a lie since, allegedly, it has no divine sanction (*Mos.* 2.278; *Praem.* 78).

Philo condemns the usurpers, referring to them a few times as “impious” (ἄσεβής, *Mos.* 2.279, 282, 285) and describing their behaviour as “wickedness” (μοχθηρία, 285). He does not point to envy as the conspirators' motivation and replaces it with the sense of superiority that was unjustifiably felt by the Levites. Philo places this group of Jewish

¹⁵ An abundant catalogue of factors that influenced the shape of the narrative on biblical history is provided by Feldman 2005, 543–570. For a more extensive context, see Alexander 1988, 99–121; Gruen 1998, 110–188.

¹⁶ *Ps.* 106:16. According to *Septuagint*, Dathan and Abiram “provoked anger” (παρώργισαν) of Moses, but they were not envious of him, see Lucas 2015, 52, 63–64.

¹⁷ Ben Sira uses the word ζηλόω to describe Korah's envy. Sometimes it has a negative meaning in the work as a synonym of φθόνος, see Ortlund 2012, 70–72.

¹⁸ Wright III 2008, 200; Caldich-Benages 2016, 123.

¹⁹ Feldman 2008, 55.

²⁰ *Opif.* 171; *Agr.* 45–46; *Conf.* 108; *Fug.* 10; *Somm.* 2.286; *Decal.* 155; *Virt.* 180; *Flacc.* 65; *Legat.* 132; *QE* 1.7b; see Feldman 2007, 175–176.

society highly as the only one worthy of making sacrifices to God.²¹ Perhaps the exegete of Alexandria was disengaged from the feeling of envy and did not focus on it because he was not its victim from his countrymen.²²

Presumably Josephus and the rabbinic authors used a common tradition.²³ Thus, it can be assumed that the rabbinical writings convey some of the ways of commenting biblical stories found in Josephus' time. Some commentators in the rabbinic tradition accuse Korah of envy of Moses or people Moses was related to.²⁴ There are also voices among them justifying the opposition to Moses' actions because Moses symbolises adherence to detailed and irrational rabbinic Halachah regulations. The rabbinic stories about Korah's objections refer to harmful legal principles that were supposedly introduced by Moses.²⁵ As a consequence, the rabbinic tradition "transmuted him into an ambiguous figure that might stand for rebellious ideas in their own day".²⁶ Therefore, according to the rabbis, Korah's protest was motivated not by envy but by the suspicion that, as stated by J. Duncan M. Derrett, "Moses and Aaron were making fools of the people".²⁷ However, no such approach exists in Josephus' work, and his interpretation of Korah's actions is no different from that of Ben Sira or Philo.

The modest account by the Psalmist, Ben Sira and the allegorical interpretation by Philo, as well as the rabbinic commentaries, rather does not provide Josephus with ideas to enrich his narrative on Korah's rebellion. First of all, it should be noted that in the discussed sources the word "envy" (φθόνος) does not appear and the Psalmist and Ben Sira refer to jealousy (ζήλος).²⁸ Moreover, the Psalmist and Philo do not even mention Korah in their accounts. In regard to Philo's narrative there is only the word "sedition" (στάσις) which is in common with Josephus' paraphrase. Generally, Josephus' narrative is much more extensive and presents a far richer perspective, the core of which is envy and its consequences disguised in the Greek conceptual terminology. Korah's characterisation is also much more elaborate in Josephus' work than in the preserved writings of the Second Temple period. Moreover, his dependence on the work of Ben Sira has not yet been established, while few potential borrowings from Philo can be discerned.²⁹

²¹ *Sacr.* 118–119, 132; *Det.* 62–68; *Her.* 124. Philo values the Levites highly for their piety, presented particularly during the events associated with the cult of the golden calf (*Mos.* 2.141–160; Feldman 2007, 142). The actual role of the Levites in Philo's times is of no great importance here.

²² Feldman 2008, 55. Philo sees φθόνος as an unambiguously negative quality, see examples in Borgen, Fuglseth, Skarsten 2000, s. v. φθονέω, φθόνος. Discussion on the role of envy in the *De Iosepho* treatise is presented in Oertelt 2015, 158–163.

²³ Noam 2018, 26–28, 163–164; Orian 2015, 205–242, 226, 229.

²⁴ The motif of envy is also present in *Midrash Tanhuma*, B 4.86–8, *Tanhuma Korah* 3, *Bemidbar* 18.2. Bloch 1879, 42, cites a later tradition (*Jalkut* I. 750), in accordance with which Korah reviled Moses because he appointed his father, Elizaphan, a commander of the Kehathite tribe and appropriated prestigious positions (*T. Sanhedrin* 109b–110a). Jealousy of Moses was felt by married Israelites who suspected him of seducing a married woman (*B. T. Sanhedrin* 110a), see Biale 2016, 22.

²⁵ I. e., *Midrash Tehillim* 1:15, 20 cites a history of a poor woman who suffered even greater poverty because of irrational legal regulations that were ruthlessly executed by Moses, cf. *Numbers Rabba* 18:2; see Vassar 2007, 50–51; Biale 2016, 20–22.

²⁶ Biale 2016, 16.

²⁷ 1993, 75.

²⁸ See footnote 68 for the difference between envy and jealousy.

²⁹ While reviewing the scholarship on the dependence between Philo's and Josephus' works, it is difficult to resist the impression that it is not possible to unambiguously determine any literary borrowings; see Feldman 1984, 410–418; Feldman 1998, 54. However, Sterling 2013, 106–107, supposes that Josephus

4. A Common Pattern in Describing Envy in the Korah and John of Gischala Narratives

In search of possible inspirations in creating the descriptions of Korah's envy and broadly to better understand the role of the vice in Josephus' works, it is worth turning now to his description of John of Gischala's envious conduct. The topic of envy as a motivation and collateral effect, which could have influenced the shape of the narrative on Korah, is in *War* and *Life*.³⁰

Starting the narrative on personal problems during his command in Galilee, Josephus makes envy the leitmotif of his enemies' actions, in particular John's. The author does not indicate any other reasons that could have been at the root of the animosity between him and his adversaries, such as fights between factions in Galilee, his own pro-Roman politics, or matters of ambition.³¹ In *War*, his troubles begin with John's machinations. He does not immediately mention envy as John's motivation, although it can be assumed that that feeling (φθόνος, *BJ* 2.614; cf. φθονέω, *Vit.* 85) is at the heart of this hostility. The Jewish author presents a deeper belief in this conviction in his later work, *Life*, when his successes and possession of power at a young age bring him "the calumnies of envy" (τὰς ἐκ τοῦ φθόνου διαβολὰς, 80, cf. 189) or even "immoderate envy" (φθόνον ... οὐτι μέτριον, 122).³² The author again mentions no other reasons for his adversaries' dislike, as in Korah's case. What makes Josephus resemble Moses is that envy towards him is also felt by commanders associated with John and some officials who are most likely local aristocrats.³³ Some of the aristocrats who hold power in rebellious Jerusalem decide — at John's urging and due to their own envy — to deprive him of command in Galilee (*Vit.* 204, 230). In Josephus' narrative, the envy of both Korah and the opponents from Galilee (John of Gischala in particular) becomes their primary motivation to plot against the honourable commander.

