

§ 12 ARISTOBULUS II 67-63 B.C.

Sources

Josephus *Ant.* xiv 1-4 (1-79); *B.J.* i 6-7 (120-58).
 Rabbinic traditions: mTaanith 3:8
 yTaanith 66d-67a
 bTaanith 23a
 bSoṭah 49b
 bBaba Kamma 82b
 bMenahoth 64b

See Derenbourg, *op. cit.*, pp. 112-18.

Psalms of Solomon and Qumran documents: see n. 30 below.

Coins: for the controversial view that Aristobulus II issued his own coinage, see Apperdis IV, 2.

Bibliography

- Derenbourg, J., *Essai sur l'histoire et la géographie de la Palestine* (1867), pp. 112-18.
 Graetz, H., *Geschichte der Juden* III (1905-6), pp. 151-65.
 Abel, F.-M., *Histoire de la Palestine* I (1952), pp. 247-61.
 Ginsburg, M. S., *Rome et la Judée* (1928), pp. 78-84.
 Jones, A. H. M., *The Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces* (1937; 1971), pp. 238 ff., 447 ff.
 Abel, F.-M., 'Le Siège de Jérusalem par Pompée', *RB* 54 (1947), pp. 243-55.
 Eammel, E., 'Die Neuordnung des Pompejus und das römisch-jüdische Bündnis', *ZDPV* 75 (1959), pp. 76-82.
 Schalit, A., *König Herodes, der Mann und sein Werk* (1969), pp. 1-19.

The Hasmonaean star was now in its decline. War broke out immediately after Alexandra's death between her sons Aristobulus II and Hyrcanus II, and after a few years ended with the loss to the Romans of the freedom won in battle against the Syrians. Alexandra had died just at the critical moment at which her son Aristobulus was on the point of seizing power by force. Her legitimate successor was her eldest son,¹ John Hyrcanus, who had already been appointed High Priest during his mother's reign. He now assumed the duties of ruler also. But his brother Judas Aristobulus had no intention of abandoning his plans. He marched against Hyrcanus with an army. Their forces clashed near Jericho, and many of Hyrcanus's men went over to Aristobulus, thereby securing the latter's victory. Hyrcanus fled to the fortress in Jerusalem but was forced to surrender there to Aristobulus. A truce was then arranged between the brothers, according to which Hyrcanus, who was in any case a weak and idle man, renounced his

1. *Ant.* xiii 16, 2 (408); xiv 1, 3 (11); 3, 2 (42).

royal and High Priestly titles in favour of his brother. In return, he was left to enjoy his revenues undisturbed.²

The issue was nevertheless by no means settled. For now the Idumaeen Antipater, the father of the future King Herod, began to interfere.³ His father, also named Antipater, had been appointed *strategos* of Idumaea by Alexander Jannaeus, and his sons seem to have followed him in this position. But he saw very clearly that he would be far better off under the weak and unmanly Hyrcanus than under the bellicose and energetic Aristobulus. He therefore did his utmost to bring Aristobulus down and help Hyrcanus back to power. First he managed to win adherents among the most distinguished of the Jews by

2. *Ant.* xiv 1, 2 (4-7); *B.J.* i 6, 1 (120-2). According to *Ant.* xv 6, 4 (180), Hyrcanus's rule lasted for three months. Graetz, *op. cit.*, III, p. 154, and Derenbourg, *op. cit.*, p. 113, assumed that Hyrcanus retained the office of High Priest. That this was not the case can be deduced from *Ant.* xiv 1, 2 (6) *αὐτὸν δὲ ζῆν ἀπραγμόνως*, and is expressly stated in *Ant.* xv 3, 1 (41); xx 10, 4 (243).

