At the end of *Antiquities* Josephus outlines the features of what turned out to be *Life*. He wrote: “Perhaps it will not be a provocation to jealousy, or strike ordinary folks as gauche, if I review briefly both my own ancestry and the events of my life while there are still those living who can offer refutation or corroboration” (*Ant.* 20.266). He confirmed this purpose at the end of *Life* where he wrote: “These, then, are the things that occurred throughout my entire life; from them let others judge my character as they might wish” (*Life* 430a). The two similar verses indicate that Josephus thought he had accomplished what he aimed to write in *Life*, meaning that he had described the events of his life.

In spite of those specific phrases from *Antiquities* and *Life*, scholars suggested that Josephus’ main purpose in *Life* was to write an apology, in which he was referring to the accusations in the book of Justus of Tiberias. Chapter 65 (336–367), where Josephus responds to the accusations, was the basis of that conclusion.

---

1 The translations in this paper are from: Mason 2001, except for occasional isolated words or very short phrases. It is accepted that in *Ant.* 20.266, Josephus is referring to what turned out to be *Life*: Feldman 1996a, 141 n. b; Peterson 1958, 259–62. An enlarged discussion and bibliography on the issues of this article see in the relevant chapters in Stern 2005.

2 The call to judge one’s character was a literary convention in personal writing or in works about individuals, e.g.: Xenophon, *Memorabilia*, IV, viii, 11. Mason says that these words point to the basic theme of *Life*, which is the character of Josephus: Mason 2001, 172–73 n. 1778.

3 Stein 1936, 8; Laqueur 1970, 7–8; Schürer 1973, 53–54; Schalit 1927, 3, passim; Rodgers 2006, 185–86. See discussion on the subject: Mason 2001, XXVII–XXVIII. In an early article Rajak even ascribes apologetic remarks besides chapter 65 to Josephus’ response to Justus’ charges: Rajak 1973, 345, 356–58 (see Rajak in the next note).
Modern scholars felt that that approach left some problems regarding *Life* unsolved, and suggested different solutions. Although scholars of both groups noticed the uniqueness of chapter 65, they still considered it as an integral part of the original writing-design of *Life*.

There is no denying that chapter 65 is Josephus’ direct apologetic answer to Justus’ accusations in his book. But does it indicate the purpose of *Life*? And, above all, was chapter 65 designed to be in the original writing-plan of *Life*?

In this paper we attempt to employ a new approach in order to understand the place of chapter 65 in *Life*: All references to Justus and their interconnections are examined *from a literary point of view*.

Justus is mentioned in *Life* five times before chapter 65.

---

4 E.g.: Josephus responded to Justus’ attacks because of his injured pride, and because of enemies apart from Justus. He portrayed himself as observing the Law, in order to win the sympathy of the Yavnean scholars: Cohen 1979, 140, 144ff; *Life* is an apology for *War*, a response to Justus’ charges, and it is also an inferior kind of autobiography in which Josephus reveals some personal details: Barish 1978, 64; Josephus defends himself against Justus’ charges, which referred to his mission in Galilee, because Josephus could no longer depend on the emperor’s protection. He defended himself as well against certain groups of Jews who were in Judah, perhaps against the early Rabbis: Schwartz 1990, 21–22; Josephus referred to written accusations of Justus and of others: Rajak 1984, 146, 152, and n. 19; 1987, 85; *Life* is a defense of Josephus’ behavior during the revolt against Rome: Goodman 2000, 205. *Life* explains the connection between Josephus’ personal history and his suitability to be the author of his works: Bilde 1988, 110–13; The connection between *Antiquities* and *Life* is not incidental. In *Life* Josephus sets himself as an example of a Jewish person, whose character demonstrates his people’s culture and tradition, as portrayed in *Antiquities*, while praising himself: Mason 1998, 53, 73–75; 2001, XLVIII–XLIX.

5 Stein 1936, 77 n. 1; “the forensic digression”: Mason 2001, XXXVIII.

6 Luther suggests that the content and the structure of Justus’ book can be reconstructed: Luther 1910, 65ff. But then he himself restricts his suggestion (ibid. 68). See more about this matter: Schürer 1973, 36; Rajak 1973, 354; 1987, 82. It seems that even when Josephus says explicitly that he responds to what Justus has written, no real reconstruction is possible. One cannot be sure how things were actually written or what their place and role were in the whole book.

7 The discussion will focus only on the aspects that are relevant directly to the topic of this paper. Mason transcripts the conventional anglicized names *Justus*—to *Iustus*, *Jesous*—to *Iesus* and *Joannes*—to *Ioannes*. So when quoted Mason’s translation they will be the way Mason chose to anglicize them. Otherwise, they will be—*Justus*, *Jesous* and *Joannes* (and see more about *Joannes* in n. 13).