

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Bachelor of Divinity

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

6-1-1955

A survey of Judeo-Roman relations, 162-4 B.C.A survey of Judeo-Roman relations, 162-4 B.C.

Paul L. Maier

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, maier@wmich.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv>



Part of the [Practical Theology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Maier, Paul L., "A survey of Judeo-Roman relations, 162-4 B.C.A survey of Judeo-Roman relations, 162-4 B.C." (1955). *Bachelor of Divinity*. 906.

<https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv/906>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Bachelor of Divinity by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

A SURVEY OF JUDEO-ROMAN RELATIONS

162 - 4 B.C.

A Thesis Presented to the Faculty
of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis,
Department of Historical Theology
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Bachelor of Divinity

by

Paul L. Maier

June 1955

Approved by:

V. M. Peterson
Adviser

C. L. ...
Reader

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
PART I	
HASMONEAN-ROMAN RELATIONS: ALLIANCE AND INDEPENDENCE	
II. JUDAS MACCABAEUS: THE FIRST ALLIANCE	5
III. JONATHAN: THE FIRST RENEWAL	13
IV. SIMON: THE SECOND RENEWAL	18
V. JOHN HYRCANUS: RENEWAL AND RESULTS.	23
VI. THE SUCCESSORS: INDIFFERENCE.	30
PART II	
ROMAN SUPREMACY IN JUDEA TO THE DEATH OF HEROD THE GREAT	
VII. POMPEY	34
VIII. HYRCANUS II: RISE OF THE HOUSE OF ANTIPATER.	48
IX. ANTIGONUS: THE LAST HASMONEAN	63
X. HEROD THE GREAT.	67
XI. CONCLUSION	80
BIBLIOGRAPHY.	86

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

And Judas heard of the reputation of the Romans, that they were powerful, and favored all who joined them, and established friendly relations with those who approached them, and were powerful.¹ (162 B.C)

And now all was full of slaughter . . . the Jews being slain by the Romans . . . of the Jews there fell twelve thousand, but of the Romans very few.² (63 B.C)

There has been much sentimental theorizing on this epoch of Jewish history. The Judeo-Roman alliances have been praised, condemned, and, in some cases, denied entirely. The fact that the above texts refer to events separated by a century of time obviates a priori any criticism of Roman "bad faith" or Jewish credulity in the alliances concluded between Jew and Roman from the time of Judas Maccabaeus to the invasion of Pompey. Unfortunately, the "alliance-misalliance" pattern is a commonplace of Hebrew history! One might dismiss the ententes in question as merely "stiff-necked" rejections by the Chosen of the prophetic injunction to trust in God rather than in man; but this makes light of real tragedy. For

¹I Maccabees 8:1 (American Translation).

²Flavius Josephus, Antiquities of the Jews (hereafter, "Antiq."), translated by A. R. Shilleto, The Works of Flavius Josephus (London: George Bell and Sons, 1889, xiv, 4, v. 4).

although these years marked a vigorous resurgence of Jewish independence, they terminated in a subjection of the Judean state which has lasted until our day.

One wishes that more information were available concerning Judea's political relations with the republic which would finally put an end to her chronic wavering between freedom and bondage. These relations, as described in I and II Maccabees and in the writings of Josephus, are highlighted by a succession of alliances each of which largely conforms to the following pattern: the Hasmonean³ in power wishes to defend his status and consolidate his gains; he follows the example of his forebears (except for the case of Judas) and sends gifts and envoys to Rome. Rome, in turn, glad to bolster a small, independent, nation against the larger Syrian enemy, agrees to the alliance in which she promises recognition and some tangible favor for the Jews. Later in the dynasty, Hasmonean "kings" will ignore Rome until Pompey appears on the eastern scene. At that moment, former alliances take second place to the political exigencies of a sovereign power. They are, in fact, forgotten.

Judeo-Roman relations from 162 to 4 B.C., then,

³or "Asmonean;" the dynastic name of the Maccabaeans, derived from "Hasmon," or "Asmon," the great-grandfather of Mattathias, I Maccabees 2:1.

constitute the "valley of the shadow" in Jewish history, but it does not require the racial nostalgia of a Jew to find interest in this period. The Christian searches here for the historical framework for the origin of his faith. The Roman historian discovers a drama which reflects the major movements in the end of the republic. The Jew, however, laments the contrast in this century and a half which opens with a free but embattled Judas Maccabaeus, yet closes with the death of a hated client-king of an alien dynasty in a state which has ceased to be independent.

The original sources for this era are chiefly the writings of Josephus, and I and II Maccabees. With due allowance for a degree of exaggeration and prejudice, they remain the best available. As Debevoise states:

Time after time from numismatic or written sources Josephus can be proved correct, even against such factually accurate writers as Tacitus. His apparent errors are only condensations.⁴

And Renan maintains, "almost always, when Josephus differs from the I Book of Maccabees, it is Josephus who is wrong."⁵ If we accept both statements, the sources must be nonpareil indeed!

In view of the nature of the original sources, this

⁴Neilson C. Debevoise, A Political History of Parthia (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1938), p. xxiv.

⁵Ernest Renan, History of the People of Israel, n. tr., (Boston: Roberts Bros., 1895), V, 108.

study has been placed more in the context of Jewish than Roman history. Judean domestic issues and eastern politics have been introduced only as a framework, however, in which to present the survey of Judeo-Roman relations.

Slightly more emphasis has been placed on the earlier period, 162 to 63 B.C., because less information is available on this epoch in contrast to the scholarship which has been directed toward the careers of Herod and of his father.

All dates in this study are to be understood B.C. unless otherwise stated.

PART I

HASMONEAN-ROMAN RELATIONS: ALLIANCE AND INDEPENDENCE

CHAPTER II

JUDAS MACCABAEUS: THE FIRST ALLIANCE (162-161)

When Antiochus III took Palestine from Ptolemy V in 200, he maintained the liberal treatment of the Jews which had characterized Egyptian as well as Persian policy. After his defeat at Magnesia, ten years later, the high priest, Simon II, built walls around Jerusalem, a gesture of independence which was to prove premature. Antiochus' son, Seleucus IV, was succeeded by his brother, Antiochus IV "Epiphanes" (175-164), who invaded Egypt a second time in 168. This was the occasion for Popilius Laenas' famous ultimatum, "ἔνταῦθα βουλεύου,"¹ as he drew the circle around Epiphanes. The result of this blasting of the king's plans led him to a battle of extermination against the Jewish religion,² and the cult of Baal Schamin was instituted in the Temple itself. The stage was set for the Maccabean revolt. A priest, Mattathias of Modin, and his five famous sons, John, Simon, Judas, Eleazar, and Jonathan,

¹Polybius, Histories, xxix, 11.

²Daniel 11:29-30 shows this connection: "he shall be grieved and return, and have indignation against the holy covenant."

began, in 167, the rebellion which led ultimately to the independence of the Jewish state. The details of this famous struggle need not concern us here except where they relate to the forthcoming alliance with Rome. It must be remembered that Rome was beginning to show very lively interest in the affairs of the eastern Mediterranean, a trend indicated by the summary action of Popilius. In 164, Judas won Jerusalem and purified the Temple on the famed "25 Chislew."³ His position was temporarily consolidated by the death of Epiphanes in the same year, when the new king, Antiochus V "Eupator" (164-162) and his regent-guardian, Lysias, were forced by the Roman Senate to reduce the Seleucid standing army.⁴ Yet Lysias attacked Jerusalem in 162, and would have hellenized the city but for the invasion of Philip, the lawful regent.⁵ Accordingly, Lysias offered the Jews peace and religious freedom. Never after this until 70 A.D. was the Temple worship seriously interrupted.⁶ The initial phase of the struggle had passed.

Antiochus V and Lysias both wrote letters to the Jews

³Flavius Josephus, Antiquities of the Jews (hereafter "Antiq."), xii, 7, 6; Wars of the Jews (hereafter "Wars"), i, 3, 35.

⁴Polybius, Histories, xxxi, 12.

⁵I Macc. 6:55-57; Antiq., xii, 11, 6.

⁶James Stevenson Riggs, A History of the Jewish People During the Maccabaean and Roman Periods (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1900), p. 44.

in which they confirmed this toleration. In connection with Lysias' letter, we have one earliest source with regard to formal Judeo-Roman relations, II Maccabees 11:34-36, in a letter sent to the Jewish senate at the same time:

Quintus Memmius and Titus Manius, envoys of the Romans, send greeting to the Jewish people. With regard to what Lysias, the king's relative, has granted you, we also give our approval. But as to the matters which he decided should be referred to the king [Antiochus V], as soon as you have considered the matter, send us word, so that we also may know what your intentions are. Good-bye. The hundred and forty-eighth year, Xanthicus fifteenth.⁷

This benign meddling was a foretaste of what would follow.

Judas would be satisfied with nothing less than political independence to complement the religious liberty which the Jews had already won; accordingly, the war continued. Antiochus V and Lysias were expelled by the king's cousin, Demetrius I "Soter," who had escaped from Rome where he had been held as a hostage. He installed Alcimus, the head of the Jewish Hellenistic party, as high priest. This the Hasmonean party could not stomach and therefore Demetrius sent Nicanor to enforce his appointment. Judas, however, met Nicanor's forces on the "thirteenth of Adar," 161, at Adassa, near Modin, where he killed Nicanor and cut down his nine thousand troops.⁸ With the renewed support of the

⁷Although II Maccabees is less reliable than I Maccabees, and in spite of the fact that Josephus does not refer to this communication, a conservative view is merited in this case. Roman legates at Antioch could well have favored the Jews.

⁸I Macc. 7:44-50; Antiq., xii, 10, 5.

Chasidim⁹ Judas again became head of the state.

There would be inevitable reprisals from Syria, and this probability could not have been overlooked by a realist of Judas' calibre. Syria would always be available to help the Hellenizers in Jerusalem; she represented a "yoke" which had to be lifted.¹⁰ Accordingly, Judas applied to Rome for help. In view of Rome's growing activity in the eastern Mediterranean, this was no unreasonable presumption on the part of Judas. He could surmise Rome's suspicion of Demetrius Soter, although the Syrian had finally induced recognition from the Senate; Judas also probably realized the peculiar position of Judea as a make-weight in Syrian politics; he was acquainted with the conscript fathers' penchant for favoring the "underdog"; he had already experienced Rome's favor through Nummius and Manius (if we may credit the account in II Maccabees).

Judas had heard of the Romans because their military success was by now the talk of the ancient world. Of Roman domestic affairs he seems to have known little, as evidenced by the preface to the account of the alliance in I Maccabees:

[Judas heard that the Romans] . . . built themselves a senate house, and every day three hundred and twenty men deliberated, constantly planning for the people,

⁹The conservative party which was to develop into the Pharisees.

¹⁰Judas sent representatives to Rome *ἀπέστειλε ἀποστόλους πρὸς ῥωμαίους* *ἐνταῦθα καὶ τὸν ἔπαυσε τὸν θυμὸν ἀπ' αὐτῶν* I Macc. 8:18.

that they might conduct themselves properly, and they intrusted the government to one man every year, and the authority over all their country, and they all obeyed that one man, and there was no envy or jealousy among them.¹¹

Judas therefore sent two ambassadors, Hupolemus and Eleazar, to establish "friendly relations, an alliance," and "firm peace," with the Romans;¹² also to beg the Senate to write Demetrius to cease further hostilities against the Jews.¹³ The Senate was pleased with the proposal and recorded the terms of the alliance on brass tablets which were set up in the Capitol; copies were also sent to Jerusalem. The principal provisions stipulated that the Jews were to help the Romans, and the Romans, the Jews, in times of war (*συμμαχία*) subject to the limitations: 1) "as Rome decides (*ὡς ἕδοξε Ρώμῃ*)"; and 2) "as circumstances required (*ὡς ἔνδραπος ἰσχυροῦς*)."¹⁴ Thus, "it practically depended on the pleasure of the Romans how far they should consider themselves bound by the agreement."¹⁵

That Rome should grant an alliance on these terms is extremely likely. The analysis of the political situation

¹¹I Macc. 8:15-16.

¹²I Macc. 8:17, 20.

¹³Antiq., xii, 10, 6.

¹⁴I Macc. 8:23-32 gives the full text of the alliance.

¹⁵Emil Schürer, A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ, translated by John Macpherson (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1891), I, p. 232.

which we ascribed to Judas, above, could well have obtained in fact. It was a general principle of Roman foreign policy to champion the cause of one nation in its disputes with others as a springboard to power.¹⁶ It is unlikely that the Senate expected tangible military assistance from the Jews on any large scale, although one authority hails the "high repute" of Jewish "courage and aptitude for war"¹⁷ in the East. "Jews" in the Roman estimation, probably amounted to little more than a "tribe of Syrian mountaineers grouped around a temple rock near Egypt."¹⁸ That this tribe was Semitic (i.e., of the same racial stock as the Carthaginians with whom Rome would war, in a decade, for the last time), has led to the conjecture that Rome wished to preclude a possible alliance of the Judeans with her hereditary enemy and thus welcomed Maccabean overtures.¹⁹ This is interesting but hardly possible.

The larger problem which superimposes itself on any discussion of Judas' alliance with Rome confronts us in the words of Renan:

¹⁶A. W. Streane, The Age of the Maccabees (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1898), p. 45.

¹⁷Claude Reignier Conder, Judas Maccabaeus and the Jewish War of Independence (London: A. P. Watt and Son, 1894), p. 153.

¹⁸Max Radin, The Jews Among the Greeks and Romans (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1915), p. 214.

¹⁹Conder, op. cit., p. 152.

we think this story, and the treaty that accompanies it, false and apocryphal. What is true is that the dynasty which succeeded Judas Maccabaeus always looked for support to the Romans; and this has led the official historian (I Macc.) to suppose the aforesaid treaty renewed subsequently.²⁰

Suffice it to say that while one must readily admit the possibility that Judas' relations with Rome are apocryphal, the consensus of research on the subject recognizes the probability of such an alliance. The Senate had a free hand in applying its terms; it was political rather than military in effect; it gave Rome a needed wedge into Syrian politics which was being dominated by that fugitive scamp, Soter; and, what is most significant, it cost Rome nothing but the recognition of Judean independence. The alliance cost

²⁰Ernest Renan, History of the People of Israel (Boston: Roberts Brothers, 1895), IV, p. 334. Schürer, op. cit., p. 232, defends the validity of the treaty by calling attention to a similar alliance of friendship between Rome and Astypalaea, 105 B.C. Michel S. Ginsburg, Rome et la Judée (Paris: Povolozky, 1928), p. 37, enlarges upon this defense. The best summary of this vexed question is found in W. O. E. Oesterley, A History of Israel (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1932), II, 238-239. Oesterley inserts the alliance after chapter nine of I Maccabees, rather than breaking the continuity of seven and nine by eight, the source of the treaty. He cites the arguments of Willrich against the treaty: 1) Recognition of the independence of the Jewish state would have been a deliberate cause for war with Syria; 2) no help came from Rome, so that Demetrius defeated and killed Judas. Edwyn Bevan, in a private communication to Oesterley, says:

the objections have no force in view of the fact that Rome behaved in exactly the same way in regard to the rebel Timarchus. It recognized him as king, but allowed him to fall before Demetrius unassisted. The Senate had indeed no intention of intervening by armed force in Syria; it only desired to embarrass Demetrius, and that it did by giving countenance to his enemies.

Judas nothing, but led her into a chronic reliance upon that recognition . . . a precarious kind of independence.

