Eyal Ben-Eliyahu  
University of Haifa  
*Josephus’ Role in Shaping the Touristic Image of the State of Israel*

The figure and writings of Josephus have played a central role in shaping the way in which the biblical/NT sites in Israel have been presented to pilgrims and other tourists over the past fifty years. In this lecture, I shall discuss and bring examples of how Josephus’ testimony has affected the way in which archaeological and tourist sites are depicted to visitors, even in places in which no archaeological evidence exists to confirm that they are indeed the place they are claimed to be or differ from other descriptions.

Caesarea is largely presented on the basis of Josephus’ writings—to a far greater degree than is warranted by the archaeological findings.

Josephus’ account of the Temple and Jerusalem played a decisive role in the construction of the Second Temple model, created at the beginning of the 1960s and now on exhibition in the courtyard of the Israel Museum. Michael Avi Yonah’s decision to rely on Josephus’ text was not self-evident, other models—such as that displayed at the Wailing Wall—preferring to use rabbinic sources.

The depiction of the events that occurred at Masada in 73 C.E. have also been heavily shaped by Josephus’ description. Josephus’ importance as a witness is attested by the fact that the official image presented to tourists on summer nights east of Masada places Josephus amongst the Roman soldiers besieging the fortification—when in fact he was in Rome throughout the whole siege in that year.

Adam Blitz  
*Reading Josephus: Emil Schürer, Spätjudentum and Anglo-Jewish Response*

Since its inception in 1874 and expansion thereafter, Emil Schürer’s ‘Geschichte des judischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi’ has served as one of the most influential text books of Second Temple Judaism, characterising German Protestant scholarship. Indeed, it was not until the mid-20th Century (i.e. post-Holocaust), that Schürer’s paradigm of a degenerate, “late” Judaism was seriously challenged by scholars.

The aim of this paper is to examine two responses to Schürer’s construction of Judaism, in particular that of the Sadducees and (more pertinently) the Pharisees, at a time when Schürer’s book was still considered definitive. The paper will also look at how both German and Jewish thinkers read Josephus (and other texts) in the context of a developing discussion on Pharisaism. In particular, the works of Israel Abrahams and Claude Montefiore, two Anglo-Jewish scholars, will be given due attention.

This is significant for two reasons: first, although leaders in Anglo-Jewry, notably their collaborative efforts as editors of *The Jewish Quarterly Review*, neither Abrahams nor Montefiore’s work has been given the scholarly concern that might be expected. Secondly, it will be shown through critical and contextual examination of their material that, despite a legitimate attempt to criticise Schürer’s historiography, Montefiore and to a less extent Abrahams’ writing reflect ulterior purposes which...
pertain specifically to their history, to early 20th Century Jewish-Christian relations and to the institutions of Anglo-Jewry.

**Jimmy Bloom**

*“Psalm of the World Citizen”: Alienation, Assimilation, and Zionism in Lion Feuchtwanger’s Josephus Trilogy*