3. On the origin of the family there exist the most contradictory reports. According to Nicolaus of Damascus, quoted in *Jos. Ant.* xiv 1, 3 (9) = Jacoby FG^rH⁹⁰ A Fg6, Antipater was a descendant of the first Jews to return from Babylon. As this assertion contradicts all the other sources, Josephus is doubtless correct in regarding it simply as flattery of Herod on the part of Nicolaus (*ταῦτα δὲ λέγει χαριζόμενος Ἡρώδῃ*); see B. Z. Wacholder, *Nicolaus of Damascus* (1962), pp. 78-9. According to Josephus, Antipater was an Idumaeen of noble descent; *B.J.* i 6, 2 (123) *γένος δ' ἦν Ἰδουμαῖος, προγόνων τε ἕνεκα καὶ πλούτου καὶ τῆς ἄλλης ἰσχῆος πρωτεῶν τοῦ ἔθνους*. Justin Martyr, on the other hand, mentions the Jewish statement that he was a native of Ascalon, *Dial. c. Trypho.* 52 *Ἡρώδην Ἀσκαλωνίτην γεγενῆσθαι*. This view appears in the writings of Julius Africanus in the more definite form that Antipater's father, Herod, was a temple attendant of Apollo in Ascalon, and that Antipater was carried off as a boy by the Idumaeans in a sack of the temple and grew up among them as one of themselves, Julius Africanus, *Epist. ad Aristidem*, in Euseb. *HE* i 7, 11, cf. 6, 2-3; also in the chronicle of Julius Africanus cited by Syncellus ed. Dindorf I, p. 561. Julius Africanus is followed by Euseb. *Chron.* ed. Schoene I, p. 130; II, pp. 134, 138; *Chron. paschale* ed. Dindorf I, pp. 351, 358; Sulpicius Severus ii 26; Epiphanius *Haer.* 20, 1, 3-4, and other Christian writers. Josephus and Julius Africanus are basically in agreement in regard to the Idumaeen descent, the only difference being that according to Josephus, Antipater's background was distinguished, and according to Africanus, lowly (he particularly emphasizes the poverty). In addition, Josephus gives the father of Antipater as Antipater, whereas for Africanus it is Herod. Certain connexions of King Herod with this town speak in favour of an Ascalonite descent (see vol. II, § 23, 1). But for the rest, the story of Julius Africanus reveals so much spite and malice that it is impossible to avoid the suspicion that it is a Jewish or Christian fabrication. Julius Africanus appeals to the *συγγενεῖς* of Jesus Christ, Euseb. *HE* i 7, 11, *τοῦ γούν σωτήρος οἱ κατὰ σάρκα συγγενεῖς . . . παρέδοσαν καὶ ταῦτα*. Cf. i 7, 14, *οἱ προειρημένοι δεσπόσωνοι καλούμενοι διὰ τὴν πρὸς τὸ σωτήριον γένος συνάφειαν*, and therefore seems to have derived it from Christian sources. Its credibility was argued by H. Gelzer, *Julius Africanus* I, pp. 258-61. See RE I, col. 2509 s.v. 'Antipatros' (16). See also W. Otto, *Herodes* (1913), cols. 1-2 (correctly rejecting the Ascalon tradition), and A. Schälit, *König Herodes* (1969), pp. 45, 677-8.

arguing that Aristobulus's occupation of the throne was unlawful and that Hyrcanus was the legitimate ruler. Then he attached himself to Hyrcanus and tried to make him believe that his life was in danger so long as Aristobulus was in power, and that he must overthrow him. To begin with, the dull and indifferent Hyrcanus paid no attention. But in the end, Antipater's intrigues were successful. He had, in effect, also persuaded the Nabataean prince, Aretas, into an alliance with him and made him promise that if Hyrcanus fled to him for refuge, he would receive him as a friend. Hyrcanus finally decided to yield to Antipater's representations, and in his company fled by night from Jerusalem to Petra, the capital of Aretas.⁴ He promised the Nabataean that when he regained power, he would return the twelve towns taken from him by Alexander Jannaeus, whereupon Aretas assured him of his support in recovering his throne.⁵

Aretas accordingly set out with an army against Aristobulus and defeated him in battle. As a result of the victory, a great part of Aristobulus's troops went over to Hyrcanus; indeed, the whole people joined him. Only a few remained loyal to Aristobulus and he was obliged to retreat to the Temple Mount, where he was besieged by Aretas and Hyrcanus. Josephus relates episodes from the time of this siege which are highly characteristic of Jewish piety at that time. On Hyrcanus's side was a certain Onias who had acquired great fame from having once prayed to God for rain during a drought, with immediate happy results. It was hoped that this man, or rather, the irresistible power of his prayer, might bring about the destruction of the besieged. He was therefore led into the camp and invited solemnly to invoke the curse of God on Aristobulus and his followers. But instead, Onias stepped into the centre and said: 'O God, Thou King of all things, since they who now stand around me are Thy people, and they who are besieged are Thy priests, I beseech thee not to hearken to either, nor to do anything that either invokes against the other'. But the people approved so little of Onias's brotherly attitude that they immediately stoned him to death.⁶ Josephus also tells the story of another incident

4. On Petra as capital of the Nabataean kingdom, see App. II below.

5. *Ant.* xiv 1, 3-4 (10-18); *B.J.* i 6, 2 (123-6). Cf. above, p. 226.