John, like Korah, is characterised by a set of similar negative features. Josephus refers to John as "an intriguer" (τις ἐπίβουλος ἀνήρ) who is "the most unscrupulous and crafty of all who have ever gained notoriety by such infamous means" (πανουργότατος μὲν καὶ δολιώτατος

probably read *De vita Mosis* because he sees similarities in how the two authors present Jewish law (Philo, *Mos.* 2.12–24; Josephus, *Ap.* 2.276–86), see Wolff 1908, 14; Niehoff 2016, 143–144.

³⁰ Feldman 1998, 199–200; Damgaard 2008, 231. This scholar notes the motif of Korah's envy in the context of Josephus' personal experiences, but he does not analyse it.

³¹ Cohen 1979, 224, points out personal rivalry between Josephus and John. According to Krieger 1994, 267–268 the conflict between John and Josephus was not of a strictly personal nature because it was a reflection of the conflict over power in Jerusalem between the moderate leaders of the rebellion, Ananias ben Saduki and Judas ben Jonathan (both supported John) and Jesus ben Gamala (who supported Josephus); cf. Rhoads 1979, 127–131. In contrast, Michel and Bauernfeind 1959, 452, n. 262, assume that the conflict between the two commanders resulted from ideological reasons (ein *sachlicher* (emphasis original) Gegensatz zwischen der priesterlich-theokratischen Kriegsordnung Jerusalems und der charismatisch-zealotischen Kriegsführung einzelner Bandenführer) as well as from the issue of financial provisions for soldiers. Silver 2021, 30, states that "(...), the rebelliousness of characters like John need not be seen as being expressive of religious devotion to the Temple, nor really as politically zealous dedication to the Temple as a symbol of Jewish national autonomy. Instead, characters like John might have been maddened by the Gordian knot of class exploitation and hypocritical subservience to Rome which tied up the Temple's claim of sanctity."

³² Rhoads 1979, 123–124, suggests that in Josephus' later work, his "characterization of [John of Gischala] is milder than it is in the *War*".

³³ *BJ* 2.627 (οἱ δυνατοὶ δὲ κατὰ φθόνον καὶ τῶν ἀρχόντων τινές). Josephus also mentions Jesus, son of Sapphas, who was an archon of Tiberias and Justus of Tiberias (*BJ* 2.599; *Vit.* 134, 271); his father, Pistus (*Vit.* 88); and the influential Simon of Gabara (*Vit.* 125).

τῶν ἐπισήμων ἐν τοῖσδε τοῖς πονηρέμασιν ἀπάντων, *BJ* 2.585, transl. H. St. J. Thackeray). Other terms referring to John's personality are "malicious designs" (κακία, *BJ* 2.585) and a great ambition that is a source of "knaveries" (κακούργημα, *BJ* 2.587; cf. πονηρόν, *Vit.* 86, 102).³⁴ Both Korah and John of Gischala are portrayed as typical demagogues.³⁵

John, together with his companions, prepares "plots" against Josephus several times.³⁶ To remove Josephus from the command, John also resorts to "calumniating" (διαβάλλω, *BJ* 2.593, 262, cf. διαβολή, *Vit.* 80) him in others' eyes by spreading false rumours (*BJ* 2.594).³⁷ As in the case of Moses, Josephus is accused of aspiring to become a "tyrant" (τύραννος, *BJ* 2.626; *Vita* 260; cf. τυραννέω, *Vit.* 302). Paradoxically, according to the author, it is John who aims to win tyrannical power, and he finally achieves this goal by removing — through conspiracy and false accusations — honourable opponents, including Jesus, his supporter (*BJ* 4.208, 224, 314–325, 389–397).³⁸

Sedition (στάσις) is the result of hostile activities against Josephus which stems from envy.³⁹ In the context of actions against Josephus, this term appears only in *Life* (87, 100, 264, 279; cf. διαστασιάζω, 266). The subject of στάσις is of a basic nature in the description of the Jewish war, part of which are disturbances in Galilee and the conflict between John and Josephus.⁴⁰ The author presents himself as the ideal general and the conqueror of sedition who is opposed primarily by John of Gischala.⁴¹ It seems that the notion of describing the rebellion against Moses as στάσις could have been modelled on Josephus' own experiences.⁴² In both cases, it is an event of exceptionally great scale, not only great in the history of the Jewish nation but also greater than even the internal conflicts known from Greek history.⁴³

The belief that Josephus modelled Korah's envious behaviour on the example of John of Gischala (and not vice versa) is additionally justified by the fact that at the time of writing the *Jewish War* he did not know the biblical text thoroughly⁴⁴.

A comparison of Korah's and John of Gischala's envy allows the conclusion that Josephus follows a specific pattern in depicting envious persons and their behaviour. The Jewish author prefers a one-sided explanation of villains' enmity as motivated solely by envy.

³⁴ Some of the aristocrats allied with John, who plotted against Josephus, have similar characteristics. For example, Ananias was "a depraved and mischievous man" (πονηρὸς ἀνὴρ καὶ κακοῦργος, *Vit.* 290); similarly, delegates from Jerusalem were characterised by "malice" (πονηρία, *Vit.* 298).

³⁵ Korah as a demagogue; see Feldman 2005, 102. Josephus does not use the word δημαγωγός to describe Moses' and his own adversary. The verb δημαγωγέω is used to describe the malicious influence of Justus from Tiberias, another enemy of Josephus (*Vit.* 40), cf. Cohen 1979, 222.

³⁶ *BJ* 2. 614–616, 620–622, 625; *Vit.* 101, 248; cf. ἐπιβουλεύω, *Vit.* 82, 217. Delegates sent from Jerusalem to deprive Josephus of command and then punish him with death also conspired against him (*Vit.* 225).

³⁷ The same methods of discrediting were used by delegates from Jerusalem sent against Josephus (βλασφημία καὶ ψεῦσμα, *Vit.* 245).

³⁸ According to Herodotus (3.80.3), φθόνος is common to tyrants, cf. Pl., *Resp.* 580a, cf. Milobenski 1964, 36.