Writing in the shadow of the Third Reich, from which he was a fugitive, the German-Jewish author, Lion Feuchtwanger (1884-1958) endeavored to render historical context for the quandary of 20th century Judaism as its adherents faced widespread rejection and denigration by host nations. He had featured several alienated Jewish protagonists in his novels, such as *Jud Süß* (Jew Suess, 1925), based on the tragic fate of Joseph Süß Oppenheimer, an 18th century Court Jew in the employ of Duke Karl Alexander of Wurttemberg in Stuttgart, *Die Jüdin von Toledo* (The Jew of Toledo, 1955) about Rahel la Fermosa, the 12th century Jewish paramour of King Alfonso VIII if Castile. However, this theme was most acutely expressed in the “Josephus trilogy”, written in the 1930s and early 1940s, literally with the Gestapo nipping at the author’s heels. *Der Jüdische Krieg*, (Josephus, 1933), *Die Sohne* (The Jew of Rome, 1935) and *Der Tag wird kommen*. (Josephus and the Emperor, 1942) reflect the conflict between Josephus’s stature as a Hellenized Roman man of letters and his latent yearning to return to his Jewish roots and garner respect for the nobility of his people. The leitmotif running through the trilogy is epitomized by Joephus’s labor on his so-called Psalm of the World Citizen, a literary conceit invented by Feuchtwanger, that embodies the heart of the author’s message. In positing the creation of the high-minded piece, Feuchtwanger shows Josphus mediating between Jewish nationalism (anachronistically depicted, as it happens) and the ideal of ecumenical cosmpopolitanism. The paper will emphasize that the specter of the Holocaust hovered over Feuchtwanger as he composed the trilogy, much as the emergence of the Zionist movement was also reflected in the work. Feuchtwanger's explicit remarks about the Jewish nationalist programme of his own time clarify this background to his depiction of Josephus and his milieu. A few facile historical anomalies, such as equating Roman legions with Nazi storm troopers or depicting a young Josephus as a Zealot sympathizer are tailored to Feuchtwanger's platform. The paper also discusses a quasi-authorized theatrical production based on the trilogy staged by the Yiddish Art Theater in New York in 1933 and the discovery of an unidentified 32-page Hebrew language script based on the trilogy among Feuchtwanger's papers. The celebrated English author, J.B. Priestly read the Feuchtwanger opus as a sort of grand scenario for a blockbuster film about the breathtaking finale of the Jewish Revolt; indeed Feuchtwanger had been in negotiations for a cinematic treatment of his great work shortly before he died. The noted script may have served as the nucleus of such a project. The paper speculates on the provenance and intended use of this manuscript.

**Stephen Bowman**

University of Cincinnati

*Josephus versus Yosippon since World War One*

Yosippon, as we have noticed in prior workshops, began to be challenged by Josephus already in the 19th century, not in terms of demographics but in terms of the new field of Geschichte. For the previous millennium Yosippon was the major source for Second Temple history among Jews and Muslims, and until the Renaissance it competed successfully through Pseudo-Hegesippus' *De Exidio Hierosolymitana* among Christians. In the 19th century Yosippon stimulated Jewish nationalism and so reigned supreme among the religious masses of Eastern Europe while Josephus gained new life among the Wissenschaft scholars and the Maskilim. This situation lasted until after WWI. First Simhoni’s scholarly translation of the Jewish War made a reliable Hebrew version available to scholars and students. At the same time Landan’s epic Masada, which was based on Yosippon as shown by Yael Feldman, stimulated a generation of young students in their developing national and literary trek through the Yishuv. Joseph Klausner disparaged Yosippon as an historical source. He was chastised for this by Micha Bin Gurion who was propagating Yosippon as a source for the new heroes of the Yishuv and later by Yitzhak Baer and David Flusser who
emphasized the medieval literary contribution of Yosippon and its influence through the centuries. Today a new generation of younger scholars has extended Flusser’s work by a restudy of old and new manuscripts and new evaluations of the text against its South Italian – Byzantine – background. This paper will explore and develop the scholarship on Yosippon and its relationship to Josephus, the latter now the major source for the Second Temple period. Yet the two seminal books remain in tandem as fundamental to the understanding of the medieval and modern Jewish and Israeli mindsets.

Yael Feldman
New York University

*Masada, Cosmopolitan Rome, or Messianic Judea? "Flavius-Feuchtwanger" and the Turmoil of Mandate Palestine, 1923-1945*

The powerful presence of ‘Josephus’ in the ethos of pre-State Israel is usually attributed to two textual events: the publications of both Simhoni’s Hebrew translation of *The Jewish War* [1923] and Yitzhak Lamdan’s dramatic poem *Masada* [1923-26]. Much ink (including my own) has been spent on the impact of Masada as a symbol and a challenge for the new Yishuv, eager for national myths of heroism-even-onto-death when necessary. Less dramatic but still substantial was the role played by Josephus’s work in the arduous but happy task of getting to know the land, its geography and history [*yedi’at ha-aretz*]. This impact had begun in fact already with the pioneers of 2nd Aliya, whose “second bible” was the Russian Josephus (see Ben Zvi, Rachel Yanait…), and continued throughout the century with the well known archeological discoveries from Metzada and Gamla to Herodion and Ir David.