Rome fulfilled her obligations, on paper at least, and sent Demetrius the warning:

Why have you made your yoke heavy upon our friends and allies the Jews? So if they appeal to us against you again, we will do them justice and make war upon you by land and sea.²¹

By this time, however, Demetrius had sent Bacchides against Judas in retaliation for the death of Nicanor and the protagonist of Jewish independence lost his life at Elasa, April, 161, before he could hear of the success of his mission.²² The very fact that he had applied for help to Rome estranged the Chasidim who feared foreign entanglements and, therefore, deserted the Hasmonean cause.²³ This attitude is easily understandable when, even in our day, Ewald criticizes the alliance in his definitive history, "every one of the greater prophets of old would have lifted up his voice against it."²⁴

²¹I Macc. 8:32.

²²This, of course, is a conjecture on the assumption that Judas sent the embassy after the victory over Nicanor, two months after which he died.

²³Elisabeth Wormeley Latimer, Judas From Cyrus to Titus (Chicago: A. C. McClurg and Company, 1900), p. 150.

²⁴Heinrich Ewald, The History of Israel, translated by J. Estlin Carpenter (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1874), V, 323.

CHAPTER III

JONATHAN: THE FIRST RENEWAL (161-143)

With the death of Judas, Alcimus and the Hellenistic party resumed power in Judea while the Hasmonaean took cover and chose Judas' brother, Jonathan, as his successor.¹ After two unsuccessful campaigns against Jonathan, Bacchides grew tired of war, made peace, and returned to Antioch, leaving the Hasmonaean as licensed outlaws. The Syrians still controlled the citadel in Jerusalem. Roman intercession at Antioch may possibly have been a factor which contributed to this withdrawal.²

Rome had never forgiven Demetrius Soter. When Attalus II of Pergamum suggested recognizing some low-born Syrian, Alexander Balas, as son and heir of Antiochus Epiphanes, Rome agreed. The pretender landed in Syria in 153, civil war broke out, and Jonathan resolved to make the most of it. He was ardently wooed by both Demetrius and Balas, Demetrius promising military powers, but Balas, shrewdly sending a purple robe and golden crown, appointed him high priest.³

¹1 Macc. 9:23-31.

²Heinrich Ewald, The History of Israel, translated by J. Estlin Carpenter (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1874), V, 325.

³Flavius Josephus, Antiquities of the Jews (hereafter "Antiq."), xiii, 2, 2.

The priesthood was too much to resist; it insured the loyalty of the Chasidim⁴ and identified the Hasmonean house with the religious as well as political leadership of Judea. With Jonathan's support, Alexander defeated and killed Demetrius Soter in 150, but Balas himself was assassinated in 147, leaving the government to Demetrius II. Jonathan gained from him nearly all the privileges which his father had promised; but Demetrius treacherously turned on Jonathan who then transferred his allegiance perforce to Balas' son, Antiochus VI, and his counselor, Trypho. Demetrius invaded Palestine to halt the spreading power of Jonathan, but the Hasmonean forces overwhelmed him, 145, in a brilliant victory near Hazor in northern Galilee.⁵ Jonathan's position was not that of an ethnarch, nominally a vassal to the king of Syria, yet independent to the extent of concluding his own treaties.⁶

"And Jonathan saw that the time was favorable, and he selected men and sent them to Rome to confirm and renew friendly relations with them."⁷ Jonathan's motives for following his brother's policy are not hard to surmise. The

⁴Shailer Mathews, A History of New Testament Times in Palestine (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1904), p. 40.

⁵I Macc. 9:59; Antiq., xiii, 5, 8.

⁶Mathews, op. cit., p. 44.

⁷I Macc. 12:1.

alliance might have been a precautionary step in view of future operations which he would undertake, and which otherwise might have aroused Rome's suspicion.⁸ Again, Jonathan in his optimism might have wished to undergird his leadership by calling the world's attention to the state and religion of the Jews.⁹ If tangible results did not issue from the first alliance with Rome, this possibility would not have been a deterrent to Jonathan. No request is made by the Jewish envoys, Numenius and Antipater, beyond the message that Jonathan and the Jewish people had sent them to "renew friendly relations and alliance on their behalf as they had been before."¹⁰ The Senate confirmed "what had formerly been decreed," and gave the two Jews letters of safe conduct for "all the kings of Asia and Europe, and to the governors of the cities."¹¹

An immediate, practical, result of this renewal appears to have been a publicity campaign in every sense of the term. Jonathan's representatives seem to have taken "the long way home," using the letters of safe conduct to good advantage

⁸G. G. E. Oesterley, A History of Israel (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1932), II, 250.

⁹James Stevenson Riggs, A History of the Jewish People During the Maccabaean and Roman Periods (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1900), p. 65.

¹⁰"ἐναυγώσατο τῆν φιλίαν αὐτοῖς καὶ τῆν συμπαρίαν κατὰ τὸ πρότερον," I Macc. 12:4.

¹¹Antiq., xiii, 5, 8.

in showing the world that they were a favored nation in Rome's estimation. Jonathan had written a special letter to the Spartans at this time, ostensibly to renew an alliance made under the high priest Onias.¹² While the Spartan alliance is regarded as suspicious by many authorities, the letter contains a significant thought. Referring to the proffered alliance, Jonathan assures the Spartans, "we are in no need of this, since we find our encouragement in the speared backs that are in our keeping."¹³ It could well be that Jonathan realized from his brother's experience with the Senate that the self-sufficiency based on military power, which was Judea's crying need, must finally be met by the unaided Hasmoneans themselves. But let the world know, meanwhile, that the sanction of the supreme Mediterranean power rested on the embattled Jews. Who could predict whether that sanction might not, under the right circumstances, become something more than a moral force? This was a possibility which Jonathan could not disregard.

¹²Probably Onias I, according to Schürer who thinks, however, that this account might be hellenizing fiction. Emil Schürer, A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ, translated by John MacPherson (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1891), I, 250.

¹³I Macc. 12:19. Ginsburg regards these and other Jewish diplomatic relations as authentic. And if the "literary tradition gives rise to certain doubts, we must not forget that the correspondence between these two states [Judea and Sparta], as we possess it, was inevitably spoiled by two successive translations," Michael S. Ginsburg, "Sparta and Judea," Classical Philology, XXIX (April, 1934), 120.

The renewed alliance did not prevent Demetrius' preparations for another invasion of Palestine but Jonathan's forethought did. He pursued Demetrius to the borders of Syria and then returned to Jerusalem to strengthen its fortifications.¹⁴ Trypho, however, had not intended an independent Judea and, very probably incensed at Jonathan's entente with Rome¹⁵ as well as at his fortifying of Jerusalem, he marched against him with a large force. Under pretense of friendship, he induced the Hasmonaean to enter Ptolemais with only a small body-guard. It was cut down, and Jonathan taken prisoner, in 143.¹⁶

¹⁴I Macc. 12:24-35; Antiq., xii, 5, 10-11.

¹⁵Edwyn Bevan, Jerusalem Under the High-Priests (London: Edward Arnold, 1904), p. 107.

¹⁶I Macc. 12:41-53; Antiq., xiii, 6, 1-3.

CHAPTER IV

SIMON: THE SECOND RENEWAL (143-135)

It was left to Simon, the last of the five brothers, to crown the twenty-year struggle with success. Trypho demanded one hundred talents and Jonathan's two sons for the release of their father, and, although Simon met these demands, Trypho killed the Hasmonean and returned to Syria where he killed Antiochus VI as well.¹ Simon, therefore, sent an embassy to Judea's old enemy, Demetrius II, with rich presents and the proposal of an alliance against the common enemy. Demetrius granted pardon to the Jews, confirmed them in their possession of the fortresses, and remitted all tributes. A year later, moreover, Simon removed the last vestige of Syrian power in the citadel of Jerusalem, and well could I Maccabees exult, "the yoke of the Gentiles was taken away from Israel."² From this year, 143 B.C., the Jews began to reckon their own cycle. In a large national assembly in 141, the high-priesthood was confirmed to the Hasmonean line forever, "until there should arise a faithful prophet."³ As proof of his independence, Simon began to issue

¹1 Macc. 13:12-24.

²1 Macc. 13:41.

³1 Macc. 14:28 ff.

coins with the inscription, "רוּטְלִים קְדוֹשִׁים", Jerusalem the Holy," on the one side, and "שֶׁקֶל יִשְׂרָאֵל", Israel's shekel" on the other.⁴

It appears that the Jews were delighted with Simon for two reasons: 1) he had brought them independence; and 2) reconciled to the need for foreign alliances, they approved heartily his diplomatic relations with Rome.⁵ That the Romans "grieved" at the death of Jonathan and sent brass tablets on which they asked a renewal of the alliance, as I Maccabees would have it, is doubtful and surely contrary to their ordinary custom. For initiative in this respect would have been below Rome's dignity. What probably happened was that Simon sent Alexander, son of Jason, and Alexander, son of Dorotheus, under the leadership of the same Hemenius whom Jonathan had sent, as an embassy to secure the renewal of the covenant with the Romans. This time the Jewish legation brought a gift, a "shield of gold" valued at one thousand mines, or "fifty-thousand pieces of gold."⁶ The Senate gladly accepted this and renewed the alliance at the former terms

⁴This is numismatic evidence not contained in the sources. Emil Schürer, A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ, translated by John MacPherson (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1891), I, 257.

⁵I Macc. 14:25-26.

⁶Perhaps \$17,500, according to Shailer Mathews, A History of New Testament Times in Palestine (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1936), p. 54; Antiq., xiv, 8, 5, although Josephus refers this embassy to the time of Hyrcanus II, infra.

with these additions: letters were dispatched by the Senate in behalf of the Jews "to free cities and to kings, that their country and their havens might be in security, and that no one among them might receive injury;"⁷ moreover, foreign nations were instructed to hand over Jewish fugitives to Simon so that they could be tried in accordance with Jewish law.⁸ The Roman consul, Lucius, sent this as a Senatus consultus to the kings of Egypt, Syria, Pergamum, Cappadocia, Parthia, and to the smaller independent states in the East.⁹ The terms, times, and circumstances of Simon's relations with Rome are a subject of much dispute. All the authorities admit that Simon probably sought help from Rome, but the terms of the alliance as given in I Maccabees 15:15-21 are nearly identical with terms of the Senatus consultus which Josephus, in the Antiquities xiv, 8, 5, assigns to the time of Hyrcanus II, a century later. Each

⁷Flavius Josephus, Antiquities of the Jews (hereafter "Antiq."), xiv, 8, 5; cf. I Macc. 15:16-21.

⁸I Macc. 15:21. The tremendous significance of this clause is pointed up by Holtzmann, as quoted by James Stevenson Riggs, A History of the Jewish People During the Maccabean and Roman Periods (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1900), p. 92. This was the first attempt to restrict the blending of the Jews with the various nationalities which surrounded them. A religious and now legal bond was to maintain their connection with each other, and with the fatherland in particular.

⁹I Macc. 15:22 ff. lists twenty-three states as receiving the consultus.

source has its defense.¹⁰

The motives which led Simon and the Senate to renew the alliance continued the same. The letters of safe conduct given Jonathan's ambassadors may have been effective enough in publicizing Roman favor toward the Jews that more and stronger ones were desired; for it was "letters" again that the three ambassadors requested as the first practical indication of good faith regarding the renewed alliance.¹¹ Letters cost the Senate nothing; there was less chance now that the Jews would need military assistance, for Simon was virtually independent. Thus, Simon was the first Hasmonean

¹⁰The authorities in favor of Josephus: Willrich, quoted by Oesterley, adds, "it is quite possible that Simon did approach the Romans with a view to remaining on good terms with them." W. O. E. Oesterley, A History of Israel (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1932), II, 206. Renan grants Simon's application to Rome, but what is recorded in "I Maccabees 15:15-24 is undoubtedly untrue." Ernest Renan, History of the People of Israel (Boston: Roberts Brothers, 1895), V, 5.

The authorities in favor of the account in Maccabees: Ewald holds the view that "through the carelessness of Josephus, [the letter] is inserted in the wrong place. The 'ninth year of Hyrcanus' must be understood, 'the ninth year of Simon.'" Heinrich Ewald, The History of Israel, translated by J. Estlin Carpenter (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1874), V, 336; Mathews, op. cit., p. 56, Schürer, op. cit., p. 267, and Riggs, op. cit., p. 92 also share this view. Similar views held by Michael S. Ginsburg, Rome et la Judée (Paris: Povolozky, 1928), p. 59; and Heinrich Graetz, History of the Jews, translated by Bella Löwy (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1891), V, 525. Graetz quotes others in agreement.

¹¹The consultum itself is cited in I Maccabees 15: 16-21, and is addressed from the consul, Lucius, to "King Ptolemy," as a representative example of the various addressees in the eastern Mediterranean.

"to be recognized by the Roman Senate as a friendly independent ruler [Independent in fact.]"¹² But to say, as Graetz, "the Roman Senate was well aware that in granting protection it had taken the first step toward reducing it [Judea] to vassalage,"¹³ seems a little premature.

Meanwhile, in Syrian politics, Demetrius II had been captured by the Parthians in 139, leaving Trypho in control until Demetrius' brother, Antiochus VII "Sidetes," allied with Simon to defeat the usurper. Antiochus, with typical Syrian perfidy, turned on Simon but was repelled by him.¹⁴ It was left to a son-in-law of Simon, one Ptolemy, to end the career of the greatest Hasmonean by treacherously killing him and two of his three sons at a banquet in his fortress, Dok, in 135.¹⁵

¹²Robert H. Pfeiffer, History of the New Testament Times (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1949), p. 19.

¹³Graetz, loc. cit.

¹⁴Demetrius' general, Kendebeus, was defeated by Simon's son, John Hyrcanus, I Macc. 16:1-10; Antiq., xiii, 7, 4.

¹⁵I Macc. 16:11-17; Antiq., loc. cit.

CHAPTER V

JOHN HYRCANUS: RENEWAL AND RESULTS (135-105)

The plot which was to have killed the third son, John Hyrcanus, miscarried and left Judea a ruler who would add to the consolidation and independence inaugurated under Simon. Hyrcanus besieged the murderer of his father but was deterred from taking the fortress because Ptolemy threatened to throw his mother from the walls if an assault were made.¹ A new threat materialized in the invasion of Antiochus Sidetes who besieged Hyrcanus in Jerusalem for a year. At last, on the Feast of the Tabernacles, the Hasmonean asked Sidetes for a week's truce for observance of the festival. With peculiar leniency, the Syrian not only acceded to Hyrcanus' request, but agreed to a settlement on condition that the Jews deliver up their arms, pay tribute for Joppa and other newly captured cities, tear down their walls, and pay five-hundred talents indemnity . . . this when the citadel itself and the reestablishment of Syrian supremacy over Judea lay within Antiochus' grasp. Josephus attributed the Syrian's leniency to "piety toward the divinity," *τῆς πρὸς τὸ θεὸν εὐσεβείας*,² but, lover of Rome though he was, Josephus

¹Flavius Josephus, Antiquities of the Jews (hereafter "Antiq."), xiii, 8, 1.

²Antiq., xiii, 8, 2.

seems to have missed the point. Why, for instance, did Sidetes not retain the much coveted Joppa and other towns for Syria? Surely not because of piety.

Authorities agree that Antiochus' leniency can definitely be attributed to Roman interference! Whatever practical results the earlier alliances might have had beyond Rome's general, moral sanction (and we can never know for lack of evidence), here was an instance of a positive Roman reaction in behalf of the Judeans which elicited a marked response from Syria. We wish that Josephus would have said this; instead he has left us two texts³ from which Rome's relations with Hyrcanus can be derived.

