

Rome and the Jews  
in the  
First Two Centuries of the Christian  
Era

by  
Henry Brash Bonsall

A Thesis submitted for the Degree of  
Master of Arts  
in the Department  
of  
Classics

The University of British Columbia

September, 1928.

"Exeudent alii spirantia mollius aera,  
Credo equidem, vivos ducent de marmore voltus,  
Orabunt causas melius, caelique meatus  
Describent radio, et surgentia sidera dicent;  
Tu regere imperio populos, Romane, memento,-  
Hae tibi erunt artes,- pacisque imponere morem,  
Parcere subiectis, et debellare superbos."

Vergil, Aeneid,  
6. 847-853.



This thesis, first and last, was undertaken under the wise and sympathetic direction of Mr. H. T. Logan, M. A., Associate Professor of Classics in the University of British Columbia, to whose skill and patience the writer owes much.

H. B. B.

## CONTENTS.

## CHAPTER ONE.

The Political History of the Jews to the Reign of Augustus.

Introduction	Page 1.
The first connection	5.
The Maccabean Period	5.
Pompey	7.
Gabinus	9.
Crassus	10.
Caesar	11.
Cassius	12.
Antony	13.

## CHAPTER TWO.

Jewish Political Theory and Practice.

Introduction	15.
--------------	-----

## I. The Jews of Palestine.

The Territory	16.
Judaea	17.
Galilee	18.
Peraea	18.
Samaria	18.
The Hellenistic towns	18.
The Sanhedrim	19.
The Religious life	20.
The temple	21.

The Priesthood	22.	ii
The high priests	22.	
The Sadducees	22.	
The Pharisees	23.	
The Scribes	24.	

## II. The Diaspora.

Extent of the Dispersion	25.
Reasons for the Dispersion	25.
The attitude of the Greek Sovereigns	27.
The attitude of the Greek cities	27.
The character of the Dispersion	28.
Its social position	28.
Proselytism	30.

## CHAPTER THREE.

### Roman Political Theory and Practice.

#### I. General Principles.

The Roman character	32.
Varied status of subject peoples in the Empire	34.
Client kingdoms	34.
Free states	35.
Provinces	36.
Local self-government in the provinces	36.
<u>Civitates stipendiariae</u>	36.
States with Roman citizenship	37.
Senatorial and imperial provinces, The Procuratorial	37.
Procedure on taking over a province	38.

<u>Lex provinciae</u>	38.	iii
Means of securing the province	38.	
Roman attitude toward the independence of subject peoples.	38.	
Local independence	39.	
The governor	40.	
Attitude towards culture	42.	
The dark side of Roman government	42.	
The bright side of Roman government	44.	

## II. Rome and the Jews.

### A. Judaea.

The procurator, his jurisdiction in	
army	47
finance	48
justice	49
administration	50
Rome's policy of conciliation	50
Summary	50

### B. The Diaspora.

Introduction	51.
Right of residence	52
Right of autonomous internal organization	55
Administration	55.
Finance	57
Jurisdiction	57
Right of citizenship	58
Hellenistic	58
Roman	59.
Summary.	61.

## CHAPTER FOUR.

iv.

### The Reign of Augustus.

Herod's pro-Roman policy	62
Confirmation of Herod in his kingdom by Augustus B. C. 30	63
Subsequent additions made by Augustus to Herod's territory	64
Augustus' attitude in the case of Aristobulus and Alexander	65
The death of Herod	66
Herod's will	67
Augustus' first settlement of the will	67
The procuratorship of Sabinus	67
Augustus final settlement of the will	69
The reign and banishment of Archelaus	69
Summary	70

## CHAPTER FIVE.

### From Augustus to the Great War A. D. 66.

#### I. Early Procurators, A. D. 6-41.

Introduction	71.
Coponius, probably A. D. 6-9.	71
Marcus Ambivius, prob. A. D. 9-12.	71
Annius Rufus, prob. A. D. 12-15	71
Valerius Gratus, A. D. 15-26	71
Pontius Pilate, A. D. 26-36.	72.
Vitellius, legate of Syria, A. D. 36-39.	75
Herod, Antipas.	75.
Herod Agrippa	76.

Caligula and the temple of Jerusalem 77

v.

Alexandria 81

Restoration of kingdom by Claudius 84

II Herod Agrippa I, A. D. 41-44

Character 85

Acceptability to Jews. 86

Policy 87

Death, A. D. 44 89

Restoration of the province. 89

III Later Procurators, A. D. 44-66.

Introduction 90

Cuspius Fadus, A. D. 44-? 91

Tiberius Alexander, A. D. ?-48 91

Ventidius Cumanus, A. D. 48-52. 91

Felix A. D. 52-60 93

Procus Festus, A. D. 60-62. 96

Albinus, A. D. 62-64 97

CHAPTER SIX.

The Great War A. D. 66-73. 99

Introduction 99

Florus, A. D. 64-66 101

Agrippa II 103

The outbreak and triumph of the revolution  
A. D. 66. 105

The war in Galilee, A. D. 67. 107

The siege of Jerusalem, A. D. 70. 116

The conclusion of the war, A. D. 71-73. 121

# I From the destruction of Jerusalem

Titus to Trajan.

The reaction of the Jews	124
Roman government of Judaea	124
The decay of the priesthood and the Sadducees, and the rise of the Scribes and Pharisees	125
The Pharisaic school at Jamnia	127
The policy of Vespasian	128
Domitian	129
Nerva	129
The Proprætors	129

## II The War under Trajan A. D. 115-117

Cyrene and Egypt	130
Cyprus	131
Mesopotamia	131

## III The Rebellion under Hadrian A. D. 132.

Causes	132
Course	134
Aelia Capitolina	137
Antoninus Pius	137
Later Emperors	137
Summary	138.

# Rome and the Jews in the First Two Centuries of the Christian Era.

## CHAPTER ONE.

### Introduction.

#### The Political History of the Jews to the Reign of Augustus.

The first recorded connection between Rome and the Jews occurred in 161 B. C., when Judas Maccabaeus, the Jewish patriot, found himself encompassed on all sides by his Syrian enemies, and appealed to Rome for help. It is the purpose of this thesis to trace the subsequent relations between the great city on the Tiber and the small Eastern state, but before doing so a few facts connected with the latter's past claim our attention.

The league of mutual protection which was granted at Judas' request connected Judaea not with the first world empire but with the fifth. Four great dominions--Assyria, Babylon, Persia and Macedon--had risen and fallen, and while Rome was perhaps to affect the Jewish nation more than any of the others, she was not the first to do so. Each of the other Empires had left its mark upon its character.

Throughout the periods of the last three of these world rulers the Jews occupied the position of subjects. Hitherto they had enjoyed an independent existence as one of the twelve tribes of Israel. But in B. C. 721 Shalmanesar, the Assyrian king, carried away captive "beyond the Euphrates" ten of these twelve tribes, and in B. C. 58<sup>6</sup>, Nebuchadnezzar, the king of Babylon, removed into his kingdom the Jews



and the Benjamites which were the remaining two tribes, and devastated their country and its capital.

Their bondage took a much lighter form under the third great Empire--the Persian. In B. C. 539, Cyrus, having overthrown the Babylonian power, liberated its captives, and permitted the Jews to return to their own land. Under this and succeeding monarchs a portion went back, rebuilt their city and its temple, and re-established a native government which functioned under the supervision of the satrap to whose province Judaea belonged. This native government has sometimes been termed a "hag-iocracy," a word which aptly describes it, for it was truly a rule of priests. The high priest was at the same time the religious and the political head of the nation, and the priests filled many of the highest offices. In short, all was characterized by an intense zeal for the law and a desire to order everything in conformity with it.

Of Israel's history during the two hundred years of Persian rule we know little. There is no satisfactory historical record, and the accounts of the events that occurred are confused and shadowy. While it was a period of restoration, it was one of humiliation also. As the new temple was built and dedicated the younger men rejoiced, but many of the older men who had seen the glory of the former temple of Solomon, burst into tears. "So that the people could not discern the noise of the shout of joy from the noise of the weeping of the people."<sup>1</sup> This incident is typical of these trying years, when the two elements of humiliation and hope mingled and strove; on the one hand was the soreness after the exile, aggravated as it was by the desperate poverty of the present conditions; on the other hand was a dawning but passionate hope of a future reinstatement. Ezra 3.13.

ment in the old position. Such sorrow and hope could only arise where there was a sense of being destined for something better, as the chosen people of God. Adding to the general unrest was the fact that Israel was hemmed in on the northwest and on the southwest by the troublesome Phoenicians and Egyptians, who kept Palestine in continuous unrest.

In its later decades the Persian Empire lost its beneficent influence. The <sup>e</sup>Emperors were inferior in heart and ability, and the governors of the provinces were petty, tyrannous and harsh; the feeling of the remoteness of Persia from her subjects increased, and dissatisfaction with it darkened still further the later years of Judaea.

For this reason Palestine was not sorry to see the Persian Empire suddenly crumble into dust and in its place a shining new empire arise, that of Alexander the Great. In a whirlwind campaign this general stripped Persia of all her western territory and at Arbela, B. C. 331, dealt her a deathblow. The Empire which he aspired to raise in place of the Persian one was to be bound together by the bond of a common culture—Hellenism; so far did he succeed in inculcating the latter that it continued centuries after its first growth abroad, and Hellenism was a living force throughout the Roman era. On his invasion of Palestine, which took place in B. C. 332, he spared the Jews and left them in full possession of their rights and customs, allowing them <sup>1.</sup> "to worship after the manner of their forefathers." Thus Jerusalem exchanged her masters; her condition remained the same. When some nine years afterwards Alexander died his empire became a bone of contention among those who had been his generals, and immediately fell apart. From a generation of turmoil Ptolemy emerged as ruler over Egypt, a successor to the Pharaohs, while Seleucus became king over Syria and Asia.

1. Jos. Ant. 11.8.5.

Palestine's new rulers were tolerant almost to the point of negligence. The country itself was left very much alone; its taxes were farmed by native princes. The period as a whole, while disturbed by some internal feuds, was marked by a peaceful stillness and the Jewish nation was held in marked respect. Egypt ruled Palestine as far north as Lebanon<sup>b</sup>. Her rule was not constant nor unchallenged, for there was continued hostility between her and Syria. On the whole, however, she was dominant in Palestine until 198 B. C., when a decisive battle was fought at Paneas; there Antiochus the Great drove the Egyptians in flight and made the Syrians masters of the Holy Land, a position they continued to hold till shortly before the Christian era.

In the earlier era Hellenic culture had made great progress in Judea. Many Jews had favoured it, some even to the point of adopting paganism. It is undertain how far this tendency would have gone had not the crude attempt of the Syrian monarch, Antiochus Epiphanes, brought about a reaction. This ruler,--a dark, wild, and also a tragic character, a great egotist, a tyrant, and one who forced his facies<sup>c</sup> on others at the point of the sword,-- decreed that Judaea should sacrifice to the Greek deities like all other lands, and completely renounce Judaism to adopt Hellenism. This order, however, had the effect of stopping the gradual assimilation by the Jews of things Greek, and of breaking them up into two hostile parties--Hellenists and Judaists<sup>d</sup>.

When all looked as if paganism would win the day a minor incident proved the turning point. In the village of Modein a priest, Matthias by name, was told by a Syrian official to sacrifice to the foreign gods. He refused. A time-serving Jew hastened to the altar to sacrifice, whereupon Matthias, in fury, cut him down and slew the official as well. Calling to-

gether his five sons; all valiant men; he fled for his life to the wilderness, and there he gathered round him, day by day, the company of such as preferred their forefathers' religion before their lives.

They had indeed left all and were face to face with death in a desperate cause. Their leaders, Matthias and his five sons, actually succeeded in leading them to victory against the Syrians; they conquered them in many battles though they themselves seemed hopelessly outnumbered.<sup>2</sup>

After the death of his father, Judas Maccabaeus, the middle son, became general. He succeeded in taking Jerusalem from the hands of the Syrians; he cast out the heathen altars, and re-dedicated the temple in 165 B. C. Wherever he went he compelled his fellow-countrymen to return to their former religious customs. But the Syrians gathered in still greater numbers to attack him, and it was in this extremity that he appealed to Rome for help. Rome, who had been narrowly watching Syrian politics ever since her encounter with Antiochus the Great in B. C. 192-189, was willing as a matter of policy to check Syrian aggression, and a league of mutual protection and support was readily confirmed by the senate. It was considerably modified, however, by the rider that each might depart from it at will.

In this way the first link in the chain of relations between Rome and the Jews was forged. It did not profit Judas, however. Before the Roman warning could reach the king of Syria, he had completely conquered Judaea, and Judas himself had fallen in battle.<sup>1</sup>

Rome does not again appear in Jewish history until a century later. These intervening years made up a period of comparative independence known as the Maccabean Age. During this time the brothers Maccabaeus were instrumental in freeing their country from the Syrian yoke, and assumed the

1. 1 Mace. 8. 2. Jos. Ant. 12. 6 sq.; Wars 1. 1 sq.  
Wars 1. 1.

leadership in turn. The Asmonaeon family, as that of Judas is sometimes called, succeeded that of Zadok<sup>2</sup>, and from it were chosen all the high priests until the Romano--Herodian period, while its eldest member was king. But the independence which Judaea enjoyed under this dynasty was increasingly threatened by the extension of Rome's power in the East; its <sup>1</sup>termination was imminent when she landed her forces in Syria under Pompey in B. C. 65; it went forever with his invasion and settlement of the Holy land two years later.

After Judas' defeat and death in 161 B. C., his brothers Jonathan and Simon succeeded, partly by desperate fighting, partly by diplomacy, in retrieving the defeat of their cause, and establishing it upon a real if precarious footing. Simon was the first high-priest of the new line. The son and successor of Simon was John Hyrcanus. He reigned happily for thirty years having, says Josephus, the three greatest benefits; "the government of his nation, the high-priesthood and the gift of prophecy."<sup>1</sup> At first he favoured the Pharisees, but later, in consequence of a quarrel, expelled them from the council of elders. A further reason for his action lay in the fact that the ideas of the Pharisees no longer coincided with the principles of the Asmonaeon house, which now began, and later continued still more, to degenerate into a secular dynasty with purely secular motives. Incidentally this is the first mention of the Pharisees and the Sadducees by these names.<sup>5</sup>

Later, in Hyrcanus' reign, Antiochus the Seventh besieged Jerusalem, and he had all but taken the city when, for some unaccountable reason he agreed to withdraw on comparatively mild terms. The explanation of this action is probably to be sought in the assumption of a threatening attitude toward him on the part of Rome which frowned on all attempts of kings to

1. Jos. Wars. 1.2.8.

2. 1 Kings 2:35.

3. Jos. Ant. 13:1-10; Wars 1:2.

enlarge their own boundaries, especially at the expense of a people friendly to herself.

John's son, Aristobulus, after a miserable reign, stained with family blood, <sup>1</sup> died one year after his accession. Alexander Jannaeus, his brother, reigned twenty-seven years, during which he suppressed the Pharisees by many barbarous acts. His wife, Alexandra, secured the throne on his death by promising the Pharisees to be guided by their counsels. The result was that she had indeed the name of regent, but the Pharisees had the authority, for it was they who restored such as were banished, and set such as were prisoners at liberty, and to say all at once, they differed in nothing from lords."<sup>1</sup> These rulers had laid emphasis on military affairs, had made Judaea a powerful state and had extended its borders. Galilee was Judaized probably under Aristobulus I.<sup>2</sup>

On Alexandra's death Aristobulus II, the younger and more violent of her two sons, came upon the elder and milder who was called Hyrcanus, and who had both the high-priesthood and kingship, to wrest the latter from him. Before it came to blows they agreed that the elder should retain the high-priesthood, while the younger should rule as king. All might have gone peacefully but for one, Antipater, the governor of Idumaea. This man, seeing for himself a chance of personal advancement in a revolution, persuaded Hyrcanus to flee to Aretus, King of Arabia, for help, and for redress of his wrongs. Together they fled, returning with an army of Arabians which put Aristobulus to flight and was about to besiege him in Jerusalem itself where he had taken refuge, when the Romans stepped in.

Pompey was straightening matters in Armenia at the time and had despatched Scaurus to Syria as its legate in B. C. 65. Hearing how matters

1. Jos. Ant. 13.16.2.

2. Jos. Ant. 13.11-16; Wars 1.3-5.

stood in Judaea, Scaurus, who had little or no business there, came down with an army in hopes of gain. He was not disappointed. Aristobulus at once offered him four hundred talents and Hyrcanus and Antipater, not to be outbid, offered a like sum. Scaurus accepted the first because he thought Aristobulus more likely to fulfil his promise and ordered the Arabians, on pain of Rome's severe displeasure, to return home immediately, which they did.

Hyrcanus and Antipater now asked Pompey to look into the case. He did so, and completely reversed Scaurus' decision by favouring Hyrcanus. When Aristobulus, torn with mingled pride and fear, put himself in Pompey's hands, his party fortified themselves in the temple mount in Jerusalem. Pompey entered the city without encountering resistance and at once brought his siege engines against the temple. After a three months' siege, terminating in late autumn, B. C. 63<sup>1.</sup>, this was taken, though it was thanks chiefly to Aristobulus' party refusing to stop him when he built his ramparts on the Sabbath days. A frightful massacre ensued; the priests still sacrificing amid the flying darts and tottering walls, every one cut down where he stood; the total number of the besieged who were slaughtered is given as twelve thousand.<sup>2.</sup> Pompey, though he did not touch the temple treasure, pushed his way into the holy of holies to see it, and earned thereby for Rome the Jews' lasting hate and suspicion.<sup>4.</sup>

Pompey's arrangement of Judaea was even more important than the conquest itself. Judaea does not appear to have been incorporated in the newly-formed province of Syria.<sup>3.</sup> It was nevertheless shorn of many cities

3. (Schürer, *Hist. Jewish People*.)

2 So. S.H.J.P. This would appear, he thinks, from what is said by Josephus of the Jews at the time of Gabinus' arrangement. Wars 1. 8.5 *ad fin.*

1. Jos. Ant. 14.4.2-4; Wars 1.7.3.-5; Dio Cassius 37.16.

2. By Josephus, Ant. 14.4.4.

4. Jos. Ant. 14.1-4; Wars 1.6, 7.



including all the coast towns from Raphia to Dora; also of all non-Jewish cities east of the Jordan<sup>3</sup> River. In almost all these towns have been found coins using the Pompeian era. This indicates that Pompey was the real founder of the Decapolis, restoring the freedom of its communes which had been taken from them by the Jews, and finally of Scythopolis and Samaria with their environs. These were all put directly under the legate of Syria.<sup>1</sup> Judaea itself was made tributary,<sup>2</sup> and Hyrcanus, though confirmed as its high priest, was deprived of the title of king, and while given freedom to exercise a political leadership was yet made accountable to the governor of Syria for the way he did it.<sup>3</sup> Here, as in Syria, Pompey, following ancient Roman precedent, introduced direct government by Rome, as little as possible, rather arranging that the country should carry on its own affairs under its own constitution. All that was left to the Roman governor of Syria was a general oversight of Jewish affairs in the interests of Rome. But Judaea had at last come directly under Rome's thumb, and though it had indeed subsequent periods of independence it was only on condition of Rome's sufferance and her own good behaviour. Thus these times partook rather of the nature of a suspended sentence or parole, than of freedom for Judaea.

In B. C. 57 Pompey's settlement of Palestine was upset by Gabinus governor of Syria B. C. 57-55. When Alexander, one of the two sons of Aristobulus, raised a revolt in Judaea, this official exercised his right of interference and invaded the country. After crushing the sedition he incorporated Judaea in the Roman province of Syria, and gave it a status very similar to that of the ordinary province. Hyrcanus' activity was restricted to his priestly functions; his political authority was taken from

1. Jos. Ant. 14.4.4; Wars 1.7.7. Also cf. Cicero, Pro Flacco 67.

2. Jos. Ant. 14.4.4; Wars 1.7.6.

3. Jos. Ant. 14.4.4; Wars 1.7.6-7.



him. His land was divided into five districts, each independent of the other, and named after their capitals Jerusalem, Gazara, Amathus, Jericho and Sepphoris.<sup>1.</sup> The significance of this division is a disputed point; possibly it concerned customs duties only,<sup>2.</sup> but it may have designated assize circuits (conventus iuridici).<sup>3.</sup> Whatever the nature of this subdivision may have been, it is certain that Palestine as a whole lost the last vestige of its political autonomy. Josephus' only comment on the national reaction does not, however, betray any dissatisfaction with her political condition;--"So the people were glad to be thus freed from monarchical government (i.e. the rule of Hyrcanus) and were governed for the future by an aristocracy (i.e. Jewish)."<sup>4.</sup> The people had lost much or all of the spirit that had inspired Judas Maccabeus a hundred years previously.

Three years later, the triumvir, M. Licinius Crassus, who succeeded Gabinius as Proconsul of Syria, led his Parthian expeditionary force through Palestine. He is said to have robbed the temple of twelve thousand talents to fit out his army.<sup>5.</sup> Both he and it were lost at Carrhae in B. C. 53.<sup>6.</sup>

The Next Syrian governor, Cassius, suppressed another rising in Palestine and sold thirty thousand of the rebellious as slaves.<sup>6.</sup>

1. Jos. Ant. 14.5.4; Wars, 1.8.4.
2. Cf. P. 46.
3. Jos. Wars 1.8.5. which is the only authority on this point lends credibility to both views, to the first in the words "and some that they might pay, jointly, tribute to Amathus," and to the second in the term "synods." Shurer inclines to the latter opinion. Cf. S.H. J. P. Div. I, Vol. I. p. 373, also note 7; Div. II, Vol. I, p. 168.
4. Jos. Wars 1.8.5.
5. Jos. Ant. 14.7.1.; Wars 1.8.8.
6. Jos. Ant. 14.7.3; Wars 1.8.9.

This and other risings were miniature civil wars, the outcome of fiercely 11. opposed factions, rather than attacks on Rome. Rome acted more as a restorer of order than a common enemy.

In B. C. 49 the era of the Roman civil wars begins,--a period in which Rome with its dominions was convulsed from top to bottom four times. Every province was drained by the fighting factions of the capital in order to carry on their own wars. "During these twenty years, from Caesar's crossing the Rubicon down to the death of Antony, B. C. 49-30, the whole Roman history was reflected in the history of Syria and also in that of Palestine. Every change and turn in the Roman history was answered by a corresponding movement in Syrian history, and during this short period Syria and Palestine changed sides and owned new masters no less than four times."<sup>1</sup>.

When Caesar crossed into Italy with his legions from Gaul, Pompey and the Republicans with the Senate fled from Rome to Greece, carrying as it proved their battlefields with them. All the East was now under the Republicans whose headquarters were in Greece, and was bound to provide them with men and supplies for the war. The decisive battle of the first civil war was fought at Pharsalia on August 9th, B. C. 48, and resulted in a crushing defeat for the Republicans. Pompey himself fled from the scene to Egypt where he was murdered on the sand of the shore where he landed.

Julius Caesar, though now lord of the entire empire, had still much fighting to do. As Judaea had aided the losing side it was needful for Hyrcanus and Antipater to win Caesar's favour. This they did when they

1. Schürer, H. J. P. Div. I. Vol. I. p. 375-6.

helped him out of an uncomfortable situation in Alexandria where he was cooped up with only a few troops. Caesar, when he visited Palestine in the summer, rewarded this service by completely upsetting the arrangements of Gabinius, making the land independent with Antipater as its procurator, who was given Roman citizenship.<sup>1</sup> Hyrcanus was made "ethnarch" which meant that he was reinstated in the political authority that had been taken from him by Gabinius.

It was Caesar's policy to keep all the provincials contented as a means of securing the Empire, but the Jews especially benefitted by it. Those in Judaea received considerable additions to their territory including the sea-port of Joppa;<sup>2</sup> Those in Alexandria were given Roman citizenship for their protection; while those of Asia Minor had their religious rights assured.<sup>3</sup> It was small wonder then that the Jews made more lamentation over Caesar's death than any other people.<sup>4</sup>

On March 15th, B. C., 44, The Empire was plunged into its second paroxysm by the murder of Julius Caesar by Brutus and Cassius and other Republicans. The triumvirs,--Mark Antony, Lepidus, and Octavian, the future Augustus,--undertook to avenge his death. Brutus fled to Macedonia, Cassius to Syria, which knew him well-- and there they raised forces and supplies to fight the Caesarians. Judaea and Galilee were not called upon to supply soldiers but were assessed seven hundred talents. Antipater and his son Herod, twenty-five years old, whom his father had appointed govern-

1. The nature of the office of "procurator" (ἐπίτροπος) in this connection is uncertain; Saurer supposes it not to contradict the existing ordinances, even those of Gabinius, and supposes it to have concerned the gathering of the taxes as Antipater is elsewhere described as ἐπίτροπος τῶν τελῶν (Jos. Ant. 14.8.1), and also by Strabo whom Josephus quotes in Ant. 14.8.3. "ἐπὶ μὲν ἑτέρῃς" is an administrative officer; in its primary application an officer of finance." S.H. J.P. Div I. Vol. I p376 note 13.  
 2. Jos. Ant. 14.10.6. 3. Jos. Ant. 14.10.8, 20-24.  
 4. Suetonius, Caesar 84; "praecipueque Judaei, qui etiam noctibus continuu bustum frequentarunt."

or of Galilee, raised the sum promptly and gained thereby the goodwill of Cassius. In reward, Herod was reappointed by Cassius as governor of Coele--Syria.<sup>1.</sup> But the townspeople of certain towns--Gophna, Emmaus, Thammia, Lydda--which were unable to raise their tribute, were sold as slaves.<sup>2.</sup>

Shortly after these occurrences Antipater was poisoned, and Herod succeeded him.<sup>5</sup>

Brutus and Cassius with the Republicans made an unsuccessful stand at Philippi late in B. C. 42. Both leaders were killed, and the conquerors divided the Empire between them, Octavian taking the West, and Antony the East. Hereupon Herod followed his father's policy and endeavoured to make friends with the Romans at all costs. By degrees he won Antony over but this did not stop the triumvir from levying enormous taxes on Judaea, in common with all the East. In B. C., 40, the Parthians overran all farther Asia, and Antigonus, the last son of Aristobulus, bribed them to turn aside, conquer Judaea, drive off Herod, and make him king. This they did. Herod then fled to Rome to Octavian and Antony, who, calling a meeting of the Senate, confirmed him as "king."<sup>6</sup>

But though acknowledged king by the Romans, he had to regain his kingdom largely by himself. Returning to it he found Antigonus ruling, untouched by Ventidius, legate of Syria,<sup>3.</sup> who had nevertheless driven out the Parthians. Neither Ventidius nor Silo, his Lieutenant, gave Herod any help in winning back his throne. But Herod collected an army on his own account, and with it regained all Galilee and Judaea, with the exception of Jerusalem. Sosius<sup>4.</sup> was the next legate of Syria, and he, at Antony's

1. Jos. Ant. 14.11; Wars 1.11.4.  
2. Jos. Ant. 14.11.2; Wars 1.11.1, 2.  
3. B. C., 39-38.  
4., B. C. 38-37.

5. Jos. Ant. 14.11.4; Wars 1.11.4.

6. Jos. Ant. 14.13.14; Wars 1.13.14.

orders, helped Herod to batter down the walls of his own capital, sharing in its plunder. Thus Jerusalem fell a second time before the Romans. Antigonus was found within and by Antony's orders and at Herod's expressed request--beheaded--, the first time Rome had so treated any king. Sosius, bribed by Herod, called off his men, and departed, leaving Herod truly a "king."