My paper will focus however on an under-explored period in Josephus’s presence in Mandate Palestine – the 1930s-40s. My argument consists of 3 points: 1. Although *Masada* still had a central role during the war years both in Europe [the poem was staged by the youth movements in the ghettos and Palestine [the 1942 desperate ‘secret’ plan for a last-defense on the Carmel named alternatively Metzada or Musa Dhag…]], these years saw the emergence of a new aspect of Josephus’s legacy: his conflicted persona. This was expressed in many ways: a public trial [1940], a staged new play by Habimah (Bistritski’s *Yerushalyim and Romi* [1941]), many public lectures, and staged radio readings from J.’s works. 2. As implied by the title of the play, attention shifted to the conflict between Rome and Jerusalem, between Cosmopolitanism and Nationalism, with all its implications for the present. 3. I suggest that the unacknowledged impetus for this shift of focus was Lion Feuchtwanger’s *Josephus Trilogy*, which was read avidly in Hebrew since 1932 and was critiqued as a direct reflection of “Feuchtwanger-Flavius”’s conflict in the face of rising Nazism in the 1930s and the failure of his cosmopolitan dream in 1945 (the publication date of the Hebrew 3rd volume [German 1942], in which Feuchtwanger sends the bereft and beaten Flavius back to Judea, where he finds a dishonorable death when joining a newly ignited Messianic revolt…).

Amir Mashiach
Orot Israel College, Ariel University

*The entry of Josephus Flavius and the story of Masada to the Halakhic discourse in the 20th century*

Josephus Flavius Is the only source of the rebellion of Masada and the heroic mass suicide at its end. This tragic event has never been mentioned in the Halakhic literature. *Chazal*, who lived at that time didn’t mention it as well and one should wander why. After all they did mention the Great rebellion and the Bar-Kokhva rebellion, not Masada.

The common explanation is that *Chazal* were against committing suicide and that is why they didn’t want to raise the issue in a heroic context. However, thorough review at their literature shows that *Chazal* didn’t have any problem with committing suicide. It all depending on the reason, i.e. if it is done because of religious principle it would be considered as a positive and heroic act. For example: The 400 boys and girls who were taken to serve as prostitutes and all of them committed
suicide (*Bavli, Gitin* 57 b). But if it is done due to a national principle it would be considered as a negative act, that shouldn't be mentioned. That is why the events of Masada and Gamla are not mentioned in *Chazal's* literature.

This conception of ignoring the event of Masada in the *Halakhic* literature even in discussions about committing suicide has changed in the 20th century. Masada has turned to be a significant event in the Zionist ethos, and several events of heroic suicide took place, such as Sara Aaronson, the leaders of the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising, Uri Ilan, and others. *Halakhic* rulers had to deal with the question of heroic suicide in battle or in captivity. The former IDF chief Rabbi Shlomo Goren, Rabbi Moshe Tzvi Nerya and Rabbi Levi Itzhak Rabbinowitz dealt with this issue. They didn't agree on the conclusion but the common denominator was that they rely on Josephus Flavius as a legitimate source for their *Halakhic* discourse. For the first time after 2000 years, Josephus Flavius entered the *Halakhic* and religious literature.

The article and the lecture will deal with the entry of Josephus Flavius to the religious discourse with the history of events of our time.

---

Zviah Nardi

*Masada in Zionist and Israeli Consciousness*

---

**Early beginnings – Yitzhak Lamdan and the poem Masada (1927)**

The historical and biographical background of the poem first calling the Yishuv in Erezt Israel “Masada”, thus indicating it is the last resort where Jews can survive as a people. The poem becomes part of the curriculum of Zionist schools during the British Mandate.

**Shemariah Gutman – The Man and the Mission.**

First visit to Masada in 1933 is followed by a constant effort to give the story of Masada a prominent place in the educational ethos of the Labor Movement's Youth.

January 1942 – Gutman leads a pilgrimage of 46 councilors of Labour youth movements to Masada. The advance of the German Wermacht led by Rommel in North Africa and rumors of possible British evacuation strengthen the symbol of Masada as the last stronghold. Plans to defend the Jewish Yishuv are considered (“Masada on Mount Carmel”).

The Palmach (elite units of the Haganah Jewish Underground) conduct pilgrimages to Masada.

March 1949 – The conquest of the area of Masada and Ein Gedi. One of the last operation of Israel's War of Independence, it was led intelligence officer, Shemariah Gutman, who personally convinced the IDF of its strategic importance.