³⁹ Alternatively, it is στάσις that leads to φθόνος; Democr. 68b 245 (Stob. 3.31.53), φθόνος γὰρ στάσιος ἀρχὴν ἀπεργάζεται, see Diels, Kranz 1952, 194.

⁴⁰ *BJ* 1.10; 4.131–137. Στάσις flared up there, together with John's arrival in Jerusalem, *BJ* 4.128.

⁴¹ Cohen 1979, 235.

⁴² According to Damgaard 2008, 229, "it seems difficult not to read his significant interest in the civil strife against Moses in light of his judgment of the Jewish war".

⁴³ *BJ* 1.1, 4, 13; *AJ* 4.12. Mason 2004, 28, n. 124. The motif of the exceptionality of the conflict can equally well be treated as a part of official Flavian propaganda; see, for reference, Mason 2021, 88.

⁴⁴ Tuvai 2013, 127.

Both adversaries resort to “slander” (διαβολή) and prepare “plots” (ἐπιβουλή). Both are characterised by a set of similar vices: “malice” (κακία) and tyrannical behaviour, although John has more vices (πανούργος, πονηρός).

The juxtaposition of the descriptions of John of Gischala’s and Korah’s conduct and the assumption that their images are dependent on each other interplay with the view that Josephus models the image of Moses on his own achievements in Galilee. The literature on the subject has increasingly drawn attention to the influence of Joseph’s experiences and thoughts during the Jewish war on the shape of the narrative in *Antiquities*.⁴⁵ Particularly in the context of Moses, several parallels have been pointed out. It has been recognised that “Josephus’ picture of Moses and the Jewish people that is given in the *Antiquities* is governed by his own self-portrait in the *Jewish War*, and that the many significant similarities between the rewritten portrait of Moses and the self-portrait in the Jewish war were meant to direct the readers to recognize the parallels”.⁴⁶ Similarities between Josephus and Moses are also extended to *Life*, which means that he would have had to pay attention to what he had written about Moses in *Antiquities*.⁴⁷ Thus, Moses’ commendation also becomes an encomium of Josephus. Similarly, the image of Korah is modelled on the characterisation of John of Gischala, about whom Josephus has an exceptionally negative opinion. It is symptomatic in this context that in both *War* and *Life*, envy remains a main motivation for conspiracies against Josephus. These similarities are discernible in the portrait of both villains, where the author follows a general pattern to describe the actions of envious persons. It starts with envy, which leads to conspiracy. Against good leaders, false allegations are fabricated, ultimately resulting in unsuccessful sedition.

5. Envy as an Indicator of John of Gischala’s Social Status

The relationship between social status and envy of John of Gischala can be analysed in terms of Greek ideas about friendship. This inquiry will allow us to show what Josephus did not want to say about John of Gischala. According to Socrates, envy appears as a reaction to the success of a friend or is felt towards people of similar status.⁴⁸ Similarly, for Aristotle (*Rh.* 1386b, 18–20), φθόνος is “a disturbing pain and directed against good fortune, but not that of one who does not deserve it, but of one who is our equal and like” (transl. J.H. Freese).⁴⁹ This is because, on the one hand, few individuals are able to resist the feeling (e. g., Aesch. *Ag.* 836–841), and on the other hand, the success of a friend makes them feel inferior.

⁴⁵ Attridge 1976, 71–107; Daube 1977, 3–25; Cohen 1979, n. 26, p. 92–93.

⁴⁶ Damgaard 2008, 220, cf. 227–235, cf. Petitfils 2014, 202, 207–208. One can add that the narratives about the war with the Amalekites and Pinhes’ zealots were modelled in the context of Josephus’ experiences, see Inman 2019, 55–56, 65–69

⁴⁷ Mason 1998, 45, 73, stressed that “*Vita* must be read in the context of *Antiquities*”.

⁴⁸ Xen. *Mem.* 3.9.8; cf. Ps.-Pl., *Def.* 416 a 13, cf. Milobenski 1964, 12–18; Walcot 1978, 11.

⁴⁹ Milobenski 1964, 66–69; Walcot 1978, 29–31, 35. This idea finds confirmation in contemporary psychological research; e. g., Protasi 2016, 536, states that “envy is an aversive reaction to a perceived inferiority to a similar other with regard to a good that is relevant to the sense of identity of the envier. This definition emerges from the overlapping of the most authoritative psychological and philosophical accounts of envy as an emotion.”

These observations are useful, especially when Josephus claims that his adversary is a poor usurper who envies him.⁵⁰ It seems that Josephus and John were initially friends because he needed help in Galilee as an outsider in Galilee. At the time of the rebellion, John was probably the most influential person from Galilee. He was also wealthy.⁵¹ He enjoyed the support not only of his city but also of Gadara (which was commanded by his supporter Simeon, *Vit.* 124). He was even able to mobilise the most important cities of Galilee against Josephus, using his personal contacts with the local commanders. This suggests that John had a significant position throughout the region and sought further self-aggrandisement through involvement in the revolt.⁵² John's close friendship with Simeon ben Gamliel (whom he later betrayed because of Simeon's own treason) and other commanders of insurgent Jerusalem suggests that John's influence went beyond Galilee.⁵³ His importance is also proven by the fact that many Galileans followed him to Jerusalem. He was supposedly a religiously zealous and ambitious person who was even ruthless in his endeavour to take power in besieged Jerusalem.⁵⁴

However, according to Cohen, lasting cooperation between the author and John of Gischala was impossible because "John resented the intrusion of a rival into his domain and Josephus was too vain to accept anyone as an associate".⁵⁵ On the basis of information on John's position in Galilee, it can be assumed that initially, he had few reasons to be envious of Josephus (although this motivation cannot be thoroughly ruled out). Taking into account these facts and premises, it was Josephus who could have acted out of envy rather than John. His dynamic, unscrupulous and even ruthless actions changed the situation, making him leader in Galilee, and his success changed their relationship for the worse over time, resulting in John's envy. Perhaps envy in the relationship between John and Josephus was his real feeling.

6. Motif of John of Gischala's Envy as a Form of Josephus' Apology

The apologetic dimension of the envy motive in Josephus' writings should come as no surprise. Not only the whole *Life* but also the entire excerpt of *War* 2.569–646 serves, on the one hand, to praise the author's personality and achievements and, on the other hand, to discredit John of Gischala as his personal opponent. Additionally, the *Antiquities* are not devoid of personal traits hidden in similarities between biblical characters and Jo-

⁵⁰ *BJ* 2.585–590. Horsley 2002, 95, emphasises that "it is difficult in the extreme (...) to reconstruct the rise of John from Josephus's polemics against his principal rival for control in Galilee".