## CHAPTER TWO.

## Jewish Political Theory and Practice.

The Jew today is ubiquitous,--persecuted in Russia, tolerated in France, libelled in America, but thriving everywhere; toiling with tireless activity he is restricted but still recovers; migrating in every direction he is driven out ruthlessly, but nevertheless is found in almost every country on the globe; aspiring to high things he is execrated and pulled down, but yet somehow fills highly important positions in nearly every commonwealth.

The Jews in the time of Augustus were divided into two classes,--the Palestinian Jews and those of the Dispersion. The former, rooted in their own land where they had lived, save for an interruption of seventy years, for untold centuries, constituted a native state; the latter, scattered throughout the Roman and Parthian Empires went with Judaea to form a united whole. The tie that bound Diaspora and native state together was a twofold one,--that of race, and still more, that of religion. This connection, which was of the strongest kind, was not taken into consideration by Rome; she naturally treated the Palestinian Jews as members of a semi-independent nation, but the Diaspora as resident aliens. The difference in the treatment handed out to Japanese in America and the respect shown to Japan itself, has some parallel elements.

In order to understand the occurrences that took place under the period of Rome's dealings with the Jews, it is necessary to have some

inkling of the peculiar methods and temperaments of each. Such a gleanings of facts, however scanty, will help to make clear the fact that the responsibility for the tragic side of this history rested with both parties. In the present chapter a sketch of the essentials of Jewish feeling and custom is attempted, and in the next an outline of the Roman theory of government. The bearing of these two subjects upon the account to follow reveals first that the Jews did not act consistently with their accepted ideals and went far beside them under the leadership of a minority, through whose rise to power the native institutions failed to function; and, second, that the Roman government, while generally patient and large-minded, failed time and again to comprehend the essentially religious nature of the Jews, and further committed the error of sending to govern Judaea "more than one procurator who had lost all sense of right or wrong," who ploughed his way through the tenderest sensibilities of the Jewish people, and aroused their wrath with the grossest outrages. The history of the Dispersion is connected with that of Palestine and the two are unfolded together in the later chapters; but the present chapter treats them separately, dealing first with the Jews of Palestine and second, with those of the Diaspora.

### I. The Jews of Palestine.<sup>1</sup>

The Jews were not the only inhabitants of Palestine. They shared it with Syrians, Samaritans and men of other races. Thus it may be divided into two parts,--Jewish and non-Jewish territory. Jewish territory at the time of Augustus consisted of Judaea, Galilee and Peraea.

Non-Jewish territory included Samaria, Idumaea, the Hellenistic towns and other states. The first of these terms is used in a general way to denote all Jewish ground in Palestine, and in a restricted sense to imply the

<sup>1</sup> cf. S.H.J.P. Ch. 23-29.

original Jewish district, bounded on the west by the Mediterranean Sea, on the east by the Jordan River, and the Dead Sea, on the north by Samaria, and on the south by Idmaea. Galilee was bounded by Phoenicia and the Jordan River on the west and east, and by Samaria on the south. Peraea was that district which lay immediately east of Judaea and Samaria having the Jordan for its western boundary.

The capital of Judaea proper was Jerusalem, which exercised a control over all Judaea, and had a partial authority over Galilee and Peraea.

1.

Judaea was divided into eleven regions known as toparchies, each taking its name from the chief city within it, which was its capital; this meant that it exercised a measure of control over the towns in the district, each of which in turn had an oversight of the villages, in its neighbourhood.

Usually the prime difference between a town and a village was that the former was big enough to have a fortified wall around it, the latter was not. In the towns and cities the constitution was roughly similar. Whatever the Gentile element in the cities, it must have been in the minority; certainly the councils were exclusively Jewish. The highest civic body in each community was the "council of elders."-- sometimes seventy-seven in number---<sup>2</sup> who represented every department of affairs and whose members could on occasion act as judges. On this council were doubtless represented the various departments of civic life, e.g., the local sanhedrin, the local council. The whole system hailed from the days of the Judges and continued throughout the Persian, Greek and Roman eras.

1. These toparchies were (1) Jerusalem (2) Gophna (3) Akrabatta (4) Thamnia (5) Lydda (6) Ammaus (7) Bethleptepha (8) Idumaea (9) Engaddi (10) Herodion (11) Jericho. Spürer substitutes Bethleptepha as in the above list for Pella which was an independent town.

(cf. Jos. Wars 4.8.1, with 3.3.5.) SH.J.P. Div. II, Vol. I, p. 157.

2. Cf. Judges, 8.14.



Galilee had been Judaized as far back as the Maccabaeon Age, and its inhabitants were mainly Jewish; they spoke Aramaic, as those of Judaea did, and were only to be distinguished from them by minute differences of custom and dialect. The country itself was beautiful, fertile and thickly populated. It had for its capital sometimes Sepphoris and at other times Tiberias,-- two towns of mixed Jewish and Gentile population; the former was one of the few cities that welcomed the Romans in time to escape destruction in the Great War of 66 to 70 A.D. Galilee was under the oversight of the Sanhedrim at Jerusalem.

Peraea was a barren and sparsely peopled land that had no capital in the Roman period.

The non-Jewish territory included chiefly Samaria and the Hellenistic towns. Samaria had been settled by the posterity of those Israelites not carried into captivity by the Assyrians, and the heathen peoples they had settled in their place<sup>1</sup>. This motley population professed paganism or monotheism, according to the expediency of the moment.

The Hellenistic towns were products of Hellenism which made the unit of government the city-state or polis, which governed not only itself but the surrounding territory as well. More than thirty of these towns are known to have existed in Palestine, some embedded in Judaea itself. Among them may be mentioned Joppa, and Straton's tower,-- two seaports of Palestine, Damascus, Abila, Sebaste, Sepphoris, Tiberias, Ptolemais, Scythopolis and Pella. Many of them had a varied career, falling first under Syrian rule, then under Jewish, and finally being incorporated in Syria, the Roman province.

1. 2 Kings, 17.

These towns, predominantly Gentile in population and non-Jewish in religion, were the outposts of Hellenic culture in the territory of the Jews. Their civilization was usually a cross between the Syrian and the Hellenistic; they spoke Greek, minted Greek coins, adopted Greek commodities, and erected Greek buildings. Thus every Hellenistic city had its piazza and baths, its hippodrome and its arena,--where, in later years, captive Jews were made to slaughter one another. They were hated by the Jews on religious grounds, and cordially returned their hatred.

The supreme legislative, administrative and judicial body in the Jewish state was the Sanhedrim. At its head was the hereditary high priest, who, in conjunction with it, regulated the whole internal affairs of the Jewish people. There is no trace of its existence prior to the Greek period, although it probably functioned as the municipal council of Jerusalem in the Persian era. Its first mention is dated in the reign of Antiochus the Great, referring to a period somewhere between 223 and 187 B. C., when it is spoken of as the "gerousia," or "council of elders."<sup>1.</sup> It continued with various extensions and modifications in regard to its powers until the destruction of Jerusalem in A. D. 70, after which it reappeared in another form in the court of Jamnia. When under Gabinius' arrangement, Jewish territory was divided into five synods or "conventus", the sanhedrim at Jerusalem was robbed of two-thirds of its former province.<sup>2.</sup> When Caesar, in 47 B. C., did away with Gabinius' division, he put under the jurisdiction of the council at Jerusalem not only all Judaea, but also Galilee. It is now called for the first time synediron or "sanhedrim." During Archelaus' rule its control was limited to Judaea.

<sup>Jes.</sup>  
1. Ant. 12.3.3.

2. cf. P. 10.

The sanhedrim contained seventy members,<sup>2</sup> presided over by the highpriest. When more than one high priest was living, as under the Herodians and the Romans, its president was the high priest in office at the time. The tenure of its members was long, perhaps for life; these were appointed, either by the members themselves, or by Herod and the Romans. It was thus radically different from the democratic Greek councils whose rulers were elected annually by the people.

Its authority was complete in the making and the enforcing of the laws. The sanhedrim constituted a supreme native court of appeal when the local tribunals of Judaea disagreed among themselves. It possessed an independent police authority and had the right to try all cases. Its authority, while limited to Judaea, had a theoretic significance for the Jews everywhere.

A different view than the above is taken of the sanhedrim by another writer.<sup>1</sup> He thinks it probable that there were two sanhedrims,-- the first political, the second religious. The political sanhedrim had the making, the enforcement and the application of criminal law, and the control of secular matters generally, and ceased in A. D. 70; he thinks the second sanhedrim was in the hands of the Pharisees and that its authority being confined to religious matters was exercised in passing religious decisions, or in condemning any teacher who contradicted the tradition.

Any survey of Jewish history that fails to take into account the Jewish religion and the place it held in Jewish life must leave much of that history unexplained. At once its purity and its later perverted form are necessary explanations of the ups and downs of Jewish life; the former alone accounts for the singularly isolated position which the Jew occupied

1. { J. Z. L. L. Rabbi, N. Y., --  
 { Jewish Encyc. Art "Sanhedrim." Vol. XL p. 41 sq.

2. cf. Discussion in S. H. J. P. Div. II Vol. I p. 174 sq.

in relation to the rest of the Roman Empire, and the latter for the madness that precipitated him into a hopelessly impossible struggle against a superior power under overwhelming disadvantages.

The Jewish religion centred around two poles--the sacrificial temple worship and the law. In the time of Augustus the third and last temple, the gift of Herod the Great,-- was in its new glory. In magnificence it was justly counted one of the wonders of the world. Standing upon one of the three hills of Jerusalem it appeared to travellers at a distance "like a mountain of snow." Those that drew near were dazzled by the gold that sparkled with fiery splendour from its sun-bathed corners.<sup>1</sup> Built of massive white stone, it was at once beautiful and strong, and was capable of itself undergoing a siege, even when the city was taken,-- a fate for which it was actually reserved.<sup>1</sup> But it had an inner significance that far exceeded anything gained by architectural grandeur. It was the seat of the Divine glory, and the centre and circumference at once of religion. The temple was supported by voluntary contributions and by impositions. The chief among the latter was the didrachma which every member of the Dispersion gave annually for its support.

The scribes of Jerusalem maintained that the temple site was the only one where worship should be offered. There was, however, a second temple at <sup>L</sup>Neontopolis, which served the Jews of Egypt much as the other served those of all the earth. It was modelled after the parent temple and its services were conducted by a branch of the old priesthood. These had fled with the high priest Onias<sup>II</sup>, in the factions between the high priests shortly before<sup>and after</sup> the Maccabean struggle, and had inaugurated the rival temple service in the land of their exile somewhere about B. C. 160.<sup>2</sup>

1. cf. Jos. Wars 5.5.

2. cf. Jos. Ant. 13.32.

Indissolubly associated with the temple worship was the priesthood, which was of great importance. This was due to several facts. The priests alone could offer sacrifices according to the law, a prerogative in which they were firmly upheld by the scribes. Then their office was strictly hereditary and was tenable for life; finally as their functions required them to live in Judaea, usually near Jerusalem, they were always in large numbers at the very place where the most important issues were decided. They were supported by legally required tithes and voluntary offerings.

Chief among the priests was the high priest. After the exile this official had a two-fold authority,--religious and political. The former he retained continuously until the destruction of the temple; the latter he held only intermittently, and in a restricted sense. This was contained in his presidency over the sanhedrim. Though always its president, his powers, along with its own, while exercised freely in the early Hellenic period, were curbed by the later Greek sovereigns, and then taken away by Herod and his successors nor ever restored by the Romans. The principle of a strict hereditary succession was ignored by the Herodians and the Romans who chose priests that were not of the Maccabaeon family and deposed them again when they pleased; but it was at least acknowledged to the extent that the choice was nearly always made from a few families, which, incidentally, formed a highly-privileged aristocracy.

The two parties in Jewish national life, whose antagonism the Romans did not fail to recognise, were the Sadducees and the Pharisees. The former were the ultra-liberal element among a conservative people. They disbelieved in the resurrection, judgment and Divine intervention,--in all of these, strikingly at variance with their opponents. These tenets

were found convenient to a class who aimed primarily at authority, and were only too eager to conciliate the prevailing spirit of Hellenism to win outside favour. In the Roman period the priesthood and the rest of the aristocracy were almost all Sadduceean in tendency. They were not bitterly opposed to the adoption of Greek culture, like the Pharisees, and they were content to obey Rome if they could enjoy a continued control of Jewish affairs under her. This fact made Rome deal with them in preference to their rivals, and entrust to them most of the government vouchsafed to their people.

They could not, however, wholly disregard the Pharisees. These, while they were only a party within the community, like the Sadducees, yet represented the people more truly than they did. Their doctrines concerned the keeping of the law and the future of Israel. As touching the former they stood for a literal interpretation of the law, and its practice in daily life down to the minutest details. They were on this account regarded as the pious of Israel, and had great influence, therefore, with all the people. In the second place, they cherished the hope of a glorious future for their race (which, they held, was divinely chosen and appointed) when Israel should forever throw off all heathen domination and, possibly rule all nations. This deliverance was to come on the advent of a Messiah, who should suddenly appear, accomplish a victory that would free them from the heathen, and afterwards be their prince. This future redemption must be prepared for by keeping the law. One rabbi said, "If we should keep one Sabbath properly, we should be saved ." This hope, which burned only the brighter in times of national humiliation, was one of the mainsprings of Israel's zeal, and the occasion of the readiness of many to oppose the Romans. The attitude of the moderate Pharisees to the Herodian and Roman

authority was one of tolerance, some of them regarding it as a heaven-sent punishment for the sins of the people, but all bearing it in hope of deliverance. The left wing of the Pharisees was known as the Zealots. These, unlike the others, believed in the use of force to bring in the promised future; many said the Messiah would at once appear when they took up arms. These men became mixed with others who adopted their doctrines as a cloak for sedition and robbery; the coming of this degenerate section to power caused the last episode of the destruction of Jerusalem.

After the Babylonian exile there grew up a class of men given to the study and interpretation of the Scriptures, known as the scribes. These men gradually took from the priests that authority which they had possessed in matters pertaining to an explanation of the law, while upholding them in the exercise of their priestly functions. These scribes were nearly all Pharisaic. They had the three-fold responsibility of teaching, interpreting, and applying the law, by virtue of which they were the nation's teachers, lawyers and judges.

## II. The Jews of the Diaspora.

The Jews abroad were more numerous than those in their native land. They are distinguished from the latter by the name of Diaspora, or Dispersion. The dispersion took place by degrees, beginning long before our period. By the reign of Claudius it had so progressed that the Jews were in every portion of the Mediterranean world. They were most numerous in Palestine, and after Palestine, in Babylon; then in Syria. In Asia Minor there were about one hundred and eighty thousand in 62 B. C.; in Egypt there were a million in Nero's time. These lived chiefly in Alexandria where they occupied two of the five city wards; in Cyprus and in Cyrenaica were many thousands more. Strabo divides the population of Cyrenaica in his time in to four classes, "citizens of Greek descent, peasants, resident aliens and Jews."<sup>1</sup> There are one hundred and twenty-eight cities in which Jewish communities are known to have existed and more are discovered continually.<sup>2</sup>

Four reasons have been given for the dispersion. The first of these is the troubled condition of Palestine with its civil and foreign wars, and the poverty that always follows in their train. These factors were especially potent after the exile and during the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes. Judaea, like a tree loaded with ripe apples, parted with numbers of its people at every convulsion that shook it. These fled, or simply migrated, but never came back. They were usually prosperous abroad, and like the majority of Old World emigrants today, saw no reason to return.

A second cause is found in the conquests of foreign kings who frequently carried the Israelites off as captives. For example; "When Ptolemy I had taken a great many captives, both from the mountainous parts

1. Quoted in Jos. Ant. 14.7.2. / 2. cf. "Orac. Sibyll. 3.271"; 1 Macc. 15.16-24; Jos. Ant. 14.7.2; Jos. Wars 2.16.4, and 7.3.3; Philo, In Flaccum 7; Philo, Legatio ad Caium 36, etc.



of Judaea, and from the places about Jerusalem and Samaria, and the places near Mount Gerizzim, he led them all into Egypt, and settled them there."<sup>1</sup>. The colony in Rome is said to have started from prisoners of war which Pompey took over and sold as slaves; though there had been Jews in Rome before.<sup>2</sup> In the three great wars between Rome and the Jews 70 A.D., 115 A.D., and 132 A. D., vast numbers were sold as slaves and transported to Italy, Spain, Gaul, and other countries, where they later formed communities. At these times a Jewish slave was sold cheaply; even the poet Martial had one. A notable thing about the Jewish slaves was that they did not remain as such for long. Their rigid adherence to their own laws in spite of all changes proved inconvenient to their masters. While the strong sense of fellowship existing between all Jews made the wealthier readily endeavour to redeem the less fortunate. Those thus redeemed were then at liberty to congregate and form the starting point of new Jewish centres.

A third factor in the dispersion was the mass deportations of the Greek sovereigns. The Greek kings had a passion for building cities which they named after themselves. To get inhabitants for these they would invite whole sections of people to dwell in them. The Jews were in the Greek age highly valued by the Greek rulers because they kept strictly to law, and were industrious and clever. To induce them they offered them special citizenship in their new cities, and guaranteed them absolute freedom to practise their own religion.<sup>3</sup> Sometimes, too, a conqueror, wishing to populate an uninhabited stretch in his own dominion, would remove by force a body of Hebrew families to be settled there. It was in this way that Ptolemy I, peopled Cyrenaica.<sup>4</sup>

1. Jos. Ant. 12;1;1.

2. Philo, Legat. ad Caium 23.

3. cf. Jos. Contr. Apion 2.4.

4. cf. Herodotus quoted in Jos. Contr. Apion 1.22.

Lastly, Jews were often planted elsewhere after serving as mercenary soldiers. In earlier times they were much valued for their strict adherence to law and their Jewish courage,"--"an absolute fearlessness of death which became a byword. As early as 650 B.C., Psammetichus I is said to have employed Jewish soldiers against the Ethiopians.<sup>1.</sup>

Once in their new country, they thrive, and multiplied greatly; also they made many proselytes among the natives and the descendants of these were often numbered among the Jews. It has been observed, too, that they migrated the more readily since their creed was linked with a book, not a place.<sup>2.</sup>

A fundamental condition promoting emigration of the Jews to other parts of the Greek world seems to have been the favourable attitude of the Greek rulers. It has been said that "without the broad cosmopolitan views of the diadochi who favoured, in the interest of their own power, the mingling and amalgamation of the various races, the Jewish diaspora could neither have originated nor maintained itself."<sup>2.</sup> The Ptolemies and Seleucids were all,--save Antiochus Epiphanes and Ptolemy Physcon,--friendly to the Jews and beloved by them in turn. Seleucus Nicator gave free citizenship to numerous Jewish settlers,<sup>3.</sup> while Antiochus the Great made them planters and tax-gatherers in Lydia and Phrygia.<sup>4.</sup> Such men as these encouraged the Hebrew strangers, and defended them by carefully enforced, protective laws.

Their kindness was welcome and important because the Greek people as a whole hated the Jews. This they did partly, no doubt, because of their religious and racial peculiarities, partly because the Jews displayed undisguised contempt for the Greek cults, parades and games; some-

1. "Aristæe, epist."

3. cf. Jos. Ant. 12.3.1.

2. Jewish Enc. art. "Diaspora." Vol. IV p. 561.

4. Jos. Ant. 12.3.4.

times through <sup>m</sup>comercial rivalry, and lastly, because they made rapid progress in proselytizing. This antagonism is written large in the history to follow.<sup>1.</sup>

The Jews of the Diaspora exhibited in a striking degree the strength and exclusiveness of Jewish nationality. Wherever ~~they~~ went the typical Jew was always true to himself. He might, and did, bring others to adopt his ways, but he himself would rather have died than have sacrificed one iota of his law and customs. Scattered wherever they were throughout the western world, the Dispersion kept to themselves. They were city-dwellers, not countrymen; in the towns they always formed a community within a community. They had their own laws, their own lawcourts, their own taxation wherever possible, and their own administration. They had as little communication with their <sup>Gentile</sup> neighbours as possible. Inter-marriage with them was abhorred; sitting at meat with them was believed to make the transgressor unclean; only in the necessary matter of trading was the dividing barrier lifted.

Their social condition varied. They engaged in commerce and in navigation. Under the Ptolemies they had high positions, appearing as tax-gatherers, divic officials and generals. But when Hadrian visited Alexandria in the Second Century, A. D., he was disgusted with the down-trodden Jews and contemptuously called them a nation of "astrologists, soothsayers and charlatans."<sup>2.</sup> The Jews in Rome, unlike those in other places, were poor and wretched. Juvenal hints at their living for a nominal rent in the vale of Egeria, a small wood near Rome.<sup>3.</sup> Martial characterizes them as beggars, fortune-tellers, and match-sellers (?).<sup>4.</sup>

1. See pp. 8, 44, 105.

2. Vita Saturnini 8.

3. Satire 3.13-18

4. 1:14.

Nevertheless weavers, tent-makers, dealers in purple, butchers, tavern-keepers, singers, comedians, painters, preachers and even poets, are mentioned, so that not all Jews in Italy or Greece were mendicants by any means.<sup>1.</sup>

During the Graeco-Roman era the Jews had a great fervor for making converts such as had never been before or has been since; and they had great success in all ranks. The infamous Poppaea, wife of Nero, Aquila the translator, and Simon Bar Giora<sup>2</sup> are random examples of proselytes or sons of proselytes. The means by which proselytism was carried on were manifold. Where the Jews were in power they often forced conversions.<sup>3.</sup> Often Jewish owned slaves accepted their masters' religion. Then the distinctive political privileges of the Jews attracted many, especially in times of persecution.<sup>4.</sup> But proselytism was chiefly carried on by moral propaganda,--by word, example and book. To many of the Romans and Greeks, sick of the corruption of society, and the hollowness of the pagan cults, there was something lofty in the monotheism of the Jews, while even their legal exactness was refreshing to a soul tired of laxity of every sort. An able apologetic literature which flourished in Alexandria sought to commend Judaism to the intellectual mind by identifying the characters in the Bible with personifications of the Greek philosophic virtues and vices, and by allegorizing what was hard for a philosopher to accept. Ancillary to these methods was the prudent procedure of not at first bringing the new proselyte under the full rigor of the legal obligations. He advanced by steps only; at first being required simply to keep the Sabbath, and not to worship idols, and later, if he saw fit, binding himself by further regulations; perhaps the son would in his time

1., cf. Agrippa<sup>1</sup>  
Berenice

2. cf. p. 1157.

3. cf. *Josephus Wars* 2:170. 4. Esther 8.17.

undergo the distinctive and final rite of circumcision which entered him upon the roll of the congregation of Israel, and laid upon him the necessity of fulfilling all the law and tradition.

## CHAPTER THREE.

### Roman Political Theory & Practice.

#### I. General Principles.

In order to complete the other side of the history of Rome and the Jews we turn in the present chapter to a summary,--brief and imperfect though it may be,--of the character and principles of the great moulder of men and nations, the Roman Empire.

Perhaps this outline may be aptly prefaced by a description of Roman character. This is as nearly set forth as in any other in the Elder Cato, who largely realized his own ideal of the "vir fortis et strenuus," whose virtues were "gravitas," the seriousness of demeanor which is the outward token of a steadfast purpose; continentia, self-restraint; industria and diligentia, words which we have inherited from them, needing no explanation; constantia, persever~~ance~~<sup>ance</sup> in conduct; and last, not least, virtus, manliness, which originally meant activity and courage, and with ripening civilization took on a broader and more ethical meaning." <sup>1</sup>. One more fitted than the writer to define Roman character has observed that it had three distinctive traits. The first of these was utility,--the impulse to direct activities to practical ends. This utility was combined with solidity and imposing size, which, though it was truly hostile to the ideal of tender, imaginative, loveliness natural to the Greek, gained a certain beauty through the harmonious proportion of its greatness. The second trait is action,--"industria in agendo," as Cicero termed it when speaking of Pompey, <sup>2</sup> and this was for the Roman the tongue into which most of his ideas were quickly translated. It is strange, in view of these two qualities to find that the Romans excelled neither in industry nor in commerce, and failed in local agriculture. Per-

1. Ward Fowler's Rome, Intro.

2. Pro Lege Manilia 11.29.

haps the cause for these facts lies in the third peculiarity, a negative one-<sup>33</sup> unimaginativeness. Imagination had enabled the Hellene to soar in nimble flights of fancy beyond the chaos of his native government to an ideal state; he revelled in hopes. The Roman was busied in getting what he wished, and when he had got it, he considered himself in a position to despise the mere idealist. This quality of his not only shows itself in art--the dulness of Roman drama is but one instance--but in action. Imagination in action spells adventuresomeness, and the Roman was not adventuresome.