**The Masada ethos in the first decades of the State of Israel.**

Masada figures in the curriculum of schools and youth movements, as part of the Israeli interpretation of the Second Temple Period. High school and youth movements hike to Masada, where Ben Yair’s last speech is read. “Josephus Trails” are staged in schools and youth movement to determine whether Josepous was a traitor.

IDF soldiers pledge allegiance to the State on Masada.

1953: Shemariah Gutman defines the course of the Snake Path and researches the Herodian water system with Azariah Alon. Siege camp A is partly excavated and restored.

1963-1965: A large scale excavation led by Yigael Yadin raises nation wide excitement and international interest. The story of Masada reaches it zenith in the ethos of Israeli society.

The ethos, or by now myth, of Masada challenged.

A. **Challenging Josephus’s narrative:**

   The historicity of Elazar ben-Yair’s speech is questioned by laymen, thus proving the wide scale of the interest in the Madada issue.

   1973 - Trude Weiss-Rosemarin – The Masada account of Josephus is merely a figment of his imagination.

   Jerome Murphy O’Connor of the Ecole Biblique in Jerusalem and British Archaeologist David Stacey also deny the occurrence of mass suicide on Masada, They were followed by Israeli teacher and tour guide Sefi Ben-Yosef.

B. **Challenging the congruity between the Josephus narrative and Archaeological remains on ground:**

   The remains of the 960 men, women and children were never found; The eleven shreds of pottery bearing names (including the name Ben Yair) are not necessarily a remnant of Josephus’ account of the “suicide lottery”. Dr. Ze’ev Meshel and Prof. Dan Bahat, who took part in Yadin’s dig, respond.

   No remains of the wooden wall built by besieged at the last minute were found; this claim was rebutted by Ehud Netzer’s excavation of the site in 1989.

   Part of a wooden wheel of a Roman siege machine discovered at Masada in 1991.

C. **Challenging the Masada narrative as presented by Gutman and, especially Yadin, or the “Masada Myth”:**

   As early as 1969 Prof. Shlomo Zeitlin of Dropsy College pointed out that the besieged were not simply “zealots” but sicarii, known for their violent and extreme behavior. He also claimed suicide is incompatible with the Jewish religion.

   Archaeologist Meir Ben Dov has recently questioned Yadin’s presentation of the Masada defenders as heroes. He found the account of infanticide especially appalling and incredible.

   Prof. Shlomo Goren argues the compatibility of the mass suicide of Masada with Halacha (Jewish religious law).

   Is the myth of Masada the appropriate one for the State of Israel, for the survival of Judaism? Prof. Amnon Linder of Hebrew University and others pointed out that the survival of the Jewish people was a result of adaptation to reality and preservation of tradition. Hence, it was Rabban Yochanan ben Zakkai and his academy in Yavneh that set the course of Judaism rather than the zealots who committed suicide at Masada.

D. **Sociologist Prof. Nachman Ben Yehudah presents a detailed rebuttal of Yadin’s “Massada Myth”, while fully accepting Josephus’s narrative:**

   Some points he raises:
*The defenders of Masada were not simply Zealots but sicarii – political terrorists who invaded the surrounding (Jewish) village especially Ein Gedi.*

*The defenders of Masada were not heroes – They choose to sit out the war and ignored Shimon Bar Giora’s appeal to join the fighters in Jerusalem.*

*The account Josephus gives is one of defeat not heroism; he does not mention a battle.*

*The siege did not last three years but a number of months (following Prof. Jonathan Roth of San Jose University California)*

*The defenders were not keen on suicide – it took Elazar ben Yair much effort to convince them,*

*Yadin gradually raised the importance of the remains of the man, woman and child found in the northern palace, finally claiming them to be of one of the important leaders of the revolt and his family*

---

**Sarah Pearce**  
Southampton University  
*Josephus in the Jewish Chronicle in the early twentieth century*

---

**Eliezer Sariel**  
Ohalo College, Sha’anan College  
*Can’t Live With Him, Can’t Live Without Him: The Approach of Ze’ev Ya’avetz to the Writings of Josephus*

Ze’ev Ya’avetz (1847-1924) was an Orthodox-nationalist historian who published a series of books surveying the history of the people of Israel from the time of the patriarchs until the last quarter of the nineteenth century. His historiographical oeuvre was part of the Orthodox reaction to the *wissenschaft* school of historiography. Ya’avetz was distinctive in his identification and cooperation with the nationalist Zionist movement. He was amongst the founders of the “Mizrachi” movement, and was editor of its journal from 1902-1905.