6. *Ant.* xiv 2, 1 (22-4). For an (unsatisfactory) attempt to identify this man with the Qumran Teacher of Righteousness see R. Goossens, 'Les éléments messianiques des traditions sur Onias le Juste chez Joseph et dans le Talmud', *Bull. Ac. Roy. Belg. Cl. de Lett.* 5 sér., 3b (1950), pp. 440-69; 'Onias le Juste, Messie de la Nouvelle Alliance', *Nouv. Cl. de Lett.* 2 (1950), pp. 336-53. The story of the hearing of Onias's prayer when he once prayed for rain appears, with much embellishment, in the Mishnah, in Taan. 3:8. He is called there Honi 'the circle-drawer' (מעגול) from the circle which he drew on the ground round his feet. Cf. yTaan. 66d-67a; bTaan. 23a. See also Derenbourg, *op. cit.*, pp. 112 f. A. Büchler, *Types of Jewish-Palestinian Piety* (1922), pp. 196-264. The rabbinic report tinged with criticism contrasts interestingly with Josephus's wholehearted praise of Onias.

which, again, does not reflect well on the besiegers. The Feast of Passover was approaching, and the priests in Aristobulus's entourage wished at all costs to offer the prescribed sacrifices.⁷ There was, however, a shortage of sacrificial animals, and they knew of no other way of obtaining a supply except by buying from Hyrcanus's people. The latter demanded one thousand drachmas a head. The price was unprecedently high. Nevertheless, the besieged agreed, and let down the money through a hole in the wall. The besiegers, however, took it and kept the animals for themselves. In Josephus's opinion, it was because of this wickedness that the merited punishment soon overtook them: a violent storm broke out which destroyed all the crops, with the result that a *modius* of wheat cost the exorbitant price of eleven drachmas.⁸

While this was taking place in Judaea, Pompey had already begun his victorious campaign in Asia.⁹ He had defeated Mithridates in 66 B.C., and had accepted in the same year the voluntary submission of Tigranes. While he himself now penetrated deeper into Asia, he sent Scaurus to Syria in 65 B.C.¹⁰ When the latter reached Damascus, he heard of the war between the brothers in Judaea and set off without delay in order to derive some advantage from the conflict for himself. He had hardly entered Judaea when emissaries appeared, sent by Aristobulus as well as by Hyrcanus. Both pleaded for Scaurus's favour and support. Aristobulus offered him in return four hundred talents, and as Hyrcanus could not then do less, he promised him the same sum. Scaurus, however, believed that Aristobulus was more likely to make good his offer, and he took his side. He commanded Aretas to withdraw, otherwise he would declare him an enemy of Rome. Aretas dared not resist and raised the siege, whereupon Scaurus returned to Damascus. But Aristobulus pursued Aretas as he retreated and inflicted on him a crushing defeat.¹¹

Roman favour, for which Aristobulus had struggled so hard, and under whose protection he now thought himself safe, was to prove fatal to him and his land. He himself did all in his power to win the approval of Pompey, as well as that of Scaurus. He sent Pompey a precious gift, a grape-vine of gold worth five hundred talents which

7. This will probably have been Passover 65 B.C., for immediately afterwards Scaurus arrived in Judaea; cf. Broughton, MRR II, pp. 159, 163, 165, n. 7.

8. *Ant.* xiv 2, 2 (25-8). For rabbinic traditions in bSot. 496, bMen. 646; bB.K. 82b; see Derenbourg, *op. cit.*, pp. 113-14.