"Illi robur et aestriplex  
 Circa pectus erat, qui fragilem truci  
 Commisit pelago ratem,"  
 Primus.

muses Horace,<sup>1</sup> and reflects Italian sentiment. When Romans did explore, it was with a practical purpose and a carefully secured rear. But what the Roman retained in a remarkable degree was the capability for organizing and consolidating what others had attempted, and in "the arts and methods of discipline, law, and government."<sup>2</sup>

The last statement substantially agrees with that of another writer: "While it was the Greek genius, which, in its later days, rose to conceptions of the unity of humanity, it was the Roman genius that translated, (or, rather, realized independently of the Greek ideal) those conceptions, in themselves unsubstantial and unbodied, into an organized system of life."<sup>3</sup>

An interesting picture of Republican Rome as seen through other eyes is afforded by the writer of I Maccabees, in his account of the circumstances under which Judas Maccabaeus made the first league with the Romans, 161 B. C. Though not accurate in all its details it yet presents a correct

1. Odes 3.9-12.

2. Based largely on Ward Fowler's "Rome", Intro.

3. Earnest Barker, "The conception of Empire," p 46 in Cyril Bailey's "Legacy of Rome." cf Reid, "Municipalities of R. E. p. 154.

picture of the impression Rome made upon subject or allied peoples. "Now 34.  
Judas had heard of the fame of the Romans, that they were mighty and valiant men, and such as would lovingly accept all that joined themselves under them, and make a league of amity with all that came under them; and that they were men of great valour.....It was told him besides how they destroyed and brought under their dominion all other kingdoms and isles that at any time resisted them; but with their friends and such as relied upon them they kept amity; and that they had conquered kingdoms both far and nigh, in-  
somuch as all that heard of their name were afraid of them; also that whom they would help to a kingdom, these reign; and whom again they would, those they displace; finally, that they were greatly exalted; yet for all this none of them wore a crown or was clothed in purple, to be magnified thereby; moreover how they made for themselves a senate house wherein three hundred and twenty men sat in council daily, consulting always for the people, to the end that they might be well ordered: and that they committed their government to one man every year, who ruled over all their country, that all were obedient to that one, and that there was neither envy nor emulation among them."<sup>1</sup>.

It was but natural that people of such varying nationalities as those which composed the dominions of Rome, entering as they did into relation with her under such diverse circumstances and at such widely separated stages in the growth of her political ideas, should be widely divergent in status. Accordingly there were many kinds of dependencies, just as at present under the British Empire.

There were some kingdoms which were in league with Rome but were not counted as part of the Imperium Romanum. These were theoretically

1. I Maccabees. 8:1, 11-16.



autonomous but were really under the suzerainty of Rome. The terms under 35. which they entered into this relationship with Rome laid at least six restrictions upon the client king. In the first place his kingship had to be confirmed by Rome; he was not allowed to make peace or war with other nations without the consent of Rome; he was forbidden to enter into relations with other nations similar to his own with Rome; he was expected to furnish troops in time of need and to assist in the protection of the frontiers of the Empire; he was forbidden to mint gold coins and often silver ones; and, lastly, he was liable to give<sup>a</sup> special money levy on occasion. It is uncertain whether a regular tribute was imposed upon the client kings in the Empire, though it seems probable that as a rule it was not.<sup>1.</sup> His remaining prerogatives embraced a complete administration of home affairs, authority to make and enforce his own laws (even when involving the power of life and death over his own subjects), the imposition of taxes and disposition of the revenue, and, finally, the organization and command of his own army. This arrangement was convenient for both parties. It preserved to the client king his kingdom, and it guaranteed to Rome the loyalty of a nation which she did not care to govern herself; moreover it at the same time provided against possible inexpediency by making the treaty not with the people but with the king so that on his death his realm might be placed under another ruling family or made into a Roman province without any violation of the treaty. Both these alternatives were frequently resorted to. In fact, the growth in the number of Rome's provinces was largely due to the annexing of former client kingdoms.

In a similar but slightly closer relation to Rome than the client kingdoms were the Civitates liberae. These were usually democracies

1. cp. Bury, A Student's Roman Empire. p. 78 with S. H. J. P. Div. I Vol. I., p. 450 and note 108 where the literature on both sides is given.

but sometimes represented tribal unities. These were technically either "civ-36. itates liberae et foederatae" or civitates (sine foedere), liberae (et immunes). The chief difference was that the first had a treaty with Rome which guaranteed their perpetual independence while the latter had none, but their liberty was based upon a lex or senatus consultum, and subject to withdrawal at any time. Both classes were very like the client kingdoms except that the ~~treaty when made~~ was made by the nature of the case with the sovereign people and not with a king.

Standing to Rome in the closest relation of all was the provincia. The Roman province had all the limitations of a client kingdom, and others in addition to it. Its land belonged to Rome and the province therefore paid a fixed annual rent called tribute. It was ruled by a governor sent out by Rome, who had no power to act beyond his own territory. Within the province itself there were various degrees of liberty enjoyed by the different communities.

This variety was characteristic of the Roman Empire, where the unit of government was largely the city state. Over five thousand six hundred and twenty-seven municipalities are known to have existed in the Roman Empire.<sup>1</sup> In each province were a number of more or less autonomous municipalities, which, while nearly all subject to the general laws which governed their province, were allowed a large amount of liberty in controlling their own affairs.

In the time of Augustus most of these were civitates stipendiariae, and were under the control of the governor of the province. But there was also an ever increasing number of communities possessing full Roman citizenship; though they paid tribute and were subject to interference from the Roman governor. Communities of this class were either called municipia or

1. Reid. Municipalities of Roman Empire, p. 44, quoting a ms.

coloniae. Finally there were Latin cities. These were quite independent 37.  
of the governor but paid tribute. Certain cities of this and the former  
class might be exempted from tribute on receiving the ius Italicum which  
raised them to the level of Italian cities.

The provinces were divided by Augustus into two classes-- those  
governed by the senate, or the senatorial provinces, like Asia and Africa,  
and those governed by the emperor, or the imperial provinces, like Syria,  
and Britain. The chief differences between them were as follows. The sen-  
atorial provinces<sup>n</sup> were generally the older and more peaceful, while the im-  
perial provinces were those that, being newer and not wholly subdued, re-  
quired the presence of large bodies of troops; as the emperor was commander-  
in-chief of the army it was fitting that these areas should be put under his  
care. Furthermore, the senatorial provinces were governed by proconsuls re-  
sponsible to the senate, but the imperial were governed by propraeors re-  
sponsible to the emperor. Both proconsuls and propraeors were always sen-  
ators of either praetorian or consular rank. In the third place, the pro-  
consuls were chosen by lot from among the ex-magistrates and sent out annu-  
ally, but the propraeors were sent out by the emperor, at his appointment,  
and they retained their office as long as he wished them to do so, some terms  
running for ten or twenty years. And lastly, the expenses were paid and the  
revenues received in the case of the senatorial provinces by the treasury of  
the senate, or aerarium, but in the imperial provinces by the emperor's  
treasury, fiscus. It was governed

There was a special kind of imperial province known as procurator-  
ial. This differed from the propraetorial province in three respects. It  
was regarded as belonging not to the Roman state but to the emperor person-  
ally, as his private preserve, although its revenue went into the fiscus.  
It was governed not by a senator but by an officer of equestrian rank, who

was known as a procurator, the significance being that he was a secretary 38. or overseer of his master's estate, and the procurator, unlike the pro-consul and the proprætor, had no legions under him, though he might have native troops or auxiliaries. There were seven such provinces in the time of Augustus, the chief being Egypt, Raetia, Noricum, Corsica with Sardinia, and Judæa. These provinces, Egypt excepted, were considered less important than the others. Egypt, a highly valued province, was so governed that it might be held more securely by the emperor; its prefect was the only equestrian in command of legions.

2 When an area was about to be made a province, a commission consisting of ten senators and the conquering general (if there was one) went into the district and after investigation, drew up what was known as the lex provinciae which defined the status of the province and formed its charter. It was like the B. N. A. Act.

Rome secured her provinces by building a chain of forts along any exposed frontier; Hadrian's wall in Britain and the Limes Germanicus in Europe are examples; by laying out a system of military roads; by the establishment of colonies of veterans. None of these practices was particularly followed in Judæa because the military problem there was not a pressing one; the most important front, the Euphrates frontier, was beneath the eye of the Syrian legions.

In dealing with provincial peoples Rome, despite the varied status under which she allowed them to live, was guided in all cases by certain general principles. The most important of these was the policy of giving local self-government to her subjects. "When a conquest had been achieved it was the Roman custom to interfere with local conditions only so far as immediate necessity required."<sup>1</sup> Her policy is expressed in the words

1. Reid. Municipalities of R. E. p. 15.

"divide et impera." In home affairs they were their own masters; in foreign 39.

affairs they had to consult Rome. She allowed her subject peoples to live on under their native institutions and customs, and while giving her governors authority to step in whenever necessary, instructed them to do so as little as possible.

Each city-state was generally a constitutional unit, made up of a populus or ἐκκλησία (i.e. an assembly of citizens), a senate or βουλή of several hundred and a magistracy elected by the populus and known as the δέκα πρώτοι or ten first citizens. This political organism was allowed considerable internal freedom, a liberty which touched administration, finances, justice and religion. In other words each city ran all its own affairs, collected and disbursed its revenues, imposing its own taxes and tariffs (Roman citizens exempted); judged under its own laws its own citizens; and worshipped its patron deity--and all independent of Roman interference. As regards the last-named privilege, Roman officials on occasion actually dedicated temples to the deities of native city-states, and shared in their worship. The worship of the Emperor, or the imperial cult, was begun under Augustus and in the time of Tiberius its observance was required of all subject peoples. But even it did not displace the native cults, but served rather to emphasize Rome's complete sovereignty in every sphere, and to bind together the Empire by a common bond of union; although required of all, the practice met with little opposition given it by any except the Jews, who were, however, exempted from the very first.

By following this policy Rome was able to take over a strange nation and have it kept in peace under its own peculiar laws and customs, systems which were centuries old and had been worn down to smooth running by long usage and constant familiarity, a fact which partly explains why Rome was able to hold so large an Empire with a comparatively small army.

It was not primarily Rome's policy to use the municipality exclusively as a centre of government, but rather to accept local conditions as she found them, and to adapt them to the interests of her own government. That the municipal system was a prominent type of government was not in the first place due to Rome, but to the fact that she fell heir to the Hellenistic Empire of Alexander in which that type of government prevailed. It is nevertheless true that she preferred it, especially in the Middle Empire and showed this preference by conferring municipal rights on many old towns and by creating new ones on the Greek model.<sup>1</sup>

The chief curb upon the liberty of the provincial peoples was the Roman governor. This official could step in at any time that he chose, and run things at his own discretion. The local institutions went on with their own self-government and as long as there was peace and nothing was attempted that would injure Rome's authority the governor did not interfere in the slightest; the moment things were not right, the governor instantly marched into the district with his army and took matters into his own hands. This he was able to do by virtue of his constitutional powers, for he was at the same time the military, administrative and judicial head in the province. The governor was responsible for his actions solely to the senate or to the emperor; none of the other governors could interfere with him, or even lead their armies across the frontier of his province. As regards his military powers he was the sole commander of all the forces in the province; and could enter with his army any city except the Latin communities, which were out of

1. Of the former statement one need not seek a more striking example than Egypt where the system received unchanged from the Pharaohs by the Ptolemies was preserved by Augustus intact; the peasant tilling the banks of the Nile lived under the same councils, obeyed the same customs as his forefathers had done for many centuries past.



his jurisdiction and responsible to the government at Rome alone.

41.

His administrative powers were directly exercised over the towns which had not a chartered constitution or which were not "attributed" to some city that had. As explained above he could at any time he saw fit exercise his authority over any city that was not autonomous, relying on his army when necessary, could dispose of <sup>its</sup> ~~his~~ affairs, secure the election or dismissal of its magistrates, or nullify its acts, at will. From his action there was, with certain exceptions, the right of appeal to senate or emperor.

In the third respect, the governor was also the highest judiciary in the province; his court for the purpose of giving justice to the whole province usually travelled in assize circuits, conventus. His court, was formed of superior officers and comites presided over by the governor himself; constituted the court of appeal from the native tribunals, and was the only one authorized to judge Roman citizens. In cases of specified importance, there was a right of appeal from the governor's court to the emperor or senate, while in the case of native convictions the governor might send the parties to Rome for judgment if he saw fit.

The finances, on the other hand, were not usually in charge of the governor, but of a Roman official known as the quaestor. The one exception was the procuratorial province where the procurator, being more a servant of the emperor, was himself the quaestor. The quaestor superintended the collection of the revenues from the tribute-paying towns and districts by lesser Roman officials. In the old days of the Republic the tribute had been paid in kind by the people and farmed in their own interests by publicani or tax contractors who paid Rome a stipulated sum for the privilege of doing so, but in the days of Augustus abuses of the old system were eliminated by direct collection. The customs duties, however, were for the most part still farmed.

If we should summarize the foregoing pages, it would be to say that Rome allowed her provincial subjects to govern themselves by a system of local self-government and granted to all toleration in religion and customs when these were considered harmless, but retained and readily exercised the right of interference, and such an interference was limited in as far as possible to those cases where it was absolutely necessary.

Rome's attitude to culture is worthy of note. The Roman Empire was divided by the Adriatic into two halves,--Eastern and Western. The Eastern half which represented the Macedonian Empire of Alexander the Great already possessed the Hellenistic civilization; it was in the Western half that Romanization was effected. While this latter contained the decayed portions of the Carthaginian Empire and a few Greek cities all else was barbarian. Although in all her empire Rome took the position of governor, in the West she came to impart one. In the East Rome left the manners of the people as they were; she never attempted to undo Greek culture. Greek was the recognized official language. The founding of a few colonies was almost the only step taken in the direction of Latinizing. But in the west, Rome encouraged Latin ways, even where the Carthaginian civilization was in sway; the tribes of Gaul and Britain were Romanized (Germany herself felt the influence of the Roman merchant); cities were founded or endowed with Roman citizenship; and, though no native tongue was ever suppressed, Latin was the official language.

To the marvellous network of controlling factors--the far-flung mechanism we call the Roman Empire--there was both a dark and a light side. Too often the benefits of Rome's government were clouded by the oppression of the governors or of the central authority itself.

Sicily, Asia and numerous other states came under Rome during the Republic wealthy and prosperous, and were in a short time reduced to poverty,



from which they seldom or never recovered. They are described by a late <sup>43.</sup> first century A. D. writer as "the bones of states with the marrow sucked out."<sup>1.</sup> The misery and hatred which the people of Asia endured finds a reflex in the slaughter of seventy thousand people of Rome in a single day by a section of these provincials in the Mithridatic War.

Too many, alas, of Roman governors, might come in part under the censure of Gabinius, governor of Syria 57 to 55 B. C., who is stigmatized by Cicero in the following language; "In Syria, when he was governor, nothing was consummated but pacts with tyrants for the purpose of extracting money, illegitimate settlements, plunderings, brigandage, slaughter,"<sup>2.</sup> And at another time in the words, "he daily drinks up from the inexhaustible and priceless treasures of Syria an incalculable<sup>1</sup> weight of gold, (and) wages war on men at peace, in order that he may pour down into the bottomless chasm of his own lusts their ancient and sacred riches."<sup>3.</sup> Suchmen, too often, when put on trial in Rome, escaped punishment by bribing the jury with a part of their ill-gotten gains.

Or, to take another type, we turn to Brutus, Caesar's adversary, who lent to the people of the Island of Rhodes a sum of money at an interest rate of fifty percent and would not let them repay the debt before it matured, but when they were unable to keep up the interest, locked their senate in the senate house till some of them were starved to death.<sup>4.</sup>

These instances are typical of thousands more, many of them happily on a smaller scale. Perhaps these evils were accidental to the Roman system, and not inherent to it. At least they throw into a welcome relief what we may term its bright side.

1. Juvenal, Sat. 8.90.

2. Cicero, De. Prov. Cons. 4.

3. Cicero, Pro Sestio. 43.

4. See also the story of Boadicea's revolt, Tacitus, Annals 14.31 sq.

If, indeed, there were acts of oppression carried out under the name of Roman rule, there were also many acts of benevolence. There is no doubt that on the whole Rome's rule was beneficial. The birth of the Empire ushered in an era of peace and prosperity for the Mediterranean world, to which it had been a stranger for centuries. The provincial peoples were kept safe by the legions that guarded the frontiers from the barbarian hordes without. When in the Middle Empire the Roman legions left Britain forever, the hapless Britons addressed the following wail to the Emperor Honorius: "Come and help us, for the barbarians drive us into the sea, and the sea drives us back again to the barbarians; so that those of us who are not killed in battle are drowned, and soon there will be none of us left at all."

When civil discord threatened to wreck the happiness of a state these same legions interposed to secure peace. When pirates held up commerce and made all water travel unsafe, specially equipped fleets swept the seas and removed the menace. When land and sea were safe the ground was cultivated. When the earth was cultivated industry and manufacture thrived. <sup>h</sup> That Rome recognized her responsibility in the matter of preserving peace is shown by the fact that Cicero, addressing a Roman political assembly (though it were from the argument of expediency) could say of Asia, "This province, gentlemen, must be defended not only from calamity, but even from the fear of calamity."<sup>1</sup>

Substantial roads, aqueducts, and other useful works were built by the friendly mistress; loans were made that allowed development of the provinces. Thus, when in the reign of Tiberius, many famous cities of Asia were destroyed by an earthquake, that emperor succored them with a gift of ten thousand sesterces and caused the senate to remit to the inhabitants the

1. Cicero Pro. Leg. Man. 14.

payment of their tribute for five years. When, a century afterwards, the 45.  
Greek states, left to manage their own finances, made a hopeless case out  
of them, the kindly Hadrian came to their aid and gave Athens and other  
cities financial assistance; Athens, which in the time of Augustus had been  
called "empty" by Horace,<sup>1.</sup> soon became so flourishing that it surprised  
travellers with the size of its population.

Perhaps the best summary is from the pen of a provincial writer  
of the Age of Antonines: "(The provincials) acknowledged that the true  
principles of social life, laws, agriculture and science, which had been  
first invented by the wisdom of Athens, were now firmly established by the  
power of Rome, under whose auspicious influence the fiercest barbarians  
were united by an equal government and common language. They affirm that  
with the improvement of art the human species was visibly multiplied. They  
celebrate the increasing splendour of the cities, the beautiful face of the  
country, cultivated and adorned like an immense garden; and the long festi-  
val of peace which was enjoyed by so many nations, forgetful of their ancient  
animosities, and delivered from the apprehension of future danger."<sup>2.</sup>

Roman civilization was given to the barbarous sections and an  
equitable and stable government to the whole Empire. Provincial peoples  
were made to feel that they shared in the Empire and this feeling gave  
them a wonderful sense of unity. Rome, like a mother, took all to her bos-  
om. This circumstance prompted such lines as the following:

"Haec est, in gremium victos quae sola recepit;  
Humanumque genus communi nomine fovit,  
Matris non dominae ritu, civesque vocavit,  
Quos domuit, nexuque pio longinqua revinxit;  
Huius pacificis debemus moribus omnes  
Quod veluti patriis regionibus utitur hospes,

1. Ep. 2.281

2. Quoted by Gibbon, Decline and Fall of R. E. Vol. 1. Ch. 2 ad fin.

Quod sedem mutare licet, quod cernere Thulen  
Lusus, et horrendos quondam penetrare recessus,  
Quod bibimus passim Rhodanum, potamus Orontem  
Quod cuncti gens una sumus. Nec terminus unquam,  
Romanae ditionis erit." 1.

46.

## II. Rome and the Jews.

### A. Judaea.

Throughout her history Rome extended to the Jews, both in Judaea and in the Diaspora, the same equity and the same protection which she accorded to all her subject peoples; indeed until A. D. 70 she granted them privileges that were given to no others.

Especially are these statements true of Judaea. From A. D. 6 to A. D. 70 (with the exception of Agrippa's rule A. D. 41-44) Judaea was indeed termed a procuratorial province but was really "a priestly aristocracy under the oversight of the procurator."<sup>1</sup> It was not governed on the strict provincial model until after its overthrow.

The Roman procurator was a sort of viceroy of the emperor, and in Judaea as elsewhere, he was supreme in four respects,-- the army, finances, justice and administration.

The procurator was subordinate in the military sphere<sup>5</sup> to the governor of Syria. Like other provincial procurators, he had auxiliary troops under him, but no legions, which only senators could command. These auxiliary troops were recruited solely from the Gentile inhabitants of Palestine, the Jews being exempted from the military levy. It is uncertain how large their forces were. The military headquarters were at Caesarea in the palace of Herod the Great<sup>2</sup>, but there were garrisons in most of the cities. Jerusalem, for example, had always a cohort<sup>3</sup>. The four legions stationed in Syria<sup>4</sup> were considered as the real military guardians for Palestine, but the event showed that the military provision for Palestine was inadequate. The unsettled condition of the country and the highly excitable temper of its inhabitants required considerable forces, not three or four days' journey off,

1. cf. Jos. Ant. 20.10 ad fin.

3. Jos. Wars 5.5.8.

5. cf. S. H. J. P. D. v. J. O. B. II. p. 45. sq. for

2. cf. Jos. Ant. 15.3.1; 20.5.4; Acts 23.23-33; 25.1-13 for Caesarea as residence of procurator.

4. Since Tiberius; in Augustus' time there were three. Jos. Ant. 15.1.9; Wars 2.2.1; 2.5.1.

but right on the spot.

48.

As regards finances,<sup>2</sup> Roman exactions of money fell in Judaea, as elsewhere, under the two heads of taxes and customs. Taxes again were divided into the land or property tax which was levied partly in kind, and the poll-tax. The word "poll-tax" included two things--the first an income tax which was variable, and the second a poll-tax proper which was levied upon all equally, including women and slaves; only those under fourteen and over sixty-five were exempt. That these taxes were sometimes oppressive is shown by a complaint made in A. D. 17: "The provinces of Syria and Judaea, wearied with their burdens, prayed for a lessening of the tribute."<sup>1</sup> During the Empire all taxes were collected by the Roman officials themselves.

The second toll was the customs. In the case of independent cities and states it was sometimes levied by the native ruler for his own benefit, on condition that Roman citizens were exempt from it. In other places, among them Judaea, it was levied by the Romans, and sent to Rome. All goods entering the country were subject to this impost. Unlike the tribute it was collected not by the Roman officials but on the old system long used in Palestine, viz; by publicani. The principal publicani, who were generally Romans, but might be Jews, sublet their districts to lesser publicani, in this case frequently Jews. These were the two important exactions. Among the lesser duties was the market toll. The collecting of the taxes in the provinces was regularly entrusted to the procurator. In Judaea the governor was also procurator, and so collected them himself.

The third sphere in which the procurator was supreme was that of justice.<sup>3</sup> As far as actual practice went his only regular duty was the judging of Roman citizens. The situation was analogous to that of the international zones in China, where foreigners have been tried under and pro-

1. Tacitus, Annals 2.42.

2. cf. S.H.J.P. Div. I. Vol. II. p. 65 sq. for discussion.

3. cf. S. H. J. P. Div. I. Vol. II. p. 575 sq. for discussion.

tected by their own laws, though much to the dissatisfaction of that country. 49. He had the oversight of all the native courts (the local courts and the ~~san-~~hedrin<sup>1</sup>) and could at any stage of the proceedings break in and try the case himself. All death sentences had to be confirmed by him, and he could waive or alter any other sentence he chose.

But while the procurator was supreme the native system of justice was preserved intact, and all things went on in their accustomed ways; the only real difference was that they were supervised. The Jewish law, composed of the Mosaic law with the traditions and interpolations of the scribes, remained in full force. It was used in the native courts, and respected by the procurator, though he did not use it in his own decisions. The attitude of the governors is well summed up in the words of the proconsul Gallio, "If it be a matter of wrong or wicked lewdness, O ye Jews, reason would that I should bear with you; but if it be a question of words, and names and of your law, look ye to it; for I will be no judge of such matters." <sup>1</sup> And he drove them from the judgment seat." In judging Romans the procurator of course followed Roman law. Jewish law was in certain points held binding upon all whether Jews or Romans. For example if any but a priest pushed his way beyond the outer court into the inner portion of the temple, he was punished with death, even though he were a Roman. Bronze steles bearing this warning in parallel columns in Greek and Latin have come down to us. <sup>2</sup> Abuse of the scriptures was another deadly offense. On one occasion some Roman soldiers were burning a rebellious village when one of them coming upon a roll of the law tore it up with contumelious remarks. On the other cities in Judaea hearing this, a complaint was made and that soldier was put to death. <sup>3</sup>

1. Acts. 18. 14, 15, 16.

2. cf. Jos. Wars. 5. 5. 2.

3. Jos. Ant. 20. 6. 4; Wars 2. 12. 2.

All administration of purely Jewish matters was vested in the sanhedrim. The procurator had a general supervision with the right and power of instant interference. All things running well, the native machinery was able and permitted to run everything itself, but the moment it showed any sign of breaking down, the procurator could step in and run things his own way till they were put right. Theoretically Rome was in Judaea not to run its government but to guarantee its smooth running and to ensure its loyalty to herself. 50.

The government of Rome showed even more toleration towards Judaea than towards other states, and honestly endeavoured to reconcile it to her rule. So far as theory and intention went, Judaea had little to complain of. Insofar as Rome understood its customs and laws she respected and endeavoured to preserve them. Shürer summarizes the situation thus; "So far, then, as the civil enactments and the orders of the supreme authorities were concerned, the Jews could not complain of any want of consideration being paid them. It was otherwise, however, with respect to the practical carrying out of details. The average Roman official was always disposed to disregard all such nice, delicate consideration. And the unfortunate thing was, that Judaea, especially, in the last decades before the war, had had more than one governor who had lost all sense of right and wrong. Besides this, notwithstanding the most painstaking efforts to show indulgence to Jewish views and feelings, the existing relations were in themselves, according to Jewish ideas, an insult to all the lofty, divine privileges of the chosen people, who, instead of paying tribute to Caesar, were called rather to rule over all nations of the world."<sup>1</sup>.