⁵¹ *BJ* 2.575–6; *Vit.* 43–5. Cohen 1979, 221. Smallwood 1976, 304, n. 42, where the author points out that due to his wealth, John was against the rebellion because it threatened his economic standing (*BJ* 2.591–592; *Vit.* 71–76).

⁵² Cohen 1979, 185; Mason 2021, 95–96.

⁵³ *Vit.* 189–193. See interesting conjectures by Cohen 1979, 231.

⁵⁴ Rappaport 1982, 479–493; Rhoads 1979, 127–128, 132–133, 136 (which contains a good summary of John's conduct); Root 2014, 31; Nikiprowetzky 1989, 233–234. Extensively on the topic of John's activity in Jerusalem, Price 1992, 87–89, 102–172, who refers to him as, e. g., "completely devoted to the rebellion". Rhoads 1979, 132, stresses John's "opportunistic desire for power". Similar observations are made by Cohen 1979, 185. Bohrmann 1994, 222, 227–228, sees him as a person cynical about the Jewish law and inclined to cheating and extorting both the Jews and the Romans. Equally, as Mason 2021, 94, 97–98, recently remarked, John had no intention of fighting the Romans but found himself in Jerusalem only by a remarkable twist of fortune.

⁵⁵ 1979, 223, cf. 224; Mason 2021, 96.

sephus' biography.⁵⁶ Especially in *Life*, designed to praise Josephus' own *ethos*, an apology for his own conduct and personality is presented, not directly but by portraying himself as the victim of an ignoble person.⁵⁷

In this context, the discussed vice plays a significant role. Referring to the realities of Greek democracy, D. L. Cairns remarks that the "use of the label 'envy' is a tactic in a domain of disputed explanations: the notion that a certain group is motivated by 'pure' envy (nothing but malicious begrudging of other's success) is a top-down explanation of a bottom-up emotion, a have's evaluation of the have nots".⁵⁸ John is presented, then, as someone with a weaker position in the area of Galilee, a poor usurper who was envious of Josephus' position and power.⁵⁹ The envy he felt disclosed the character of a person who was also worse than Josephus in terms of personality traits. The author, according to this assumption, draws attention to his own well-deserved success, thus the presence of envy becomes an indicator of the success achieved, just as its absence is an indicator of mere mediocrity.⁶⁰

Josephus' self-praise seems more efficient because it is indirect. The accomplishments and personality of John of Gischala become a negative reflection of Josephus' own merits and virtues.⁶¹ Thus, he can additionally present himself as, e. g., a stoic sage who is free from weakness such as envy (Diog. Laert. 2.8.91). According to Antisthenes, an envious person is absorbed by this feeling (6.1.5). At the same time, envy — the dangerous results of which affect distinguished individuals from the Jews' past — brings them closer in Josephus' narrative to himself. He must have had a similar objective when constructing the description of the conflict between Korah and Moses, in which the lawmaker is portrayed as a better person than his envious adversary.

Moreover, Josephus draws attention away from his own involvement in the problem, which is the background or the cause of the accusation. He conceals his own negative actions or avoids searching for the right reasons for his adversaries' actions against people whom he values or idealises due to reasons related to his apologia. Rather, he tries — through a rhetorical measure — to direct the audience's attention to a specific arrangement of events that will lead to blaming his opponent.⁶² This approach resembles Demosthenes' strategy, which — in the oration *De Corona* — delicately conceals from the Athenians his own responsibility for the consequences of the battle of Chaeronea and directs the blame

⁵⁶ Daube 1977, 3–25.

⁵⁷ Mason 1998, 50–51.

⁵⁸ Cairns 2003, 237.

⁵⁹ Cohen 1979, 78, 156, 159, remarks that *Life* is "generally much less hostile than *BJ* towards John" because in the former work, the main adversary is Justus of Tiberias. Horsley 2002, 95, emphasises that "it is difficult in the extreme (...) to reconstruct the rise of John from Josephus's polemics against his principal rival for control in Galilee".

⁶⁰ Steinlein 1944, 41; Most 2003, 139, cf. 134.

⁶¹ Van Henten, Huitink 2018, 252, noticed that the envy felt towards Josephus by his opponents "is an index of the high regard in which Josephus himself is held". Krieger 1994, 258–259; Bohrmann 1994, 217. Villalba Varneda 2011, 344–351, indicates Josephus' narcissistic autopresentation of his own achievements, part of which were supposed to be the attacks caused by John of Gischala's envy.

⁶² Eidinow 2016, 137–138. Rhoads 1979, 129, points out that Josephus tried to conceal the true nature of the accusations against him of revolutionary pursuits under the guise of malicious motivations resulting from envy.

at Aeschines. Adams notes that in the context of Demosthenes' rhetorical strategy, "the art of making 'the worse appear the better cause' was never used with more skill"⁶³

As can be observed in the practice of the Attic orations, Josephus also skilfully attempts to link personal aspects with the nation's well-being. By referring to ὕβρις and other flaws, it is possible for him to indicate that the opponent is not only driven by envy directed against an innocent person but also has characteristics that endanger the country and its citizens.⁶⁴ Referring to φθόνος, Josephus suggests to the recipients that even though the adversary refers to the well-being of the country and its citizens in his accusations, in reality, he is driven by envy of the commander (*AJ* 4.20). One can even apply Cairns' wording, "politics of phthonos", in regard to Josephus' use of the motif of envy.⁶⁵ Last, the reference to envy is a convenient solution for Josephus when a non-Jewish reader is unable to understand theologically motivated arguments.

7. Josephus' Use of the Words φθόνος and ζήλος and the Parallel between John of Gischala and Joab

The last topic in the discussion on Josephus' use of φθόνος serves as an attempt to clarify supposed correlations between the presentation of Joab and John of Gischala raised by Louis H. Feldman.⁶⁶ According to Feldman's interpretation, "there can be little doubt that Josephus has recast the figure of Joab so as to parallel that of his archenemy John of Gischala, particularly with regard to the theme of envy".⁶⁷ This interpretation is disproved by the lack of the word φθόνος in reference to Joab's motivation. In this case, the author uses another term, ζήλος. Even though they are sometimes treated as synonyms in translations, their meanings are different.⁶⁸ While φθόνος refers to the craving for what someone else has, ζήλος refers to the fear of losing what one already has.⁶⁹ Aristotle contrasts the two words: in *Rhetoric* (1388a 35–36), ζήλος belongs to πάθη ἐπιεικῆ, whereas φθόνος is ἀφ᾽ αὐτὸν πάθος.⁷⁰

Josephus uses the word ζήλος very precisely. Joab treacherously murders Abner because he fears the loss of his position as a commander in David's army. He describes Joab's motivation as follows, *AJ* 7.36–38 (cf. 7.31–32):

⁶³ 1927, 54–55.