9. On Pompey's wars in the east (66-62 B.C.) see Broughton, MRR II, pp. 155, 159-60, 163-4, 169-70, 176; M. Gelzer, *Pompeius* (1949), pp. 87-120; J. Van Ooteghem, *Pompée le Grand* (1954), pp. 204-77; E. Will, *Histoire politique du monde hellénistique II* (1967), pp. 419-34.

10. See n. 7 above.

11. *Ant.* xiv 2, 3 (29-33); *B.J.* i 6, 2-3 (127-30).

Strabo saw exhibited in the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus in Rome.¹² Yet none of this was able to save Aristobulus once Pompey found it convenient to withdraw his favour from him and to turn it towards Hyrcanus. In the spring of 63 B.C., Pompey left his winter quarters in Syria,¹³ subjugated the greater and lesser dynasts in the Lebanon,¹⁴ and advanced through Heliopolis and Chalcis to Damascus.¹⁵ Here three Jewish parties appeared before him; not only Aristobulus and Hyrcanus, but, in addition, envoys of the Jewish people. Hyrcanus complained that Aristobulus had seized power unlawfully, and Aristobulus defended himself by pointing to Hyrcanus's incompetence. The people, however, wished to have nothing to do with either of them, and desired the constitution created by the Hasmonaean priests to be abolished and the ancient sacerdotal theocracy restored.¹⁶ Pompey listened to them, but temporarily postponed his decision, declaring that

12. *Ant.* xiv 3, 1 (34-6). The words *τοῦτο μέντοι τὸ δῶρον ἱστορήκαμεν καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀνακειμενον ἐν Ῥώμῃ* are not those of Josephus, but form part of the quotation of Strabo (= Jacoby, FGrH 91 F 14), as the narrative goes on to demonstrate (the value of the golden vine is given once more, although Josephus has already mentioned it). It is true that Josephus could have seen it on his first visit to Rome in A.D. 64-5. But he would then not have omitted to remark that this had taken place before the great fire. For the Capitol was burned down in A.D. 69, *Tac. Hist.* iii 71-2; *Suet. Vit.* 15; *Dio* lxiv/v 17, 3.

13. According to *Dio* xxxvii 7, 5, Pompey spent the winter of 65-4 B.C. in the town of Aspis, the exact location of which is not known. R. Dussaud, *Topographie historique de la Syrie antique et médiévale* (1927), p. 237, suggests that Aspis was near Hama. But during this winter Pompey was still in Asia Minor. The winter of 64-3 was probably spent in Antioch, see Gelzer, *Pompeius* (1949), p. 108, and Schalit, *König Herodes* (1969), p. 7, notes 6-7.

14. Among the subjugated dynasts Josephus mentions in *Ant.* xiv 3, 2 (40) a Jew named Silas, tyrant of Lysias, a strongpoint near Apamea, see *RE* s.v. 'Lysias' (5). A similar lesser dynast is presumably also 'Bacchius Judaeus', whose submission is recorded by a coin of Aulus Plautius, aedile 54 B.C. See *BMC Roman Republic I* (1910), pp. 490-1. This 'Bacchius the Jew' might be identical with Dionysius of Tripolis, mentioned in *Jos. Ant.* xiv 3, 3 (39).

15. *Ant.* xiv 3, 2 (40). The text of most manuscripts reads here *διελθὼν δὲ τὰς πόλεις τὴν τε Ἡλιούπολιν καὶ τὴν Χαλκίδα καὶ τὸ διεύργον ὄρος ὑπερβαλὼν τὴν κοίτην προσαγορευομένην Συρίαν ἀπὸ τῆς Πέλλης εἰς Δαμασκὸν ἦκεν*. This would result in the impossible march route Heliopolis-Chalcis-Pella-Damascus. Niese rightly chose *ἄλλης* found in the best manuscripts (cod. Palat.), rather than *Πέλλης* ('crossing the mountains dividing Coele-Syria from the rest of Syria'). '*Ἡ ἄλλη Συρία* in contrast to *κοίτη* is supported by *Ant.* xiv 4, 5 (79) and *Philo. Leg. ad Gaium* 36 (281). It should also be noted that the golden vine of Aristobulus was presented to Pompey in Damascus, *Ant.* xiv 3, 1 (34). Josephus, it is true, mentions this before his report of Pompey's advance out of Syria through Heliopolis and Chalcis to Damascus, which makes it appear as if Pompey went to Damascus twice, in 64 and 63 B.C. But it is clear that Josephus derived the account of the golden vine from another source and did not insert it into the right place in the context of the main narrative. Cf. Niese, *Hermes* 11 (1876), p. 471.