1. S. H. J. P., Div. I, Vol. 2. p. 79.



### B. The Diaspora .

More than half the Jewish nation was, as we have seen, scattered throughout the Mediterranean World. Imbedded in the composite national life of this conglomeration of states and races, native born and yet deemed aliens, these strange citizens were held in a curious mixture of suspicion, envy and contempt. They had held their own, thanks in part to the good will of the Greek rulers, but now, with the fall of these autocrats, this support was removed. One by one, by conquest, request or bequest, so to put it, their realms had fallen into the lap of Rome. Now ~~that~~<sup>the</sup> question, "What will Rome do with these realms?" has been in part answered in the earlier portion of this chapter, we naturally ask "What will Rome do with the people within these realms--that strange and insular race that forms as it were an imperium in imperio--the Jews?" She aimed first to gain the loyalty of the state or city; what would be her attitude to the section within the state or city to which it was more or less hostile? In short, did Rome come as the Jews' friend or enemy?

Here are two rigid yet contrary forces,--Roman imperialism and Judaism. We have seen them meet,--in Palestine,--dovetail, we should say,--rather than mingle. But with the Diaspora there is at least more difference for the respective positions are reversed; now it is the Jew who is the stranger in the land of Rome, and of Rome's allies, and not the Roman in the land of the Jew. Then, too, the latter was united, equipped with arms and supplies, and friends, with natural and artificial munitions, but the former was scattered, and non-militaristic. How will these rival forces meet under the new conditions?

The Jews were hated and despised by the Romans. Their insular ways and rigid practices fostered dislike and suspicion, naturally; further-

more they were under a cloud which malicious misrepresentation,--the work largely of the literati of Alexandria-- had thrown around them. All sorts of absurd and abominable stories about the Jews passed as current truth. They seldom appear in Greek or Roman literature without being disparaged. Their religion, of which the elements were distorted beyond recognition, was regarded as a barbara superstitio.<sup>1.</sup> Ignorance and malice apart, it is not unnatural for the Romans to say of the proselytes with Tacitus, that they are taught to despise the gods, to repudiate their nationality, and to disparage parents, children and brothers.<sup>2.</sup> Such a background of prevailing sentiment throws into sharper relief the logical and thoroughgoing impartiality of the Roman authorities. The account to follow shews how far Rome accomodated herself to the Jews of the Diaspora and to trace the elasticity of Roman governmental practice which could take under its supervision sound-bending and peculiar a people as the Jews, and yet remain true to itself.

The facts may be conveniently classified under the heading of three great privileges which Rome gave to the Dispersion,--the right of residence, the right of autonomous internal organization, and the right of citizenship.

The first, and obvious privilege, the right of residence, was accorded to the Jews in all parts of the Empire. There was a strong community in the city of Rome itself. The first mention of Jews in Rome is in connection with the historic embassy sent thither by Judas Maccabæus;<sup>3.</sup> succeeding embassies also visited it.<sup>4.</sup> The third of these, that of Simon, 140-139 B. C., which concluded an effective alliance with Rome,<sup>5.</sup> stayed there long enough to start religious propaganda, on which account <sup>its members</sup> they were expelled

1. Cicero, Pro Flacco 28.

2. Hist. 5.5.

3. cf. p. 67.

4. cf. 1 Maccabees 12.1-4; 16.

5. cf. 1 Maccabees 14.24; 15.15-24.

by the praetor Hispalus, during the consulate of Popilius Laenas and H. Calpurnius Piso, 139 B. C. This is deducted from the uncertain statement in Valerius Maximus 1.3.2: "Idem (Hispalus) Judaeos, qui Sabazi Jovis cultu Romanos inficere mores conati erant, repetere domos suas coegit." Sabazi Jovis is apparently a confusion of Jupiter Zabazius of Phrygia<sup>1.</sup> with the Jewish Sabaoth. At least it is to the ambassadors and not to Jewish residents that Schürer understands this passage to refer. His inference from it is that there was no settlement in Rome at this time. ~~Theodor Reinach,~~<sup>2.</sup> however, ~~bases upon the same passage the contention that there was a community, evidently making "Judaeos" apply to colonists, instead of ambassadors.~~

If we accept the <sup>above</sup> ~~former~~ view, the founding of the Jewish community in Rome occurred in the time of Pompey, and was the result of his bringing over from the war in Palestine Jewish slaves who were afterwards liberated by their Roman masters. These were given Roman citizenship, settled beyond the Tiber in the Regio Transtiberiana, the modern Trastevere, and formed an independent colony.<sup>3.</sup> They formed an important part in Roman life, and it is interesting to note that they were present when Cicero made his speech in defence of Flaccus,<sup>4.</sup> and that they mourned at Caesar's bier for nights running.<sup>5.</sup> Eight thousand went out to meet the embassy from Palestine, in 4 B. C.<sup>6.</sup>

In the time of Tiberius the Jews were expelled from Rome, and four thousand of their number deported to fight the pirates in the unhealthy island of Sardinia. This was because certain renegade Jews had swindled a

1. cf. C. I. L. 6 N. 429, 430: Cicero, De Natura Deorum, 3.23.58.  
~~2. Art. Diaspora, Jewish Enc. Vol. 4, p. 53.~~  
~~3. Philo, Leg. ad Caium 23.~~  
~~4. Cicero Pro Flacco 28.~~  
~~5. cf. p. 12.~~  
~~6. cf. Jos. Ant. 17.11-1; Wars 2.6-1.~~

wealthy Roman proselyte of high rank, Fulvia, of large sums of money which she had entrusted to them to send to the temple in Jerusalem. The drastic decree is traceable to the Anti-Jewish Sejanus; however, even severer punishment had been meted out to priests of Isis for a previous scandal.<sup>1.</sup> 54.

After Sejanus overthrow in A. D. 31, Tiberius perceived the injustice of the slander, and gave edicts to safeguard their customs.<sup>2.</sup> They were probably allowed to return at the same time.<sup>3.</sup>

Under Claudius the Jewish assemblies were prohibited; and, probably at a different time, the Jews were expelled.<sup>4.</sup>

In the days of Nero the colony in Regio Transtiberiana had branched, and a new one was found in the Campus Martius,<sup>5.</sup> and in the commercial and industrial district of the Subura.<sup>6.</sup> A later reference mentions their leasing the sacred grove of Egeria, by the Porta Capena.<sup>7.</sup> Five Jewish cemeteries have been discovered.<sup>8.</sup> These, like the synagogues, are known to have been protected by severe laws against desecration.

There was also a Jewish community at Puteoli, first mentioned in B. C. 4.<sup>9.,</sup> While this is the only other settlement in Italy whose existence can be proved for the early Empire there is no proof that there were not others on the peninsula. Many appear in the later Empire, not only in Italy, but in different parts of Gaul and Spain.

In Alexandria the Jews were from the earliest days allotted a special district, an arrangement which, needless to say, was not upset by the

1. Jos. Ant. 18.3.4.

2. Philo, Leg. ad Caium 24.

3. In general cf. Tacitus, Annal. 2.85; Suetonius, Vita Tiber. 36; Jos. Ant. 18.3.5.

4. cf. Suetonius, Claud. 25; Dio Cassius 60.6; Acts 18.2.

5. C. I. G. 9905, 9906.

6. C. I. G. 6447.

7. cf p. 28.

8. One before the Porta Portuensis, two on the Appian way, one opposite and the other beyond the catacomb of Callistus, a fourth, of the age of the Antonines, in the region of the Esquinal and Viminal, and a fifth and slightly later one, in Porto at the mouth of the Tiber.

9. Jos. Ant. 17.12.1; Wars 2.7.1.

Romans; this quarter, comprising in Caligula's time, two of the five wards into which the city was divided,<sup>1.</sup> was situated in the east of the town, and in the so-called Delta, on the harbourless coast.<sup>2.</sup> They must, nevertheless, have been allowed to move freely through the city for there were synagogues scattered throughout it.<sup>3.</sup>

As has been previously stated,<sup>4.</sup> the Jews resided in almost every city of the Roman world.<sup>5.</sup> The second privilege which Rome accorded to her Jewish subjects was that of autonomous internal organization. That is, even when the Jews were in Gentile cities she permitted them to administer their own affairs, and to practically constitute "a community within a community." The Jewish population in Rome was "divided into a large number of separate and independently organized communities, each having its own synagogue, gerousia, and public officials."<sup>6.</sup> Apparently these were not allowed to form a united whole. One was called *συνάγωγη Ἀυγουσטיανή* after Augustus, another *ἡ συνάγωγη Ἀγριππῆς* after Marcus Agrippa. There were at least seven such communities. The president of the gerousia is termed on the inscription *ἡγεμὼν* 7. the "archons"<sup>8.</sup> were of the committee of the gerousia, or council of elders, and were elected some for a term, but others for life.<sup>9</sup>

In Alexandria the Jews were permitted to unite under the rule of a single man, called an ethnarch, who, according to Strabo "governs the people and administers justice among them, and sees that they fulfil their obligations and obey orders just like the archon of an independent city."<sup>10.</sup> Such an

1.. Philo. In Flaccum 8.

2. cf. Jos. Apion 2-4 init.

3. Philo. Legat. ad Caium 20.

4. p. 15.

5. cf. Orac. Sibyll. 3.271: *Ἰσραὴλ ἐν ταῖς οὐραῖς πάντας καὶ πᾶσα θάλασσα.* ; Decree of Senate in 1 Macc. 15.16-24; Strabo in Jos. Ant. 14.7.2; Jos. Wars 2.16.4; Philo. In Flaccum, 7; also especially Legat. ad Caium, 36, where Agrippa in his letter to Caligula gives the fullest account of Jewish colonies; Acts 2.9-11; 17.1, 10, 17; 18.4, 7; C.I.G. 4.n. 9900, 9906 &c.

6. S.H.J.P. Div. II. Vol. II. p. 247.

7. C.I.L. 9.6213; 10.n. 6221; C.I.G. n. 9902.

8. C.I.G. nn. 9906, 6447, 6337.

9. cf. C. I. G. 9910 with C. I. G. 9103.

10. Quoted in Jos. Ant. 14.7.2.

independence was possible chiefly because Alexandria lacked the city-council 5  
common to the Hellenistic towns. Augustus substituted the rule of a gerousia for that of the ethnarch.<sup>1.</sup>

The Cyrenian Jews, like those of Alexandria, had an independent administration together with equality of civil rights (ἰσονομία)<sup>2.</sup> Those in the town of Berenice are known to have formed a distinct πολίτευμα governed by nine archons.<sup>3.</sup>

The formation of communities within bounds of cities was not carried out by Jews alone. The Samaritans, Egyptians, Tyrians and many other peoples had a dispersion, like that of the Jews, and where they were found in foreign cities they were frequently bound together by a guild or association, sometimes political, but more often religious. The political collegia were organized for diverse ends--some co-operative unions, others merely burial societies (collegia funeraticia). Those of distinct political character were banned by Caesar and Augustus. The religious collegia were formed to promote the worship of a foreign deity. "The main distinction between these and the sacerdotia publica populi Romani lay in this, that while recognized by the state they were not publicly endowed, but had to depend for their support upon the voluntary contributions of their members."<sup>4.</sup>

The Jewish communities in Rome and Greece held in the eyes of the law the position of voluntary religious associations. In Alexandria the Jews had, as explained above, privileges of a higher order. The Jewish collegia, or in the abstract, Judaism, was expressly protected throughout the Empire by Roman legislation. This official recognition was chiefly the work of Caesar and Augustus, many of whose decrees are preserved for us

1. Philo, In Flaccum 10.

2. Jos. Ant. 14.7.2; 16.6.1.

3. C. I. G. 3.5361.

4. S. H. J. P. Div 2, Vol. 2, p.255.

in a somewhat mangled form by Josephus.<sup>1</sup> These rulers, while they deliber- 57.  
ately suppressed or discouraged free unions generally, because of the abuse  
of their privileges for political ends, confirmed, extended and protected  
Judaism. Nor were they alone in this policy. We find, for instance, Dolabella,  
Antony's partisan, bidding the authorities of Ephesus tell the Jews  
of Asia minor that he had ratified their exemption from military service,  
and their right to continue their worship,<sup>2</sup> and Marcus Junius Brutus, the  
opponent of Antony, commanding these same authorities to proclaim to the Jews  
freedom to keep the Sabbath.<sup>3</sup> "In consequence of all this, Judaism acquired  
such a legal standing that it came to be treated as a religio licita  
throughout the whole extent of the Roman Empire."<sup>4</sup> It was allowed to carry  
on proselytizing propaganda until the Flavian period.

Besides the prerogative of the Jews of free worship contained in  
the recognition of the Jewish communities as religious guilds was that of administration  
of their own funds, and of exercising jurisdiction over their  
own members. This sanctioned the didrachma<sup>5</sup> and other exactions. It was  
one of Flaccus' acts to confiscate a Jewish collection which was about to be  
sent to Jerusalem.<sup>6</sup> The outflow of gold which the didrachma tax especially  
involved, stirred up much opposition from the local Roman or Greek authorities,  
but the practice was repeatedly confirmed in Caesar's time,<sup>7</sup> and by  
Augustus<sup>8</sup> while its confiscation was punishable as sacrilege<sup>9</sup> even until the  
time of Titus.<sup>10</sup>

Jurisdiction over its own members by the Jewish community was practically  
a permission to them to remain under their own law. Even where this

1. Ant. 14.10; 16.6.

2. Jos. Ant. 14.10.11,12.

3. Jos. Ant. 14.10.25

4. S. H. J. P. Div. II. Vol. II. p. 260.

5. cf. above p. 21.

6. Cicero, Pro Flacco 28.

7. Jos. Ant. 14.10.21

8. Philo, Legat. ad Caium.

23; 40. Jos. Ant. 16.6.27

9. Jos. Ant. 16.6.2,4.

10. Jos. Wars 6.6.2.



law impinged upon Roman custom great allowance was made by the authorities. 58. Thus Jews were everywhere exempted from military service, because this necessitated infraction of the Sabbath and of certain other laws.<sup>1</sup> When the day for the public distribution of corn fell upon a Sabbath the Jews were allowed to collect their portion on the following day.<sup>2</sup> A Jew was excused from appearing in court on the Sabbath.<sup>3</sup> In the provinces Jews were to be given money in place of the free rations of oil, seeing this was of pagan preparation.<sup>4</sup>

The Jewish law thus respected by a foreign power, was executed throughout the Dispersion in Jewish courts. These tried both civil suits and criminal, though it is questionable whether the latter were sanctioned by the state. That they were held is abundantly illustrated by the experiences of the Apostle Paul.<sup>5</sup> Civil suits were sanctioned as is testified by the letter of Lucius Antonius, governor of Asia 50-49 B. C., to Sardis.<sup>6</sup>

In the third privilege extended to Jews, viz. that of citizen rights, Roman rule also appears in a characteristic light. The Jewish ~~settlers~~ colonists immigrated to the older cities as settlers, but to the later Hellenistic cities as citizens. This last, at least, is Shürer's view; he takes without questioning the authorities given below. Reinach<sup>7</sup> discounts them, and maintains that while Hellenistic citizenship was undoubtedly given to individual Jews, it was not given to Jews as a class; the citizenship in the Greek towns in the Roman era gave to them the enjoyment of all the economic privileges of citizens, but denied them the right to share in government, as is the case with foreigners in a western community of today. In

1. Jos. Ant. 14.10.6, 11-14, 16, 18, 19.

2. Philo, Legat. ad Caium 23.

3. Jos. Ant. 16.6.2, 4.

4. Jos. Ant. 12.311.

5. cf. Acts 9.2; 22.19; 26.11; 2 Cor<sup>r</sup>. 11.24; <sup>Acts</sup> 13.12-16; 13.17.

6. Jos. Ant. 14.10.17.

7. Art Diaspora, Jewish Enc. Vol. 4. p. 5674q.



either case, the position of Jews naturally differed in detail according to 59.  
the special regulations made by the various communal authorities under which  
they lived.<sup>1</sup> In consequence there existed in numerous Eastern cities in  
the time of Augustus the paradoxical position of an independent community  
sharing with the Gentile population the government of the town while immov-  
ably opposed to it in religious matters, though these were interwoven with  
the practices of civic life in a Hellenistic state. It is no wonder that in-  
tense and universal dissatisfaction and rivalry should have arisen. It was  
a common complaint that the Jews did not worship the gods of the city.<sup>1a.</sup>  
The Jews had been upheld in their municipal rights by the Diadochi, and when  
Rome took over their realms she assumed this responsibility from them.

"Such a thing as the toleration of various worships alongside of each other  
was really possible only within the cosmopolitan circle of the Roman Empire.  
For there was realized in all its fulness the fundamental thought for which  
Hellenism paved the way, that every man is free to be happy after his own  
fashion."<sup>2</sup> Herod's old minister, Nicolas Damascenus, on one occasion re-  
marked that the hitherto unheard of boon which the Romans gave was the uni-  
versal privilege of each "to live and worship his own gods."<sup>3</sup>

Rome further granted the rights of Roman citizenship. Philo says  
that most of the Jews in the capital had citizen rights which they obtained  
as children of the slaves brought over by Pompey, manumitted by their own  
masters and given the rights of citizens at the same time.<sup>4</sup> St. Paul was a  
Roman citizen,<sup>5</sup> as well as the citizen of a Hellenistic city.<sup>6</sup> There were  
large numbers in Ephesus, Sardis, Delos and in Asia Minor generally, as well

1. cf. Appian, Syr. 57; Jos. Ant. 12.3.1; Wars. 7.5.2; 7.3.3; Apion 2.4;  
Ant. 14.10.1; 19.5.2; 12.31.2; 16.6.1.  
1a. Jos. Ant. 12.3.2.  
2. S. H. J. P. Div. II. Vol. II. p. 274.  
3. Jos. Ant. 16.2.4.  
4. Legat. ad Caium 23.  
5. ~~Legat. ad Caium 23.~~ Acts 16.37 sq; 22.25-29; 23.27.  
6. Acts 21.39

as in other parts of the world.<sup>1.</sup> The privileges which Roman citizenship gave to those who held it included exemption from scourging, crucifixion and like penalties; the right of appealing to the emperor any civil or criminal sentence of stipulated importance,<sup>2.</sup> and also the distinct right of appeal in the process of trial.<sup>3.</sup>

Some Jews even attained to equestrian rank,<sup>4.</sup> while many who had abjured their religion held public office. As a good example may be taken one of the most illustrious families of the Dispersion, that of Philo in Alexandria. Philo's brother, like many Jews before him, was the alabarch, "probably chief collector of customs on the Arabian side of the Nile."<sup>5.</sup> Philo's nephew, Tiberius Alexander, was procurator of Judaea, in A. D. 44,<sup>6.</sup> served under Corbulo against the Parthians,<sup>7.</sup> was made governor of Egypt<sup>8.</sup> and was a trusted counsellor of Titus at the siege of Jerusalem.<sup>8a.</sup> Another member of the family, Julius Alexander, possibly Tiberius' son or grandson, was one of Trajan's legates in the Parthian Wars,<sup>9.</sup> consul in A. D. 116-119.<sup>10.</sup> Another Alexander was commander of the cohorts of Flavia, and an ἀγορανόμος over the second city district in Alexandria. He erected a statue to Isis in the reign of Antoninus Pius.<sup>11.</sup>

When in 212 A. D. Caracalla granted Roman citizenship to all peoples of the Empire, the Jews were of course not excluded. They even fared better than the others because they were exempt from military service, and from compulsory office in the senate, which had now become more a burden than an honour.

1. Jos. Ant. 14.10.13, 14, 16-19.

2. Acts 16-37 sq.; 22.25 sq.

3. Acts 25.10 sq.; 26.32; Pliny, Ep. 10.96. (ad. 97)

4. Jos. Wars 2.14.9

5. S. H. J. P. Div. 2. Vol. 2. p. 230.

6. cf p. 91.

7. Tacitus, Annals 15.28.

8. Jos. Wars 2.15.1; 2.13.7; 4.10.6; Tacitus, History 1.11; 2.74, 79; Suetonius, Vespasian 6.

Jos.  
8a. Wars 5.1.6; 6.4.3.

9. Dio Cassius 68.30.

10. cf. Cal. t. 6. n. 2078, 2079.

11. Annali dell' Instituto di corrisp. archeolog. 1875. p. 15. quoted by Schürer.

The privileges recorded above go to prove that Rome, whatever her 61.  
dislike of the Jews, applied her governmental theories impartially. That  
she hated the Jews and could yet accord them the same or even greater priv-  
ileges than other peoples, enhances, rather than impairs the sense of her  
impartiality.

## CHAPTER FOUR.

## The Reign of Augustus.

When on September 2, B. C. 31, by the battle of Actium, Augustus became master of the Roman World, Herod, the Jewish king, set himself to win his favour. His lifelong policy had been to keep on good terms with Rome; it was to be pursued till his death. When Roman authority had been represented in the East by Crassus, he had assisted him; when Cassius and Brutus were lost, and Antony their victor held sway in the East, he had won his esteem, and confidence; and now when Antony, in turn, was to flee before his former colleague, Octavian, Herod sought to have this latest Roman master upon his side. While he had not suffered much by Antony's fall, he was in great fear of the man whom he had lately opposed.

There was another definite reason in Herod's pro-Roman policy. It was not sentimentality, for Herod was not given to sentiment; where men subordinate love, natural ties and principles to an overwhelming ambition for power, sentiment does not readily flourish. It was because a far-seeing statesman like Herod, clearly perceived that all hope of his kingdom's independence rested upon the good favour of Rome. Furthermore he knew that he was hated by all the Jews, as a foreigner, being an Idumaeon, and that his rule was regarded by the scribes as unlawful.<sup>1</sup> So for internal, as well as external reasons, the pro-Roman policy of the Jewish king was a natural one, and he accordingly improved every occasion of cultivating the friendship of the emperor, and of showing himself a useful and loyal ally to the Roman cause.

He had foreseen the inevitable effects of such a policy at home,--the intense dissatisfaction, always ready to break out into revolt--and pre-  
1. Deuteronomy 17.15.

pared to cope with them. This dissatisfaction he dispelled partly by a sag- 63.  
acity almost amounting to cunning, with which he estimated the niceties of  
Jewish custom and ideal, and revered them, or affected to do so; and part-  
ly by resistless energy, barbarity of an appalling kind, and a large mercen-  
ary army.

Herod's first opportunity of showing loyalty to the new emperor  
soon came. Antony had kept a troop of gladiators at Cyzicus in readiness to  
celebrate his intended victory. These men on hearing of their master's de-  
feat at Actium, hastened to Egypt to render what help they could. Didius,  
the governor of Syria, was anxious to apprehend them, and Herod lent timely  
aid, preventing their reaching Antony.<sup>1.</sup>

Having thus afforded a proof of his good-will, he hastened towards  
Samos, where Octavian was staying, in order to settle affairs in the East.  
The meeting took place, in the winter of B. C. 30, at Rhodes. Herod, while  
in much alarm for himself, did not put off his kingly manner, though he  
came in without his diadem; beginning his speech by admitting and boasting  
of his allegiance to Caesar's late enemy, he ended by saying "if thou wilt  
put him (Antony) out of the case, and only examine how I behave myself to  
my benefactors in general, and what sort of a friend I am, thou wilt find  
by experience that we shall do and be the same to thyself, for it is but  
changing the names, and the firmness of friendship that we shall bear to  
thee will not be disapproved by thee." He was hereupon received with great  
kindness by Augustus who restored him his diadem, and bade him be as great  
a friend to him as to Antony. He also procured him a senatus consultum,  
recognizing him as a rex socius of Rome.<sup>2.</sup> As he was going to Egypt he  
allowed Herod to accompany him. When they reached Ptolemais the Idumaeen  
tendered Augustus a splendid reception, and as they left gave eight-hundred

1. Jos. Ant. 15.6.7; Wars 1.20.2; Dio Cassius 51.7.

2. cf. p.34.

talents, and lavishly provided his soldiers with everything they needed for 64. their long, desert journey, including wine and water, thereby obtaining the hearty good wishes of them all.<sup>1.</sup>

Friendship with the emperor once established, Herod lost no chance of cultivating it,--a course which indeed repaid him well. When he next visited Augustus, the latter was in Egypt, and received him very graciously, rewarding him with Jericho with its palm trees, which Cleopatra had taken away, and giving him Gadara, Hippos, Straton's Tower, Samaria, Gaza, Anthedon and Joppa besides.<sup>2.</sup> It was on the site of Straton's Tower that Herod afterwards built a glorious city, with an artificial haven, and called it Caesarea in honour of his patron. Joppa was especially valuable, as being the only natural sea-port Palestine possessed.

Other visits were paid the Emperor from time to time. In B. C. 23 Herod sent his two sons Aristobulus and Alexander to Rome for a Roman education, and received from Augustus on this occasion Auranitis, Batanaea and Trachonitis.<sup>3.</sup> These districts, which all lie east of the Jordan, were inhabited by nomad robber tribes. In B. C. 20 when Herod came to fetch his sons back after their training, Augustus gave him Ulatia, and Pannias, and the surrounding country north and west of the Sea of Galilee, and allowed him to appoint his brother Pheroras tetrarch of Perea. Through his patronage of Augustus, Herod had his dominions doubled.<sup>4.</sup>

But his friendship did not extend to Augustus alone of Romans. He was on particularly good terms with Agrippa, the emperor's able minister whom he visited in Mitylene, 23-21 B. C.<sup>5.</sup> Seven years later Agrippa paid Herod a visit in Jerusalem and was received with loud shouts of acclamation

1. Jos. Ant. 15.6.5-7; Wars 1.20.1/3.

2. Jos. Ant. 15.7.3; Wars 1.20.3.

3. Jos. Ant. 15.10.1; Wars 1.20.4.

4. Jos. Ant. 15.10.3; Wars 1.20.4. Wars 1.24.5.

5. Jos. Ant. 15.10.2

by the joyful populace; when he offered a hecatomb on the altar in the temple, the praise of his piety scarcely knew bounds.<sup>1.</sup> Flatterers asserted that Herod was dearest to Augustus, next to Agrippa, and to Agrippa next to Augustus.<sup>2.</sup> 65.