⁶⁴ *Pl. Leg.* 731a–b; Milobenski 1964, 44–45; Eidinow 2016, 129–130.

⁶⁵ 2003, 249.

⁶⁶ See note 6.

⁶⁷ Feldman 2006, 476; cf. Feldman 2005, 209.

⁶⁸ Liddell, Scott 1963, s. v. ζήλος "eager rivalry, zealous imitation, emulation, a noble passion, opp. to φθόνος (envy)". In the most basic sense, the two words have different meanings in French. See Littré 1874, s. v. envie: "chagrin et haine qu'on ressent du bonheur, des succès, des avantages d'autrui"; s. v. jalousie: "attachement pour, zèle pour". However, the second available meaning brings this word closer to l'envie, which means "mauvais sentiment qu'on éprouve quand on n'obtient pas ou ne possède pas les avantages obtenus ou possédés par un autre". In English, the language in which Feldman writes, the difference in meaning between φθόνος and ζήλος is sometimes blurred; see Foster 1972, 167–168, who presented the issue of both words' meanings in English, cf. Walcot 1978, 1; Sanders 2012, 375; Protasi 2016, 536. The necessity of distinguishing between the two terms is emphasised by Parrott, Smith 1993, 906–919.

⁶⁹ See Eidinow 2016, 75. Elliott 2016, 89, states that "whereas phthonos always focuses on intended harm to others, zêlos focuses on the self". Gallet 1990, 53, indicates that the meaning of the adjective φθονερός is "l'égoïsme replié sur lui-même, incapable de se dévouer au bien public". The word φθόνος here means "refus de donner"; see Gallet 1990, 50–52, 55–57.

⁷⁰ Nikolaou 1969, 20–25; Walcot 1978, 14.

...ὡς δὲ τάληθές εἶχε δέισαντος περὶ τῆς στρατηγίας καὶ τῆς παρὰ τῷ βασιλεῖ τιμῆς, μὴ τούτων μὲν αὐτὸς ἀφαιρεθεῖν, λάβοι δὲ παρὰ Δαβίδου τὴν πρώτην τάξιν Ἄβεννήρος, ἐκ τούτων ἂν τις κατανοήσειεν, ὅσα καὶ πηλίκῃς τολμῶσιν ἄνθρωποι πλεονεξίας ἔνεκα καὶ ἀρχῆς καὶ τοῦ μηδενὶ τούτων παραχωρῆσαι· κτήσασθαι γὰρ αὐτὰ ποθοῦντες διὰ μυρίων κακῶν λαμβάνουσι, καὶ δέισαντες ἀποβαλεῖν πολλῶν χείροσι τὸ βέβαιον αὐτοῖς τῆς παραμονῆς περιποιούσιν, ὡς οὐχ ὅμοιου δεινοῦ τυγχάνοντος πορίσασθαι τηλικούτου μέγεθος ἐξουσίας, καὶ συνήθη τοῖς ἀπ’ αὐτῆς ἀγαθοῖς γενόμενον ἔπειτ’ αὐτὴν ἀπολέσαι, τούτου δὲ ὑπερβολὴν ἔχοντος συμφορᾶς, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο χαλεπώτερα μηχανῶνται καὶ τολμῶσιν ἐν φόβῳ ἔργα πάντες τοῦτ’ ἀποβαλεῖν γενόμενοι.

...He feared for his command of the army and his place of honour with the king, of which he himself might have been deprived while Abner received the foremost place from David. From this one may perceive to what lengths of recklessness men will go for the sake of ambition and power, and in order not to let these go to another; for, in their desire to acquire them, they obtain them through innumerable acts of wrongdoing and, in their fear of losing them, they ensure the continuance of their possession by much worse acts, their belief being that it is not so great an evil to fail to obtain a very great degree of authority as to lose it after having become accustomed to the benefits deprived therefrom. Since this last would be a surpassing misfortune, they accordingly contrive and attempt even more ruthless deeds, always in fear of losing what they have. (Transl. H. St. J. Thackeray, R. Marcus.)

This longer quotation perfectly illustrates the meaning of the word ζῆλος, which does not appear initially but only later (in a rarer form of ζηλοτυπία), when David describes Joab’s motivation (7.386).⁷¹

Moreover, in Josephus’ work, φθόνος never has any positive connotations.⁷² In turn, ζῆλος and ζηλοτυπία also refer to laudable deeds: Mattathias ben Johanan’s motivation to act against the order of Antiochus IV Epiphanes (*AJ* 12. 271), philanthropic rivalry between Phasaël and his brother Herod (14.161), and the initial zeal of Gaius to pursue honourable goals (19.211).⁷³

The abovementioned analysis indicates that envy cannot be a reason for identifying John of Gischala with Joab, due not only to the words used but also to the description of the motivations that inspire the two offenders. Josephus chooses his words carefully in the context of describing situations in which envy plays a leading part. Thereby, he aims to remain in the current of the Greek writing upon which he patterns himself.

⁷¹ A similar example is Apollodotos, leader of Gerasans, who was killed by his own brother because he was envious of his authority among the citizens (*AJ* 13.261).

⁷² Φθόνος rarely has a positive meaning: The dominating notion in older scholarship, as well as in most contemporary studies, is that envy is a bad quality; see, e. g., Schoeck 1987, 3. Recently, however, a more nuanced approach has emerged that distinguishes a positive side of envy (“emulative envy”); see Protasi 2016, 540–541. Of course, such a sophisticated approach does not change the general negative assessment of envy. One can point to Demosthenes (21.196), who tried to arouse a legitimate envy of the judges against his wealthy opponent, Medias. More ancient Greek examples of this kind of envy are provided by Sanders 2014, 43–44.

⁷³ See Feldman 1996, 144. The discussed words also refer to envy caused by an excessive feeling on the husband’s part: ζῆλος, *AJ* 15.82; ζηλοτυπία, *BJ* 1.443; *AJ* 3.271; 5.279; 15.82, 213; 16.207; 20.149; ζηλοτυπος, *BJ* 1.440; *AJ* 5.277. These examples confirm the assumption that the word ζῆλος and its derivatives refer to a situation in which possessions are threatened (in this case fear of a wife’s fidelity). They do not describe a situation in which somebody’s wife is desired or when envy is felt that someone has a more beautiful spouse. A rare treatment of both analysed words as synonyms can be found in the narrative on the envy of Patriarch Josephus’ brothers (*AJ* 2.10) and in one of the orations by Dio Chrysostom (τὸν φθόνον καὶ τὴν ζηλοτυπίαν τὴν ἐκ τῆς πολιτείας, 31.99).