Josephus presented a two-fold challenge for Ya’avetz. On the one hand, he was the most important historical source for the history of the Second Temple period. On the other hand, Josephus’s defection to the Romans violated Ya’avetz’s Orthodox values as well as his nationalist values. Ya’avetz found himself between the hammer of history and the anvil of ideology.

In this lecture I will present the various and, at times, contradictory components of Ya’avetz’s approach to Josephus, noting the ambivalence inherent in the approach of any Orthodox Zionist historian to Josephus. This ambivalence provides a glimpse into the world of Orthodoxy, of Zionism, and particularly the world of nationalist Orthodoxy in its embryonic stages at the start of the twentieth century. The complexity of Ya’avetz’s approach to Josephus may, as well, contribute to improving our understanding of Josephus himself.

---

**Orr Scharf**  
University of Haifa  
*Taking Josephus Personally: The Curious Case of Emanuel bin Gorion*

Although Josephus studies in early 20th century Germany flourished, his figure was not a popular object of personal identification. In this sense, Ukrainian-born novelist and savant Micah Yosef Berdyczewski (1865-1921) was an exception. Upon moving to Berlin in 1911 he expressed the
admiration he had harboured for Josephus for many years, by changing his last name to bin Gorion, in a double tribute to the author of the *Yosippon* and the ancient historian. This veneration passed on to his son, Emanuel (1903-1987), who, as an up-and-coming intellectual, published in the early 1930s two Josephus translations: *Das Leben des Flavius Josephus* (The Life of Flavius Josephus, 1934), in which he offered a biographical sketch of the ancient historian by assembling passages from *Vita, Wars* and *Antiquities*; and *Das Haus des Herodes* (The House of Herod, 1936) – a collection of excerpts from *Antiquities, Wars* and supplementary rabbinical sources, portraying the figure of the powerful “römischer Vasall.”

In Emanuel bin Gorion’s prolific bibliography from the years leading up to World War Two, these translated anthologies are rather unusual items. The editor-in-chief of the prestigious *Philo Lexikon: Handbuch des jüdisches Wissens* (handbook of Jewish knowledge), compiler and editor of some of his father’s unpublished anthologies and studies, and editor of an anthology of German works of literature inspired by the Hebrew Bible, Emanuel departed from his customary *modus operandi*, and took his family namesake personally: as an historical figure of great merit, and as a consummate biographer of a near-contemporary Jewish king. Making this excursion all the more fascinating, Emanuel chose to put his scholarly skills to the task within the non-academic, yet scholarly setting of Verlag Schocken’s *Bücherei* series.

In my paper, I will present these practically-unstudied works, exploring their content and context. I will begin with a description of Josephus according to bin Gorion, who is not so much a “proto-Zionist” or the safeguard of Jewish memory against Christian counter-histories. Instead, we meet in Emanuel’s translations a pragmatist navigating dicey politics of identity, who alternated between experiencing reality in the first person and describing it in the third-person; as well as an inspiring chronicler, whom Emanuel lauds an nothing less than “one of the greatest storytellers of world literature.” Moving on to context, I will examine the project’s interests and methodology as framed by the legacy of bin Gorion’s father, who combined erudition, talent and insight to produce subversive historical studies and comprehensive anthologies of Jewish lore. The discussion will consider the aspects in Josephus’ biography -- a cultured Jew faring on a road between Hellenistic culture and Roman power -- that appealed to Emanuel, a German-born intellectual of Ostjude descent who came of age in the turbulent years of the Weimar Republic and the rise of Nazism.

**Daniel Schwartz**
Hebrew University (via Skype)

**Shifra Sznol**
Hebrew University
*Reading and interpreting Josephus Flavius in the Warsaw Ghetto (1941-1943)*

Everyday life in the Ghetto during the Second World War is associated with hunger, terror, transport and death. This proposal seeks to illuminate the presence of cultural and spiritual resistance that arose in the Ghetto. The dramatic figure of FJ and his rich literary creation were a source of inspiration and raised multiple questions related to the present insufferable situation in the Ghetto, and to the future of the Jewish people as a whole.