The position Herod held in the eyes of the emperor is indicated by the fact that when Agrippa was absent for a period from the East Augustus gave orders to the provincial governors that they should take Herod (possibly alone of all native princes) into their counsel in all important matters.<sup>3.</sup>

Yet Herod, in his friendship for Rome, did not neglect the Greek world. He travelled a great deal, and wherever he went showed a lavish kindness beyond his means which endeared him to many heathen peoples. Everywhere he went he would give some donation, build this temple, or repair that portico. Incidentally, the fact that he benefitted heathen religions along with the Jewish one, is a true indication of the catholicity of his attitude to religion.

Herod suspected his two sons Alexander and Aristobulus of conspiring to murder him and take his throne. It was quite a groundless suspicion, born chiefly of his having murdered their mother Mariamne, in a fit of jealousy, and expecting a retribution to come on his head from her sons. After considering the matter he determined to accuse them before Augustus; but the "mild earnestness" of the latter, who saw the state of things more clearly than he did, effected a temporary reconciliation. After a time, however, his suspicions were again inflamed, and he asked the emperor to consent to their death. He did so, but asked that a trial be first

1. Jos. Ant. 16.2.1; Philo. Leg. ad Caium 37.

2. Jos. Ant. 15.10.3; Wars 1.20.4.

3. Jos. Ant. 15.10.3; Wars 1.20.4.

4.

given. Some sort of a trial was arranged, the legate of Syria being one of 66.  
the judges and the only dissenting voice in the decision. According to the  
verdict the brothers were sentenced to death, and their execution took  
place in the town where, thirty years before, their mother's wedding had  
been celebrated.<sup>1.</sup>

There is no need to trace the domestic troubles that darkened  
the last years of this monarch's life. Through them all, however, and  
through all the people's rebelliousness and discontent, his loyalty to  
Rome remained unwavering. To the last day of his life he continued her  
faithful and attentive ally. Sometimes, indeed, he incurred the emperor's  
displeasure, once seriously. It was on the occasion of his sending a pun-  
itive expedition against the Arabians, though with the consent of the Roman  
governor of Syria. When the Arabians sent an embassy to Augustus, he was  
very angry and bade Herod call back his troops; it took two embassies from  
Herod before his confidence was restored.<sup>2<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub></sup> But, such incidents aside,  
his Roman friendships were not only fruitful, but constant.

When, in B. C. 4, worn out in body and soul, though true to his  
character till the last, the old king died, there were few that mourned,  
though the funeral was a splendid one.<sup>3.</sup> The people all hated him fiercely,  
and now that he was dead entertained wild hopes of freedom. They were  
ready for any innovation, and now that the strong hand of Herod was removed,  
there was none able to check them. But Herod had been a client king of  
Rome, and since both his land and his people, unlike lands and peoples of  
today, were regarded as his private possessions, on their owner's death  
these same possessions reverted to Rome for disposal. Thus on Herod's  
death Judaea automatically came into Rome's hands until she herself decided

1. Jos. Ant. 16.4.1-6; 16.11.1-3,7,8; Wars 1.23; 1.27 etc.

2. Jos. Ant. 16.9; 16.10.8,9.

3. Jos. Ant. 17.8.1-3; Wars 1.33.8,9 &c.



whether it should be made into a province, or governed by a native prince. 67. Until this decision should be made Augustus sent Sabinus as procurator, to take charge of the kingdom in Rome's name. This act checked the zealots in their unfounded hopes of freedom.

Augustus revered Herod's late friendship to the extent of carrying out his will as far as expedient. By its terms his kingdom was divided among three of his sons--Archelaus, Antipas and Philip. Archelaus was to rule Judaea, Idumaea and Samaria, and to wear the crown; Antipas, his younger brother, was to have Galilee and Peraea; and Philip Trachonitis, Gaulonitis, Batanaea and Pannaea.<sup>1</sup> But there was considerable rivalry among these sons and others who had been left out, and opposition to all by the Jewish people. As a consequence it was no easy matter for the emperor to give a decision.

In a special meeting in his palace, before a council including his personal friends, the emperor reviewed the claims of Archelaus. Antipas also presented himself, and claimed Archelaus' inheritance for himself, because it had been given to him by a former will of Herod. A third party, composed of some other members of Herod's family was there and asked for direct Roman government, or else to have Antipas rather than Archelaus. Augustus heard all sides, then from the ground gently raised up Archelaus who had fallen at his feet, and declared him deserving of the kingdom. He gave, however, no formal nor final decision, but bade them abide by the will of Herod, and dismissed them.<sup>2</sup>

No sooner had Archelaus and Antipas left for Rome than wild disorders arose in every part of the country, and all was in a chaos. First a revolt broke out in Jerusalem, which Varus, legate of Syria, hastened with some legions to suppress. He then retired leaving one legion under Sabinus,

1. Jos. Ant. 17.8.1; Wars 1.33.7,8.

2. Jos. Ant. 17.9.1.-7; Wars 2.2.1-7.

which that officer only used to hunt out the king's money, seize citadels, 68. and oppress the people. The Passover season was at hand, and Jerusalem was filled from end to end with visitors of the Dispersion, with Galilaeans and Idumaeans all eager for war. They parted themselves into three bands and attacked the Romans in three places. These sent to Varus for help, but meanwhile succeeded after a desperate struggle in defeating the Jews, partly by burning down the beautiful cloisters from the top of which they were hurling missiles upon them. Only after much bloodshed was order restored. As spoils of war, Sabinus openly removed four hundred talents from the temple treasure.<sup>1</sup>

There were very many other disorders of every sort; occasioned by some who wished to avenge themselves, or seize power; and the whole country groaned with robbery and murder. When several companies of the seditious got together, and lighted on a leader, he was proclaimed king immediately, and led his new-found henchmen in terrorizing the land about him. Sabinus himself was besieged by one of these parties in the palace of Herod in Jerusalem. The only common ground among the factions was a desire to be rid of the Romans.<sup>2.</sup>

Meanwhile Varus, having received Sabinus' earnest calls for help, hastened to Judaea with his last two legions, and four hundred horsemen, augmented by Auxiliaries supplied by tetrarchs and kings on the way, including several Arabians who came chiefly to wreak their hatred on the Jews. After burning some villages they came upon Jerusalem, whose inhabitants protested their innocence, as the visitors had been too powerful for them; and had started the revolt against Sabinus. As for Sabinus, he did not so much as stop to see Varus' face, but stole privately out of the city to the sea-side. Two thousand revolted were crucified, the rest for the most part forgiven; a

1. Jos. Ant. 17.10.32 Wars 2.3.4-3.

2. Jos. Ant. 17.10.3-7; Wars 2.3.4-2.4.3.

few were sent to Caesar who executed the Herodians among them, but dismissed 69.  
the others.<sup>1.</sup>

After quiet had been restored in Palestine an embassy of fifty Jews set sail for Rome with Varus' permission, to complain of Archelaus, and of the Herodians generally, and to ask Augustus that their country might be added to Syria and freed from all forms of monarchy, and that they might live according to their own laws. He heard them in the temple of Apollo adjoining his palace, in company with other leading Romans. Feeling obliged to give a final decision, Augustus made Archelaus ethnarch of Judaea, Samaria and Idumaea, with the hope of being called "king" also if he should prove himself worthy; Antipas tetrarch<sup>r</sup> of Galilee and Peraea; and Philip of Batanaea, Trachonitis and Auranitis. Salome, Herod's sister was given three cities. The towns of Gaza, Gazara and Hippos were to be attached to Syria. The revenue which Archelaus was entitled to receive was fixed at six hundred talents, that of Antipas at two hundred, of Philip at one hundred; Salome was to receive annually five hundred thousand pieces of silver. Thus the will of Herod was sustained in all important points.<sup>2</sup>

The reign of Archelaus was short and unhappy. Like his father he was cruel, cunning, licentious, but he lacked his father's ability and energy. He violated that most sacred Jewish office--the high-priesthood-- by making and unmaking priests at will. After nine years of oppressive rule an embassy representing the Jewish and Samaritan aristocracy came before Caesar and presented a list of complaints against Archelaus. These must have been serious, for, Augustus, having sent for Archelaus and heard his defence, banished him to Vienne in Gaul and commissioned Cyrenius, the ex-consul, to seal up his house. His kingdom, consisting of Judaea, Samaria

1. Jos. Ant. 17.10.30; Wars 2.5.43.

2. Jos. Ant. 17.11.1-5; Wars 2.6.1-3. cf. also Strabo 16.2.46.

and Idumaea, was then made into a Roman procuratorial province, but not of the 70. strict provincial type.<sup>1.</sup>

This act ushered in a period of sixty years in which Rome, deeming herself unable to keep Judaea orderly and loyal by a client king, introduced a more direct form of government. But this new thing was tempered by the kindly art of Augustus according to his design to impose upon subject peoples an unbreakable but not a galling yoke. He left for future emperors in Judaea, as in the rest of the Empire, an example to follow. They had little reconstruction to effect; all was done, and their virtue lay in following in the great re-organizer's steps.



Scanned by UBC Library

From Augustus to the Great War, A.D. 66.

The Early Procurators, A.D. 6-41.

The Status of Judaea varied at different times in her history. Prior to A.D. 6 it had variously been that of a gens barbara, a civitas libera et foederata<sup>1</sup>, a provincia<sup>2</sup>, and a client kingdom<sup>3</sup>. Augustus made it a Roman province. Looking forward from A.D. 6 towards the beginning of the state's dissolution in A.D. 66, the history of Judaea is divided into three periods. The first is that of a Province, A.D. 6-41, the second consists of the kingdom of Herod Agrippa I, A.D. 41-44, the third is that of a province again, A.D. 44-66.

Throughout the first period the status of Judaea remained substantially as Augustus had fixed it. Galilee and Peraea continued under the virtually independent administration of the tetrarch Herod Antipas; Auranitis, and the surrounding regions were governed in peace by his half-brother Philip; while Judaea, with Idumaea and Samaria were ruled by the Roman procurators who followed one another in regular succession.

Of the first four of these officials little is known beyond their names. The first was Coponius (probably A.D. 6-9), the second, Marcus Ambivius (probably A.D. 9-12), in whose period of office Salome died and bequeathed her three cities to the empress Livia<sup>4</sup>, the third Annias Rufus (probably A.D. 12-15), in whose reign Augustus died and

1. cf. p. 35.

2. cf. p. 36.

3. cf. p. 34.

4. Jos. Ant. 18.2.2.

Tiberius succeeded him as emperor, and the fourth, Valerius Gratus, (A.D. 15-26). In the long term of this last, the Jewish high priest was four times deposed and another appointed in his place; in each appointment, however, the choice was made from one of the recognized high-priestly families.

The fifth governor, Pontius Pilate, (A.D. 26-36) is more famous. He was a type of the bad Roman governor. Pilate is described in a letter of Agrippa I as of "an unbending and recklessly hard character," and is accused of "corruptibility, violence, robberies, ill-treatment of the people, grievances, continuous executions without even the form of a trial, endless and intolerable cruelties."<sup>1</sup>. Illustrating the kind of government Judaea had by Rome during his rule are four incidents of his stay presented for us by Josephus and Philo. He had no sooner entered upon his office than he sent troops to Jerusalem by night, with ensigns bearing the Emperor's image, though he must have known that the bringing of any image into the Holy City was regarded by its inhabitants as sacrilege. If so he was certainly not mistaken in calculating what the reaction would be, for as soon as the Jews heard what he had done, multitudes of them flocked to Caesarea to see him, and besought that he would take away the offensive emblems. But Pilate was adamant. Then after some days he arranged a meeting in an open space around which he had concealed his soldiers. When the Jews assembled and filled this space he gave a signal whereat his

1. Philo, Leg. Ad Caium, 38.

soldiers suddenly appeared with drawn swords. Pilate then threatened instant death if they did not leave off disturbing him, and go their ways, -shewing them their utter unreasonableness, but the people immediately fell prostrate as one man, bared their necks, and protested that they were willing to die rather than that the least of their laws should be transgressed; so Pilate had the standards removed.<sup>1</sup>

The next occurrence ended otherwise. Pilate contemplated the building of an aqueduct to carry water from a supply base in the hills to Jerusalem, - a distance of some twenty-five miles, and to do this useful work appropriated the temple treasure. But he made wiser preparations this time, for bidding certain of his men to dress as the Jews did, and to carry clubs under their garments, he had them mingle among the complaining crowds; on his giving them the signal they drew forth their weapons and mercilessly belaboured the people before they could understand; many of whom died in the *melee*.<sup>2</sup> That he persevered in his design is testified by the presence of certain large tanks discovered in the hills around Jerusalem by British Royal Engineers in 1918 while prospecting <sup>for a water</sup> supply base for the British Army; buried near them were the records.<sup>3</sup>

Probably in Pilate's time occurred the third incident which well contrasts the ignorance and bravado of subordinate officials with the quiet wisdom of the Emperor. Some richly gilt shields, bearing no

1. Jos. Ant. 18.3.1; Wars 2.9.2-3; Eus.Eccl. Hist.2.6.4.

2. Jos. Ant. 18.3.2; Wars 2.9.4; Eus.Eccl. Hist.2.6.6,7.

3. Lecture given by Mrs. Owan, wife of Major Reginald Owen of R.E's., in Chicago Nov. 4th, 1927, reported in Vancouver "Star", Nov. 5th, 1927.



image but only the name of Tiberius, were placed by the procurator in the temple as a votive offering "less for the honour of Tiberius than for the annoyance of the Jewish people." First the Jews, headed by their nobles and the four sons of Herod, visited the governor and asked that the objectionable symbols be removed, and on his refusing, sent a petition to the Emperor, who, clearly perceiving how matters stood, ordered his governor, on pain of his severe displeasure at once to take them down. Of course he did so, "and thus were preserved both the honour of the Emperor and the ancient customs of the city."

The fourth incident is historically important because it occasioned Pilate's dismissal. A light-minded Samaritan multitude went on a pilgrimage to Mount Gerizzim for the purpose of witnessing a pseudo-prophet unearth certain Mosaic relics which, he asserted, were buried there. Apparently with no other provocation than the presence of a crowd, Pilate set out in pursuit with a body of his troops and attacked them. Many were killed, others hunted in flight and others again put in prison where the most powerful and distinguished were put to death. But the Samaritans appealed to Vitellius, who was the emperor's legate in Syria. This governor had no doubt a special authority by virtue of which it was possible for him to depose a Judaeian procurator and send him to the emperor for trial.<sup>1</sup> At any rate he sent Pilate to Rome and appointed one of his own officers, Marcellus, in his place.<sup>2</sup> We have no information as to whether he was succeeded by an-

1. "Cunctis quae apud orientem parabantur L. Vitellium praefecit". Tacitus, Annals 6.32.

2. Jos. Ant. 18.4.1, 2.



other governor before the province became a kingdom in A. D. 41.

Vitellius in some measure quieted the discontent among the Jews which the procuratorship of Pilate had aroused by two visits to Jerusalem in person which he made the occasion of tactful acts of courtesy. On his first visit at the Passover in A.D. 36 he remitted the taxes on fruits sold in the city, and removed a standing grievance by surrendering the beautiful robes of the high-priest which since A.D. 6 had been in the custody of the Romans.<sup>1</sup> He left Judaea to spend the summer settling the Roman candidate Tiridates on the throne of Parthia. Next Spring, when marching southward with an army he was met at the border of Judaea by a representative Jewish embassy which begged him not to defile it by taking the soldiers image - bearing standards through it. He was reasonable enough to send his soldiers by Peraea instead, while he himself went up to Jerusalem alone.<sup>2</sup>

Herod Antipas had been ruling Galilee and Peraea in comparative peace. He had married a daughter of King Aretas of Arabia, but divorced her in order to marry a relative, Herodias, who brought about his downfall. Angered by the treatment given his daughter, Aretas had destroyed Herod's army in a pitched battle. Herod appealed to Tiberius, who ordered Vitellius to attack the Arabian. It was on this mission that Vitellius was met by the embassy of Jews, and requested not to lead his troops through Judaea. During his stay in Jerusalem he got news that Tiberius was dead, and straightway recalling his troops

1. Jos. Ant. 18.4.3; 15.11.4.

2. Jos. Ant. 18.5.3.

led them back to Antioch to await instructions from the new Emperor.<sup>1</sup>

There now arose an object of jealousy to Herod in the person of Agrippa. Herod Agrippa was grandson of Herod the Great by Aristobulus. He had been educated in Rome, and, thanks to the patronage of Antonia, widow of the elder Drusus, and daughter of Antony with whom the old Herod had been on terms of closest friendship, was even admitted to the court of Tiberius. He was so trusted that the emperor made him the guardian of his grandson, who was also called Tiberius. Agrippa's real friendship, however, was with the grandson of his patroness, Caligula, who on his accession gave him the tetrarchies of Philip and of Lysanias, with the title of "King." The former tetrarchy had been added to Syria since Philip's death in A.D. 33-34. Herod Antipas had only the title of "tetrarch" and his wife Herodias, persuaded him to go to Rome and ask that he like Agrippa should receive the title of "king" from Caligula. Much against his will he went, and the meeting took place at Baiae. But Agrippa had sent a representative with a document containing Herod's offences; his collection of weapons was appealed to in proof. Herod could not clear himself, and his kingdom was taken away, and himself banished to Lugdunum. Herodias was given permission to remain on her private estate but followed her husband into his place of exile. There, according to a confused statement in Dio Cassius, it would seem that he was subsequently put to death<sup>2</sup>. His tetrarchy

1. Jos. Ant. 18.5.1-3<sup>1</sup>.

2. 59.8.

was added, though probably not previous to A.D. 40, to the kingdom of Agrippa.<sup>1</sup>

In A.D. 39, Vitellius was succeeded as legate of Syria by Publius Petronius,<sup>2</sup> during whose governorship a great disaster threatened Judaea. Caligula lost his head because of his power, and after a number of tyrannous acts proclaimed himself divine, and as a proof of loyalty demanded worship of all people in the Empire without exception.

Caesar and Augustus truly had been called divine; the latter had even a regular worship in the provinces celebrated by a pan-provincial priesthood, whose members were known as "Augustales"; though Tiberius never allowed himself to be worshipped in Rome and discouraged his worship in the provinces. But emperor worship had been more a political policy designed to emphasize the all embracing comprehensiveness of the Roman state in the religious as well as the political sphere, than a course adopted for the sake of its own glory. Gaius, however, perverted it, so that it was purely personal in tone. He insisted that divine honours should be paid him in Rome as well as in the provinces; and put himself above all other deities recent and remote, laying claim to be worshipped first.

The Jews for a brief period were deprived of the right of worshipping Jehovah alone unmolested. His worship was not actually forbidden, but that of the emperor was demanded in addition; this, to

1. Jos. Ant. 18.8.2; 18.7.1,2; Wars 2.9.6.
2. Jos. Ant. 18.8.2; Suetonius, Vitell. 2;  
Dio Cassius 59.27.

the Jew, however, amounted to the same thing, for if Judaism is not monotheism it cannot exist as Judaism. The attitude of Caligula was in direct violation of the policy of Augustus; and had never before been assumed by Rome; fortunately it was to be discontinued immediately after its author's death. The reign of Gaius, is therefore in this respect only an interruption in the even course of Roman political history.

After a short but severe persecution of the Jews in Alexandria,<sup>1</sup> the attention of the emperor was called to the position of those in Judaea. The heathen population in Jamnia had erected a rude altar to the emperor, which was promptly destroyed by the Jews, whereupon Herennius Capito, the imperial procurator of the city,<sup>2</sup> reported the incident to Caligula. This threw the emperor into a great rage, and he commanded Publius Petronius, legate of Syria, to set up his statue in the Jewish Temple in Jerusalem and to take with him half his army to crush possible resistance.

Petronius, a mild and reasonable man, very unwillingly set about this childish command. Marshalling two of the four Syrian legions, and gathering as many auxiliaries as he could, he marched them down to Ptolemais and there passed the winter of A.D. 39. Thither the Jews, having heard of his commission, "covered Phoenicia like a cloud", and besought him to save their sanctuary from its threat-

1. ef. p. 61 sq.
2. One of the three cities bequeathed by Salome to the empress Livia. ef. pp. 69, 71; Jos. Ant. 18.6.3; also 18.2.2.

ened desecration, saying they preferred death. Petronius though greatly impressed by their earnestness, and wishing to be quit of the whole affair, dared not disobey the word of the emperor. He nevertheless sent him a letter asking for delay because the statue was not ready, and also because the harvest was not yet gathered in, and might be destroyed through exasperation if he obeyed orders immediately. When this letter reached Gaius he was very angry, but wrote back at once commending the legate for his prudence, and bidding him finish his commission with all speed, as by now the harvest would surely be safely gathered in.<sup>1</sup>

But Petronius further delayed until the autumn; then he went to Tiberias to gauge the sentiment of the people there. Tens of thousands of distressed Jews once more flocked around him, once more fell upon their faces, bared their throats and said they were ready to die. For forty days and nights they continued thus so that the season of sowing was now passing and all tillage was neglected. Moved by these circumstances and by the urgent entreaties of Agrippa's mother and other nobles, Petronius determined to throw his own life in the balance, and write once more to Gaius, saying that on grounds of right and of wisdom and best policy would be to revoke the edict.<sup>2</sup>

Shortly before this epistle reached Rome, Agrippa, who happened to be in the capital, also determined to risk his life and write a letter to the emperor laying before him the claims of the

1. Philo, Leg. ad Caium 30-34.

2. Jos. Ant. 18.8.3-6; Wars 2.10.3-5.

Jewish People, and saying that no other emperor had ever attempted anything like it. To the surprise of all this had the desired effect, for Gaius ordered that if his statue had already been set up, it was to be left where it was, but if not the matter was to be let drop; but he characteristically nullified this concession by stipulating that if anyone wished to erect a temple to the emperor outside of Jerusalem he was not to be stopped from doing so, which, fortunately for the peace of the land, no one undertook to do.

Then came the letter of Petronius. Gaius was full of wrath and immediately sent a vessel to Palestine with a <sup>command to his</sup> presumptuous officer to put himself to death, repented of having revoked his edict concerning the statue, and made plans for a new one to be prepared in Rome, and, on his prospective journey to the East to have it landed on the shore of Palestine and brought secretly into Jerusalem.<sup>1</sup>

These plans were never carried out, for on the 24th day of January, A.D. 41, Gaius was assassinated while passing through a vaulted corridor connecting his palace with the Circus Maximus, whither he was going to see the horse races. At once a vessel set out for Palestine bearing the news, and happily it arrived full twenty-seven days before the former ship bearing Petronius' order for self-destruction. This letter had been delayed by storms so as to take three whole months in making the voyage, and when it arrived its addressee

1. Philo Leg. ad Caium 35-43.

was no longer under any obligation to carry out the unwelcome command.<sup>1</sup>

The reign of Caligula also caused much distress for the Jews of the Diaspora, especially in Alexandria. No people had hailed the new emperor more joyfully than they; sacrifices had at once been offered for him in Jerusalem. During the first eighteen months of his reign they enjoyed almost universal peace and quiet. But when orders came for all people, irrespective of creed, to worship their new god, they came at once into conflict with the Jewish monotheism. Never before nor since was its strength thus challenged by Rome. To the Alexandrian Greeks, however, the command was exceedingly welcome, and they made it the occasion of gratifying their standing grudge against their Jewish fellow-citizens, and were abetted in this by the unjust Roman prefect, Aulus Avilius Flaccus. This Governor had hitherto administered the province blamelessly, but when, as a close friend of Tiberius, he fell under the disfavour of Caligula, he made it a matter of policy to promote the worship of the emperor at any cost, and win back his lost favour. The Jews in Alexandria had given to Flaccus a petition which he had promised to send to the emperor, explaining their religious position, which was only kept by him, and did not reach Gaius until some months later when Agrippa sent it himself with an explanation of the delay.

It was in August 38 A.D. that Herod Agrippa, on his way to his new kingdom stopped at Alexandria. Though he gave no provocation he was rudely treated by the mob. After this a madman, dressed to

1. Jos. Ant. 18.8.9, Wars 2.10.5.

represent him headed through the streets a band of children armed with sticks, and was saluted by the Alexandrians in Syrian as "Lord". The Greeks next attacked the resident Jews, and with the connivance of the Roman governor, placed statues of Caligula in their synagogues. Becoming more inflamed, they spoiled the Jews under the very eyes of the prefect, without his interfering in the slightest. He himself later deprived the Jews of their citizen rights by an edict, while a last decree of his gave leave to persecute the Jews at will. These decrees were followed by scenes of cruel disorder in which the Jews were some of them murdered and afterwards mutilated, some burned, and yet others dragged alive through the streets; Jewish women were compelled to eat swine's flesh; thirty-eight members of the Jewish gerousia were carried bound into the theatre and there scourged before the eyes of their foes, so that some died and others never recovered health; all the synagogues were destroyed, or profaned by the setting up of an image of the new god; houses and warehouses were plundered, and soldiers were commanded to search all homes for arms. Then the slaughter ended almost as suddenly as it had begun. That same autumn an order came from the emperor which brought back Flaccus to Rome a prisoner; thence he was banished to the island of Andros in the Aegean, where, with other exiles of high rank he was later put to death.<sup>1</sup>

This action of Caligula's showed only the freakish, imperious side of his nature, rather than any policy of toleration towards Jews.