8. Conclusion

Analysis of the meaning of “envy” in the most conspicuous cases in Josephus’ works allows us to state that the application of φθόνοϛ was carefully thought out multidimensional and precise (the case of Joab) because of its strategic importance in his works as an element of one’s own apology and, at the same time, as a tool to depict one’s opponents negatively. The motif of John of Gischala’s envy served as a form of Josephus’ apology because it was designed to praise the author’s personality and achievements, hide his own misconduct, and discredit John of Gischala, his personal opponent, as a villain and a loser.

The Jewish author treated the vice as one of the primary factors in human motivations because he considered envy the sole explanation of hostility to Moses and, more significantly, to himself. This tendency resulted from Josephus’ preference of emotional over historical or political explanation as more appealing to a popular reader more or less accustomed to the vice.⁷⁴ This one-sided approach was undoubtedly more convenient because it allowed him to present history in a black-and-white manner devoid of any shades of grey that could have been embarrassing to the author or the heroes of the Jewish past. Josephus especially benefited from identifying his own vicissitudes with Moses’ problems caused by envy. In this account, he followed the sequence of events whereby envy led to false accusations, then to sedition, and ultimately to internal war. The richness of functions that played the vice in Josephus’ narrative meant that he sought to move the reader emotionally. This approach places him among Greek historians such as Theopompus.⁷⁵

What is especially worth emphasising is the fact that the Jewish author enriched and modelled the narratives of the rebellion of Korah not on the Second Temple rewritings (which are rather scanty in regard to that story) but on the description of his own peripeteia from the time of his command in Galilee. It seems that in creating a pattern to describe envy and its consequences, Josephus’ personal experiences were equally important as literary convention. This means that he actually believed he was a victim of envy.

References

- Adams Ch. G. *Demosthenes and His Influence*. London — Calcutta — Sidney, George G. Harrap & Co., 1927.
- Alexander P. S. Retelling the Old Testament. In: D. A. Carson, H. G. M. Williamson (eds). *It Is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture: Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1988, 99–121.
- Atkinson K. The Historical Chronology of the Hasmonean Period in the War and Antiquities of Flavius Josephus: Separating Fact from Fiction in Flavius Josephus Interpretation and History. In: J. Pastor, P. Stern, M. Mor (eds). *Flavius Josephus. Interpretation and History*. Leiden — Boston, Brill, 2011, 7–27.
- Attridge H. W. *The interpretation of Biblical history in the Antiquitates Judaicae of Flavius Josephus*. Missoula, Scholars Press, 1976.
- Barclay J. M. G. (transl., comm.) *Flavius Josephus, Translation and Commentary, Vol. 10: Against Apion*. Leiden, Brill, 2007.
- Bengthon H. Die griechische Polis bei Aeneas Tacticus. *Historia* 1962, 11, 458–468.
- Biale D. Korah in the Midrash: The Hairless Heretic as Hero. *Jew. Hist.* 2016, 30, 15–28.
- Bloch H. *Die Quellen des Flavius Josephus in seiner Archäologie*. Leipzig, B. G. Teubner, 1879.

⁷⁴ Most 2003, 128, remarks that “the poet who decides to thematise or to marginalise envy in his compositions does so for rhetorical and tactical reasons, not for sociological or journalistic ones, and his aim is not to analyse everyday behaviour so much as to bring his audience to a certain state of belief, by transforming the materials of experience with which they are familiar”.

⁷⁵ See Feldman 1998, 5–6.

- Bohrmann M. *Flavius Josephus, the Zealots and Yavne. Towards a Reading of The War of the Jews*. Bern, Peter Lang, 1994.
- Borgen P., Fuglseth K., Skarsten R. (eds) *The Philo Index. A Complete Word Index to the Writings of Philo of Alexandria*. Grand Rapids, Eerdmans — Leiden, Brill, 2000.
- Cairns D.L. The Politics of Envy: Envy and Equality in Ancient Greece. In: D. Konstan, K.N. Rutter (eds). *Envy, Spite and Jealousy: The Rivalrous Emotions in Ancient Greece*. Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press, 2003, 235–252.
- Calduch-Benages N. The Exodus Traditions in the Book of Ben Sira. In: J. Gärtner, B. Schmitz (eds). *Exodus. Rezeptionen in deuterokanonischer und frühjüdischer Literatur*. Berlin, de Gruyter, 2016, 117–130.
- Cohen S. J.D. *Josephus in Galilee and Rome. His Vita and Development as a Historian*. Leiden, Brill, 1979.
- Damgaard F. Brothers in Arms: Josephus' Portrait of Moses in the 'Jewish Antiquities' in the Light of His Own Self-Portraits in the 'Jewish War' and the 'Life'. *JJS* 2008, 59, 218–235.
- Daube D. *Typologie im Werk des Flavius Josephus*, München, Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1977.
- Derrett J. D. M. The Case of Korah Versus Moses Reviewed. *JSJ* 1993, 24, 59–78.
- Diels H., Kranz W. (eds) *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker. Griechisch und deutsch, Zweiter Band*. Berlin, Weidmannsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1952.
- Eidinow E. *Envy, Poison, and Death. Women on Trial in Classical Athens*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2016.
- Elliott J.H. *Beware the Evil Eye: the Evil Eye in the Bible and the Ancient World. Volume 2, Greece and Rome*. Eugene, Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2016.
- Feldman L. H. *Josephus and Modern Scholarship (1937–1980)*. Berlin — New York, de Gruyter, 1984.
- Feldman L. H. Josephus' Portrait of Moses. *JQR* 1992, 82, 290–326.
- Feldman L. H. Josephus' Portrait of Moses. Part Two. *JQR* 1993, 83, 7–48.
- Feldman L. H. *Studies in Hellenistic Judaism*. Leiden — New York — Köln, Brill, 1996.
- Feldman L. H. *Josephus's Interpretation of the Bible*. Berkeley, University of California Press, 1998.
- Feldman L. H. (transl., comm.) *Flavius Josephus, Vol. 3: Judaeae Antiquities 1–4. Translation and Commentary*. Boston — Leiden, Brill, 2004.
- Feldman L. H. *Studies in Josephus' Rewritten Bible*. Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2005.
- Feldman L. H. *Judaism and Hellenism Reconsidered*. Leiden — Boston, Brill, 2006.
- Feldman L. H. *Philo's Portrayal of Moses in the Context of Ancient Judaism*. Notre Dame, University of Notre Dame Press, 2007.
- Feldman L. H. Philo's Interpretation of Korah. In: K. E. Pomykala (ed.). *Israel in the Wilderness: Interpretations of the Biblical Narratives in Jewish and Christian Traditions*. Leiden — Boston, Brill, 2008, 55–70.
- Foster G. M. The Anatomy of Envy: A Study in Symbolic Behavior. *Curr. Anthropol.* 1972, 12, 165–202.
- Freese J. H. (transl.) *Aristotle. The "Art" of Rhetoric*. London, Heimenann, — Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1947 [1926].
- Gallet B. Sur le sens de l'adjectif φθονερός; la 'jalousie' des Athéniens dans le Discours contre Leptine (Démosthène XX, § 10, 140 et 164). *REA* 1990, 92, 45–58.
- Gehrke H.-J. *Stasis. Untersuchungen zu den inneren Kriegen in den griechischen Staaten des 5. und 4. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.* München, C. H. Beck, 1985.
- Goodnick B. Korah and His Aspirations. *JBQ* 2000, 28, 177–181.
- Gray R. *Prophetic Figures in Late Second Temple Jewish Palestine. The Evidence from Josephus*. New York — Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Gruen E. S. *Heritage and Hellenism: The Reinvention of Jewish Tradition*. Berkeley — Los Angeles, University of California Press, 1998.
- van Henten J. W. Josephus as Narrator. In: E.-M. Becker, J. Rüpke (eds). *Autoren in religiösen literarischen Texten der späthellenistischen und der frühkaiserzeitlichen Welt. Zwölf Fallstudien*. Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 2018, 121–150.
- van Henten J. W., Huitink L. Josephus. In: K. De Temmerman, E. van Emde Boas (eds). *Characterization in Ancient Greek Literature. Studies in Ancient Greek Narrative, vol. 4*. Leiden — Boston, Brill, 2018, 251–270.