The first source is a diary written by teenager, Yitzhok Rudashevsky, in the Vilna Ghetto from June 1941 to April1943. The diary was written in Yiddish and extends over 204 pages, written partly in pencil and partly in ink. Y. Rudashevsky is able to deliver a detailed account of life in the Ghetto. With a masterful hand, he describes the constant battle for survival and the cruelty of the Nazi police to the Jewish population. The only source of light was the cultural life of the Ghetto, especially the activity at the Real Gymnium (Secondary School with the emphasis on Classics) where Rudashevsky was a brilliant student.
The teen-aged author provides a detailed description of the curriculum that included literature, Latin, mathematics, science and especially history. He had a special preference for history and describes a club of 'historians ' in which he was an active participant. They held weekly meetings. They prepared questionnaires which were distributed among the population with the aim of recording everyday life of the Ghetto. The main subject of Jewish studies during that year was Josephus Flavius and in general the history Rome. The writer quotes from books by the historians H. Graetz and S. Dubnow. During the same year he provides a description of preparation for two 'literary trials' at the community cultural center.

The first 'trial' was against King Herod and the second against Josephus Flavius. Rudashevsky took an active part in the preparation of both. In the diary he offers a vivid description of his perceptions of Jewish history, and refers to the importance of the Herod trial. As a prosecutor Rudashevsky accused Herod of ambiguity, of having the role of Rome's agent and of being a mass murderer. However, he also reveals understanding for other ideas, mainly by his teachers, related to the defense of Herod. The details of the trial discussion also reflect the internal conflict in the Ghetto in regard to the Judenrat and its leaders.

The trial against Josephus was held during the last weeks of the Warsaw Ghetto (7th March 1943) and it is less documented. Rudashevsky got the role of a witness, the famous hero Yohanan of Gush Khalav.

Rudashevsky was educated mainly in the Yiddish language and its literature. In his curriculum of studies Rudashevsky does not mention Bible or Hebrew, neither Jewish religion nor tradition. It may be assumes that the Real Gymansium did not have a Zionist national orientation, and was probably belonging to the Bund or Socialist party.

In the second part of the diary (March 1943) Rudashevsky reflects an extraordinary susceptibility to the end which is near, (‘We may be fated for the worst‘…). He was killed when he was 15 years and three months of age. The diary was recovered by his cousin after the end of the war.

The second source is devoted to the writer and poet Yitzhak Katzenelson (Poland 1886-1944) who chose the figure of Josephus Flavius for a play titled: ‘Between shepherds: one night around Jerusalem’. The original was written in Hebrew before the war. It was later expanded and translated into Yiddish for a performance in the Ghetto, probably in 1941. The main issue is a meeting of a group of halutzim (pioneers, in Hebrew) in the hills of Jerusalem with dramatic figures of Jewish history: King Saul, Daniel, Josephus Flavius and Salomon Molcho. They are introduced by a figure that represents the link between the world of the living and the world of the dead.

The figure of Josephus starts with a short speech in Latin and in Yiddish followed by a long dialogue between himself and the halutzim. This dialogue questions the role of Flavius Josephus in Jewish history, his betrayal, his written legacy, his personal weakness and ambition. The author regards the War against Rome as an expression of Jewish heroism, despite the final defeat. Katzenelson reveals his knowledge of the Josephus books through details and the names of heroes quoted in the play.

The dialogue between J F and the halutzim, related to the Great Revolt against Rome and to the leadership of the rebels, can be understood also in relation to the different political and ideological streams that existed during the tragic years in the Ghetto. Y. Katzenelson shared an ideological identification with the Zionist movement and he supported the underground against the Nazis as a fighting writer.

In summation, the authors of both texts revealed a basic knowledge of Josephus's writings, mainly the 'Jewish War', and they interpreted it as a metaphor of their own distressed reality. Rome represents Germany and the Nazi movement, and the surrender of Josephus to the Romans is a treachery in the same way as Jews collaborating with the Germans. Although their defeat is known, there is identification with the extreme rebels (Kanaim) in both texts.