1. Philo, In Flaccum 3-21.



His real attitude is shown in an illuminating account given by Philo, the philosopher, who was a member of an embassy from Alexandria, which came before Caligula, probably in the spring of A.D. 40, to plead the Jewish cause. Both Jews and Greeks sent deputations to Rome which landed on the shores of Campania at the same time. The Jewish body endeavoured to give the emperor a written statement containing the chief points of that already tendered by Agrippa, were first received by him in the Campus Martius at Rome, where he merely promised to hear them at a more convenient time, followed him to Puteoli where they were not received, and finally met him, - we do not know how much later, - in the Larnian gardens of Maecenas. "We found the tyrant," says Philo, "surrounded by stewards, architects, and work<sup>k</sup>men, - every hall and chamber thrown open for his inspection, ranging from room to room. Called into his presence we advanced reverently and discreetly, saluting him by the title of Augustus and Imperator.".... Caligula suddenly stops and addresses them, "What, are you the god-haters, the men who deny my divinity, confessed by all the world besides?" The Alexandrian ambassadors now pressed forward, "Lord and master, still more, and more justly, will you hate them when you learn that of all mankind these Jews alone have refused to sacrifice for your safety."... "Lord Gaius, Lord Gaius" exclaimed the poor Jews, "we are slandered. We have sacrificed for you, we have offered hecatombs, we have not feasted on the flesh of our victims, but have made holocausts of them,

not once, but thrice already; first when you assumed the empire, again when you were restored from your dire disease (A. D. 38), once more for the success of your expedition against the Germans." "Be it so," replies he, "Ye sacrificed for me, but not to me." Panic-stricken the poor Jews look up to see the Emperor rushing off to view other distant apartments, some upstairs, others below, giving orders all the while to his architects. Dogging his footsteps they find themselves nudged by the Alexandrian ambassadors, who are ever jeering at their adversaries "as in a play". Half dead with terror, they keep up the never-to-be-forgotten chase, interjecting a word of apology at every possible opportunity, while the emperor owns their presence by every so often spinning round upon them with a jest. On one such occasion he asks, "Pray, gentlemen, why do you not eat pork?" (Loud laughter from the Greeks; at which some of the imperial attendants frown), but the Jews answer, "Every people has its special customs; our opponents are not without their own peculiarities," but they have not got much further in conversation when Caligula has rushed off again. When they think all is over the emperor turns and dismisses them with the remark, "Men who think me no god are more unfortunate, after all, than criminal."<sup>1</sup>

As Caligula had reacted against the policy of Tiberius so Claudius reacted against the policy of Caligula and assumed that of Augustus which Tiberius had followed in the later years of his reign.

1. Philo, Leg. ad Caium; Merivale's trans.  
Hist. of Romans Ch. 47.

He undertook a thorough-going restoration. The political prisoners and exiles were pardoned and recalled; the estates which had been confiscated were given back to their former owners; the court was purged of the oriental cults which had been introduced into it by Caligula. The synagogues which had been seized in Alexandria, were now, if not before, returned. An edict was given out proclaiming universal religious toleration, by which Judaism was once more put upon a legal footing.

Herod Agrippa who with shrewd foresight had previously kept on very good terms with Claudius, and had rendered him signal service in the crisis pending his accession was not left unrewarded for his friendship. Directly Claudius became emperor he made him king of all Judaea and Samaria, in addition to his own territory. With this appointment of Rome a Jewish prince for the last time and for the space of three years was to reign over his land. His dominion embraced all that King Herod the Great had governed - - Judaea, Samaria, and Idumaea; Galilee and Peraea, and his original trans-Jordanic kingdom. Judaea now ceased to be a Roman province; the Roman procurator and his officials were recalled; and the country of the Jews became once more a civitas libera et foederata.

## II Herod Agrippa, A. D. 41-44.

The new king of Judaea was in nature like his grandfather

Herod, "only milder in disposition, and somewhat more sly." Like Herod the Great he affected a regard for all things dear to the Jews, and studiously avoided giving offense to the religious sentiments of the people. But this was purely a matter of policy for at heart he was pagan, for when he travelled beyond Jewish territory he favoured his hosts by building temples and hippodromes. At Berytus he erected at his own expense a fine theatre, a piazza, baths, and an amphitheatre. At the opening of the last a magnificent spectacle was put on at which 1400 malefactors were made to slaughter one another. Games were performed at Caesaraea. Statues of his daughters were erected in towns other than Jerusalem, and while the coins minted by him in Jerusalem bore only innocent symbols, those struck in other places had the image of the emperor, and sometimes his own with the title: βασιλεὺς μέγας φιλόκαισαρ εὐσεβὴς καὶ φιλορώματος.

To the Jews Herod Agrippa was welcome as a ruler; he was felt to be one of them despite his Idumaeian ancestry, as indeed he legally was being an Edomite enrolled in Israel from the third generation.<sup>1</sup> His rule was therefore less odious to the Jews than that of the Romans, for they were always felt to be foreign masters, whose very authority was contrary to the Law. Just how far Herod had won his way into the hearts of the people is shown by the following incident. In the Feast of Tabernacles, A. D. 41, he was reading publicly in the law according to ancient customs, when he came to the words,

1. Deuteronomy 23.8,9.

"Thou mayest not set a stranger over thee who is not thy brother."

Hereupon Agrippa burst into tears because he thought himself referred to in them, but the people cried out to him, "Be not grieved Agrippa! Thou art our brother! Thou art our brother!"<sup>1</sup>

This acceptableness on hereditary grounds, was enhanced by his tactful outward piety in matters in which Judaism was concerned, and by the natural amiability of his temper.<sup>2</sup> On his arrival in Jerusalem from the West one of his first acts was to hang up in the temple a golden chain which Caligula had given him. He then sacrificed a thank-offering, "because he would not neglect any precept of the law." Moreover he continued his endearing spendthrift ways in his own land, so that Josephus could say "The revenues which he received were no less than twelve million drachmae. Yet did he borrow great sums from others; for he was so very liberal that his expenses exceeded his incomes, and his generosity was boundless."<sup>3</sup>

His policy which may be broadly defined as "Pharisaic-national", found expression in one or two significant acts which, however, were nullified by the governor of Syria. He commenced to strengthen the fortifications of Jerusalem on such a scale that if they had been finished it said that it would have been well nigh impossible for them to have been taken; before this took place Marsus, the legate of Syria, interfered and ordered that the work be discontinued.<sup>4</sup> After

1. Mishna, Sota 7.8. *quoted by Schürer.*

2. of. the story in Jos. Ant. 19.17.4

3. Jos. Ant. 19.8.2.

4. Jos. Ant. 19.77.2.

this Herod summoned a gathering of certain vassal kings of Rome at Tiberias when Marsus again stepped in and bade the guests depart without delay.<sup>1</sup>

Agrippa ever espoused the cause of the Jews as his own people, and it is probable that he had it at heart, notwithstanding the shallowness of his Judaism.

Showing the harmony which might prevail between a Roman official sent to preserve Rome's interests and an Eastern King bent on his country's welfare was the incident of Doris. About this time some violent natures in this city carried a statue of Claudius into a Jewish synagogue. Agrippa at once appealed to Publius Petronius, legate of Syria, under whose jurisdiction the city was. Petronius, in turn, wrote a sharp note to the magistrates of Doris. After a stiff rebuke, he writes, "It is but the part of natural justice, that everyone should have the power over the place belonging peculiarly to themselves according to the determination of Caesar (to say nothing of my own determination) - which gives the Jews leave to make use of their own customs, as also gives orders that they enjoy equally the rights of citizens with the Greeks themselves. - I and king Agrippa, for whom I have the highest honour, have nothing more under our care than that the nation of the Jews may have no occasion of getting together under pretence of avenging themselves and become tumultuous, - I therefore charge you, that you do not, for the time to come, seek for any occasion of sedition or disturbance, but that everyone be

1. Jos. Ant. 19.8.1.

allowed to follow their own religious customs."<sup>1</sup>

After only three years of rule - golden ones truly, for Pharisaism - Agrippa died. According to Josephus,<sup>2</sup> he was in the arena arrayed all in a robe of silver and this sparkled in the sun so that the flatterers said, "It is a god," He acquiesced and soon after he suffered a most severe pain in the abdomen; he was carried to his house and died after five days. The population of the Gentile towns rejoiced; and the Sebastian cohort showed such unseemly joy that the emperor ordered it to serve in Pontus, a punishment happily averted in answer to a petition ~~was~~ sent in by the offenders.<sup>3</sup> The Jews, on the other hand, sincerely mourned Herod's death; they would have lamented still more could they have foreseen the future, for thus had perished the last native ruler of their land.

The death of Herod Agrippa at this time was a calamity for Judaea. Had he lived long enough he might have silenced the chronic discontent and welded the disorderly elements of his country into a united whole. As it was, his death left the Jews without anyone capable of handling them. Herod's only heir was his son, also called Agrippa, who was but seventeen. The emperor Claudius was disposed at first to enthrone him, but on the representations of his advisers, he converted Judaea once more into a Roman Province.

1. Jos. Ant. 19. 6. 3.

2. Jos. Ant. 19. 8. 2.

3. Jos. Ant. 19. 9. 1, 2.

### III The Later Procurators, A.D.44-46.

The newly-created Roman province was in practically all points a continuation of the one created by Augustus, except for the fact that it now included Galilee and Peraea, with part of Philip's trans-Jordanic tetrarchy. Indeed, in many ways, the three years of Agrippa's reign may be looked upon merely as an interval in the middle of an otherwise continuous period of direct Roman rule from A.D. 6 to A.D. 66. There was, however, this difference. Poor as the procurators of the earlier province had been, those of the later were almost uniformly worse. These, "as if by secret arrangement, so conducted themselves as most certainly to arouse the people to revolt. Even the best among them, to say nothing at all of the others, who trampled right and law under foot, had no appreciation of the fact that<sup>a</sup> people like the Jews required, in a permanent degree, consideration for their prejudices and peculiarities." <sup>1</sup> The appointment of men such as these was Rome's chief contribution to a war that involved the destruction of her charge, though it should be noted that these men represented not the real theory of Roman government but a perversion.

The Jewish people, on the other hand, were more embittered, and, looking upon their crushed hopes with a rueful glance, formed a melancholy contrast between their former and their present rulers. This deep discontent grew stronger yearly. The fifty-seven years of

1. S.H. J.P. D.V.I. Vol.II  
P.166,7.



Roman rule form an organic whole in which, especially during the latter half, events moved as with resistless tread, slowly at first but relentlessly quickening until with awe-inspiring rapidity they evolve into a final catastrophe as complete as it was colossal.

Of the first two procurators little of importance to our subject is known. The former, Cuspius Fadus,<sup>1</sup> after settling a boundary dispute between Peraea and Decapolis in favour of the latter, unwisely demanded custody of the high priest's robe which had been returned by Vitellius to the Jews. Fadus and Cassius Longinus, Governor of Syria, who had come to Judaea on this very account, consented <sup>to allow</sup> a Jewish embassy, however, to set the matter before Claudius in Rome. Thanks to the mediation of Agrippa II who was living in Rome at the time, the embassy was successful, and the garment was restored to the Jews.<sup>2</sup> Fadus also put down a rising headed by a pseudo-prophet, Theudas.<sup>3</sup> It is uncertain when his period ends and that of his successor Tiberius Alexander begins. The latter, whose family history was referred to in an earlier chapter,<sup>4</sup> finished his term of office in A. D. 48.

During the term of the third procurator, Ventidius Cumanus (A. D. 48-52), occurred disturbances similar to those under the predecessors, but of a more serious nature.

The mention of these may serve to illustrate conditions.

1. Jos. Ant. 19.9.2.
2. Jos. Ant. 20.1.1,2.
3. Jos. Ant. 20.5.1; Eus. Hist. Eccl. 2.11; C.I.G.H. 2684, 3563, 3920, 5698.
4. Ref. p. 60.

The first was caused by a want of discipline in the Roman Army. At the Feast of the Passover, A.D. 48, one of the detachment of soldiers assigned as usual to preserve order on such occasions, coarsely insulted a throng of worshippers, which demanded his punishment by Cumanus; but Cumanus, instead of complying, first tried to hush the matter up, and then failing in this, sent his men against the complainants. Thousands of Jews were slain in the ensuing fracas. <sup>1</sup> Not long afterwards, further trouble arose when Stephanus, an imperial official, was waylaid and robbed on a thoroughfare near Jerusalem; In retaliation the procurator destroyed all the villages near the scene of the robbery. One of the soldiers who was engaged in burning a house came upon a roll of the law, which he forthwith tore up, cursing as he did so. This outraged the Jews everywhere and they visited him en masse at Caesarea; this time Cumanus yielded to them, and gave orders that the offender be put to death. <sup>2</sup>

It was the third and last encounter which caused Cumanus' dismissal. Some Galilaeans, bound for Jerusalem for the feast, were murdered in a Samaritan village on the way. Cumanus, who had been bribed by the Samaritans, took no steps towards condemning the guilty, and the Jews took this the duty upon themselves. Forming two bands they attacked the village and massacred everyone they could lay their hands upon without regard to sex or age, burning their buildings. Cumanus now appeared, and captured many of the Jews.

1. Jos. Ant. 20.5.3; Wars 2.12.1.
2. Jos. Ant. 20.5.4; Wars 2.12.2.

Both the Samaritans and the Jews laid their complaints before Ummidius Quadratus, governor of Syria, the one accusing the Jews and the other accusing their enemies along with Cumanus. After making a rigid enquiry, for which he came to Samaria in person, Quadratus sent Cumanus together with the ring-leaders to the Emperor. A trial was held before Claudius in which Agrippa II upheld the cause of the Jews. Thanks largely to his efforts Cumanus was stripped of his office and sent into banishment. <sup>1</sup>

The procuratorship of Felix (A. D. 52-60), Cumanus' successor, marks a distinct turning-point in the downward career of the Jewish state. Tacitus says of him that "with all manner of cruelty and lust he exercised royal functions in the spirit of a slave." <sup>2</sup> He had been appointed by Claudius at the recommendation of Jonathan the high priest who was one of the Jewish embassy sent to Rome over the trouble with the Samaritans. As Felix was a freed-man his appointment was an innovation in Roman governmental practice, as the office of procurator was reserved exclusively for those of equestrian rank. His brother, Pallas, was private secretary of the emperor, and Felix' appointment was probably due to his influence; it was probably due to his continued support that Felix was the more ready to "believe that he might commit all sorts of enormities with impunity". <sup>3</sup>

1. Jos. Ant. 20.6.1-3; Wars. 2.12.3-7.

2. Hist. 5.9.

3. Tacitus, Annals 12.54.

During his procuratorship three parties, all more or less hostile to the Romans, gained prominence in Judaea. The first was that of the Zealots, (called by Josephus, "robbers"), political fanatics who went about in bands forcing people to oppose Roman rule. These men Felix crushed by crucifying all whom he could get his hands on - "an incalculable number" comments the Jewish historian. Their motives were ostensibly political - the freeing of Judaea from the Romans - but they used this contention as a cloak for robbery.

The second party, the Sicarii, called from the sicae or daggers they carried, was a band of assassins with combined mercenary and political motives. These marking beforehand their victims, dispatched them in some crowded thoroughfare, themselves got lost in the crowd, and by feigning the greatest sorrow for the deed, diverted suspicion. Their first victim was Jonathan the high priest, whose death was effected at the instigation of Felix, who wished to get rid of him because he found his continual rebukes tiresome. While the Sicarii were not in sympathy with Roman government, they <sup>for once</sup> lent themselves joyously to this scheme of its representative. Such murders were soon so numerous, that the suspense for all became intolerable; no one knew if it were not his turn next, and in the midst of endless precautions men were cut down.

Last of all, there were the religious fanatics, who were "not so impure in their actions but worse in the results" of their

deeds than either of the other two groups. These taught that the kingdom of God was to come by force, and that the first stage of this kingdom was the throwing off of the Roman yoke, as said the first party, but they differed from these by saying Divine help would be given, and with this nothing was impossible. This enabled them to plunge blindly into the most foolhardy enterprises, which always ended disastrously. For example, during the governorship of Felix there arose an Egyptian, <sup>سك</sup>like Theudas, a pseudo-prophet, who gathered together a band of followers whom he persuaded that if they followed him he was able to cause the walls of Jerusalem to fall down; he would then take the Roman garrison, and free Judaea of the Romans. The way it ended was that ere he reached the Mount of Olives Felix appeared and scattered his army.<sup>2</sup>

The disorder of the Jewish state was further increased and the problem of the maintenance of order made still more difficult by vicious quarrels of the ruling and the deposed high priests. The latter more than once stirred up factions against their successors; about this time there appeared the unedifying spectacle of a pitched battle in the streets between the respective followers of each.<sup>1</sup> Even when the high priests were not fighting, many did not scruple to rob the other priests of the tithes on which they depended, so that many of them starved to death. If the people refused to give them the tithes due to the lessër priests they would on occasion send servants

1. cf. Jos. Ant. 20.8, 8; 20.9.4

2. Jos. Wars. 2.13.5; Ant. 20.8.6.

to the threshing-floors and forcibly extract the tenth, beating anyone who should oppose.<sup>1</sup> Such was the condition of society in Jerusalem when Nero succeeded Claudius in A. D. 52.

Towards the end of Felix' rule a dispute arose between the Syrian and the Jewish population of Caesarea. The Jews claimed certain privileges because Herod founded the city, but the Syrians resisted them. Street battles went on without any interference on the part of this governor until at last he routed the victorious Jews with his cavalry and allowed his soldiers to plunder their homes, but later sent both parties to Rome to Nero to plead their respective sides.<sup>2</sup> Nero's reign was not wholly unfavourable to the Jews on account partly of the influence of the Empress Popaea, who was a Jewish proselyte. On this occasion, however, the Syrians got an unfair advantage because they were able to bribe Beryllus, the secretary for Nero's Greek correspondence, and by his influence to obtain a decision in their favour. An imperial rescript declared the Jews to have forfeited even the privileges they had previously possessed.<sup>3</sup> But before this decision was given, Felix, probably in A. D. 60, was recalled by the emperor, Nero.

The fifth procurator, Porcius Festus (A. D. 60-62), was a just man who tried to make matters right, executing several of the trouble-makers, but in the two short years of his rule he was not able

1. Jos. Ant. 20.9.2,4.

2. Jos. Ant. 20.8.7; Wars 2.13.7.

3. Jos. Ant. 20.8.9; Wars. 2.14.4.

to undo the evil of Felix or to stem the rising tide of discontent. The outrages of the Sicarii and the propaganda of the religious fanatics continued despite the rigorous measures he took against them. He himself died in office in A. D. 62.

His successor was Albinus (A. D. 62-64), later procurator of Mauretania, and eventually put to death by Vitellius' party.<sup>1</sup> Albinus walked in Felix' steps and raised the people to a pitch of fury. The account of his Jewish government comes from Josephus, and as the summary in the Wars, which is a lively one, sets forth first hand the provocations which stung the Jews to madness and a suicidal war with Rome; it is here given and left to speak for itself.

"Albinus, who succeeded Festus, did not execute his office as the other had done, nor was there any sort of wickedness that could be named but he had a hand in it. Accordingly, he did not only, in his political capacity, steal and plunder everyone's substance nor did he only burden the whole nation with taxes, but he permitted the relations of such as were in prison for robbery, and had been laid there, either by the senate of every city, or by the former procurators to redeem them for money; and nobody remained in the prisons as a malefactor but he who gave him nothing. At this time it was that the enterprises of the seditious at Jerusalem were very formidable; the principal men among them purchasing leave of Albinus to go on with their seditious practices; while that part of the people

1. Tacitus, History 2.58, 59.

who delighted in disturbances joined themselves to such as had fellowship with Albinus; and everyone of these wicked wretches was encompassed with his own band of robbers, while he himself, like an arch-robber or a tyrant made a figure among his company, and abused his authority over those about him in order to plunder those that lived quietly. The effect of which was this, that those who lost their goods were forced to hold their peace when they had reason to show great indignation at what they had suffered; but those who had escaped were found to flatter him who deserved to be punished, out of the fear they were in of suffering equally with the others. Upon the whole nobody durst speak his mind but tyranny was generally tolerated; and at this time were those seeds sown which brought the city to destruction." <sup>1</sup>

1. Jos. Wars 2.14.1; cf. also  
Ant. 20.9.2-5.



## CHAPTER SIX

## The Destruction of Jerusalem. A. D. 70

Nero committed the inexcusable folly of sending to govern Judaea at this time the very worst procurator that she had ever had, Gessius Florus (A. D. 64-66). Owing to this official's incapacity, his tyranny and absence of loyalty to Rome's interests, the long-threatened revolt of the Jews, which ended in the annihilation of the Jewish state, was precipitated.

At the time when this procurator was appointed the whole country was in a turmoil. All the discontent regarding Rome which had been simmering more or less violently since Pompey took Jerusalem in B.C. 63 was now at the boiling point. The good intentions of Rome, however true they may have been, had been "rendered nugatory by the perversity of the procurators." This nation which had held the loftiest ideals together with the highest conception of its position and destiny was naturally discontented at serving under a foreign yoke of any sort. But, when it had been brow-beaten and bullied, its most cherished ideals misunderstood and trampled upon, its most sacred institutions profaned, it is not to be wondered that the same discontent burst into flame.

The greatest ill of all was not the deeds which Florus performed in themselves, but the fact that he put upon the system of

native self-government a strain greater than it could bear. The peace party included "the men of power, with the high priests, as also all the part of the multitude that were desirous of peace."<sup>1</sup> As long as they retained their grip on affairs of state, the native machinery could still function, and the country remain in order. The policy of the leaders was that of obedience to Rome at all costs, as the only means of preserving the state. When, through the unjust actions of Florus this policy was made to appear futile and undesirable, they steadily lost the support of the people, and eventually were overcome. Thus there fell from the helm of the state the only ones capable of handling it, and when this took place the native government went to pieces.

Florus, moreover, did not give the ruling party adequate support from his soldiers, to keep down the masses, and Cestius Gallus, the legate of Syria, also failed to realize the seriousness of the situation and support Florus and the high priests with his legions in time, as he might have done.

But the Jews were also at fault for their bigotry and headstrong unreasonableness, and their reckless, self-willed tenacity made the approaching crisis seem inevitable. Then, too, the Pharisaic theories of Israel's future position were irreconcilable with Roman Government so that the cause of the war must be sought beyond the

1. Jos. Wars 2.17.5.

tyranny of a Florus or an Albinus, in the doctrines and sentiments of the Pharisees, who were the leaders of the common classes.

The character of Florus, was such that by comparison that of Albinus appeared "extraordinarily righteous." Whereas the latter had oppressed his subjects secretly, Florus did so openly, and made a boast of it "as though he had been sent as an executioner to punish condemned malefactors," and his whole period of rule was an orgy of arrogance, bribery and cruelty.<sup>1</sup>

One of his first acts was to take seventeen talents from the temple treasure at Jerusalem. The already disaffected people were infuriated at this act of sacrilege and amid wild shoutings as those of a riotous mob, they reproached Florus, and called upon Caesar in their cries, while some wits went about the city, bearing baskets and begging money for the poor and needy Florus.

When this last reached the ears of the governor he resolved to punish it, so ordered the high priests to produce the offenders. But these were either unable or afraid to do so, and begged Florus to let the matter drop, and not further stir up the passion of the people. Deaf to all their warnings and entreaties Florus bade his soldiers plunder one of the sections of the City, who in their alacrity exceeded his instructions and besides plundering houses wholesale both in and out of the condemned area, slaughtered all whom they

1. Jos. Ant. 20.11.1;  
Wars 2.14.2.

caught, while the governor himself set them an example by putting several to death, and showed an utter disregard of Roman law by having scourged and crucified some Jews of equestrian rank. Berenice, the sister of Agrippa II, herself supplicated the governor, but in vain.<sup>1</sup>

This took place on May the 16th, A. D. 66. On the following day Florus called in his troops and warned the people as a proof of their good-will to greet on the morrow two cohorts which he would send from Caesarea. These, persuaded with great difficulty by the high priests, who saw that their only hope lay in obedience, awaited outside the city the arrival of these troops, but these, when they came, refused to return the salutations of the populace, because they were instructed beforehand. At this some of the seditious cried out, when immediately the soldiers whipped out clubs and drove the people before them with blows into the city, where street-fighting took place.<sup>2</sup>

These incidents, standing as they do among others of like character, serve to show the nature of Florus' rule. He acted in all things in such a way as to stir up a rebellion. Josephus, indeed, throws out the sinister hint, that he did this out of cold-blooded policy, so as to make the people enemies of Rome through their revolting, and thus to escape the danger of being charged by them before the emperor with his other acts.

1. Jos. Wars 2.14.6-9; 2.15.1

2. Jos. Wars 2.15.3-6.

Additional help, however, came from another quarter.

Agrippa II, appeared in the city and endeavoured to win the people over to reason. Being the son of Herod Agrippa, and educated entirely at Rome he was able to treat with both Jews and Romans, but his sympathies were really with the latter, to whom he consistently adhered. Claudius had given him the small kingdom of Herod of Chalcis, in the Lebanon about A. D. 50, together with his prerogatives of managing the temple and the temple treasure, and of nominating the high priest.<sup>1</sup> In A. D. 53, Claudius had taken back Chalcis, and given him in return the tetrarchies of Philip and of Lysanias,<sup>2</sup> to which Nero had added the cities of Tiberias, Tarichaea and Julias;<sup>3</sup> but Agrippa had still retained his oversight of temple matters, and this was a sufficient pretext for his interference in Jewish state affairs.

Though resembling his father in many things, he differed from him in being openly indifferent to the Jewish religion; and to a lesser extent to the Jews as a people. He had enough interest, nevertheless, to enter their capital and in a well-reasoned speech endeavoured to show them the hopelessness of undertaking a war with Rome. He advised them to rebuild the cloisters which had been destroyed in the street fighting. They actually began this, but when he further laid upon them the necessity of submitting themselves to Florus they lost patience, and drove him from the city with stones.<sup>4</sup>

After his departure a son of the high priest of Ananias,

1. Jos. Ant. 20.5.2; Wars 2.12.1.
2. Jos. Ant. 20.7.1; Wars 2.12.8.
3. Jos. Ant. 20.8.4; Wars 2.13.2.
4. Jos. Wars 2.17.1.