- Horsley R. A. Power Vacuum and Power Struggle in 66–67 C.E. In: A. M. Berlin, J. A. Overman (eds). *The First Jewish Revolt. Archaeology, History, and Ideology*. London — New York, Routledge, 2002, 87–109.
- Hutton R. R. Korah. In: D. N. Friedman (ed.). *Anchor Bible Dictionary, vol. 4. K-N*. New York, Doubleday, 1992, 100–101.
- Inman J. Josephus's Blunting of Amalek and Phinehas the Zealot in Jewish Antiquities: A Statement Against Nationalism. *Studia Antiqua* 2019, 18, 55–69.
- Krieger K.-S. *Geschichtsschreibung als Apologetik bei Flavius Josephus*. Tübingen, Francke Verlag, 1994.
- Liddell H. G., Scott R. (eds) *An Intermediate Greek-English Lexicon*. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1963 [1889].
- Littre É. *Dictionnaire de la langue française, vol. 2*. Paris, Hachette, 1874.
- Lucas A. J. *Evocations of the Calf Romans 1:18–2:11 and the Substructure of Psalm 106 (105)*. Berlin, de Gruyter, 2015.
- Mader G. *Josephus and the Politics of Historiography. Apologetic and Impression Management in the Bellum Judaicum*. Leiden — Boston — Köln, Brill, 2000.
- Mason S. Josephus, Daniel, and the Flavian House. In: F. Parente, J. Sievers (eds). *Josephus and the History of the Greco-Roman Period. Essays in Memory of Morton Smith*. Leiden — New York, Brill, 1994, 161–91.
- Mason S. An Essay in Character: The Aim and Audience of Josephus's Vita. In: F. Siegert, J. U. Kalms (eds). *Internationales Josephus-Kolloquium Münster 1997. Vorträge aus dem Institutum Judaicum Delitzschianum*. Münster, LIT Verlag, 1998, 31–77.
- Mason S. *Flavius Josephus on the Pharisees. A Composition-Critical Study*. Boston — Leiden, Brill, 2001.
- Mason S. (transl., comm.) *Flavius Josephus, Life of Josephus. Translation and Commentary*. Leiden — Boston, Brill, 2004.
- Mason S. John of Gischala and Simon bar Giora from Gerasa. A National Revolt? In: M. Bar-Asher Siegal, J. Ben-Dov (eds). *Social History of the Jews in Antiquity. Studies in Dialogue with Albert Baumgarten*. Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 2021, 87–108.
- Michel O., Bauernfeind O. (transl., comm.) *Flavius Josephus, De bello Judaico. Der jüdische Krieg. Band I*. Darmstadt, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1959.
- Milobenski E. *Der Neid in der griechischen Philosophie*. Wiesbaden, Otto Harrassowitz, 1964.
- Most G. Epinician Envy. In: D. Konstan, K. N. Rutter (eds). *Envy, Spite and Jealousy: The Rivalrous Emotions in Ancient Greece*. Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press, 2003, 123–142.
- Niehoff M. *The Figure of Joseph in Post-Biblical Literature*. Leiden — New York — Köln, Brill, 1992.
- Niehoff M. R. Josephus and Philo in Rome. In: H. H. Chapman, Z. Rodgers (eds). *A Companion to Josephus*. Chichester, Wiley Blackwell, 2016, 135–146.
- Nikiprowetzky V. Josephus and the Revolutionary Parties. In: L. H. Feldman, G. Hata (eds). *Josephus, the Bible, and History*. Detroit, Wayne State University Press, 1989, 216–236.
- Nikolaou T. *Der Neid bei Johannes Chrysostomus unter Berücksichtigung der griechischen Philosophie*. Bonn, H. Bouvier u. Co. Verlag, 1969.
- Noam V. *Shifting Images of the Hasmoneans. Second Temple Legends and Their Reception in Josephus and Rabbinic Literature*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2018.
- Oertelt F. *Herrscherideal und Herrschaftskritik bei Philo von Alexandria. Eine Untersuchung am Beispiel seiner Josephsdarstellung in De Josepho und De somniis II*. Leiden — Boston, Brill, 2015.
- Orian M. Hyrcanus II versus Aristobulus II and the Inviolability of Jerusalem. *JSQ* 2015, 22, 205–242.
- Ortlund D. C. *Zeal Without Knowledge: The Concept of Zeal in Romans 10, Galatians 1, and Philippians 3*. London — New York, T & T Clark, 2012.
- Parrott W. G., Smith R. H. Distinguishing the Experiences of Envy and Jealousy. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 1993, 64, 906–919.
- Petitfils J. M. Martial Moses in Flavian Rome: Josephus's *Antiquities* 2–4 and Exemplary Roman Leadership. *JGRChJ* 2014, 10, 194–208.
- Pichon E. Les vices chez Flavius Josephus ou le retour à l'animalité. *Bulletin de l'Association Guillaume Budé* 2004, 2, 111–141.
- Price J. J. *Jerusalem under Siege. The Collapse of the Jewish State 66–70 C.E.* Leiden — New York — Köln, Brill, 1992.
- Protasi S. Varieties of Envy. *Philos. Psychol.* 2016, 29, 535–549.
- Rappaport U. John of Gischala: From Galilee to Jerusalem. *JJS* 1982, 33, 479–493.