16. *Ant.* xiv 3, 2 (41-5); *Diodorus* xl 2.

it was his intention to regulate matters as soon as he had completed the campaign planned against the Nabataeans. Till then, they were all to maintain the peace.¹⁷

Aristobulus was not satisfied with this, and betrayed his discontent by suddenly parting from Pompey at Dium, where he had accompanied him in his campaign against the Nabataeans.¹⁸ Pompey became suspicious, put off his expedition against the Nabataeans, and marched at once against Aristobulus. He skirted Pella, crossed the Jordan at Scythopolis, and entered Judaea proper at Corea (Κορέα).¹⁹ From there, he sent messengers to Alexandrium, where Aristobulus had fled, and ordered him to surrender the fortress. After long hesitation and much negotiation, Aristobulus did so, but travelled immediately to Jerusalem to mobilize resistance there.²⁰ Pompey followed him through Jericho and soon appeared in the vicinity of Jerusalem. But then Aristobulus lost courage. He went to Pompey's camp, brought him new gifts, and promised to surrender the city to him if Pompey would suspend hostilities. Pompey was satisfied, and despatched his general Gabinius to take possession of the city while he detained Aristobulus in the camp. Gabinius, however, returned with nothing done because the people of the city had barred their gates to him. Pompey became so enraged at this that he took Aristobulus prisoner and advanced immediately against the city.²¹ In Jerusalem, opinions were now divided. Aristobulus's followers wished to hear nothing of peace and were prepared to defend themselves to the utmost. Those of Hyrcanus, on the other hand, saw Pompey as their ally and wanted to open the gates to him. The latter were in the majority and had their way. The city was surrendered to Pompey, who sent in his legate, Piso, and took possession of it without striking a blow. But the war party had assembled on the Temple mount and mobilized resistance there.²²

The Temple mount was then, as later, the strongpoint of Jerusalem.

17. *Ant.* xiv 3, 3 (46).

18. *Ant.* xiv 3, 3 (47); *B.J.* i 6, 4 (132). On the location of Dium and the reading in this passage, see vol. II, § 23, 1. Compare also Schalit, *König Herodes*, p. 11, n. 38.

19. On the location of Corea, see Abel, *Géog. Pal.* II, pp. 300-1. It is to be identified with Tel Mazar near modern Qarawa at the mouth of Wadi el-Far'a. The neighbouring fortress of Alexandrium must therefore have been Sartabeh. Cf. Abel, *Géog. Pal.* II, pp. 241-2. On the mosaic of Medeba also, *Kopeous* is marked as being south of Scythopolis; see Avi-Yonah, *The M. Zabar Mosaic Map* (1954). Pompey thus marched from Scythopolis in the Jordan valley directly south to Jericho.

20. *Ant.* xiv 3, 4 (48-53); *B.J.* i 6, 5 (133-7).

21. *Ant.* xiv 4, 1 (54-7); *B.J.* i 6, 6-7, 1 (138-41). Pompey's camp is also mentioned in *B.J.* v 12, 2 (506).

22. *Ant.* xiv 4, 2 (58-60); *B.J.* i 7, 2 (142-4).

It fell steeply away to the east and the south. To the west, also, it was divided from the city by a deep ravine. The terrain was level only to the north, but even here access was almost impossible on account of strong fortifications. It was in this mighty bulwark that the followers of Aristobulus entrenched themselves, and Pompey was obliged, whether he liked it or not; to decide on a regular siege. Naturally, he selected the northern side for his point of attack. A rampart was thrown up, and the great siege engines brought from Tyre were mounted on it. For a long time the powerful walls withstood the impact of the missiles. But at last, after a siege lasting three months, a breach was made at one place. A son of the dictator Sulla was the first to go through with his men. Others followed. A fearful blood-bath then ensued. The priests, who were at that moment offering sacrifice, would not allow themselves to be diverted from the exercise of their duties and were cut down at the altar. No less than twelve thousand Jews are said to have perished in the general massacre. It was in the late autumn of 63 B.C., in the consulship of Cicero, on the Day of Atonement, according to Josephus, on a Sabbath according to Dio, that the holy city capitulated to the Roman commander.²³