The story would seem to be this. Hyrcanus had pressing reasons for wishing to fall in line with typical Hasmonean policy in renewing an alliance with Rome. This was in 135, before the fall of Jerusalem; Antiochus had taken Joppa, Gazara, and other important coastal towns.⁴ Accordingly, he sent three ambassadors to the Senate, Simon, Apollonius, and Diodorus, who laid these requests before the conscript fathers:

1. The renewal of the existing friendship and alliance.
2. That Joppa, Gazara, and the other cities which Antiochus had taken from them, contrary to senatorial decree, be restored to them; that Antiochus

³Antiq., xiii, 9, 2; xiv, 10, 22.

⁴This is the supposition which explains the following requests. Although not mentioned by Josephus, these towns were probably captured on Antiochus' march to Jerusalem.

- be forbidden to pass through their country; that Antiochus' war-time decrees be voided.
3. That the Romans send ambassadors who would survey the damage and make proper restitution to the Jews.
 4. That the usual letters of protection "to kings and commonwealths" be given them for the return trip.⁵

The Senate definitely acted on the first point and promised to consider the others when it had opportunity. Meanwhile the praetor, Fanius, gave the ambassadors money for the trip home as well as copies of the decree which would furnish safe-conduct.

The problem is the location of this passage. Josephus includes it after his account of Antiochus' leniency. But the Antiochus who is mentioned by the ambassadors must have been Sidetes, because "under no earlier Antiochus were the Jews in possession of the towns of Joppa and Gazara, and of the later kings there was none able to usurp any authority worth mentioning over the Jews."⁶ It is inconceivable that the ambitious Sidetes would have returned these towns if his hand had not been forced.

Inasmuch as the Senate put off the Jewish question, Hyrcanus probably sent a second delegation (which Josephus mistakenly included in a decree of the Pergamenes, Antiquities xiv, 10, 22), consisting of ambassadors named Strato, Aristobulus, Sosipater, and Apollonius (doubtless the same

⁵ Antiq. xiii, 9, 2.

⁶ Emil Schürer, A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ, translated by John MacPherson (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1891), I, 277.

Apollonius of the earlier group). The requests must have been the same or similar, for the Senate this time decreed:

1. Antiochus, the son of Antiochus, should not harm the Jews who were allies of the Romans.
2. All captured fortresses, harbors, and territory were to be restored. The garrison at Joppa was to be expelled, "⁷
3. The Jews were to have free use of their own harbors; other nations were required to pay toll, except Ptolemy of Egypt who was also a friend and ally of the Romans.⁸

A senator named Lucius Peltius insisted that the Senate really enforce the decree, which evidently it did if we may judge by Sidetes' leniency. Antiochus, of course, is Sidetes, son of Demetrius, not "son of Antiochus," because the Seleucid successors of Sidetes would not have represented a threat sufficient enough for Hyrcanus to call on Rome's aid. This must have been Antiochus VII Sidetes.⁹ Hasmonean policy of friendship with Rome thus succeeded where Hasmonean arms would certainly have failed. If, at last, alliance with the Senate would produce results such as these, then

⁷Antiq., xiv, 10, 22.

⁸In Josephus' context, all these provisions are related to the Pergamenes so that they, too, will ally with the Jews. They do.

⁹This is Schurer's construction, Schürer, *op. cit.*, p. 278, which is followed by other authorities: Shailer Mathews, A History of New Testament Times in Palestine (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1904), p. 60; James Stevenson Riggs, A History of the Jewish People During the Maccabean and Roman Periods (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1900), p. 100; Heinrich Graetz, History of the Jews, translated by Bella Löwy (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publications Society of America, 1893), II, 134; E. W. Latimer, Judea From Cyrus to Titus (Chicago: A.C. McClurg and Co., 1900), 172. Schürer's construction seems to solve more difficulties than others' views.

the consistent policy of Judas, Jonathan, and Simon formed the foundation for the friendship which a son and nephew would use to good advantage against an enemy which finally felt compelled by Roman threats. Hasmonean policy had become geared to a weak Syria and a strong Rome.

Subsequent relations of Hyrcanus and Sidetes were friendly. The Syrian's death in 128 left the throne open to his brother, Demetrius II, who was reinstated by the Parthians and ruled three years.¹⁰ Demetrius, however, was weakened by the revolt of Alexander Zabinas who was supported by Ptolemy VII Physcon. Under these circumstances, Hyrcanus conquered new territory, including Joppa according to the view of some authorities who place the delegation to Rome at this time.¹¹ Antiochus VIII Grypos (125-113) executed Zabinas, and then threatened Joppa in 120, thus causing the disputed delegation according to Ewald.¹² Antiochus IX Cyzicenos (113-95) allied with Ptolemy Lathyrus to prevent

¹⁰Antiq., xiii, 8, 4.

¹¹W. O. E. Oesterley, A History of Israel (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1932), II, 277. Oesterley maintains Willrich's construction. Hyrcanus is supposed to have taken Joppa after the death of Sidetes. He renewed the alliance with Rome and applied to her for protection when he found Demetrius advancing against Joppa. Hereupon Rome wrote what is quoted in Antiq., xiv, 10, 22, to "the free cities and to the kings," the "kings" being Demetrius, Zabinas, and Ptolemy.

¹²Heinrich Ewald, The History of Israel, translated by J. Estlin Carpenter (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1874), V, 364. I find no substantiation for this opinion.

Hyrcanus from taking Samaria and this is the occasion for Rome's interference according to Renan.¹³ At all events, Hyrcanus' conquest of Samaria, the ancient rival, marked his most important territorial addition since the defeat and forcible incorporation of the Idumaeans. Hyrcanus was supported in his extra-Judean efforts by the Sadducees who now emerged in contrast to the "little-Judean" Pharisees, a development of great consequence in the internal politics of the Jewish state.¹⁴

Judea at the end of Hyrcanus' reign "was probably more prosperous than at any time since the reign of Solomon . . . almost for the first time in its history, commerce began to be of importance."¹⁵ The Jews had definitely achieved status in the Mediterranean world during Hyrcanus' long administration. The importance of Rome's sanction in contributing to this new position has, perhaps, been underestimated. It appears that John Hyrcanus made better use of Rome's favor for propaganda purposes than any of his predecessors. In the Antiquities, xiv, 10, Josephus describes

¹³Ernest Renan, History of the People of Israel (Boston: Roberts Brothers, 1895), V, 34. According to Renan, if Rome did not stop this invasion it mitigated its effects. Most other authorities, however, follow Schürer, supra; cf. also Edwyn Bevan, "Syria and the Jews," The Cambridge Ancient History (Cambridge: The University Press, 1930), VIII, 530 f.

¹⁴Antiq., xiii, 10, 5-6.

¹⁵Mathews, op. cit., p. 69.

in his account of the diplomatic relations of Hyrcanus II with the Senate and Caesar, certain treaties which really belong to the time of Hyrcanus I, of which Schürer cited the one with the Pergamenes to explain Hyrcanus' embassy to Rome.¹⁶ It seems that sections twenty to twenty-five of this chapter should be assigned to the time of the first Hyrcanus.¹⁷ In that case, Hyrcanus communicated Rome's favorable decree to the Laodiceans (20), Milesians (21), Pergamenes (22), Halicarnassians (23), Sardians (24), Ephesians (25), and others, and secured remarkable exemptions¹⁸ and favorable dispositions toward his scattered subjects.

John Hyrcanus fell heir to the Hasmonean policy of friendship with Rome. In that sense he was not the original genius that Judas was. Yet no man before or after Hyrcanus capitalized on Roman favor as did he, to evoke from the Senate both serious intervention and protection as well as the favored respect of other nations issuing from that intervention. Hyrcanus had demonstrated that there was much to gain from the Roman republic; his successors would show there was much to lose.

¹⁶Supra, p. 26.

¹⁷So Ewald, op. cit., p. 364; Mathews, loc. cit., and others.

¹⁸These included freedom of worship on the Sabbath, exemption from military service, acquiring places of worship and the like.

CHAPTER VI

THE SUCCESSORS: INDIFFERENCE (105-69)

We hear of no further negotiations or embassies between Judea and Rome in the forty years before Pompey's arrival in Syria. This decided alteration in Hasmonean policy is due to the new position in which Judea found herself. No longer threatened by a powerful Syria, Judea would do some threatening of her own and this could hardly entice the Romans into the usual renewal of alliance and friendship. The Jews had obtained what they needed from Rome; hereafter they would satisfy their own needs in a rugged new type of independence. Once more Rome would interfere indirectly and help the Jews, but no longer out of love for them. After that she would interfere for the last time.

Aristobulus (105-104), son of Hyrcanus, was not content to share the state with his mother as his father had willed. After killing her, he imprisoned three of his brothers and killed a fourth.¹ He forcibly incorporated the Itureans of Northern Galilee into his kingdom, and, what would be most significant to Roman eyes, he assumed the diadem and title of "king," a practice which was followed by his brother and

¹Flavius Josephus, Antiquities of the Jews (hereafter "Antiq."), xiii, 11, 1.

the Hasmonean successors.²

Alexander Jannaeus (104-78) was freed from prison by the widow of Aristobulus, Salome Alexandra, who also married him. Wars of expansion and domestic revolt characterized the reign of "this valiant prince who does not seem to have thought much of Roman friendship."³ He attacked Ptolemais on the coast, was defeated by Ptolemy Lathyrus, but saved by Ptolemy's mother, Cleopatra III, who drove her son to Cyprus. After taking large territories east of the Jordan in 96, Alexander's armies met annihilation at the hand of the Nabateans two years later. This caused a Pharisee-inspired rebellion which called on the son of Grypus, Demetrius III Eucerus, to defeat Jannaeus. Again the Hasmonean was beaten, but his fate inspired patriotism in the Jews who rallied to his cause and Jannaeus regained his throne. After more trouble with Syria, Alexander added Transjordan to the expanding Judcan state, and, by the time of his death, he had nearly restored the kingdom of Solomon to his Jewish...

²Antiq., loc. cit.: "Ἀριστοβούλου τὴν ἀρχὴν εἰς βασιλείᾳ μεταθεῖναι δοῦναι, ἔκρινεν ἡρ ὄντω, διαζῶν πρῶτος ἐπιτίθειν," Strabo, Geography, xvi, 2, 40, claims that Alexander was the first to declare himself a king instead of a priest. It is likely that he overlooked Aristobulus' year of rule.

³Heinrich Ewald, The History of Israel, translated by J. Estlin Carpenter (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1874), V, 388. There may possibly have been a diplomatic trend away from Rome and toward Parthia at this time, according to Debevoise. Perhaps in the time of Sidetes some kind of agreement had been reached between the Jews and the Parthians, which may account for Hyrcanus' bold attacks on Syrian cities. Neilson C. Debevoise, A Political History of Parthia (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1938), pp. 95 ff.

subjects!⁴

Alexandra (78-69) succeeded her two husbands and ruled the state in a peaceful, prosperous prelude to the coming storm. She appointed her eldest son, Hyrcanus II, to the high-priesthood but could well anticipate trouble from the younger and more ambitious Aristobulus II. On his death-bed, Jannaeus had told her to conciliate the Pharisees and the queen followed his advice. After a systematic assassination of the Sadducean leaders who had crucified eight-hundred rebellious Pharisees in the reign of Jannaeus, the vindictive party gained access to the Gerousia (Sanhedrin) and banished its enemies.⁵ In opposition to Hyrcanus II who, as high priest, was associated with the party in power, the Sadducees held onto their fortresses and turned to Aristobulus II. The country was ready for civil war.

The foreign policy of Alexandra was assayed by the invasion of Tigranes of Armenia who besieged Ptolemais in 69. An expedition of Aristobulus against Damascus failed, but the Queen's embassies and gifts conciliated the new conqueror to the extent that he "gave them good hopes of his favor."⁶ Whatever this involved cannot be known, for once again it was Rome's intervention which saved the day. Tigranes

⁴Epitome of Antiq., xiii, 12, 1 to xii, 16, 1.

⁵Epitome of Antiq., xiii, 16, 1-6.

⁶Antiq., xiii, 16, 4.

received the news that Armenia was being laid waste by Lucullus and thus he was forced to withdraw. Again it was Rome acting in Judea's interest, but indirectly this time, and certainly out of no friendship for the Hasmoneans.

While it is not possible accurately to appraise Rome's feelings toward the Jewish state at this time, it is well to bear in mind: 1) there was little basis for friendship since the alliance had not been renewed in sixty-five years;⁷ 2) the assumption of the regal title had not had Rome's approbation; 3) Alexander Jannaeus' impetuous conquests had added to the unrest in the East and must certainly have been offensive to Rome;⁸ 4) Rome may have suspected Jannaeus' possible friendship with the Parthians. This was a poor time for the Jewish state to evoke Rome's mistrust whatever the basis for that suspicion might have been. Roman power was now represented in the East by troops as well as consulta. It was much too late to renew the old "friendship and alliance" of the heroic Hasmonean era.⁹

⁷This calculation posits the second embassy of Hyrcanus in 135-134 B.C.

⁸Hugo Willrich, Das Haus Des Herodes Zwischen Jerusalem und Rom (Heidelberg: Carl Winters Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1929), p. 13. In Willrich's words, "der rücksichtslose Vernichtungskampf Alexanders gegen das Griechentum den Römern /muss/ sehr unangenehm gewesen sein."

⁹Rather than conclude with a summary of pre-Pompeian, Hasmonean-Roman relations at this point and break the continuity of the survey, I have included this in the general summation at the end.

PART II

ROMAN SUPREMACY IN JUDEA TO THE DEATH OF HEROD THE GREAT

CHAPTER VII

POMPEY (69-63)

With the death of Alexandra in 69, war immediately broke out between Hyrcanus II and his brother, Aristobulus II, a struggle which was to continue intermittently until it deprived Judea of its hard-won independence. Aristobulus, much the more popular, defeated Hyrcanus at Jericho and within three months the brothers agreed that Aristobulus would take the kingdom and the high-priesthood¹ while Hyrcanus would content himself as a mere private citizen enjoying his fortune. At this point every good Jewish historian of the "old school" adds some such phrase as, "would that this arrangement had been allowed to continue," or, "but for Antipater's interference Judea would have retained her independence!"

If the first Hyrcanus practised the first intolerance

¹Flavius Josephus, Antiquities of the Jews (hereafter "Antiq."), xiv, 1, 2; Wars of the Jews (hereafter, "Wars"), i, 6, 1. Graetz maintains that Hyrcanus retained the high-priesthood, Heinrich Graetz, History of the Jews, translated by Bella Löwy (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1893), II, 58. Per contra: Emil Schürer, A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ, translated by John Macpherson (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1891), I, 314, and others.

attributable to the Jews of that era when he forcibly incorporated the Idumaeans,² his son, Alexander Jannaeus, made a greater "error" in appointing an Antipater as governor or general, *επαρχὸς*,³ of Idumaea. For his son, also named Antipater, re-ignited the civil war which brought Roman domination, and fathered the son who would put an end to the Hasmonean dynasty. The younger Antipater inherited his father's prerogatives as governor and determined to seek power for himself. The indolent Hyrcanus could easily be controlled and so he installed himself as champion of the former high-priest's cause in 65. The sluggish Hasmonean would have none of it at first, but Antipater assured him that his life was in danger and that Aretas III stood ready to aid his cause. Accordingly, Hyrcanus fled with Antipater from Jerusalem and was received at Petra by the Arabian king who pledged his aid on the condition that Hyrcanus return to the Arabians the twelve cities taken from them by Alexander Jannaeus, if successful. He readily agreed, and the three invaded with fifty thousand men. Aristobulus was defeated and was forced to retreat to the Temple mount where he was besieged by

²See p. 28; cf. Graetz, *op. cit.*, p. 8.