- Rengstorff K. H. et al. (ed.). *A Complete Concordance to Flavius Josephus, vol. IV: P–Ω*. Leiden, Brill, 1983.
- Rhoads D. M. *Israel in Revolution 6–74 C. E. A Political History Based on the Writings of Josephus*. Philadelphia, Fortress Press, 1979.
- Root B. W. *First Century Galilee. A Fresh Examination*. Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 2014.
- Sanders E. 'He Is a Liar, a Bounder, and a Cad'. The Arousal of Hostile Emotions in Attic Forensic Oratory. In: A. Chaniotis (ed.) *Unveiling Emotions: Sources and Methods for the Study of Emotions in the Greek World*. Stuttgart, Franz Steiner Verlag, 2012, 359–387.
- Sanders E. *Envy and Jealousy in Classical Athens. A Socio-Psychological Approach*. New York, Oxford University Press, 2014.
- Schoeck H. *Envy. A Theory of Social Behaviour*. Indianapolis, Liberty Found, 1987 [1970].
- Silver M. M. *The History of Galilee 47 BCE to 1260 CE. From Josephus and Jesus to the Crusades*. Lanham, Lexington Books, 2021.
- Smallwood E. M. *The Jews under Roman Rule. From Pompey to Diocletian. A Study in Political Relations*. Leiden, Brill, 1976.
- Spilsbury P. *The Image of the Jew in Flavius Josephus' Paraphrase of the Bible*. Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 1998.
- Steinlein W. *Φθόνος und verwandte Begriffe in der älteren griechischen Literatur*. Diss., Erlangen, 1944.
- Sterling G. S. A Man of the Highest Repute. Did Josephus Know the Writings of Josephus? *SPhA* 2013, 25, 101–113.
- Thackeray H. St. J. (transl.) *Josephus, Vol. II. The Jewish War. Books I–III with an English Translation*. Cambridge, Harvard University Press, — London, Heinemann, 1989 [1927].
- Thackeray H. St. J. (transl.) *Josephus, Vol. IV. Jewish Antiquities, Books I–IV with an English Translation*. Cambridge, Harvard University Press, — London, Heinemann, 1995 [1930].
- Thackeray H. St. J., Marcus R. (transl.) *Josephus, Vol. V. Jewish Antiquities, Books V–VIII with an English Translation*. Cambridge, Harvard University Press, — London, Heinemann, 1988 [1934].
- Tuval M. *From Jerusalem Priest to Roman Jew. On Josephus and the Paradigms of Ancient Judaism*. Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 2013.
- Vassar J. S. *Recalling a Story Once Told. An Intertextual Reading of the Psalter and the Pentateuch*. Macon, Mercer University Press, 2007.
- Villalba Varneda P. The Early Empire. In: G. Marasco (ed.). *Political Autobiographies and Memoirs in Antiquity. A Brill Companion*. Leiden — Boston, Brill, 2011, 315–362.
- Walcot P. *Envy and the Greeks. A study of human behavior*. Warminster, Aris & Phillips, 1978.
- Winterling A. Polisbegriff und Stasistheorie des Aeneas Tacticus. Zur Frage der Grenzen der griechischen Polisgesellschaften im 4. Jahrhundert v. Chr. *Historia* 1991, 40, 193–229.
- Wolff A. *De Flavii Iosephi belli Iudaici scriptoris studiis rhetoricis*. Halle, Wischan und Burkhardt, 1908.
- Wright B. G. The Use and Interpretation of Biblical Tradition in Ben Sira's Praise of the Ancestors. In: G. Xeravits, J. Zsengellér (eds). *Studies in the Book of Ben Sira. Papers of the Third International Conference on the Deuterocanonical Books, Shime'on Centre, Pápa, Hungary, 18–20 May, 2006*. Leiden, Brill, 2008, 183–207.

Риторическое и стратегическое значение слова “зависть” (φθόνος) у Иосифа. На примере Корея и Иоанна Гисхальского

Войцех Бейда

Поморский университет в Слупске,
Польша, 76–200, Слупск, ул. Кшиштофа Арцишевского, 22А; wojciech.bejda@upsl.edu.pl

Для цитирования: Bejda W. Rhetorical and Strategic Meaning of “Envy” (φθόνος) in Josephus. Examples of Korah and John of Gischala. *Philologia Classica* 2024, 19 (1), 19–36.

<https://doi.org/10.21638/spbu20.2024.102>

Цель данной статьи — проанализировать тему зависти в произведениях Иосифа в риторическом и стратегическом смысле, а не только в качестве литературного топоса.

Статья фокусируется на двух случаях, мотивированных завистью: восстании Корея против Моисея и конфликте между Иосифом и Иоанном Гисхальским. В этих двух случаях проявляются характерные черты завистников и даны подробные описания их пагубной деятельности. Идея зависти Корея была основана не на Библии, литературе или традициях Второго храма, а на собственном опыте Иосифа в период его кратковременного командования в Галилее (декабрь 66 — июль 67 гг.), когда он вступил в конфликт со своим завистником Иоанном Гисхальским. Руководствуясь апологетическими задачами, он создает впечатление, что его судьба и судьба Моисея переплелись, поскольку у них были противники со схожими характеристиками, движимые одним и тем же пороком. Более того, Иосиф в обоих повествованиях придерживается определенной последовательности, согласно которой зависть приводит к *заговору* (ἐπιβουλή), затем к *ложным обвинениям* (διαβολή) и, наконец, к *смуте* (στάσις). Он стратегически использовал тему зависти для собственной апологии, чтобы осудить своего врага, Иоанна Гисхальского. Зависть, которую тот испытывал, раскрывала характер человека, который по своим личностным качествам был хуже Иосифа. Иосиф же предстает перед читателями как стоический мудрец, свободный от таких слабостей, как зависть. В то же время автор привлекает внимание к собственному заслуженному успеху, поэтому наличие зависти становится показателем его достижений. Он скрывает собственные негативные действия во время командования в Галилее и пытается направить внимание аудитории на определенный расклад событий, который приведет к обвинению его оппонента.

Ключевые слова: Иосиф, Корея, Моисей, Иоанн Гисхальский, концепции зависти.

Received: 13.12.2023

Accepted: 05.04.2024