Eleasar by name, who was governor of the temple, and a Zealot, caused the daily sacrifice for the emperor and the Roman people to cease, despite the pleadings of the chief priest. The breaking off of this part of the temple ritual was equivalent to a declaration of war.<sup>1</sup>

The peace party in great distress sent two embassies, one to Agrippa, and the other to Florus, to ask for an army. "Agrippa was equally solicitous for those that were revolting and for those against whom the war was to be made, and was desirous to preserve the Jews from the Romans, and the temple and the metropolis for the Jews; he was also sensible that it was not for his own advantage that the disturbances should proceed; so he sent 3,000 horsemen~~x~~ to the assistance of the people."<sup>2</sup> In striking contrast was the conduct of Florus, who gave the ambassadors no answer at all, and left matters to take their course.

Affairs in Jerusalem took on the aspect of a civil war. "The peace party took courage and seized upon the Upper City; for the seditious part had the lower city and the temple in their power; so they made use of stones and slings perpetually against one another, and threw darts continually on both sides; and sometimes it happened that they made incursions by troops, and fought it out hand to hand."<sup>3</sup>

After a week the seditious drove the peace party from the Upper City; they allowed Agrippa's cavalry to go out of the metropolis unharmed, but the Roman cohort was besieged in its tower, and

1. Jos. Wars 2.17.2-4.
2. Jos. Wars 2.17.4.
3. Jos. Wars 2.17.5.

treacherously put to death while on safe-conduct. To gain the debtors, the records for debt were destroyed along with the archives. Ananias, the high priest, who before any other, might have righted matters was found shortly after and slain.<sup>1</sup>

While these and subsequent events were occurring in Jerusalem equally terrible scenes were being enacted elsewhere. In Syria "every city was divided into two armies, encamped one against the other, and the preservation of the one party was in the destruction of the other."<sup>2</sup> 10,600 Jews were slaughtered by their Gentile fellow-citizens in Damascus, 13,000 in Scythopolis, 20,000 in Caesarea, and 50,000 in Alexandria; in no Eastern city where there were Jews, was there rest.<sup>3</sup>

At this time Cestius Gallus, the governor of Syria who was responsible for the quiet of Judaea, invaded it with about one half of the forces at his disposal. After passing from Antioch through Ptolemais, Caesarea, Antipatris, and Lydda, he pitched his camp 50 stadia from the rebellious city and prepared to besiege it. He had attacked it only for a little while, had gained some success, and was, had he known it, on the eve of its capture, when for some unknown reason and to the surprise of all, he turned about and retreated northward; whatever his reason - possibly because he thought he had not sufficient forces, possibly lack of heart - the result was the same, and that result was calamity; if, to attack was dangerous, to retreat was nothing

1. Jos. Wars.2.17.4-10.

2. Jos. Wars 2.18.2.

3. Jos. Wars 2.18; 2.20.2.

short of disastrous, both for himself and for the Jews. It was truly unfortunate for him, for directly he commenced to withdraw, his rear was harrassed by the rebellious who sallied out of the city to attack it. His men were forced first to abandon their baggage, then to destroy the pack mules, and later to leave behind the siege-engines, which were to be used against their fellow-soldiers at a later day. But the crowning catastrophe came as they were crossing through Beth-horon, a steep and narrow pass, as they filed through which the Jews clambering upon the rocks above, hurled boulders upon them so that only the approach of night saved the remnant of his army.<sup>1</sup> Nevertheless for the Jewish cause it was still more unfortunate, for it meant its irrevocable commitment to a war with Rome. To the Romans this disaster brought home the fact that they had on their hands a real war, for which they must make adequate provision. To the Jews it meant the undertaking of the revolt in real earnest. "Many of the most eminent of the Jews swam away from the city, as from a ship when it is going to sink."<sup>2</sup> Possibly it was at this time that the Christians made good their escape.<sup>3</sup> Those of the pro-Roman party who remained were either forced or persuaded to join the revolters. Both Romans and Jews prepared for the contest in characteristic manner.

Nero was in Achaia when he got the news about Cestius. It was at once determined to secure the services of the best soldier the Empire could produce, and the choice fell upon Vespasian. This

1. Jos. Wars 2.18.9-2.19.9.
2. Jos. Wars 2.20.1.
3. Eus. H. Ecc. 3.5.2-3.



seasoned warrior who had seen service in Britain and elsewhere, was placed in command of an army ultimately including three legions, - the fifth, tenth, and fifteenth; twenty-three auxiliary cohorts; six alae of cavalry; and the auxiliary troops of Agrippa, Antiochus of Commagene, and Soemus of Emesa and Malchus of Arabia. His entire fighting force was about 60,000 men.<sup>1</sup>

The Jews, for their part, held an assembly in the temple and mapped out a plan of defence. Nearly all of the eleven toparchies of Judaea were put under a separate commander; Joseph, son of Gorion, and the high priest Ananus, were leaders in Jerusalem; Idumaea was put under two priests; while Galilee was entrusted to Josephus the historian.

Galilee was strategically the most important part in the Jews' defence, as it would have to be attacked first, if Rome chose to advance from Syria and not Egypt; and when it was captured the doom of Palestine would be sealed; it was moreover in itself, rich and populous. Apparently the choice of its commander was regulated partly by personal ties, for Josephus was a priest only thirty years of age, and while clever at stratagem, and at copying the strong points in another's method, he could hardly be expected to match swords with a veteran like Vespasian. He nevertheless did his best, for mobilizing an army of 100,000 he sought to teach these undisciplined men the rudiments of Roman army routine, while he fortified the strongest

1. Jos. Wars 3.4.2.

cities in his province. But the hopelessness of his task was increased by the disloyal state of many of the cities and families, which were obedient neither to him nor to the Romans, and divided into factions.

The second stage of the war centred around Galilee. Sepphoris, its strongest and most pro-Roman city had sent to Vespasian for a garrison to guard it against Josephus, and had received one from him. When Josephus made an attack on the disloyal Sepphoris, he failed; and Vespasian sent other troops to its relief; thus he secured without a fight the most important city of the tetrarchy.

But there was an even more important result than the taking of a city. Josephus had relied upon two means to combat the Romans, first his army, and second, the fortified towns; but the real means of defense of course lay in the army. When Josephus' recruits failed at Sepphoris and heard that Vespasian's legions had invaded Palestine, their hearts melted and they fled hither and thither into the fortified towns. Thus on the loss of Sepphoris, Galilee was left without an organized fighting force, and its subjugation became merely a matter of taking ~~to~~ walled cities one by one.

Josephus, gathering together some of his men undertook the defence of one of the strongest of these, called Jotapata. The siege of this town, which was like that of Jerusalem in miniature, is one of the most dramatic accounts in all the history of Josephus.<sup>1</sup>

1. Jos. Wars 3.7.

The stories of the townsfolk hanging about the neck of the young commander and beseeching him not to leave them; of their heroism in the defense of their homes, and of the desperate cunning of Josephus in defending the city against <sup>the</sup> discipline of the Roman soldiers, and the sagacity of their commander; then of the end, on July 1, on the 47th day of the siege, when, one foggy morning, the Romans broke through the unwatched breach, cut down the exhausted guards, and awoke the city to its doom, - all combine to thrill the reader. Josephus, one of the only two survivors, was taken prisoner by the Romans but was later given friendly treatment by Vespasian, on the occasion of his foretelling him his future position as emperor; Josephus, indeed, was till the end retained as adviser to give information about the Jews. <sup>1</sup> When it was all over he took up his residence in Rome where in the favourable quiet of the evening hours of his life, he wrote his "Wars", and afterwards his "Antiquities of the Jews", which are the principal sources for Jewish history from the Maccabees to the fall of Judaea in A. D. 70.

After their exertions Vespasian let the soldiers rest at Caesarea, while he himself was magnificently entertained by Agrippa II, at Caesarea Philippi for twenty days. General and men then proceeded against the untaken towns. Tiberias opened its gates to Vespasian and was spared for King Agrippa's sake; <sup>2</sup> Tarichaea was taken

1. Jos. Wars 3.8.9; Dio Cassius 66.1; Suetonius, Vespasian 5.

2. Jos. Wars 3.9.1,7,8.

by Titus early in September; <sup>1</sup> and Gamala in Gaulanitis in October, though only after severe losses; <sup>2</sup> Mount Tabor also fell; <sup>3</sup> and, last of all Gischala. <sup>4</sup> At the close of A. D. 67, all Galilee was in the hands of the Romans.

The task of the Romans in conquering Judaea was made easier by the fiercely opposing factions of the Jews that sprang up in the crisis and that fought each other in the very presence of the Roman army. A brief survey of the rise and history of these mushroom parties explains how, in the eyes of a peace-loving Jew, Rome might justly be looked upon as a friendly power, come to restore order for the country's own good, in vindication of her own right. Josephus says that the three greatest misfortunes came upon Jerusalem, war, tyranny and sedition, and that war was the least of these, <sup>5</sup> and that the things suffered from the Romans were not to be compared with those suffered from their own people. "The sedition," he continues, "destroyed the city, and the Romans destroyed the sedition." <sup>6</sup>

There is a marked contrast between the firmness and forbearance, the wisdom and humanity of Vespasian, and the incapacity and insolence of Florus. The latter shows a Roman official at his worst, the former at his best.

1. Jos. Wars 3.10; Suetonius, Titus 4.
2. Jos. Wars 4.1.1-10.
3. Jos. Wars 4.1.8.
4. Jos. Wars 4.2.1-5.
5. Wars 4.7.1.
6. Jos. Wars 5.6.1.

There fled out of Gischala during its siege a man named John who later became the leader of one of the factions of Jerusalem. He escaped thither from Galilee and boasted of the ignorance of the Romans, and thereby stirred up the Zealots who represented the war party.<sup>1</sup> At the same time their forces were augmented by numbers of renegade Jews who had been plundering the Jewish towns and who flocked into Jerusalem. They thus were able to gain the upper hand.<sup>2</sup> These inflamed those who were like them in temper, and together they dragged off the wealthy to prison and slew them there. "They trampled on the laws of men, and laughed at the laws of God," remarks the historian. In accord with this spirit was their choosing a high priest of their own by lot; as it happened the choice fell upon a certain Phannias, who was a rustic, and quite unacquainted with the priestly duties.<sup>3</sup>

At last Joseph, the son of Gorion, and Ananus the oldest of the high priests got together the people, and drove the Zealots into the temple; they made this their fortress and were in fear of their lives.<sup>4</sup> John of Gischala played a double part; pretending to advise and support Ananus, he accompanied him everywhere, but secretly told all to the Zealots besieged in the temple. These, by his advice, sent messengers privately to the Idumaeans, asking them to come over and help them since their lives were threatened by the pro-Roman

1. Jos. Wars 4.<sup>22-5</sup>~~22-5~~.
2. Jos. Wars 4.3.1-3.
3. Jos. Wars 4.<sup>36</sup>~~4~~-8.
4. Jos. Wars 4.3.9-12.

element, as they called them. This war-loving nation gladly sent an army of 20,000 men, who were refused admittance into the city ~~by~~ Ananus. They then camped outside the gates.

That night came a terrific storm and an earthquake. Ananus who had hitherto kept the strictest watch, because of the violence of the tempest, allowed the guards to sleep in the cloisters. Under cover of the darkness and downpour the Zealots stole out of the temple. Beneath the sound of the wind and thunder the rasping of their saws as they cut through the bars of the gates was unheard, and before any of the people knew what had happened the Idume<sup>a</sup>ans were in the city. These spent the rest of that night and the following days in murder and pillage. When, satiated with slaughter, they departed, they left the residue of the people broken in spirit with almost all their leaders slain and the Zealots insolent and triumphant.<sup>1</sup>

The Zealots soon after split into two parties, one favouring John of Gischala, and one opposing. He, by virtue of his brazen deceit, boldness, cunning and cruelty, made them an apt leader.

While these things were taking place Vespasian, contrary to the advice of some of his generals, refrained from attacking Jerusalem. He knew that as matters were going the warring factions were playing into his hands, while if he laid siege to the city these same factions would unite against him as against a common foe.<sup>2</sup> So he turned aside to subdue Peraea. In March, of A. D. 68, he took

1. Jos. Wars 4.4.1 - 4.5.3.

2. Jos. Wars 4.6.2,3.

possession of Gadara, and left it with a garrison. Entrusting the conquest of the rest of Peraea to his office, Placidus, to whom he gave 3,000 infantry and 500 horsemen, he returned to Caesarea. In the early summer he invested Antipatris, captured Lydda and Jamnia; after raiding Idumaea, he passed through Samaria, to Jericho, June 2nd. This town was garrisoned, together with Adida; Gerasa was destroyed by one of his subordinates, Lucius Annius.<sup>1</sup> By these actions Vespasian's rear was now secured sufficiently for him to begin the siege of Jerusalem; and to this end he was making preparations when an event caused him to halt.

Word came that Nero had died at Rome on June 9th. Affairs in the capital were in disorder, and did not warrant undertaking a foreign siege in the crisis; moreover it was customary for the old emperor's unfulfilled commands to be ratified by the new; both of which considerations made Vespasian suspend all warlike operations. When the following winter, A. D. 68-69, word came that Galba was Emperor, Vespasian sent Titus, his son, to greet him. But he had only reached Corinth when he heard of Galba's murder, which had taken place on January 15th, A. D. 69, and so returned to Caesarea to his father, where they together resolved on a policy of watchful waiting.<sup>2</sup>

But he was led to take some action by the activities of a certain robber chief - Simon Bar Giora, - who was terrorizing Judaea and Idumaea. This man was like John of Gischala, - if anything more

1. Jos. Wars 4.7.3 - 4.8.1.

2. Jos. Wars 4.9.2.

bloodthirsty and bold. To offset his influence Vespasian after a whole year of comparative inactivity - made himself master of Judaea more completely. He subdued Gophna and Akrabatta, Bethel and Ephraim, while Cerealis his tribune destroyed Hebron. All Palestine except Jerusalem and the fortresses of Masada and Machaerus was now in the hands of the Romans.<sup>1</sup>

In Jerusalem matters were growing steadily worse. Terrible cruelties were perpetrated by both <sup>factions</sup> upon the defenceless multitude, who were so troubled they dared not even cry, but in silence mourned secretly; in fact, the only mark of mourning indulged in was when some would pathetically cast a little dust upon their heads. As for their dead relations, many of whom were denied burial by the Zealots, they ceased to mourn for them esteeming theirs to have been the happier fate. As for John, he played the part of a tyrant, having his own lieutenants and henchmen go about the town raiding and rifling at pleasure.

The people together with those Zealots that opposed John, made the fatal mistake of calling in Simon, as supposing that he would be a check upon him. He, gladly accepting the invitation, but the people found that while he indeed fought John in their city, he combined with him in oppressing them; and they had thus two tyrants. John was forced to retire to the Temple Mount and Simon held the rest of the city. These shot bolts at each other incessantly over

1. Jos. Wars 4.9.3 - 9.



the temple wall. <sup>1</sup>

News reached the East, that Vitellius, the general of the Western legions, had been proclaimed emperor by his men. The legions in Egypt and Syria, who were jealous of the power of their fellow-legionaries and thought their own commander would be a more suitable emperor than Vitellius, then proclaimed Vespasian emperor in July A. D. 69; before the middle of the month Vespasian was acknowledged emperor by all the East. <sup>2</sup>

Vespasian went to Antioch, where he sent Mucianus to Rome with an army overland; he himself sailed for Alexandria where he took up his residence. While there he learned of the murder of Vitellius, which occurred Dec. 20th. A. D. 69, and of his own accession as emperor. He left Egypt for Rome early in the summer of A. D. 70, to assume his new authority and entrusted the conduct of the Jewish War to Titus, who led again his army into Palestine. <sup>3</sup>

In Jerusalem the two parties had fought incessantly. A third party headed by Eleazar had broken off from that of John and this held the inner court of the temple; John the Temple Mount; and Simon the city. Each bombarded the other with engines and darts. The space around the temple was a desert. These were unabated in their madness toward each other and the citizens, and made the city a battlefield. In their insane rivalry they burned up the vast stores of

1. Jos. Wars 4.9.11 - 12.
2. Jos. Wars 4.10.2 - 6; Tacitus, History 2.79-81; Vespasian 6.
3. Jos. Wars 4.10.6; 4.11.1,5; Tacitus, History 2.81 - 83.

grain in the city, stores which would have kept all for years to come.<sup>1</sup>

The army of Titus consisted of four legions, the Fifth, Tenth, Fifteenth, and ill-starred Twelfth, and the auxiliaries supplied by the native kings.<sup>2</sup> His chief adviser was Tiberius Alexander, the former procurator of Judaea.<sup>3</sup> With these forces he undertook the siege of Jerusalem arriving there shortly before the Passover Festival, April 17th, A. D. 70.<sup>4</sup>

Titus advanced before the walls with 600 horsemen to reconnoitre. He narrowly escaped death on this occasion on account of a sudden sortie of the Jews, and had to depend wholly upon his personal valour for his safety.<sup>5</sup>

The tenth legion was attacked and almost overcome by the Jews as it was fortifying its camp on the Mount of Olives. Here, as all through the war, the courage of Titus was conspicuous; it was entirely due to his assistance that the attackers were beaten off.<sup>6</sup>

In the city during the Passover Festival, Eleasar's party which held the inner court of the temple, allowed those that wished to enter and worship on a truce. John's party concealed weapons about them, and mingling with the worshippers entered and over-powered Eleasar's men. From henceforth there were again two parties in Jeru-

1. Jos. Wars 5.1.1 - 5; Tacitus, History 5.12.

2. Jos. Wars 5.1.6; Tacitus, History 5.1.

3. Jos. Wars 6.4.3. The elder Pliny was his ἀρτεπίτροπος, in this way according to Mommsen's rendering of the inscription of Aradus, C.I. G. t.3. p.1178, n. 4536. (S.H.J.P.)

4. <sup>cf.</sup> Jos. Wars 5.3.1. with 5.13.7.

5. Jos. Wars 5.2.1, \* 2.

6. Jos. Wars 5.2.4, \* 5.

salem, John's and Simon's.<sup>1</sup>

The city was built upon three hills. The western and higher one was called the Upper City, and was separated by a deep gully from the eastern and smaller one which was called the Lower City; while north of that again was the Temple Mount. On the north of the Temple Mount was the Castle Antonia, which was attached to it. The Temple Mount was surrounded on all four sides by a wall, and was easily defended. The Upper and Lower Cities were surrounded by a wall which started at the northwestern corner of the temple wall and ran around in a great circle to join up with it again at its southeastern corner. There was also a wall separating the Upper from the Lower City. The outside wall was built upon a sheer precipice on the western, southern, and eastern sides of Jerusalem, but on the northern there was a gentler slope. The fortification of this weaker side was strengthened by a second wall, outside the first, which enclosed the older suburb. Outside of this again was yet a third wall, begun by Agrippa I<sup>2</sup> but only completed after the outbreak of the revolution; this, which, was the strongest of all, enclosed the new suburb of Bezetha.<sup>3</sup>

The northern side was of course chosen as the point of attack, and Titus set his battering rams to break up the outer wall at three places. When these began their work Simon and John gave up

1. Jos. Wars 5.3.1; Tacitus, History 5.12 ad fin

2. P. 104 87.

3. Jos. Wars 5.4. cf. S.H.J.P. Div. 104. p. 228, 9.

their fighting one another, and undertook to defend the wall. After several desperate sallies of theirs had been repulsed the wall fell on May 7th.<sup>1</sup>

Five days afterwards Titus captured the second wall, and after being driven from it, made it his own permanently four days later.<sup>2</sup>

He now raised four earthworks, each one the task of one legion; two of these were against the Antonia, which John of Gischala was defending, and two were against the Upper City which was defended by Simon.<sup>3</sup> While these were under construction Josephus was used by Titus to summon the city to surrender, but he was mocked, and he retired unsuccessful.<sup>4</sup> But the earthworks were a great concern to the besieged. John of Gischala attacked those opposite his wall by a running tunnel under the city wall beneath them. This tunnel he kept propped up with timber until he was ready, when he set fire to it. When the wooden props burned through the tunnel collapsed, and the earthwork fell, to the great chagrin of the legions. Two days later, Simon, by a ferocious assault, razed the other two with fire.<sup>5</sup>

Titus now surrounded the entire city with one long stone wall, which was finished in three days. It was carefully guarded and from now on all escape was impossible. As a result the famine in the city became terrible. The Zealots seized the stores, and entered the

1. Jos. Wars 5.6.2 - 5; 5.7.2. Suetonius Titus 5.
2. Jos. Wars 5.7.3- 4; 5.8.1 - 12.
3. Jos. Wars 5.9.2; cp. 11.4.
4. Jos. Wars 5.9.3 - 4.
5. Jos. Wars 5.11.4 - 6.

private houses in search for food. Whenever they saw anyone well-nourished they thrust him through, assured that he had a private supply of his own. Parents and children fought like snarling wolves to seize the bread from each other's teeth. The whole city was strewn with unburied corpses.<sup>1</sup>

Titus built four other ramparts, this time all against the wall by the Antonia. So widely had the surrounding country been devastated by the Romans that wood had to be carried for these from a distance of 90 stadia. These took twenty-one days in building; they were attacked, as previously by the Jews, but this time with much less vigour. The engines were plied from them against the third wall. This soon gave way, only to reveal a second which John had built behind it. Thanks to the exploits of some of the soldiers this was scaled, and the Antonia captured, and razed.<sup>2</sup>

On July 17th, the daily morning and evening sacrifice, which had not ceased to be offered for generations, failed - not so much because of the famine as "through the want of men."<sup>3</sup>

The kindness of Titus was shown by his again permitting Josephus to summon his fellow-countrymen to surrender though in vain.<sup>4</sup>

After an unsuccessful assault upon the temple, Titus prepared to besiege it in the regular manner. Wood for the ramparts had this time to be brought a distance of 100 stadia. Four earthworks

1. Jos Wars 5.12.1 - 3; 5.13.6,7; 6.3.3.

2. Jos.Wars 5.12.4; 6.1.1 - 8; 6.2.1.

3. Jos.Wars 6.2.1.

4. Jos.Wars 6.2.1, 2.

were erected. The temple consisted of a strongly walled square, on the inside of which ran corridors. Inside this square was another and smaller one, walled like the first; this was the inner court. From the top of the corridors the Zealots rained missiles upon the soldiers below. On one occasion these surprised them by departing suddenly. Unwisely the Romans climbed upon them, but no sooner were they safely up when the Jews set alight a train of combustibles, so that the corridors were at once a mass of flame, and nearly all upon them perished.<sup>1</sup>

When the rams could not shake the massive walls, Titus had recourse to fire to burn down the gates. It was decided in council that the temple should be spared; this intention, however, was frustrated on the morrow by the act of a soldier who in the fighting, threw a lighted torch through an aperture. Titus hurried to the spot directly, but amid the conflict his commands fell upon deaf ears. Other soldiers persisted in the work of firing the edifice, and soon the whole splendid pile was enveloped. Titus succeeded, however, in obtaining a view of the inner court before its destruction.<sup>2</sup>

Priests and people alike were massacred by the soldiers, but Simon and John made good their escape to the Upper City where they continued their work of killing and robbing. Amid the blazing ruins of the temple the soldiers, in the temple court planted their standards, and saluted their general as imperator.<sup>3</sup>

1. Jos. Wars 6.2.7 - 6.3.2.

2. Jos. Wars 6.4.2 - 7.

3. Jos. Wars 6.5.1,2; 6.6.1; Suetonius Titus 5; Dio Cassius 66.7; Orosius 7.9.6. (S.H.J.P.)

Simon and John, when called upon to surrender, wanted terms, but Titus indignantly refused. He set about burning a portion of the Lower City, which fell with the taking of the temple, and erected ramparts against the wall which divided it from the Upper City. These easily effected a breach in the wall, while the Zealots within it were exhausted and unable to withstand the besiegers. After a half-hearted attack, they turned and fled into subterranean vaults, whence they were not taken till sometime later. The whole of the Upper City fell into the hands of the conquerors. These sang the paeon, and reared again their standards. Then they made their way through, sacking the city and slaughtering all. Of those townsfolk who had survived the famine, the Zealots and the missiles, some were sent to the mines, others reserved for death in the arena, and others slain on the spot. But the finest were spared till the day of the triumph in Rome, among whom was Simon. He was executed in prison after the procession in Rome, A. D. 71.<sup>1</sup> John of Gischala, then captured, begged for his life, and was sentenced to life-long imprisonment.<sup>2</sup>

So complete was the destruction of Jerusalem that a stranger coming a few years later would have been unable to tell where it was. Only four remains were left, three towers, as monuments of the former strength of the city, and a portion of the wall to shelter the garrison that was left in charge.<sup>3</sup>

Leaving the Tenth legion as a garrison for Jerusalem,

1. Jos. Wars 7.5.6; Dio Cassius 66.7.
2. Jos. Wars 6.6.2 - 7.2.3.
3. Jos. Wars 7.1.1.

Titus visited many of the Gentile cities in Palestine and Syria, accepting their hospitality, and giving entertainments at which his prisoners were made to slaughter one another. In the winter of A. D. 70 - 71 he marched to Alexandria, and there disbanded the legions. He himself sailed for Rome and participated in a joint triumph with his father over the subjugation of Palestine.<sup>1</sup>

Not all Palestine, nevertheless, was conquered. Three strongholds, Herodium, Masada, and Machaerus still remained to be subdued, and this task was given to Lucilius Bassus, who was governor of Judaea. Herodium was easily taken. Machaerus surrendered when the governor caught a warrior who had been conspicuous in its defence, and threatened to crucify him in view of the city. At this time Bassus died and his successor, Flavius Silva, had the work of taking Masada.<sup>2</sup>

This fortress was the most difficult of all to subdue; it was built on a very steep mountain, inaccessible save at one point. It was defended by Sicarii, headed by Eleasar, a descendant of Judas of Galilee. With much preparatory toil Silva filled in the hollow before the wall, which he proceeded to batter down, only to find a second behind it made of logs filled between with earth. As this was elastic the battering rams had little effect; it was finally destroyed by fire. When Silva entered the city he found it unaccountably still. Eleasar and his men, when they saw the last hope of de-

1. Jos. 7.1.2 - 7.5.7; Dio Cassius 66.7.

2. Jos. Wars 7.6.1 - 4; 7.8.1.



fence being taken away, had agreed to slay their families and then each other. In April, A. D. 73, the last stronghold fell in this manner.<sup>1</sup>

As an aftermath of the war there took place revolts of the Jews in Cyrene and in Alexandria; the revolt in the latter place led to the closing down of the temple at Leontopolis by the Roman authorities.<sup>2</sup>



Scanned by UBC Library

1. Jos. Wars 7.8.1 - 7; 7.9.12.
2. Jos. Wars 7.10.11; Life 76.

CHAPTER SEVEN<sup>1</sup>From the Destruction of Jerusalem.<sup>1</sup>

The events which occurred after the fall of Jerusalem only showed how completely Rome had failed to satisfy the Jews. After the destruction of their capital all further attempts at reconciliation were useless, nor were they indeed made. This peculiar and sensitive people now retired farther than ever from Rome's arms.