³*Antiq.*, xiv, 1, 3; *Wars*, i, 6, 2. Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History*, i, 6, 4, prefers Africanus' view of Herod's origin, i.e., that Herod's father Antipater was the son of Herod of Ascalon. Schürer, *op. cit.*, p. 314, corroborates Josephus.

Aretas and Antipater. Meanwhile, word came that Pompey's general, Scourus, was coming from Damascus into Judea.⁴ This was a "bolt from the blue" which irrevocably changed Jewish history! This was the first time that Roman power had intruded on Judean soil and would not be the last.

That the arrival of Scourus was one of the very critical moments in all of Hebrew history is a fact duly appreciated by most of the authorities, some of whom (the old school) reserve their choicest imagery for the occasion. No one has outdone Graetz whose history is a classic in the field. Of Rome's arrival he says:

The hour had struck when the Roman eagle, with swift flight, was to swoop down upon Israel's inheritance, circling wildly around the bleeding nation, lacerating her with cruel wounds and finally leaving her a corpse. It was a beast with iron teeth, brazen claws and a heart of stone, that should . . . come upon the Judean nation to drink its blood, eat its flesh, and suck its marrow.⁵

Or, more subtly:

Rome resembles an unfaithful guardian, who takes infinite care of the property of his ward, only to gather riches for himself.⁶

The latter image is excellent for metaphors but hardly obtains in fact. Rome had long ceased her "guardianship," and the "ward" had been out fending for himself.

With the dissolution of the Seleucids, a power vacuum

⁴Epitome of Antiq., xiv, 1, 4 to xiv, 2, 3.

⁵Graetz, op. cit., II, 61.

⁶Graetz, op. cit., I, 525-526.

remained which three nations were to fill: Rome, by reason of the bequest of Pergamum; Pontus, under Mithradates; and Armenia, under Tigranes who, in 83, incorporated Northern Syria. Nine years later, Nicomedes III of Bithynia died and willed his kingdom to Rome as Attalus III had done, but Mithradates invaded Rome's property and precipitated the Third Mithradatic War, 74-63. Lucullus, who had indirectly relieved Alexandria, had left Mithradates at large and was removed in favor of Gnaeus Pompey, who shattered Mithradates' army in 66 and made peace with Tigranes. Pompey then turned his attention to the Syrian problem and would soon "put an end to all the wretched divisions, local dynasties, and bands of foreign mercenaries under which the Syrian Empire was perishing."⁷ Roman police power was to salvage order out of chaos.⁸

Meanwhile Scaurus, who had been sent ahead to Damascus while Pompey set up his winter quarters in Antioch, 65,

⁷Ernest Renan, History of the People of Israel (Boston: Roberts Brothers, 1895), V, 125.

⁸The Romans "waren als Polizei der Vorsehung unentbehrlich Syrien wäre von den kleinen Räubern verzehrt worden, wenn nicht die grossen eingeschritten wären." J. Wellhausen, Israelitische und Jüdische Geschichte (Berlin: Druck und Verlag von Georg Reimer, 1901), p. 293. More positively, Pompey wished a cultural reconstruction as well, according to Willrich: "Kein Zweifel, dass Pompey ehrlich gewillt war, statt der bisher von Rom im Orient getriebenen Zerstörungspolitik aufbauende Arbeit zu leisten." Hugo Willrich, Das Haus des Herodes zwischen Jerusalem und Rom (Heidelberg: Carl Winters Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1929), p. 5.

found that Lollius and Metellus had the situation in hand; therefore he pushed on into Judea.⁹ Aristobulus and Hyrcanus each sent embassies to intercept the general and thus resurrected the old Hasmonean policy to meet the new situation. The trouble was that every princeling in the East was doing the same thing. It was the time for covering submission before the new Potentate, or, even more humiliating, before the Potentate's representative.

For Scaurus' favor and support, Aristobulus' embassy offered four hundred talents¹⁰ and, not to be outdone, Hyrcanus' offered the same.¹¹ For the practical consideration that the citadel would be difficult to take and Aretas' forces easy to scatter, Scaurus decided in favor of Aristobulus. He ordered Aretas to withdraw unless he wished to be "πολεμίου ῥωμίων." Aretas obeyed but was pursued by Aristobulus who dealt him a serious defeat on his way homeward. In this way Aristobulus gained two years of grace; but he must have known that Scaurus' favor was merely temporary, because he

⁹Graetz thinks that Scaurus was an opportunist who hoped to exchange an insignificant position at home for a powerful one abroad, Graetz, op. cit., II, 61. Renan mentions the fact that Tyre raised a statue to him, Renan, op. cit., V, 125.

¹⁰Antiq. xiv, 2, 3; Wars i, 6, 2-3, however, states that Aristobulus alone gave three hundred talents.

¹¹The Hyrcanus delegation likely knew that Scaurus' decision would be subject to review by Pompey and therefore offered no more than the delegation of Aristobulus, according to A. H. M. Jones, The Herods of Judaea (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1938), p. 19.

sent Pompey a "golden vine" worth five hundred talents.¹²

Shortly thereafter, Antipater met Pompey on behalf of Hyrcanus while a Nicodemus represented Aristobulus. The latter accused Scaurus of taking the four hundred talents and another legate, Gabinus, three hundred. This injudicious action must certainly have estranged Scaurus and Gabinus from the cause of Aristobulus. Pompey ordered discussion of the problem in the spring of 63 B.C. At that time he broke his winter quarters and advanced on Damascus where he was met by Aristobulus, Hyrcanus, and Antipater, in person, as well as by a third group representing the Jewish people. Hyrcanus presented his case:

1. He was the elder brother and Aristobulus had deprived him of his rightful prerogative.
2. Aristobulus was responsible for the raids (ἄστυδρομίες) which had been made into neighboring countries and also for piracy at sea (τὰ περιπλοκήρια καὶ ἐν τῇ θάλασσῃ).
3. But for Aristobulus, there would have been no revolt.¹³

Antipater provided a group of one thousand Jews who corroborated these statements. Aristobulus defended his coup by referring to Hyrcanus' "weak, contemptible nature" which was not fit to govern. The third group opposed both brothers because they had transformed the state into a monarchy and it asked for a return to the old government of the high

¹²Antiq. xiv, 3, 1: ἡ χρυσοῦς ἄμπελος. In the context, Josephus says that Strabo had seen this vine, or "garden," deposited in the Capitol.

¹³Antiq., xiv, 3, 2.

priest and Cercusia.

Hyrcanus' second argument about raids and piracy must certainly have had some effect on the original Bane of the buccaneers, and he condemned Aristobulus for his violent proceedings.¹⁴¹ Moreover, Aristobulus' case had been seconded by an insolent and overbearing group of supporters which added to the bad impression. Pompey ordered the brothers to keep the peace and promised a decision after his campaign

¹⁴¹I find very little emphasis given this point by the authorities, but it seems very important. It possibly furnishes not only a motive for Pompey's undoubted preliminary decision in favor of Hyrcanus, but also one of the major considerations for Pompey's intervention in Palestine in the first place. After each side had stated its case, Pompey's only partial reaction was to condemn Aristobulus' violence, *Βίβλ. Antiq.*, xiv, 3, 3. In the parallel account in the *Wars*, i, 6, 4, the chief objective of the hyrcanus delegation was to engender in Pompey a detestation of the violence of Aristobulus, *ἡλικίαι αὐτῶν ἡ βία*. The context strongly indicates that *βία* refers to all three aspects of Aristobulus' behavior in Hyrcanus' case, *supra*. Pompey was all but convinced by this presentation for, after the conference, "he paid great attention to Aristobulus, lest he should make the nation revolt," *Antiq.*, *loc. cit.* The subsequent actions of Aristobulus also betray the force of the arguments against him. Now *βία* was bad enough when it caused civil discord (arguments one and three), but when it was demonstrated by "raids" and "piracy" beyond the territorial limits of Judea (argument two), then the intervention of Roman police power could be expected. Pompey was, no doubt, well aware of this brigandage and it may well be one of the major causes for his intervention in Judea. Too many authorities simply dismiss the causes of Pompey's intervention with a phrase such as Graetz's, "the quarrel between the two brothers gave Pompey an excellent means for adding another conquest to his long list of triumphs," *op. cit.*, II, 63. Indeed, Dio Cassius, xxxvii, 15, 3, says that Pompey invaded Palestine "because its inhabitants had ravaged Phoenicia, *ὡς καὶ τῶν ἑοικέντων ἡλικίων ἡλικίαι αὐτῶν*." Strabo, *Geography*, xvi, 2, 40, says that after Pompey destroyed the Temple, he also removed the "haunts of robbers" and the "treasure-holds of tyrants, *ἀσκήρια... τῶν τυραννίδων*" Only Willrich, *op. cit.*, p. 7, hints at this cause.

against the Nabataeans. Probably already decided in favor of Hyrcanus, Pompey did not want a hostile Aristobulus to cut him off while he was campaigning against Aretas.¹⁵ That Aristobulus had reason to believe he had come out second best in Pompey's estimation is shown by his vacillation between force and conciliation. He went as far as Dium with Pompey, but then fled to the fortress of Alexandrium where he was compelled to surrender.¹⁶ Pompey had now postponed his Nabataean campaign in order to settle the pressing Judean problem first. Aristobulus fled in rebellion to Jerusalem to prepare for war while Pompey approached the capital from Jericho. The wavering Hasmonean came out to meet him and offered money and the surrender of the city if Pompey would cease hostilities. Pompey agreed and sent Gabinius to receive what was promised. While the city was willing to receive Rome and avoid bloodshed, the soldiers of Aristobulus closed the gates against Gabinius. The enraged Pompey threw Aristobulus in chains and was admitted into Jerusalem by the adherents of Hyrcanus. He proceeded against the Temple mount which the party of Aristobulus had prepared for resistance and besieged it for three months. By building a rampart from the north and capitalizing on the Jews' refusal to engage in

¹⁵"Pompey determined from the beginning that the weak-minded Hyrcanus was . . . better than the daring Aristobulus." Graetz, *op. cit.*, II, 64.

¹⁶*Antiq.*, xiv, 3, 3-4.

offensive operations on the Sabbath, Pompey's forces breached the fortress on the Day of Atonement (October, 63 B.C.), and killed twelve thousand Jews.¹⁷ Pompey and a few friends entered the Holy of Holies but did not remove the Temple-treasure of two thousand talents "on account of his regard to religion."¹⁸

The Roman epoch in Jewish history was inaugurated by Pompey's defilement of that sacred spot. The new master had arrived to end the eighty-year independence¹⁹ which Jewish heroes of another generation had wrenched from the hand of Syria. Drastic changes in government and territory were to be made, but much was left to continue. Pompey ordered the Temple cleansed and sacrifices were to be resumed the next day. The high-priesthood was restored to Hyrcanus (without the title of "king") as well as domestic control of the contracted territory.²⁰

Those who had instigated the war were beheaded. Judea was made tributary to Rome²¹ and its boundaries greatly

¹⁷Cornelius Faustus, Sulla's son, was the first to scale the wall, Antiq., xiv, 4, 4. The facts here are accepted by most of the authorities. Only Radin says, "the highly colored versions of Pompey's . . . storming of the temple are probably rhetorical inventions." Max Radin, The Jews Among the Greeks and Romans (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1915), p. 215.

¹⁸Antiq., xiv, 4, 4; Wars, i, 7, 6; Cicero said that it was to "avoid Jewish slander," Pro Flacco, ii, 1.

¹⁹Calculating from 143 B.C., the "first year of Simon."

²⁰Antiq., loc. cit.; Wars, i, 7, 7; Strabo, Geography, xvi.

²¹ἐνοτάθη ἡ πόλις Ῥωμαίου ἐπιγέου, Antiq., loc. cit.

reduced. The coast towns, the non-Jewish cities of Coele-Syria, the cities of Scythiopolis, Samaria, and others were placed under the rule of the governor of Syria, which now became a Roman province. Thus, Galilee, Perea, and Idumaea were retained.²²

Pompey placed Syria "from the Euphrates to Egypt" under the control of Scaurus while he himself returned, through Asia Minor, to Rome. Aristobulus and his two sons, Alexander and Antigonus, were taken along, but Alexander made his escape on the journey.²³ Aristobulus had to march in front of Pompey's chariot in 61 at his triumph in Rome.²⁴ Besides the former king and his family, Pompey had brought many other Jewish captives with him who were later released and became the nucleus for a subsequently thriving community in Rome.²⁵

All Judeans did not regard Rome's arrival as a disaster. While it seems incorrect to describe Judea's reaction to Pompey solely in the terms of Renan, "there was not a trace of mourning or anger,"²⁶ or Radin, "Pompey . . . left a fine harvest of hate for the next generations to reap,"²⁷ the

²²W. O. E. Oesterley, A History of Israel (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1932), II, 302.

²³Antiq., xiv, 4, 5; Wars, i, 7, 7.

²⁴Appian, Mithradatic Wars, xvii, 117; Plutarch, Pompey, xiv, 4.

²⁵Before this, there were few Jews in Rome, Radin, op. cit., p. 27.

²⁶Renan, op. cit., p. 132.

²⁷Radin, op. cit., p. 64.

truth lies between these extremes. The Pharisees were pleased with the change because Rome's interference removed the military party and a dynasty hostile to them while it left religion untouched.²⁸ Pompey was no Antiochus Epiphanes but rather "acted in a manner that was worthy of his virtue."²⁹ To some he was a savior: the cities exploited by the Jews were repopulated to form the Decapolis during the years 64 to 62 B.C.³⁰ Peace and religious liberty descended on the land.

The people did not react to the change as readily as the Pharisees. Having once tasted freedom, the patriotic spirit lingered on in them and asserted itself in subsequent rebellions and in the Messianic hope.³¹ Although Pompey dealt more leniently with Judea than would some of his successors, the people could never forgive the general who had brought Roman rule.

* * *

The most important question in Judeo-Roman relations

²⁸Not that they had any love for Rome; Pompey was rather the "scourge of God" for punishing the Hasmoneans and restoring Pharisaic ascendancy.

²⁹καὶ τοῦτο τῆς ἡπὶ δόξῃς ἐπὶ αὐτοῦ ἐποίησεν, Antiq., xiv, 4, 4.

³⁰Many of the new settlers were pirates which Pompey had captured. Appian says he repopulated Μαδύρα καὶ Ἀγέραι, Mithradatic Wars, xvii, 115.

³¹"Dem gemeinen Mann war hart an's Herz gegriffen, und die folgende Zeit war nicht dazu geeignet, den Stachel aus der Wunde zu nehmen." A. Hausrath, Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte (Heidelberg: Verlagsbuchhandlung von Fr. Basserman, 1873), p. 123.

from 162 to 4 B.C. must, inevitably, be: Why did Rome, despite the history of alliances with the Jews, forcibly intervene and attach Judea to the province of Syria? Josephus answers simply:

Now the causes of this misery which came upon Jerusalem were Hyrcanus and Aristobulus by their being at variance with one another; for we lost our liberty and became subject to the Romans.³²

But had Pompey been friendly or neutral he should have restored the rightful claimant to his throne and withdrawn. The Hasmonean quarrel was rather the pretext for an intervention which Rome must have planned sometime before the arrival of Scaurus in 65.