23. *Ant.* xiv 4, 2-4 (61-71); *B.J.* i 7, 3-5 (145-51). Dio xxxvii 16, 1-4. In general see also Strabo xvi 2, 40 (762-3); Livy, *Epit.* 102; Tac. *Hist.* v 9; Appian, *Syr.* 50/252; *Mithridat.* 106/498. The Day of Atonement: *ἡ ἡμέρα τῆς νηστείας σημεῖρα*, *Ant.* xiv 4, 3 (66). The Sabbath: *ἐν τῇ τοῦ Κρόνου ἡμέρα*, Dio xxxvii 16, 4. Cf. Strabo, *loc. cit.* The Day of Atonement falls on 10 Tishri (=September/October). There can be no doubt, from the established Jewish usage of the term, that this is what Josephus means by 'Day of Fasting', *Ant.* xvii 6, 4 (165); xviii 4, 3 (94); Philo, *Vita Mos.* II 4 (23); *Spec. leg.* I 168-93; II 193-203; *Leg. ad Gaium* 39 (306-7); Acts 27:9; mMen. 11:9 *יום צום*; cf. the Aramaic *צומא רבא*, yMK. 83a, yTaan. 67c, etc.; see also Dalman, *Grammatik*, p. 248. The most important parallel comes from 1QpHab. XI 6-8, where the sect's 'Day of Atonement' (*יום הכפורים*) is paraphrased as 'the Day of Fasting, their Sabbath of repose' (*יום צום*). See below, n. 30. The third month, *περὶ τρίτον μῆνα*, *Ant.* xiv 4, 3 (66) is not the third month of the year, Jewish or Greek, but the third month of the siege, as Josephus explicitly states in *B.J.* i 7, 4 (149) *τρίτω γὰρ μηνί τῆς πολιορκίας*. Cf. *B.J.* v 9, 4 (397), *τρισὶ γούν μηνὶ πολιορκηθέντες*. Herzfeld, *MGWJ* 4 (1855), pp. 109-15, suggested that the date of the Day of Atonement rests on a mistake by Josephus, who discovered in his pagan sources that the conquest took place on a fast-day, but which meant, not the Day of Atonement, but (in accordance with the misapprehension widespread in the Graeco-Roman world that Jews fast on that day) the Sabbath, see Suet. *Div. Aug.* 76; Justin xxxvi 2, 14; Petronius F. 37, ed. Bücheler=Reinach, *Textes d'auteurs grecs et romains sur les juifs et le judaïsme* (1895), p. 266. This is rendered almost a certainty by the fact that Josephus in *Ant.* xiv 4, 3 (68) quotes among his authorities Strabo (i.e. his *History*, see Jacoby, *FGH* 91 F 15), who in his *Geography* xvi 2, 40 (763) writes concerning the conquest of Jerusalem *κατελάβετο* (scil. Πομπήιος) *δ' ὡς φασὶ, τρησας τὴν τῆς νηστείας ἡμέραν, ἡνίκα ἀπέχοντο οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι παντὸς ἔργου*. This does indeed read 'a Sabbath fast-day'. But even if it is not proved that the

Pompey himself broke into the Holy of Holies, where only the High Priest was allowed to enter. But he left untouched the treasures and precious things of the Temple, and took care to ensure that divine worship should continue undisturbed. His judgment on the vanquished was severe. Those responsible for the war were beheaded, and the city and land were made subject to tribute, τῇ τε χώρῃ καὶ τοῖς Ἱεροσολύμοις ἐπιτάσσει φόρον.²⁴ The extent of Jewish territory was greatly reduced. All the coastal towns, from Raphia to Dora, were taken from it; similarly, all the non-Jewish towns east of Jordan such as Hippos, Gadara, Pella, Dium and others, and also Scythopolis and Samaria with considerable territories. All these towns were placed under the immediate jurisdiction of the governor of the newly-established Roman province of Syria.²⁵ The diminished Jewish territory was awarded to Hyrcanus II as High Priest without royal title.²⁶