After much bewilderment and enquiry they took the calamity which had befallen them for a punishment of their sins, and turned themselves with greater zeal than ever before to the observance of their law. Kindled anew was the hope of the Messiah who should come and "restore the kingdom to Israel," when they had duly fulfilled that law.

After Rome had conquered Palestine she organized it according to the strict provincial model. It was made into a propraetorial province, generally under the command of a praetorian up to Hadrian's time and under a consular thereafter; both ranks being in command of one legion. The sanhedrim was abolished and its authority was vested in the governor, who himself managed the administrative and judicial affairs of the province.

Under Roman rule the Gentile elements prospered exceedingly, and many cities were added to, or established. Caesarea continued

<sup>1</sup> cf. S.H.J.P. Ch. 26.

to be the headquarters of the governor,<sup>1</sup> and now that Jerusalem lay in ruins its claim to pre-eminence was undisputed, so that Tacitus terms it "Judaea caput".<sup>2</sup> Emmaus was made a colony by Vespasian, and was inhabited by his veterans.<sup>3</sup> In Samaria the thriving and rapidly growing Flavia Neapolis was founded upon the site of Shechem in 72 A.D. and later became one of the chief cities in Palestine. Its pagan character is indicated by its coins which bear the title "Most High Zeus"; it was famous for its games in the second century. Capitolias was founded in Decapolis in the time of Nerva or Trajan;<sup>4</sup> Aelia, in that of Hadrian.<sup>5</sup> Other but later foundations were those of Diocaesarea (Sepphoris), Diospolis (Lydda) and Eleutheropolis in the reign of Septimius Severus; and Nicopolis (Emmaus) in that of Helio-gabalus.

The destruction by Rome of the two great institutions of Jewish national life, the temple and the Sanhedrim, had a profound effect upon the internal organization of the Jewish people, yet only served to show the inwardness and strength of their nationality.

The temple at Jerusalem which had possessed a uniqueness on account of its hallowed site was never rebuilt; and the city itself lay as it had been overthrown. The fact that <sup>the</sup> second temple at Leontopolis was closed <sup>6</sup> shortly after the destruction of the first suggests a deliberate policy on the part of Rome to suppress those features

1. Jos. Wars 7.10.1

2. History 2.78.

3. Jos. Wars 7.6.6.

4. cf. C.I.L. t.6.n. 210; t.10.n. 532.

5. cf. p. 133.

6. cf. p. 123.

of the Jewish religion which she considered to endanger her rule over the Jews. But Rome, while she hindered the rebuilding of the temple, does not seem to have forbidden the offering of sacrifices. It was apparently left to the decision of the Jews whether they should offer sacrifices in another place, or none at all; and even the course they actually pursued is still a matter of dispute.<sup>1</sup>

When the temple was destroyed the priests lost all their functions, and though they still received their tithes, gradually lost their power. The high priest was no longer the head of the nation. When the Sanhedrim was destroyed, the Sadducees lost their places as rulers, and as they represented the political aspect of Jewish life and not the real, inner and spiritual side, they, too, lost all importance and are never heard of again. The authority of these two classes was vested in the scribes and Pharisees, who stood for the religious ideals of the people, and their rise to power was occasioned by a shifting of all emphasis upon the law. Judaism in its most Pharisaic form, became henceforth the predominating tone for all the Jews, and it has not lost all its power even to the present day. The rabbis in Jewish synagogues are successors or descendants of the scribes, while traces of priestly ancestry remain in such names as "Cohen" etc.

1. Schürer thinks they did not. The procedure was justified by some scribes, and there are many allusions to it in rabbinical literature, but other references equally clear contradict it, and Schürer quotes as notable among them Taanith 4.6; Pesachim 10.3; 72b; Rosh Hashana 1.4, 31b; Sebachim 60b; Justin, Dialogus cum Trypho: 40, 46., and points as explanation of the former allusions, the fact that the scribes still discuss all points of the temple ritual.

Rome, however, allowed the Jews still to have a sort of Sanhedrim of their own. This was the rabbinic school founded at Jamnia (Jabne), which consisted of scribes who passed decisions on religious matters, which were respected by all the Jews as binding. If there were, previous to the fall of Jerusalem, two Sanhedrims, - one a political and the other a religious, - it may have been a continuation of the latter. Certainly like the religious sanhedrim it had seventy-two members, presided over by a scribe who was subsequently called a "patriarch."

Illustrative of Rome's easy-going government is the circumstance that this school at Jamnia was allowed little by little to usurp judicial authority. The change took place only gradually; the Sanhedrim first inflicted fines, beatings, and imprisonment upon Jews who had violated its law, but in the third century Origen writes "There are also secret legal proceedings in accordance with the law, and many are condemned to death without any general authority having been obtained for the exercise of such functions, and without any attempt to conceal such doings from the governor."<sup>1</sup> It was also allowed, at least in the later days of the Empire, to receive the contributions of the Diaspora, which formerly had been received by the treasury of the priests at Jerusalem. In short, Origen in the same passage, speaking of its president, says, "The power of the Jewish ethnarch is so great that he is in no respect different from a king."

1. Origen Epistola ad Africanum 14.

As regards judicial matters its authority in civil cases may have been legal, sanctioned by the same law which gave like authority to the courts of the Diaspora; in criminal matters, however, it can only have been a piece of usurpation.

About Rome's rule of the Jews and her policy towards them from Vespasian onwards, we know unfortunately but little. That little is gleaned from meagre and widely scattered sources. Only two events stand out with any clearness - the armed conflicts <sup>of the war</sup> ~~war~~ under Trajan, and the rebellion under Hadrian respectively. These, and particularly the latter, we know to have been of the greatest magnitude and severity, and comparable to the overthrow of A. D. 70, but because of the dearth of information they occupy but a small section in the extant history.

Vespasian took from the Jews all political independence, but he granted the Diaspora permission to continue in the rights of local administration and justice which had been confirmed to them by Augustus. Josephus says: "One may discern the equity and generosity of the Romans, especially of Vespasian and Titus, who, although they had been in a great deal of pains in the war against the Jews, and were exasperated at them, because they did not deliver up their weapons to them, but continued the war till the very last, yet did not they take away any of their fore-mentioned privileges belonging to them as citizens, but restrained their anger and overcame the prayers of the Alexandrians and Antiochians, - nor would they alter any of the ancient favours granted

to the Jews, but said that those who had borne arms against them, and fought them, had suffered punishment already and that it was not just to deprive those that had not offended of the privileges they enjoyed."<sup>1</sup> The didrachma tax which had been collected by the Jews for their temple was levied by Vespasian for the temple of Jupiter Capitolinas in Rome.<sup>2</sup> This imposition was naturally a very galling one to the Jews.

Of Domitian we know only that he was anti-Jewish, exacted the didrachma tax with the utmost rigour,<sup>3</sup> and punished Roman converts to Judaism with confiscation of goods or with death.<sup>4</sup>

Under Nerva the didrachma was levied in a less offensive form,<sup>5</sup> and the restriction against proselytism was removed.<sup>6</sup>

During the reigns of these emperors Palestine continued under propraetors, of whom but little is known. There is information only covering ten of these, and that includes little beyond their names. The first is Sextus Vettulenus Cerealis,<sup>7</sup> who was commander of the Fifth legion at the siege of Jerusalem, and when Titus left Judaea, was put in charge by him of the garrison on the ruined site. His successor was Lucilius Bassus,<sup>8</sup> who died in office,<sup>9</sup> leaving in charge Lucius Flavius Silva;<sup>10</sup> Marcus Salvidenus was governor about A. D. 80, as is

1. Jos. Ant. 12.3.1; Wars 7.5.2.
2. Jos. Wars 7.6.6; Dio Cassius 6.6.7.
3. Suetonius, Domitian 12.
4. Dio Cassius 67.14.
5. So we infer from the coins of the time which bear the inscription "Fisci Judaici Calumnia sublatā."
6. Dio Cassius 68.1.
7. C.I.L. t.10 n.4862. (*S.H.J.P. and below*)
8. C.I.L. t.6 n.2059; Acts of the Arval Priesthood; Ephemeris Epigraphica 5. p.612 sq.
9. cf. p. 122. ; Jos. Wars 7.6.1 - 7.8.1.
10. C.I.L. t.6 n.2059; cf. p. 122 ; Jos. Wars 7.8, 9. He was consul in A. D. 81.

testified by coins. Cn. Pompeius Longinus, A. D. 86, is referred to in a military diploma of Domitian.<sup>1</sup> Atticus, about A.D. 107, is mentioned by Eusebius as being a governor under Trajan.<sup>2</sup> Pompeius Falco is known to have ruled from about A. D. 107 and onwards.<sup>3</sup> Tiberianus<sup>4</sup> was governor about 114 A. D., and Lusius Quietus, about A. D. 117. Tineius Rufus, A. D. 132, and Julius Severus, A. D. 135, complete the known list.

"The calamities of the Jews also continued to grow with one accumulation of evil upon another."<sup>5</sup> In 115 A. D. while Trajan was in Mesopotamia undertaking its conquest, the Jews in Egypt and Cyrene,<sup>6</sup> "as if driven along by the wild spirit of revolution, began to make riots against the non-Jewish inhabitants of the land."<sup>7</sup> They were under a leader called Lukuas<sup>8</sup> while Rutilius Lupas was governor of Egypt. In A. D. 116 the Jewish revolt took serious proportions. Many appallingly cruel deeds, that if true, could be actuated only by the most violent hatred, are charged against the Jews by Dio Cassius. Among other acts they are said to have eaten the flesh of their enemies and besmeared themselves with their blood. The Jews defeated the Greeks in an engagement, and drove them into Alexandria. There the latter

1. C.I.L. 3. p.857, Dipl. 14.
2. Eusebius Hist. Eccl. 3.32.3, 6.
3. C.I.L. t.10. n.6321; Pliny Ep. 1.23; 4.27; 7.22; 9.15.
4. The sources for this war are Dio Cassius 68.32; Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. 4.2.
5. Eusebius Hist. Eccl. 4.2.
6. cf. Appian: Civ. 2.90.
7. Eusebius Hist. Eccl. 4.2.
8. By Eusebius, but, by Dio, "Andreas."



had the upper hand and massacred all the Jews. The Roman governor seems not at first to have realized the strength of the movement; a general specially appointed by Trajan, named Marcius Turbo, was sent against the Jews "with foot and naval forces, besides cavalry. He, however, protracting the war a long time against them in many battles, slew many thousand Jews, not only of Cyrene, but also of Egypt, that had joined them, together with their leader, Lukuas."<sup>1</sup>

The revolt spread to the island of Cyprus. There, under leadership of a certain Artemion, the Jews destroyed the capital Salamis and committed various crimes. Dio doubtless exaggerates the number of victims when he places that in Egypt at 220,000, and that in Cyprus at 240,000. The violence, however, of the revolt is shown by the reaction, when "for this reason no Jew may set foot on that island, but even if one of them is driven upon its shores by a storm he is put to death."<sup>2</sup>

The final scene of the revolt was Mesopotamia. Trajan in his Parthian Wars had pressed on eastwards towards Ctesiphon, the capital of the Parthian Empire, when the Jews in his rear, rebelled. He entrusted the Moorish prince the Roman general, Lusius Quietus, with their subjugation. This officer accomplished his task, though with great barbarity, and was made governor of Palestine by Trajan in recognition.<sup>3</sup>

1. Eusebius Hist, Eccl. 4.2.
2. Dio Cassius History 68.32.
3. Eusebius Hist. Eccl. 4.2; Dio Cassius 68.32  
He was recalled by Hadrian and later put to death. Spartian, Vita Hadriani 5.7. Dio Cassius 69.2.

There are evidences that the revolt continued in minor forms until the beginning of Hadrian's reign, in A. D. 117. While Palestine would seem to have joined in <sup>1</sup> it is doubtful whether the rebellion there was general.

In the early years of Hadrian's reign occurred the final catastrophe, when the Jews rebelled and were so crushed that they were never able to revolt again on any large scale. <sup>2</sup>

The cause of their rebellion is obscure. Only two trustworthy passages throw any light upon it. One is in Spartian's "Hadrian", in which he says that the war was caused by a prohibition by the emperor of circumcision. The other is in Dio Cassius <sup>3</sup> where he says "When Hadrian had founded at Jerusalem a city of his own in place of the one destroyed, which he called Aelia Capitolina, and on the site of the temple of their God erected another temple to Jupiter the great and long-continued war broke out. For the Jews regarded it as a horrible outrage that foreigners should settle in their city, and that temples for strange gods should be built in it."

It is quite possible that both facts were causes of the war, <sup>4</sup> though the first may have been an indirect one. But it is likely that Rome did not mean to provoke the Jews by these acts. Knowledge of their opinions might have combined with sympathy, and these acts never have been performed, but though they were performed it does not appear to

1. Spartian, Hadrian 5; "Lycia denique ac Palaestina rebelles animos efferebant."

2. The literary sources for this revolt are Dio. 69.12-14; Eus.H. Eccl.4.6. (Chronicon 2.166-169.)

3. History 69.12

4. So, Renan, in the Fortnightly Review, Vol.35. p. 595.

have been in a spirit of idle malice. In the first place circumcision was not prohibited to the Jews only, but to all nations, so that these may not have been not specially intended. The nature of the rite itself seems to have been misunderstood and its vital place in Judaism missed entirely. In the second place the founding of Aelia on the site of Jerusalem, and a foreign shrine on the temple mount was not an act which Hadrian went out of his way to do in order to provoke the Jews. Wherever he went - and he toured the empire as no other emperor had done - he founded cities and erected temples; this was part of his activity in the interests of culture in the provinces, and with him a ruling passion. In his visits Palestine also shared, and he reared buildings there as elsewhere. Tiberias, Gaza, Petra were receivers of his bounty; the last, indeed, changed its name to Hadriana Petra, in gratitude.<sup>1</sup> It would therefore have been no unnatural ambition to take advantage of the commanding position of the site of Jerusalem to erect a new city. In view of these considerations it is plain that Hadrian did no unusual thing in founding Aelia; just how far he realized what his action would mean to the Jews is a matter that cannot be decided.

To them in reality it was a most terrible blow. All the sorrow following the destruction of their temple had been alleviated by the hope that one day it would be restored, along with the city. Now that a permanent foundation was to be made upon the ruins of Jerusalem, and the temple mount was to be desecrated in their eyes by a

1. Epiphanius, Haer. 30.12; Chronicon 1.4, 74; Coins.

heathen sanctuary, this hope was cruelly dashed to the ground. The deed itself was comparable in sacrilege to that of Antiochus Epiphanes. This quite likely came upon them already chafing under the former prohibition, and drove them to war in desperation.

This war broke out in A. D. 132.<sup>1</sup> It occurred during the emperor's last great journey in the East. Previous to this year he had gone to Syria from Greece, A. D. 130, from Syria to Egypt in November of the same year, and had returned to Syria in A. D. 131. It was no doubt in either his first or his second visit to Syria that he laid the foundations of Aelia, on his tour through Palestine. When he left Syria the second time, the hitherto smouldering revolt burst into flame.

Its leader was Simon, termed Bar Cochba or Bar Cosiba. This title was a nick-name meaning "Son of the Star" and indicated the Messianic character which he bore for the Jews. He was heralded by some of the scribes, especially Rabbi Akiba, as the promised Deliverer, and drew the mass of the people after him, over whom he set himself up as a prince and issued coins. Those issued in his first year bear the title "Simon, prince of Israel," but those in his second have, significantly enough, just "Simon." The aim of the revolt is shewn by other coins which have the figure of a star above a temple, signifying presumably Bar-Cochba's intention to rebuild it.

1. This date is based on Eckhel's proof (Doctrina Nummorum 6.489-491) that Hadrian's visit to Egypt occurred in A. D. 130. See S.H.J.P.D.A. I, Vol. II. p.295, and note 76.

The means by which the war was conducted were irregular. Fortresses, caverns, and subterranean vaults were made the headquarters of the rebels from which they raided all in the surrounding country who did not join them. They do not appear to have been centrally organized to any great extent, nor to have ventured an open stand against the Romans.

Of the course of the war very little is known. Tineius Rufus the governor of Judaea, and attempted to crush the revolt but failed, whereupon with great rapidity it spread over all Palestine, apparently affecting the restless elements in other lands so that Dio could say "the whole world, so to speak, was in commotion."<sup>1</sup> Large bodies of Roman troops were sent to Palestine from outside, Rufus appears to have been in supreme command in the earlier stage, and to have had as his colleague Publius Marcellus,<sup>2</sup> the governor of Syria; but the rebellion was finally stamped out by Julius Severus,<sup>3</sup> who had been summoned from Britain to take sole charge of the legions.

Eusebius says "As the revolt of the Jews again proceeded to many and great excesses, Rufus, who was lieutenant-governor of Judaea, destroyed, without mercy, myriads of men, women, and children in crowds; and by the laws of war he reduced their country to a state of subjection."<sup>4</sup> In the first success of the rebellion the Jews besieged and captured Aelia.<sup>5</sup> This was recaptured by the Romans and

1. Hist. 69,13
2. C.I.G. n. 4033, 4034.
3. C.I.L. t.3. n.2830.
4. Hist. Eccl. 4.6.
5. Appian was an eye-witness, (Syr.50). Its capture is also indicated in Jewish coins bearing the inscription "The Freedom of Jerusalem."

what was left of the old Jewish portion destroyed.

The methods of Julius Severus by which he crushed the revolt took a long time, but were very effective. The rebels were cooped up in their strongholds, and overpowered one by one, by assault or starvation. In this manner he succeeded in "harrying, exterminating and rooting them out" of the whole country.<sup>1</sup>

Among the last of these Jewish strongholds to be seized by the Romans was the one in which Bar-Cochba was taking refuge - the mountain fastness of Beth-ther, three hours journey south-west of Jerusalem. The capture did not take place until A. D. 134-135, when the "originator of all the mad fanaticism which had called down the punishment,"<sup>2</sup> paid the penalty.

According to Dio Cassius at least, "All Judaea was well-nigh a desert;" fifty fortresses and 985 villages were destroyed, and 580,000 Jews were slain, not counting those who died of wounds or famine.<sup>3</sup> An innumerable multitude of the survivors were sold as slaves; so great was the number of these that the annual auction-market at the Terebinth in Hebron was glutted, and a Jewish slave fetched no more than a horse. The unsold were put up for sale again at Gaza, and those who still remained were shipped to Egypt, on the way to which many of them died of hunger or by shipwrecks.<sup>4</sup>

1. Dio Cassius, Hist. 69.13.

2. Eusebius Hist. Eccl. 4.6.

3. Dio Cassius 69.14.

4. Jerome-Ad Zechar. 11.15; Ad Jerem. 31.15; Chronicon Paschacale. (quoted by Schürer).

In honour of his victory Hadrian was a second time greeted as imperator;<sup>1</sup> and Julius Severus gained the ornamenta triumphalia.<sup>2</sup> But so great had been the losses sustained by the army that Hadrian in his letter to the senate significantly omitted the customary phrase "I and my army are well."<sup>3</sup>

After the war the process of building a city on the ruins of Jerusalem was completed. The new foundation was given the constitution of a colony without the jus Italicum; its official title was "Colonia Aelia Capitolina." All Jews were expelled from its environs and if any were found there he was put to death.<sup>4</sup> Jupiter was the deity chiefly worshipped, but Bacchus, Serapis, Astarte (Aphrodite) and the Dioscuri appear on the coins.

Under Antoninus Pius, Hadrian's successor, another revolt started, but was suppressed by strong measures.<sup>5</sup> The emperor had apparently the alternative of permitting circumcision to the Jews, or of exterminating them. He lifted the ban in their case, while continuing to uphold it by penalties in that of Gentiles,<sup>6</sup> which meant that the Jews were permitted to practise their religion but not to propagate it.

A similar attitude was taken by later emperors, even by those hostile to the Jews. Their worship continued to enjoy the

1. C.I.L. t. 6. n. 975, 976. (S.H.P.)

2. C.I.L. t. 3. n. 2830. (S.H.P.)

3. Dio Cassius 69.14.

4. Justin: Apol. 1.47: Dial. cum Trypho 16.92: Tertullian, Adv. Jud. 13. (quoted by Schürer.)

5. Capitolinus, Antoninus Pius, 5.

6. Digest 48.8.11. (S.H.P.)

formal protection of the state, they were allowed, as formerly, to administer their own funds, and to continue to send the sacred tribute to the patriarchate at Jamnia. (Not till the close of the fourth century did this begin to be checked.) In the later imperial times the permission to try civil cases was still given.

During these years and afterward, the tendencies to Pharisism and Rabbinism which became so prominent after the fall of Jerusalem in A. D. 70, became only more deeply entrenched in Jewish hearts.

Throughout the three hundred years and more that Rome had dealt with the Jews, they had continually turned their face away from her. She might affect them favourably or adversely by making her power felt upon their daily life and upon their institutions for good or ill, but she could not touch the inner springs of their national life, and as long as she was beaten here, her government could never achieve its wonted triumph. Other nations had been conquered, tamed, and made to love the Roman yoke, and to regard themselves as part of her empire, But Judaism which was of so hard a nature that it might be shattered, or annihilated, but not bent by any of the means that Rome used, was never tamed, and hence never assimilated. Had Rome possessed a winning and subtle weapon like the Hellenism of an Alexander the result might have been somewhat different. As it was, for all her wisdom and power she might make the Jews her slaves, but could never



make them her citizens. She had first conquered them under Pompey, then ~~given~~ them a limited government under the Herods; when this was no longer practicable she had allowed them to live by their own institutions under the supervision of her governor; and when all experiments were signally unsuccessful she finally took away all freedom of political government, and ground them to an outward submission. But still the Jew was unconquered, and after it all Rome had to admit that she had failed.

Though Rome had not conquered the resistance of Judaism, this did not mean that the Jews did not come out of <sup>the</sup> contest <sup>with</sup> impaired. Henceforth Rome as she had begun, continued to be averse to Jewish law, and the Jews were still averse to Roman law. This distress of circumstance and this spirit of indomitable loyalty to their City and Religion, appear side by side in the quotation from Jerome<sup>1</sup>, written about the beginning of the fifth Century, with which Emil Schürer closes his "History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ:"

"Up to the present day the faithless country-folk --- are forbidden to enter Jerusalem, and they buy with money the privilege of weeping over the ruin of their city. - - -You may see on the anniversary of the day on which Jerusalem was captured and destroyed by the Romans a mourning people flocking thither - broken down women and ragged old men.---

1. Jerome, Ad Zephan. l.15 sq.  
("also cp. Origen, In. Josuam Horn.17.1")

"Throughout the day they wail on their knees, and, with reddened arms and disshevelled hair bewail the ruin of their temple, a people wretched, yet not to be pitied; and the soldiery demand a reward to permit them to continue their wailing. Lamentations are made over the ashes of the sanctuary and over the ruined altar, and over the lofty corners of their temple."



Scanned by UBC Library

## Select Bibliography.

### Sources.

- DIO CASSIUS, History 68.32; 69.12-14
- EUSEBIUS, Church History (Eccl. Hist.) 4.2,6
- JOSEPHUS, Antiquities of the Jews, Bkk. 11-20; *Apion*;  
Life;  
Wars of the Jews.
- I MACCABEES,
- PHILO, Ad Flaccum;  
De Legatione Ad Caium, (in quotation)
- (Other sources referred to in the footnotes.)

### Literature.

- ARNOLD, W. T. "Roman Provincial Administration."  
Blackwell, Oxford, 1914.
- BURY, J. B. "The Student's Roman Empire."  
John Murray, London, 1922.
- EWALD, H. "A History of Israel." (Eng. Tr.) Vol. V.  
Longmans Green, London, 1874.
- HENDERSON, B. W. "The Life and Principate of the Emperor Nero."  
Methuen, London, 1905.
- JEWISH ENCYCLOPEDIA Funk & Wagnalls, New York, 1903. as below:-
- { REINACH, T. "Art, Diaspora" Vol. IV. P. 559 sq.
- { LAUTERBACH, J. Z. "Art, Sanhedrin" Vol. XI. P. 41 sq.
- MOMMSEN, T. "The Provinces of the Roman Empire from Caesar to  
Diocletian." Eng. Tr.  
Macmillan, London, 1909.
- MORRISON, W. D. "The Jews Under Roman Rule."  
T. Fisher Unwin, London, "Story of the Nations"  
series.
- REID, J. S. "The Municipalities of the Roman Empire."  
Cambridge Press, 1913.

RADIN, M.

"The Jews Among the Greeks and Romans."  
Jewish Publication Society, Philadelphia.

SHUCKBURGH, E. S.

"Augustus, Life and Times of the Founder of the  
Roman Empire." B. C. 63-A. D. 14."  
T. Fisher Unwin, London, 1905.

<sup>C</sup>  
SHURER, E.

"A History of the Jewish People in the Time of  
Jesus Christ." Eng. Tr.  
Clark, Edinburgh, 1910.



Scanned by UBC Library