The Hasmonean-Roman alliance, which had required five embassies in twenty-six years (161-135) to sustain it, would be little more than a memory after seventy years of diplomatic doldrums. Rome's attitude toward Judea had meanwhile changed from friendship to neutrality to suspicion, and this at a time when the entire political status of the Eastern Mediterranean had changed. All the previous advantages of a Judeo-Roman alliance would now be scorned by Rome. Syria was broken and this fact obviated the necessity of an independent Judea. Rome no longer found it requisite to favor smaller over larger nations because she was supreme. She could no longer capitalize on Judea's disputes with her neighbors, and these quarrels rather offended the nation which was

³²Antiq., xiv, 4, 5.

trying to drive *Bis* out of the Mediterranean. The son of the rampaging Jannaeus had evidently inherited his father's traits, for he had demonstrated his violence against his brother by deposing him, against neighboring lands by raiding them, and against shipping by piracy. The Hasmonean line could not be left with sovereignty or the peace of Syria would be destroyed. Why not include the troublesome state in the new province of Syria? In this way Rome could round out her control of the eastern Mediterranean³³ and, with liberal treatment of the Jews, she could gain a coign of vantage for future operations against Arabia and Egypt. Why, moreover, should Judea merit a settlement different from the rest of Syria? Actually,

the Romans, who had entered into the heritage of the Seleucids, regarded Judaea merely as a part of the Seleucid realm which had, for a brief space, asserted its independence.³⁴

Or, as Ginsburg summarizes the situation:

There existed at the frontier an independent Jewish state, which, in the course of one century, had defended with obstinacy its rights to liberty and which had not ceased for a moment to war against a much more powerful adversary; it might undertake what could cause undesirable complications in the future. . . . /And of the alliance: we do not believe that the existence of this treaty would have made the cold Roman politicians renounce the decision once taken. The events

³³The Jewish state was too obvious an exception. "When all was conquered, the Jewish nation alone still resisted, and Pompey conquered them." Appian, Syrian Wars, viii, 50.

³⁴Oesterley, op. cit., 332.

which materialized in Judea during the war of Pompey against Mithradates were of a nature to facilitate the intervention of Rome in the affairs of Judea.³⁵

Rome had the pretext and she inaugurated a subjection of the Judean state which has lasted until our generation.

³⁵Michael S. Ginsburg, Rome et la Judée (Paris: Fovolozky, 1928), p. 80. This excerpt was translated by the author of this survey.

The newly-arrived proconsul of Syria, Gabinius, besieged him at the stronghold of Alexandria until a breach was made and he was taken. Antiochus' strength though, Aristobolus gave up his surrender and was granted freedom. Since Herodotus was unwilling to stop movements like these, Gabinius took the political administration out of his hands and divided Judea into five districts, *chorae*, with capitals at Jerusalem, Jericho, Caesarea, Antioch, and Sephoris.² Thus the remains of political independence were removed from the Hasmoneans, and Herodotus had to content himself with priestly functions.

A year later, Aristobolus and his son, Antigonus, escaped from Rome and tried their hand at rebellion. Pitholeus, the commander at Jerusalem, joined them, but after a two

²Flavius Josephus, Antiquities of the Jews (hereafter "Antiq."), xv, 2-31. Antiq., xv, 2-31.

³Antiq. xiv, 7; Flavius Josephus, Wars of the Jews (hereafter "Wars"), I, 8, 5. The *chorae* may be regarded as either customs districts, or districts marking the jurisdiction of law courts, according to G. A. S. Castorley, A History of Israel (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1932), 11, 135.

CHAPTER VIII

HYRCANUS II: RISE OF THE HOUSE OF ANTIPATER (63-40)

Scourus was succeeded in Judea by M. Philippus and L. Marcellinus but nothing of note occurred until 57 when Alexander, the son of Aristobulus who had escaped on his way to Rome, organized a rebellion with an army of ten thousand men. The newly-arrived proconsul of Syria, Gabinius, besieged him at the strong-hold of Alexandrium until a breach was made and he and M. Antony¹ stormed though. Aristobulus gave up his fortresses and was granted freedom. Since Hyrcanus was powerless to stop movements like these, Gabinius took the political administration out of his hands and divided Judea into five districts, *ἐνομοτοχία*, with capitals at Jerusalem, Jericho, Gazara, Amathus, and Sepphoris.² Thus the remains of political independence were removed from the Hasmoneans, and Hyrcanus had to content himself with priestly functions.

A year later, Aristobulus and his son, Antigonus, escaped from Rome and tried their hand at rebellion. Pitholaus, the commandant at Jerusalem, joined them, but after a two

¹Flavius Josephus, Antiquities of the Jews (hereafter "Antiq."), xiv, 5, 2-3; Plutarch, Antony, iii, 1.

²Antiq. xiv, 5, 4; Flavius Josephus, Wars of the Jews (hereafter "Wars"), i, 8, 5. The *ἐνομοτοχία* or *ἐνομοτοχία* "may be regarded as either customs districts, or circuits marking the jurisdiction of law courts," according to W. O. E. Oesterley, A History of Israel (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1932), II, 335.

year siege at Machaerus, Aristobulus was forced to yield and again he was taken to Rome as prisoner. The Senate allowed the two sons to stay in Judea.³

Gabinus began an expedition against the Parthians, but Ptolemy XI Auletes bribed him instead to invade Egypt and to place himself on the throne. When Gabinus took up this campaign, Alexander determined to drive the Romans out of Judea and raised a larger rebellion, in 55, than his futile attempt two years before.⁴

Antipater, meanwhile, was becoming the power behind Hyrcanus. The Idumaean maintained a constant policy throughout his life-time and passed it on to his son, Herod, who, in turn, carried it through to his death. That tactic was simply this: to serve and conciliate Rome and whichever Roman happened to be in power at the time. Rome, in turn, would reward this persevering loyalty with a grant of political power at the expense of the Hasmoneans. It was a policy of subservience to Rome, but supremacy at home. It would lead ultimately to a transfer of monarchy itself from the Hasmonean dynasty to the house of Antipater, but only after the Idumaeans walked a political tightrope in trying to support the right Roman master at the right time.

Above all, Antipater had to demonstrate to Rome that he

³Antiq., xiv, 6, 1; Wars, 1, 8, 6.

⁴Antiq., xiv, 6, 2; Wars, 1, 8, 7; Dio Cassius, xxxix, 56, 6.

would not only prove loyal, but that he could maintain order in the turbulent Judean state as well. Scaurus had been the first Roman whose favor Antipater had gained. He had invaded Nabataea as Pompey had planned, but his armies were stranded for lack of food; Antipater saved the day not only by supplying provisions, but also by using his good offices to settle the struggle.⁵ Gabinus was next secured; Antipater had aided in quelling the revolt of Aristobulus in 57 and now not only furnished him with provisions for the Egyptian campaign, but won over the Jews who held the passes on the route to Egypt.⁶

Meanwhile Alexander's revolt was attracting a large following and again Antipater had the opportunity of demonstrating his indispensability to Rome. He curbed its spread and enabled Gabinus to administer the final blow against Alexander at Mount Tabor, when again the Roman treated him with leniency.⁷ Antipater, however, was to have his reward. "Gabinus settled the affairs which belonged to the city of Jerusalem as was agreeable to Antipater's wishes."⁸ Later Josephus calls him "superintendent" or "first minister" of

⁵Antiq., xiv, 5, 1; Wars, 1, 8, 1.

⁶At Pelusium. Antiq., xiv, 6, 2; Wars, 1, 8, 7.

⁷Antiq., xiv, 6, 3. The wife of Aristobulus II seems to have "established a personal ascendancy over Gabinus," according to A. H. M. Jones, The Herods of Judaea (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1938), p. 25.

⁸"ὁ δὲ β' Ἀντιπάτρου βίβλος" Antiq., xiv, 6, 4.

the Jews;⁹ he probably served as officer of finance to Hyrcanus.¹⁰

In 54, the triumvir, Crassus, came to Syria as proconsul in place of Gabinus,¹¹ and forced Antipater to hand over to him the Temple treasure of two thousand talents gold and other effects worth eight thousand talents. His pretext was support of the Parthian campaign; his promise, to take no more than was "offered" him. The robbery by Crassus outraged the Jews and nothing pleased them more than the "act of God" at Carrhae in the following year, 53. The victory over Crassus increased the prestige of Parthia, particularly among the Jews who turned their eyes toward that state for deliverance from Roman oppression. A revolt was initiated by Pitholaus (for Aristobulus and Alexander seem to have wearied), but it was subdued by Cassius who had extricated Crassus' army from Mesopotamia and had succeeded him as proconsul. On the advice of Antipater, the rebel was put to death.

⁹ "Ἀντίπατρος ὁ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐπιμαχὲς ἐξ ἐντολῆς Ἰρκανοῦ" Antiq., xiv, 8, 1. Antipater never attempted to remove Hyrcanus from the high-priesthood and seems to have shown him the utmost respect.

¹⁰ Emil Schürer, A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ, translated by John MacPherson (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1891), I, 377. Jones, op. cit., p. 26, identifies the position as a "vizier."

¹¹ While Gabinus was notorious for his exactions, he was an enlightened man and the "restorer of Palestine" according to Renan. Ernest Renan, History of the People of Israel (Boston: Roberts Brothers, 1895), V, 164. Indeed, Josephus summarizes his administration as "ἀσπίς καὶ ἀσκήνη" as far as its military aspects were concerned, Antiq., xiv, 6, 4.

Judeo-Roman relations during the civil wars illustrate the importance of periferal provinces in determining the central issues of the republic. Most of the prominent actors in these struggles found their way into Syria and Palestine which thus became more the stage than the side-show of the great drama which was being unfolded. Antipater's policy was to remain on Rome's side, but the question of the day became, "Who is Rome?" "Whoever has the greatest imperium in the East" was the inevitable response which compelled Syria and Palestine to acknowledge four new masters in sixteen years, from Pharsalus in 48, to Actium in 32. The shrewd versatility of Antipater and Herod was to spare Judea much bloodshed.

In 49, after Pompey and the senatorial party had fled from Rome, Caesar rightly assumed the Antipater was Pompeian.¹² Accordingly, he released Aristobulus and gave him two legions with which to oppose Pompey's support in Syria, but adherents of Pompey in Rome poisoned the hapless Hasmonean. Shortly thereafter, the father-in-law of Pompey, Q. Metellus Scipio, apprehended Aristobulus' son Alexander in Antioch and beheaded him at Pompey's command.¹³

¹²It is not recorded that Antipater ever materially aided Pompey, but he must have gone along with the rest of the East in supporting him. Pompey's military reputation was high and he was expected to win. Jones, op. cit., p. 26.

¹³Scipio was proconsul of Syria, 49-48, and commanded the center of Pompey's army at Pharsalus. Antio., xiv, 7, 4; Wars, 1, 9, 1-2.

After his victory at Pharsalus in 48, Caesar had followed Pompey to Egypt but was detained there after Pompey's murder by a war with Ptolemy XII in which he soon found himself besieged in Alexandria. Mithradates of Pergamum started for Egypt in the spring of 47 with reinforcements to aid Caesar but was hindered at Pelusium. For Antipater and Hyrcanus, of course, Pharsalus had meant a change of loyalties and this was an ideal opportunity to ingratiate themselves with Caesar. Actually, for a moment the Idumaean became "one of the determining factors of universal history."¹⁴ He stormed Pelusium and cleared the way for Mithradates, wrote letters to the Egyptian Jews who responded to his importunities by provisioning the relieving forces, and thus turned the tide of the decisive battle which gave Caesar the victory.¹⁵

In the summer of that year, Caesar went to Syria and showed his gratitude in a generous manner. In spite of Antipater's obvious favor with the Roman, Antigonus, the only remaining son of Aristobulus, thought he had a case and appealed to Caesar that his father and brother had died in his cause.¹⁶ Antipater, of course, had only to remind

¹⁴Shailer Mathews, A History of New Testament Times in Palestine (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1904), p. 102.

¹⁵Antiq., xiv, 8, 1-3; Wars, i, 9, 3-5.

¹⁶Antiq., xiv, 8, 4; Wars, i, 10, 1-2. Antigonus also stated that Hyrcanus and Antipater were Pompey's nominees and governed the nation with violence.

Caesar of his recent, crucial, assistance in Egypt and Caesar made a settlement in favor of Hyrcanus-Antipater which restored to the Jews many of the privileges which Pompey had removed.¹⁷ Hyrcanus was confirmed for the tenth time in the high-priesthood, while Antipater was given Roman citizenship and freedom from tribute, that is, he could formally rely on Roman protection and Judea was immunized from taxation.¹⁸ Hyrcanus was also appointed ἑθνοάρχης and thus regained the political authority of which Gabinius had deprived him. Caesar gave Antipater "what position he himself should choose . . . so he made him procurator [ἑπιτρόπος] of Judea,"¹⁹ a formal confirmation of authority which made him independent of Hyrcanus. Rome could henceforth rely on Antipater to do all that was possible to retain order. Permission was also given Hyrcanus to rebuild the walls of Jerusalem which Pompey had destroyed, doubtless to protect both Hyrcanus and Antipater from domestic revolt.²⁰

¹⁷Caesar would doubtless have appointed Antigonus had not Antipater distinguished himself in his service. Theodor Mommsen, The Provinces of the Roman Empire From Caesar to Diocletian, translated by William F. Dickson (London: Macmillan and Co., 1909), II, 174.

¹⁸Antiq., xiv, 8, 3. "The Jewish kingdom obtained the best position which could be granted a client-state, complete freedom from dues to the Romans, and from military service and from levy." Mommsen, op. cit., p. 176.

¹⁹Antiq., xiv, 8, 5. "This is not . . . the Roman procuratorship of the imperial period, but an office formally [later] conferred by the Jewish ethnarch." Mommsen, op. cit., p. 174.

²⁰Cesterley, op. cit., p. 339.

There follows in the Antiquities, xiv, 8, 5, the account of the Jewish delegation to Rome with the golden shield, but this event is to be assigned to the time of Simon rather than that of Hyrcanus II.²¹ Further information on the relations of Caesar and the Jews is given in xiv, 10, 1-10, where Josephus summarizes the concessions which Caesar granted the Jews in the empire as well as in Judea.²² The documents cited, however, are "so slight and fragmentary that in regard to many particulars no certain conclusions can be reached."²³ Unquestioned, however, is Caesar's letter to the Sidonians, xiv, 10, 2, in which he substantiated his appointment of Hyrcanus as hereditary ethnarch and high priest with these prerogatives:

if at any time hereafter there arise any questions about the Jewish customs, I will that he determine the same. And I do not approve of their being obliged to find us winter quarters, or of any money being required of them.²⁴

Hyrcanus and his children were also declared "εὐαμείχους "

²¹Cf. supra, p. 20.

²²The question of why Caesar was so lenient to the Jews has frequently been answered with a view to the imaginative rather than the factual. In addition to the easy syncretism in Caesar's Rome, it has been suggested that Caesar recognized the weakness of a world-state whose people were denationalized and therefore favored the Jews as a counter-acting force. Norman Bentwick, "Rome and Judea," Menorah Journal, XXXVI (1948), 56.

²³Schürer, op. cit., p. 379.

²⁴Antic., xiv, 10, 2.

of Rome.²⁵

About the year 45,²⁶ Hyrcanus sent an embassy to Rome "to ratify the league of friendship and mutual alliance,"²⁷ but more specifically to seek further concessions from Rome. Early in 44, the Senate issued a decree which was not immediately recorded²⁸ and consequently a new decree was passed after Caesar's death during the consulship of Antony and Dolabella, April 11, 44 B.C. Since this edict (Antiq., xiv, 10, 9-10) is merely the formal statement, its contents must be assembled from other decrees, particularly that in xiv, 10, 6,²⁹ which contains the provisions that:

1. All Judea except Joppa was to pay tribute to Jerusalem, except during the Sabbatical year.
2. The same tithes were to be paid Hyrcanus and his sons³⁰ as before, the same privileges granted by towns.
3. No soldiers were to be raised or quartered in Judea.
4. The cities of the great plain were to be returned to the Jews.
5. Jewish ambassadors were permitted to sit with the

²⁵Antiq., loc. cit.

²⁶In Antiq., xiv, 10, 1, Josephus speaks of an earlier delegation being sent in 46, on the eve of the African campaign. No recorded results of diplomatic activity appear until 44, however.

²⁷Antiq., loc. cit.

²⁸Antiq., xiv, 10, 7.

²⁹This is Schürer's construction. Schürer, op. cit., p. 380-382.

³⁰It is significant that the names of Hyrcanus and sons appear in this treaty as distinct from the Jews. All previous treaties were concluded with "the Jewish people," the high-priest not being mentioned. According to Willrich, this was

senators at the gladiatorial fights, and could be assured of a reply from the Senate within ten days on diplomatic business.

Jews beyond Judea were granted free exercise of their religion;³¹ Alexandrian Jews were even granted Roman citizenship.³² These were exception privileges not enjoyed by the non-Jewish alien groups in the republic. Small wonder that the Jews would wail very loudly over the death of their benefactor.³³

Even these concessions, however, could not ameliorate the Jewish attitude toward Roman rule as represented in the person of the hated Idumaeen, Antipater. Fully aware of this sentiment but devoted to the cause of order, Antipater tactfully suggested to the Jews that they support Hyrcanus in the interests of domestic peace and prosperity, for the alternative would be a despotism under the high-priest and himself, while the Romans and Caesar would become "their bitter enemies . . . for they would never suffer him to be set aside whom they had appointed to govern."³⁴

intended to emphasize the monarchical character of the Jewish government as compared with its earlier, more republican forms. Hugo Willrich, Das Haus des Herodes zwischen Jerusalem und Rom (Heidelberg: Carl Winters Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1929), p. 25.

³¹In Antiq., xiv, 10, 8, Josephus cites Asia Minor.

³²Schürer, op. cit., p.380.

³³In Rome, "praecipueque Judaei . . . etiam noctibus continuis bustum frequentarunt." Suetonius, Caesar, 84.

³⁴Antiq., xiv, 9, 1.

Antipater implemented his administration by appointing his two sons, Phasael and Herod, as *επαρχοί* in Jerusalem and Galilee respectively.³⁵ Although only twenty-five, Herod faced his first challenge very successfully. A robber-chief named Hezekiah was making life miserable for the Romans in Galilee, but Herod, who was ambitious to secure favorable attention from Rome, quickly executed him and many of his followers.³⁶ While this measure gained him the favor of the Syrian proconsul, Sextus Caesar, it enraged both the Pharisees and the Sadducees who resented this violation of the prerogative of capital punishment which belonged to the Sanhedrin. At their demand Hyrcanus summoned Herod before that body and the young governor appeared, relying, no doubt, on his Roman citizenship in the event of an adverse decision.³⁷ Indeed, the Sanhedrin was about to condemn Herod when Hyrcanus adjourned it at the warning of Sextus Caesar to whom Herod presently fled. Consoled by the proconsul with the title, "*επαρχὸς τῆς κοίτης Συρίας*," Herod returned in vengeance against Jerusalem, but was restrained by Antipater and sent back to Galilee.³⁸

The next year, 46 B.C., while Caesar was fighting in

³⁵Antiq., xiv, 9, 2; Wars, i, 10, 4.

³⁶Antiq., loc. cit.; Wars, i, 10, 5.

³⁷Walter Otto, Herodes—Beitrag zur Geschichte des letzten jüdischen Königshauses (Stuttgart: J. B. Metzlersche Buchhandlung, 1913), p. 20.

³⁸Antiq., xiv, 9, 3-5; Wars, i, 6-9.

Africa, an adherent of Pompey, C. Bassus, secured the assassination of Sextus Caesar and assumed control of Syria. He was later besieged at Apamea by Caesarian forces under C. Vetus and by reinforcements from Antipater who thus had another opportunity of proving his loyalty to Caesar.³⁹ In 44, Caesar sent S. Murcus, the new governor, and M. Crispus, the governor of Bithynia, to aid the besiegers; but after the fateful Ides of March, others represented Rome in the East. Antony's hostility sent Brutus to Macedonia and Cassius to Syria. Upon the latter's arrival in 44, both the besiegers and the besieged at Apamea went over to Cassius.⁴⁰

While Antony and Dolabella maintained Caesar's policy of concession and favor to the Jews at Rome, Judea itself was coerced into another change of allegiance. Cassius had experienced Antipater's efficiency, and now assigned to him the collection of seven hundred talents as an exaction for his needs against Antony. Antipater and his two sons proved zealous in collecting this sum, particularly Herod to whom Cassius demonstrated his gratitude by reappointing him *στρατηγός* of Coele-Syria,⁴¹ assigning him both land and

³⁹ Antiq., xiv, 11, 1; Wars, i, 10, 10.

⁴⁰ Cassius experienced little or no resistance in Syria. Both Caesar's followers in Egypt and the Jews changed "*στρατηγός*." Dio Cassius, xlvii, 28, 2.

⁴¹ In the Wars, i, 11, 4, Herod is appointed "*στρατηγός*" *στρατηγός*. This is conceivable if *στρατηγός* be understood solely in a military sense.

sea forces, and even promising to make him king of Judea at the end of the war against Antony.⁴²

A certain Malichus had also been appointed by Antipater to collect the tribute for Cassius, but instead he had organized a conspiracy against Rome and Antipater. He bribed Hyrcanus' butler to poison the Idumaean and proceeded to succeed him as ruler of Judea. With the encouragement of Cassius, however, Herod had Malichus assassinated at Tyre and, with his brother Phasael, succeeded his father in the control of Hyrcanus and Judea, in 43.⁴³ Thus passed from the scene the extraordinary Idumaean⁴⁴ who had interposed himself between Jew and Roman, earning the hatred of the one, the confidence of the other. The cominant ambitious of Antipater first plunged Judea into the civil war which brought Pompey but subsequently it served more constructive ends. Subservience to Rome was the political expedient of the day, yet the Jews could not easily espouse such a policy which was so inconsistent with their national pride, witness their many ineffectual revolts. The administration of Antipater, however, while very probably devoid of any patriotic

⁴²Otto doubts that Herod would have received the kingship (or even "Königswürde"), or that this was, in fact, promised by Cassius. Why should Antipater have been set back in favor of Herod? Otto, op. cit., pp. 21-22.

⁴³Antiq., xiv, 11, 6; Wars i, 11, 8.

⁴⁴Jones points out the remarkable mercy of Antipater's rule. There is no record of massacres, assassinations, or even judicial murders. In fact, leniency in the case of Malichus was the cause of Antipater's assassination. Jones, op. cit., p. 31.

sentiment, had prevented much possible bloodshed by the simple prescription: 1) flexible loyalty to Rome and the reigning Roman, and 2) order in Judea.

When Cassius left Judea in 42, general anarchy followed. Antigonus, the only remaining son of Aristobulus, again revolted and Herod frustrated his attempt but could not prevent Marion, tyrant of Tyre, from taking some Galilean territory.⁴⁵ A fresh crisis befell the house of Antipater when it was forced to change allegiance the third time, in 42, after Philippi. To add to the embarrassment of Phasaël and Herod, Antony was met in Bithynia by a Judean embassy which requested him to remove the sons of Antipater and restore Hyrcanus to power. Guided by his former friendship with Antipater and no less by Herod's gifts, Antony did not even give the delegation a hearing.⁴⁶ In the same year, Antony was met in Ephesus by a deputation from Hyrcanus which requested the emancipation of those Jews whom Cassius had enslaved for non-payment of taxes, and the restoration of Marion's conquests in Galilee. Antony acceded to these requests and dispatched appropriate letters to Hyrcanus, the Tyrians, Sidonians, Antiochians, and Aradians.⁴⁷

⁴⁵Antiq., xiv, 12, 1; Wars, i, 12, 2-3.

⁴⁶Antiq., xiv, 12, 2; Wars, i, 11, 8.

⁴⁷Antiq., loc. cit. The letter to Hyrcanus, Antiq., xiv, 12, 3; to the Tyrians, Antiq., xiv, 12, 4-5; the others, Antiq., xiv, 12, 6 ff.

Later in the year, Antony came to Antioch where he was met by a delegation of one hundred influential Jews who calumniated Herod to his own advantage. For when Antony had reviewed both sides, he asked Hyrcanus, with a skillful show of impartiality, "Who governs the nation best?" Herod's cowed grandfather-in-law⁴⁸ dutifully responded, "Herod and his party," whereupon Antony appointed Phasael and Herod tetrarchs "and committed the public affairs of the Jews to them."⁴⁹ Hyrcanus retained the high-priesthood, shorn of political power. A subsequent deputation of a thousand Jews was resisted by arms. Thus, control remained with the Idumaeon house.⁵⁰

⁴⁸Herod was engaged at this time to Hyrcanus' granddaughter, Mariamne, and was called "ἡγεμὼν" although he did not marry her until four years later.

⁴⁹"ἡγεμῶν καὶ ἀρχιερέων καὶ τῶν ἱεροδουλῶν ἀποπέμψας ἐπιτρόπους ἡγεμῶνα τε," *Antiq.*, xiv, 13, 1; cf. Mommsen, *op. cit.*, p. 177, for further discussion.

⁵⁰*Antiq.*, xiv, 13, 2; *Wars*, i, 12, 6.

In this connection, it is worth mentioning that Phasael's death was probably due to the fact that there would probably have been no blood left, and this was an honorable way out of the difficulty. Phasael was the elder, Herod's father-in-law, and it is probable that his death was the result of the fact that he was the Idumaeon house. (See *The Idumaeon House*, 1910, p. 11.)

CHAPTER IX

ANTIGONUS: THE LAST HASMONEAN (40-37)

Antony was already exhibiting the traits which would ultimately spell his ruin. His dalliance with Cleopatra in Egypt, in 40, was poorly timed so far as the eastern political situation was concerned. At the very moment when the Parthians were invading Syria under Pacorus, the Jews were seething with resentment at Antony's exorbitant taxes and his treatment of their delegations. Under these circumstances a Judeo-Parthian alliance was natural if someone would champion the cause against Phasaël and Herod. For the last time, Antigonus revolted and this time with a three-year success. He promised Pacorus one thousand talents and five hundred women if he would aid him in regaining the throne. Accordingly, the Parthians invaded under Pacorus and the satrap Barzapharnes, but Herod and Phasaël knew nothing of this agreement. When Pacorus, therefore, treacherously asked that Herod and Phasaël come to Barzapharnes' forces to discuss terms of peace, Phasaël and Hyrcanus agreed against Herod's importunities to the contrary. The result was grim: Phasaël beat his brains out in prison¹ and Antigonus bit off

¹In this connection, Jones makes a perceptive comment. Phasaël's death was actually fortunate for Herod. The brothers would probably have come to blood later, and this was an honorable way out of the rivalry. Although Phasaël was the elder, Herod's ambitious matrimonial alliance had shown his hand. A. H. M. Jones, The Herods of Judea (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1938), p. 41.

the ears of Hyrcanus so that he might never again become high priest.² After plundering Judea, the Parthians withdrew, leaving Antigonus to rule as king and high-priest from 40 to 37. These years constituted the last glimmer of Judean independence.³

Meanwhile Herod, who had been warned, fled Jerusalem by night with his family and troops. Denied asylum by Malchus at Petra, Herod went to Alexandria. There he refused Cleopatra's proffered command of an expedition which she was preparing and took ship for Rhodes.⁴ After a stormy passage, late in the fall of 40, Herod pushed on to Brundisium and Rome where he immediately sought Antony. The mission was a fantastic success! Herod had come to Rome with the object of replacing the captured Hyrcanus by the latter's grandson, Aristobulus, brother of Mariamne, in order that the house of Antipater might continue to rule through its Hasmonean "front." Accordingly, he bribed Antony to recognize Aristobulus as

²Epitome of Antiq., xiv, 13, 3-9; Wars, i, 13, 1-11. For the levitical rule on disfigured priests, cf. Lev. 21:16-24.

³Antigonus even issued coins with the inscription, "ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ ΑΝΤΙΓΟΝΟΥ ΜΑΤΘΑΘΙΑΣ ΣΗΛΕΩΝΙΤΟΥ", Mattathiah being his Jewish name. Emil Schürer, A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ, translated by John MacPherson (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1900), I, 392. The Parthian invasion seemed so providential to the Jews that one of the Messianic prophecies which found vogue after 70 A.D. predicted that the Parthians would prepare the way for the Messiah by conquering Palestine a second time. J. Darmesteter, "Parthia and Judea," Journal of the Asiatic Society, IX, iv (1894), p. 43.

⁴The flight from Jerusalem was the nadir in Herod's career. He almost killed himself when his mother's carriage overturned and he feared capture. Antiq., xiv, 13, 8.

king and himself as tetrarch under the old arrangement. But Antony and Octavian agreed on nothing less than a change of dynasty for Judea. The Hasmoneans had consistently antagonized Rome; at present the hated Antigonus had allied with the Parthian enemy. The title of "king" coupled with Roman recognition of the usurping dynasty would strengthen Herod's hand in the battle against Antigonus. Antony and two senators, therefore, cited the loyal administration of the house of Antipater before the Senate, whereupon that body, in formal session, declared Herod "king of Judea." After a sacrifice at the Capitol and a banquet by Antony,⁵ Herod returned from his momentous week in Rome, elated, yet probably sobered by the realization that "Rome could give him a crown, but Judea had to provide the throne."⁶

Herod landed in Ptolemais in 39, but received only intermittent support from the armies of Ventidius and Silo whom Antony had commanded to assist Herod against Antigonus. When, therefore, Antony arrived at Samosata in 38, Herod visited his patron and was received with great honor and the promise of assistance from Sosius, who had succeeded Ventidius.⁷ Herod soon conquered all of Judea and forced Antigonus into Jerusalem which he proceeded to invest in

⁵Antiq., xiv, 14, 4-5; Wars, i, 14, 4.

⁶Jacob S. Minkin, Herod (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1936), p. 35.

⁷Antiq. xiv, 15, 7-9; Wars, i, 16, 6-7.

the spring of 37. When the siege machines were in place, Herod left temporarily to marry Mariamne in Samaria⁸ and returned after the celebration. Sosius now appeared. With joined forces he and Herod attacked Jerusalem from the north as Pompey had done. By the same tactic of attacking on the Sabbath, the Temple was captured on the twenty-seventh anniversary of Pompey's seizure of the citadel. The subsequent plunder and pillage of Jerusalem by the Roman troops⁹ drew forth Herod's comment that the Romans were making him "king of a desert," and he had to bribe Sosius to withdraw. Antigonos was carried away to Antioch, but by a large gift Herod persuaded Antony to have him beheaded, the first occasion in which Rome executed such a sentence upon a king.¹⁰ The Hasmonean dynasty had thus ceased to rule, in theory as well as in fact.

⁸Antiq., xiv, 15, 14; Wars, i, 17, 8. This union has been criticized by Renan and Wellhausen in view of the subsequent grief which the Hasmonians caused in Herod's household. Minkin, however, op. cit., p. 33, objects that the marriage was necessary to found a dynasty. This is not quite accurate inasmuch as Herod's kingship was legitimized by Rome before his marriage to Mariamne. But such a union was to Herod's advantage in securing peaceful succession for his dynasty in Judea, joined as it now was, by Hasmonian blood.

⁹Dio Cassius, xlix, 22, 4, records the hostility which the Romans felt towards the followers of Antigonos who had killed some Roman guards in the course of the revolt.

¹⁰Dio Cassius, loc. cit.; Antiq., xiv, 16, 4; Wars, i, 18, 3.

CHAPTER X

HEROD THE GREAT (37-4 B.C.)

Herod is one of the very controversial figures in history. To most people he is the monster who ordered the slaughter of the Innocents in Bethlehem. Even historians whose purviews extend beyond this final, sorry, chapter in Herod's life differ widely in their evaluation of the king. To Graetz, he is

the evil genius of the Judean nation; it was he who brought her bound captive to Rome; it was he who placed his feet triumphantly upon her neck.¹

Minkin maintains that he is "next of kin to Alexander of Macedon,"² while Renan apologizes, "to wish for Herod without his crimes is to wish for Christianity without its dreams, the revolution without its excesses."³ This study, however, is concerned with Herod's relations with Rome and, in total contrast to the suspicions, intrigues, and outrages of his domestic life, Herod pursued the same enlightened policy as

¹Graetz, Heinrich, History of the Jews, translated by Bella Löwy (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publications Society of America, 1891), Vol. I; 1893, vol. II. 77. Such a view is by no means passé today, e.g., a Jewish pamphlet by Israel A. Abrams, The Fall of Judea (Baltimore: Talmud Torah, 1913), 3: "The Indumean slave . . . was ready to commit any crime to gratify his ambition."

²Minkin, Jacob S., Herod (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1936), p. 1.

³Renan, Ernest, History of the People of Israel, (translator ?), (Boston: Roberts Bros., 1895), vols. IV and V, 226.

had his father. He elicited thereby close friendship from Rome until finally even Augustus had to blink at the enormities of his personal life. While Antipater had been very cautious that nothing in his conduct of domestic affairs should offend Rome, Herod might frequently have compromised his position by his constant excuses for violence in the family had Rome failed to need such a vigorous and loyal administrator as he. Driven by the same ambition as his father, Herod resolved that he would not follow Antipater's leniency toward intrigue, for this had cost him his life. Accordingly, in due course, his wife, her grandfather, his mother-in-law, brother-in-law, and three of his sons were to come under suspicion and be executed.

The first ten years of Herod's reign were devoted to consolidation of his power. He vigorously reduced the rebellious elements among the people who grudgingly tolerated the "half-Jew"⁴ creature of Rome. Both Pharisees and Sadducees withdrew from political life⁵ and Herod gained complete control of the high-priesthood. With due honor he recalled the earless Hyrcanus from Babylon but appointed a certain Ananel to the high-priesthood in place of the disqualified Hasmonean. Mariamne's mother, Alexandra, resented this appointment and applied to Cleopatra to champion the cause of her son, the

⁴Herod is called 'Ημιουδαίος, Josephus, Antiq., xiv, 15, 2.

⁵Herod executed forty-five of the wealthiest Sadducees who had supported Antigonus. Josephus, Antiq., xv, 1, 2.

young Aristobulus, for the high-priesthood. Antony was sent a picture of the handsome seventeen year old youth and, upon evidence of his favor, Herod deposed Ananel and appointed Aristobulus to the office.⁶ Alexandra, meanwhile, could not stand the climate of suspicion and espionage in Herod's house and arranged an escape to Egypt for her son and herself, but their secret was betrayed. This and the immense popularity of the high-priest convinced Herod to eliminate the Hasmonean. He had him drowned during a swimming party at Jericho and, after due histrionic grief, Herod reappointed Ananel,⁷ 35 B.C. But Alexandra appealed to Cleopatra, who persuaded Antony to summon Herod to a conference at Laodicea to answer for his conduct. Herod was well aware of Cleopatra's designs on Judea but he was equally apprehensive of Antony's possible infatuation with his beautiful wife.⁸ After the disastrous Parthian campaign, however, Antony was not minded "to sacrifice a faithful supporter because of his own moral delinquencies."⁹ He gladly received Herod's gifts and arguments and added that "it was not good to require an account of a

⁶Josephus, Antiq., xv, 2, 5-7.

⁷Josephus, Antiq., xv, 3, 3-4; Wars, i, 22, 2.

⁸Accordingly, he ordered his brother Joseph to kill her in case he failed to return. Herod clearly underestimated his value to Antony. Josephus, Antiq., xv, 3, 5, (Cleopatra asked repeatedly for Judea.)

⁹Jones, A. H. M., The Herods of Judea (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1938), p. 55

king as to the management of his kingdom," and, as to Cleopatra, "it would be best for her not to inquire too closely into the acts of princes." Herod was thus cleared but Antony gave the Egyptian queen Coele-Syria as a sop.¹⁰

Cleopatra, however, continued to be the bane of Herod in eastern politics. She persistently nagged Antony for more territory until, in 34, he gave her Phoenicia, some of the Judean coast, parts of Arabia, and the palm district around Jericho, which was the most profitable part of Palestine. Herod perforce acquiesced and had to pay rental for Jericho and stand bond that the Arabian king would do the same.¹¹ With the grace of the diplomat that he was, he even cordially received Cleopatra on a state visit during which the queen tried to seduce him and he thought seriously of killing her.¹²

The hostility of the Egyptian queen, however, turned out to Herod's eventual advantage. When war broke out between Antony and Octavian in 32, Herod would normally have assisted Antony but Cleopatra insisted that he punish Malchus of Arabia

¹⁰Josephus, Antiq., xv, 3, 5-8.

¹¹Josephus, Antiq., xv, 4, 1-2. Wars, i, 18, 5.

¹²Ibid. Renan, op. cit., V, 220, suggests that only Herod could have revealed this plan which is, therefore, doubtful. Josephus says that Herod seriously planned the murder for Antony's good. Jones, op. cit., 51, adds skeptically, "nothing is more unlikely than that Herod seriously thought of sacrificing his career for Antony's good, or . . . that Cleopatra would have wasted her charms on a client king." Otto, Walter, Herodes, Beitrage zur Geschichte des letzten jüdischen Königshauses. (Stuttgart: J. G. Neetzlersche Buchhandlung, 1913), 47, thinks otherwise.

for non-payment of tribute due her.¹³ Accordingly he defeated the Arab in a brilliant victory while his patron was vanquished at Actium in 31.¹⁴ Although it was time for the usual shift of allegiance for Antipater's house, Herod, as he later confessed to Octavian, still supported Antony, urging him to kill Cleopatra and compromise with Octavian.¹⁵ But upon the enthralled Roman's refusal to follow his advice, Herod resolved to support Octavian in a fourth and final change of allegiance in the Antipatrid dynasty. He demonstrated his new loyalty by aiding Didius, governor of Syria, in his attack upon a band of Antony's gladiators at Cyzicus;¹⁶ the king was now ready to meet Octavian.

Although he might well have anticipated success with the Roman, Herod took no chances; he executed his only possible rival, the aged Hyrcanus, and left orders regarding Mariamme similar to those which he had given Joseph during his crisis with Antony.¹⁷ In the spring of 30 he met Augustus at Rhodes with a speech which proved Herod to be a persuasive orator (or Josephus an imaginative historian). He readily admitted

¹³Josephus, Antiq., xv, 5, 1. Her real plan was that the two vassal kings might weaken each other. She also feared his influence with Antony.

¹⁴Josephus, Antiq., xv, 5, 2. Plutarch, Antony, lxi, 2, states that "Herod the Jew" sent an army to Antony at Actium.

¹⁵Josephus, Antiq., xv, 6, 6.

¹⁶Josephus, Antiqu, xv, 6, 7.

¹⁷Ibid.

his past loyalty to Antony which, but for Cleopatra's jealousy, would have caused him to fight at Actium. This loyalty he would transfer to Augustus, for it was "but changing the names." Augustus had heard of the Cyzicus incident and now graciously confirmed Herod in the kingship and asked that he "show himself as great a friend to him as he had been to Antony."¹⁸

Herod subsequently received Augustus with pomp at Ptolemais¹⁹ on the latter's march to Egypt and again visited him after the suicide of Antony and Cleopatra in 30. At this meeting Augustus favored Herod with Cleopatra's Galatian body-guards, the territory which she had taken from Herod, and also the cities of Gadara, Hippos, Samaria, Gaza, Anthedon, Joppa, and Strato's tower.²⁰ Upon these acquisitions, Herod accompanied his patron as far as Antioch and returned with "greater honor and security than ever." Antipater's policy had reached full fruition; no more shifts of loyalty were necessary. "From the Roman standpoint, the conduct of the new dynasty . . . [had been] correct in a way to draw tears from the eyes of observer."²¹

¹⁸ Josephus, Antiq., xv, 6, 7. Wars, i, 20, 1-3.

¹⁹ Ibid. Herod provisioned the army and gave Augustus 800 talents.

²⁰ Josephus, Antiq., xv, 7, 3. Wars, i, 20, 3.

²¹ Mommsen, Theodor, The Provinces of the Roman Empire from Caesar to Diocletian, translated by William P. Dickson (London: MacMillan and Co., 1909), p. 179.

The condition of Herod's domestic life developed in inverse proportion to his political successes. Herod's suspicion and Mariamme's contempt for him finally led to her execution in 29 and Alexandra soon followed her daughter's fate.²² The king nearly went insane with grief over his dead wife, but he recovered when threatened by the revolt of the Idumaean Costobar, which he subdued in typical Herodian style, in 25 B.C.²³

The decade after 25 B.C. is the period of architectural splendor in Herod's reign. While Augustus rebuilt Rome, Herod constructed race-courses, amphitheatres, emperor-temples, theatres, and even cities in Judea, many of these public works bearing the name of his patron or dedicated to his honor. E.g., Sebaste (old Samaria), Caesaria (Straton's Tower), trophies and quadrennial games in honor of Augustus, the *καυκάπεια* (temples built in honor of Augustus).²⁴ Herod's most ambitious constructional operation was, of course, his restoration of the Temple in Jerusalem, much of whose external architecture was in Greek style.²⁵ Even on this monument to the Jewish past, Herod affixed the Roman eagle

²²Josephus, Antiq., xv, 7, 3-6 (Mariamme); xv, 7, 7-8 (Alexandra).

²³Josephus, Antiq., xv, 7, 10.

²⁴Josephus, Antiq., xv, 8, 5.

²⁵Saul Lieberman, Hellenism in Jewish Palestine (New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 5711-1950), 169.

until it was torn down in his last days.²⁶ While championing such a program of Romano-Hellenization in Judea, Herod himself took a somewhat late interest in Greek arts and letters and surrounded himself with a circle of cultured Greeks which included Nicholas of Damascus.²⁷

The Jews resented this Hellenization as also Herod's absolutism which had stripped the Sanhedrin of political importance and made the office of high-priest subject to his whimsey. When, therefore, Herod also levied heavy taxation upon the land, revolt could well be expected; but he imposed a chain of fortresses on Judea, namely, Masada, Herodium, Hyrcania, and others, which were designed to protect his administration from habitual Jewish insurrections. At that the Pharisees twice refused an oath of allegiance which Herod had required for himself and for the emperor.²⁸

Not since Pompey had a Judean ruler governed with so free a hand in domestic affairs as Herod. His legal position, in Rome's eyes, was that of rex socius with the epithets, *πίλος καὶ σύμμαχος*.²⁹ As client-king, Herod con-

²⁶Josephus, Antiq., xvii, 6, 2. Wars, 1, 33, 2.

²⁷Josephus, Antiq., xix, 7, 3. Nicholas was Herod's minister and tutor for many years. Josephus used his universal history as a source for his own works.

²⁸Josephus, Antiq., xv, 10, 4; xvii, 2, 4.

²⁹Josephus, Antiq., xvii, 9, 6.

trolled the entire Judean administration including finances and the military, with the power of life and death over his subjects. He was restricted, however, in the following particulars: 1) he could not conclude treaties with other states or go to war with them without Rome's approval; 2) he could not coin in gold or silver;³⁰ 3) he was obliged to provide troops and tribute at Rome's request.³¹

Herod's relations with Rome until 14 B.C. were little short of ideal. He used his frequent visits with Augustus to such good advantage that the extent of his territory was nearly doubled. When, in 23, Herod sent his sons Alexander

³⁰ Only copper coins have been found from any of the Herodians. Schürer comments: this fact is particularly instructive, since it shows us that Herod by no means belonged to the most distinguished of those client kings. op. cit., 450.

This lends credence to Minkin's assertion, despite the good will of Caesar, it is doubtful whether Herod had ever been regarded in any other light than as ruler of a petty kingdom by the grace of Rome. op. cit., 243.

³¹ Schürer, loc. cit. Jones, op. cit., 62-67 has an excellent discussion of Herod's legal status in the Empire, of which the following points are of particular interest: the mandate for the client-king expired at his death; it was purely personal. Herod was privileged in 22 B.C. to appoint his successors, but this right was later withdrawn. The client-king was not part of the permanent machinery of the empire; his reign was intended as preparatory for full incorporation which he was to hasten by civilizing his kingdom. 66, 67.

"The rule of the native king was preferred to that of the Roman governor in districts where the population was . . . intractable . . . The Jews were obviously an ideal case for a client kingdom." 66.

Otto, op. cit., 58, holds that the title, *φίλος τῆς βουλῆς*, does not indicate that Herod's relations with Rome rested on any treaty, (foedus.) nor in the case of any other client-king.

and Aristobulus to Rome for their education, Augustus, perhaps mindful of Herod's aid to Gallus in his campaign against Arabia two years before, gave the Judean king the districts of Trachonitis, Batanea, and Auranitis.³² In 20, when Augustus visited Syria, he added the tetrarchy of Zenodorus, the districts of Panias and Ulatha, and the region northwest of the Sea of Galilee to Herod's possessions.³³ On this occasion Herod obtained permission to appoint his brother Pheroras to the tetrarchy of Perea and, in a final gesture of confidence, Augustus "made him [Herod] one of the procurators of Syria, and commanded that nothing should be done without his approbation."³⁴ In 17, Herod visited Rome to take his sons back to Judea and was very cordially received by Augustus.³⁵

Herod was also on the best of terms with his patron's son-in-law, Agrippa. Herod visited him in Mytilene, c. 22, and Agrippa returned the visit in 15 when he went to Judea and was accorded a hearty reception by the Jewish people.³⁶ The following year, Herod took his fleet and joined Agrippa

³²Josephus, Antiq., xv, 10, 1; Wars, i, 20, 4.

³³Josephus, Antiq., xv, 10, 3; Wars, ibid.

³⁴Ibid. This probably obtained only during the period of Agrippa's absence from the East, Schürer, op. cit., p. 454; Wars: "ἄρτεστας δὲ αὐτῶν ἐν Συρίᾳ ὄντας ἐπίτροπον."

³⁵Josephus, Antiq., xvi, 1, 2; Strabo, loc. cit., states that Augustus was fond of the sons.

³⁶Josephus, Antiq., xvi, 2, 1.

at Sinope after which the pair made a leisurely trip through Asia Minor. In fact, Josephus describes the relationship: "Augustus preferred no one to Herod after Agrippa; and Agrippa made no one his greater friend than Herod except Augustus."³⁷ Herod capitalized on this influence also to secure the rights of Jews in the diaspora.³⁸

The last decade of Herod's life represented the morbid climax in a career dominated by domestic distress. Another of Herod's sons, Antipater, calumnized the brothers Alexander and Aristobulus, whom Herod accused before Augustus at Aquileia in 12 B.C. With paternal concern, the emperor restored peace in the family and, after due thanks, the three returned to Judea.^{39*} Suspicion continued unabated, however, and, to add to Herod's misery, he had to contend for the first time with imperial disfavor. A certain Sylleus of Arabia had provoked Herod into a war by which he discredited the king in the sight of Rome. In order to explain his breach of the peace, Herod sent an embassy to Rome; and when this failed, he sent another under Nicholas of Damascus, who succeeded in

³⁷Josephus, Antiq., xv, 10, 3. Wars, Ibid. Willrich, Hugo, Das Haus des Herodes zwischen Jerusalem und Rom (Heidelberg: Carl Winters Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1929), 88, considers this a mistaken exaggeration on Josephus' part.

³⁸Josephus, Antiq., xvi, 2, 3-5. He also sent them lavish gifts. Bevan, Edwyn, Jerusalem Under the High-Priests (London: Edward Arnold, 1904), 152, compares Herod's attitude toward the Jews, domestic and foreign, with the French policy toward Roman Catholics.

³⁹Josephus, Antiq., xvi, 4, 1-6; Wars, i, 23, 305.
*During this visit, Herod obtained from Augustus the concession of half of the copper-mines in Cyprus.

restoring Augustus' favor.⁴⁰ Shortly thereafter, Herod again accused his sons of plotting treason and this time Augustus gave him absolute power to deal with them but advised that he summon a justiciary court to Berytus. Herod did this; the court pronounced the death sentence, and Alexander and Aristobulus were strangled at Sebaste in 7 B. C.⁴¹

To avoid complications, Antipater had gone to Rome but he was recalled by Herod to answer charges of treason in a trial before Varus, the governor of Syria. Augustus was apprised of his condemnation and sent his permission for execution with the bitter epigram, "I would rather be Herod's pig than Herod's son."⁴² Antipater was executed, in 4 B.C., just five days before Herod himself died. After frequent changes, Herod's will finally named Archelaus king, his brother, Antipas, tetrarch of Galilee and Perea, and another son, Philip, tetrarch of Aulonitis and Batanea. As a final, posthumous favor to Herod, Augustus would confirm this testament.⁴³

From the Roman point of view, Herod's epithet, "the Great," cannot be denied him. His entire career had been

⁴⁰Josephus, Antiq., xvi, 10, 8-9.

⁴¹Josephus, Antiq., xvi, 11, 2-7.

⁴²Macrobius, Saturnalia, ii, 4, 11.

⁴³While Augustus had granted Herod the right of determining his succession, the latter had stipulated that the emperor should approve his choice. Augustus complied with the will except that he withheld the title of king from Archelaus until he should prove himself.

molded about Antipater's policy of firm domestic administration and consistent loyalty to Rome. He had furthered Augustus' plans for the East in two general phases: 1) he instituted a constructive Hellenism which was the true counterpart of his patron's Augustan age in Rome; 2) he introduced order into the additional territories which Augustus had given him while maintaining it at home, thus complementing the Princeps' policy of containment and systematization for the empire. He was an enlightened policeman and patron of the arts. To the Jews, of course, he was never more than the bloody, half-Jew, oppressor, the "scourge of God" who robbed them in Rome's interest. Yet, except for the violence in his house, he pursued Judeo-Roman relations with a success which could well serve as a pattern for other ambitious client-kings.

CHAPTER XI

CONCLUSION

In the century and a half before Christ, it would seem that Roman policy had been executed in two successive phases so far as Syria and Palestine were concerned: 1) by consulta supported with the threat of force, and, eventually 2) by naked military might. The decrees and letters which Rome sent to the East might occasionally be disregarded earlier in this period inasmuch as internal movements at Rome rendered her indisposed toward a more active interference in Syrian politics. After the Third Macedonian War, however, it was merely a question of time and the geographical extent of direct Roman absorption. . . a period of quiescence and then the Third Mithradatic war and Pompey.

One of the ironies in this epoch of Jewish history is the fact that Judeo-Roman relations were the most cordial when Rome was the least inclined toward direct intervention, but they were cool, even hostile, when Pompey was in the process of annexing Syria. Perhaps this explains why Rome consummated the early alliances with Judea so readily. Syria would have to be dealt with eventually; meanwhile it was good policy to recognize the Judean state. Rome would be spared the pains of sending an armed force to neutralize the Seleucids as this

was the Jews' task. Her consulta in behalf of the Jews might not evoke instant response from Syria but such an eventuality would not warrant armed intervention, for this was the very thing which Rome wished to avoid at this time. As Judea became stronger, however, the Seleucids would be forced to acknowledge Rome's protection of her ally. The Senate, moreover, controlled the administration of the Jewish alliances and, thus, words, letters, and warnings were sent which cost the Senate nothing.

For the Jews, however, the letters were more than mere scraps of paper. Judas applied to Rome for recognition and military assistance; the Senate dispatched a letter which failed to halt the invasion of Demetrius. Jonathan renewed the alliance as a precautionary step and received letters which made good propaganda of Rome's favored sanction of the Jewish nation. Simon's letters guaranteed the integrity of Judea and recognized his extraterritorial jurisdiction over Jews. Hyrcanus secured not only effective Roman intervention in the Forced Withdrawal of Antiochus Sidetes, but, in view of Rome's approbation, extensive countenance from the Mediterranean world which insured favorable exemptions for the Jews of the diaspora. These benefits have been largely underestimated; the alliances go far in explaining the favored position in which the Jew found himself in the Roman world. A small nation had applied to the Colossus for recognition and was accorded respectability.

The indifference to Rome which characterized the Hasmonean successors complemented what must have been a similar attitude on the part of the republic. The diminution of the Seleucid power ended the advantages which an independent Judea had provided Rome. When Rome annexed Syria, therefore, why should a lapsed alliance prevent Rome from incorporating the troublesome bordering state whose Hasmonean rulers had added to the violence of the Mediterranean?

After Pompey's settlement, many Jews considered Rome merely another Syria whose "yoke" could be lifted by another Judas or Simon Maccabaeus. Frequent revolts led to an even stricter surveillance under Gabinius. Antipater and Herod interposed, however, stood bond for Jewish law and order, and, by demonstration of loyalty to Rome, secured the successive favor of Caesar, Antony, and Octavian, and more territory with greater domestic freedom than Judea had enjoyed at any time since 63 B.C.

The story of a nation's subjection is never a happy one. The account of Judea's relations with Rome will always be summarized by two propositions: 1) the embattled Jewish state applied to Rome for alliance and friendship; 2) Rome absorbed Judea. Many have reasoned this into a syllogism by adding the conclusion: "Therefore Judea allied with her conqueror," or, more baldly, "The Jews committed national suicide by approaching Rome." The thought is that Judas Maccabaeus inaugurated a policy which would lead to the

destruction of his own dynasty; and the Senate, which had previously ignored Judea, engaged in a century-long scheme which inexorably overpowered the credulous country. Alexander Jannaeus is rather applauded for turning his back on Rome.¹

The question, of course, is that of an alternative. Had the earlier Hasmoneans pursued an independent course and never approached Rome, what would have been the reaction of the Pompey who would just as surely have been on the borders of Judea in 63? Jannaeus and his successors, moreover, had neutralized the effects of earlier ententes; therefore, in reality, this was the very situation. Only in one, absurd, hypothetical situation might the Hasmoneans have acted differently. Had they chosen to remain loyal vassals of an invigorated Syria and somehow managed an alliance with the Parthians as well, then, perhaps, the eastern balance of power might have prevented Rome from conquering at that time. There would have been no independence for Judea, of course, and this would be unthinkable for the Maccabaeian mind.

In a day when national sovereignty and right fell before the expediencies of a dominant power whose interest was order and unity, Pompey was inevitable. Rome, in the final analysis, would have absorbed Judea whether the Hasmoneans

¹Respected authorities state or imply this view and the opinion is, no doubt still widespread today. Ewald, Heinrich, The History of Israel, translated by J. Estlin Carpenter (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1874), vol. V., 323, 388, 408; Graetz, op. cit., I, 525, 526; and others.

had allied with her or not.² In view of this inevitability,
it had been in Judea's interest to conciliate Rome both before
and after Pompey. Judas, Jonathan, Simon, and Hyrcanus, by
 an early approach to Rome (even if the republic would over-
 whelm them) certainly contributed to the cause of Judea's
 century of independence. If, indeed, Roman support did not
 make that independence possible. To reason that these re-
 lations caused or even accelerated Roman domination in Judea
 is extreme.

When Roman dominion arrived, it again remained in the
 best interests of the Jews to cooperate. Antipater and Herod
 had learned this lesson well ahead of their subjects and
 spared them the horrors which their children would suffer at
 the time of Titus and Bar Kochba. Indeed, Antipatrid policy
 advocated the same stability and alliance with Rome which had
 been fostered by the early Hasmonians but reprobated by their
 heirs. Except for his Idumaean stock, Judas Maccabaeus would
 sooner have approved Antipater, his political successor,
 than Antigonus, his biological heir. For Judas, too, would
 have recognized the difference between a Syrian and a Roman
 master.

²Had Alexander Jannaeus continued the alliance policy;
 had Alexandra actively opposed Tigranes in Rome's interest,
 and had a peaceful succession of a loyal dynasty obtained
 instead of the violence of Aristobulus, a case could be made,
 I suppose, that Pompey's settlement would have provided for
 a Hasmonian client-kingdom similar to that under Herod.

In a final sense, Rome's conquest of Judea paved the way for an ideology which would, in turn, conquer her. Christianity could never have developed in a strong Jewish national state. Rome's rex socius failed to eliminate the "king of the Jews," J. B.C., and future emperors would curse him for his mistake.

Josephus, Jewish War, VIII. The Loeb Classical Library; Josephus' Jewish War, translated by H. St. John Thackeray, London: William Heinemann, 1912.

Josephus, Ant. The Loeb Classical Library; Josephus' Antiquities, translated by H. St. John Thackeray, London: William Heinemann, 1912.

Josephus, Jewish War, I. The Loeb Classical Library; Josephus' Jewish War, translated by H. St. John Thackeray, London: William Heinemann, 1912.

Josephus, Jewish War, I. The Loeb Classical Library; Josephus' Jewish War, translated by H. St. John Thackeray, London: William Heinemann, 1912.

Josephus, Jewish War, I. The Loeb Classical Library; Josephus' Jewish War, translated by H. St. John Thackeray, London: William Heinemann, 1912.

Josephus, Jewish War, I.

Josephus, Jewish War, I. The Loeb Classical Library; Josephus' Jewish War, translated by H. St. John Thackeray, London: William Heinemann, 1912.

Josephus, Jewish War, I. The Loeb Classical Library; Josephus' Jewish War, translated by H. St. John Thackeray, London: William Heinemann, 1912.

Josephus, Jewish War, I. The Loeb Classical Library; Josephus' Jewish War, translated by H. St. John Thackeray, London: William Heinemann, 1912.

Josephus, Jewish War, I. The Loeb Classical Library; Josephus' Jewish War, translated by H. St. John Thackeray, London: William Heinemann, 1912.

Josephus, Jewish War, I. The Loeb Classical Library; Josephus' Jewish War, translated by H. St. John Thackeray, London: William Heinemann, 1912.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Primary Sources

- Appian. Mithradatic Wars, xvi-xvii. The Loeb Classical Library: Appian's Roman History, translated by Horace White. London: William Heinemann, 1912.
- ✓ Appian. Syrian Wars, viii. The Loeb Classical Library: Appian's Roman History, translated by Horace White. London: William Heinemann, 1912.
- Cassius, Dio. The Loeb Classical Library: Dio's Roman History, translated by Ernest Cary. III-IV. London: William Heinemann, 1914.
- Eusebius. Ecclesiastical History, i. The Loeb Classical Library: The Ecclesiastical History, translated by Kirsopp Lake. I. London: William Heinemann, 1926.
- ✓ Josephus, Flavius. Antiquities of the Jews; Wars of the Jews.
Greek references: Benedictus Niese. Flavii Iosephi Opera. Berolini: Weidmannos, 1790.
English references: A. R. Shilleto. The Works of Flavius Josephus, revision of Whiston's translation. London: George Bell and Sons, 1889.
- ✓ I and II Maccabees.
Greek references: Henry Barclay Swete. The Old Testament in Greek According to the Septuagint. Cambridge: The University Press, 1894.
English references: Edgar J. Goodspeed. The Apocrypha — An American Translation. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1938.
- Plutarch. Antony. The Loeb Classical Library: Plutarch's Lives, translated by Bernadotte Perrin. IX. London: William Heinemann, 1920.
- Plutarch. Pompey. The Loeb Classical Library: Plutarch's Lives, translated by Bernadotte Perrin. V. London: William Heinemann, 1917.
- ✓ Polybius. Histories. The Loeb Classical Library: The Histories, translated by W. R. Paton. V. London: William Heinemann, 1927.

Strabo. Geography. The Loeb Classical Library: The Geography of Strabo, translated by Horace Leonard Jones. VII. London: William Heinemann, 1930.

Suetonius. Caesar—The Divine Julius. The Loeb Classical Library: The Lives of the Caesars, translated by J. C. Rolfe. I. London: William Heinemann, 1935.

B. Secondary Sources

Abrams, Israel A. The Fall of Judea. Baltimore: Talmud Torah, 1913.

Bentwick, Norman. "Rome and Judea." Menorah Journal. XXXVI, 1948.

Bevan, Edwyn. Jerusalem Under the High-Priests. London: Edward Arnold, 1904.

Bevan, Edwyn. "Syria and the Jews." The Cambridge Ancient History. VII. Cambridge: The University Press, 1930.

Conder, Claude Reignier. Judas Maccabaeus and the Jewish War of Independence. London: A. P. Watt and Son, 1894.

Darmesteter, J. "Parthia and Judea." Journal of the Asiatic Society. IX, 1894.

Debevoise, Neilson C. A Political History of Parthia. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1938.

Ewald, Heinrich. The History of Israel. Translated by J. Estlin Carpenter. V. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1874.

Ginsburg, Michael S. Rome et la Judée. Paris: Jacques Povolozky, 1928.

Ginsburg, Michael S. "Sparta and Judea." Classical Philology. XXIX, April, 1934.

Graetz, Heinrich. History of the Jews. Translated by Bella Löwy. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publications Society of America, 1891.

Hausrath, Adolph. Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte. Heidelberg: Verlagsbuchhandlung von Fr. Bassermann, 1873.

- Jones, A. H. M. The Herods of Judaea. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1938.
- Latimer, Elizabeth Wormeley. Judea From Cyrus to Titus. Chicago: A. C. McClurg and Company, 1900.
- Lieberman, Saul. Hellenism in Jewish Palestine. New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1950.
- Mathews, Shailer. A History of New Testament Times in Palestine. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1904.
- Minkin, Jacob S. Herod. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1936.
- Mommsen, Theodor. The Provinces of the Roman Empire from Caesar to Diocletian. Translated by William P. Dickson. London: Macmillan and Company, 1909.
- Oesterley, W. O. E. A History of Israel. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1932.
- Otto, Walter. Herodes, Beitrage zur Geschichte des letzten jüdischen Königshauses. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzlersche Buchhandlung, 1913.
- Pfeiffer, Robert H. History of the New Testament Times. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1949.
- Radin, Max. The Jews Among the Greeks and Romans. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1915.
- Renan, Ernest. History of the People of Israel. Translator not given. IV and V. Boston: Roberts Brothers, 1895.
- Riggs, James Stevenson. A History of the Jewish People During the Maccabaeian and Roman Periods. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1900.
- Schürer, Emil. A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ. Translated by John MacPherson. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1891.
- Streane, A. W. The Age of the Maccabees. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1898.
- Wellhausen, Julius. Israelitische und Jüdische Geschichte. Berlin: Druck und Verlag von Georg Reimer, 1901.
- Willrich, Hugo. Das Haus des Herodes zwischen Jerusalem und Rom. Heidelberg: Carl Winters Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1929.