After Pompey had thus regulated affairs in Palestine, he sent Scaurus back to Syria as governor, while he himself hastened back to Asia Minor. He took Aristobulus with him as a prisoner of war, as well as the latter's two daughters and his sons Alexander and Antigonos, the first of whom managed to escape on the way.²⁷ When Pompey celebrated his triumph in Rome in 61 B.C. with great pomp and splendour, the Jewish Priest-King, the descendant of the Maccabees, was made to

event took place on the Day of Atonement, it must nevertheless be maintained that it occurred in the late autumn. For the long sequence of events between Pompey's start in the spring of 63 B.C., *Ant.* xiv 3, 2 (38), and the conquest of the city, cannot have happened within the space of a few months. It is therefore very unlikely that the conquest could have taken place as early as June, as might be suggested if the phrase 'third month' were understood as the third month of the Jewish year.

24. *Ant.* xiv 4, 4 (71-3); *B.J.* i 7, 6 (152-5). Cf. Cicero *pro Flacco* 28/67, 'Cn. Pompeius captis Hierosolymis victor ex illo fano nihil attigit.' Cf. however, Dio xxxvii 16, 4.

25. On all these towns and their location in the Roman period compare vol. II, § 23, 1. Josephus's list in *Ant.* xiv 4, 4 (75-6); *B.J.* i 7, 7 (155-6) is not complete. He names only the most important. Without doubt, not only all the coastal towns received their freedom, but also all those east of Jordan which afterwards formed the so-called Decapolis. For in most of the cities of the Decapolis the coinage shows that the Pompeian era was used. See e.g. *BMC Syria*, pp. lxxxiii f. It should however be noted that an actual minting of coins did not begin in these places until later, see A. R. Bellinger, 'The Early Coinage of Roman Syria', *Studies in Roman Economic and Social History presented to A. C. Johnson* (1951), pp. 58-67. For a survey see H. Bietenhard, 'Die Dekapolis von Pompeius bis Traian', *ZDPV* 79 (1963), pp. 24-58.

26. *Ant.* xiv 4, 4 (73); *B.J.* i 7, 6-7 (153). Cf. *Ant.* xx 10, 4 (244) τῷ δ' Ὑρκανῷ πάλιν τὴν ἀρχιερωσύνην ἀποδοὺς τὴν μὲν τοῦ ἔθνους προστασίαν ἐπετρέψεν, διάδημα δὲ φορεῖν ἐκέλευεν.

27. *Ant.* xiv 4, 5 (77-9); *B.J.* i 7, 7 (137-8).

walk in front of the conqueror's chariot.²⁸ In addition to Aristobulus and his family, Pompey was also accompanied by a great number of Jewish captives. When these were later set free, they formed the basis of an extensive Jewish community in Rome.²⁹

With Pompey's decrees the freedom of the Jewish nation was carried to its grave after barely eighty years of existence (reckoning from 142 B.C.) He was admittedly shrewd enough not to make any essential changes in the internal conditions of the country. He left the hierarchical constitution unaltered, and gave the people Hyrcanus II, the man favoured by the Pharisees, as their High Priest. But their independence was at an end, and the Jewish High Priest was merely a Roman vassal. This result was, of course, inevitable once the Romans had set foot in Syria. For their power was of a different order from that of the Seleucid rulers. And even the mightiest and most popular dynast would not have been able to resist permanently in face of Rome's superiority. However, Rome's work of conquest was facilitated by the fact that the country was disunited and that the contending parties were foolish enough to call for protection and help from strangers. There was little trace left of that spirit which a hundred years earlier had led the nation into battle.³⁰

28. Compare the description of the triumph in Plut. *Pomp.* 45; Appian *Mithridat.* 117/571-8; Pliny, *NH* VII 26/98; full references in Broughton, *MRR* II, p. 181. Appian *loc. cit.* erroneously states that Aristobulus's death took place after the triumph, whereas he did not die until 49 B.C. (see below).

29. See Philo, *Leg. ad Gaium* 23 (155), and Smallwood, *ad loc.* The origins of the Jewish community in Rome go back to before 61 B.C., for Jewish money was exported from Italy to Jerusalem already when Flaccus was pro-praetor of Asia (62 B.C.), Cicero, *pro Flacco* 28/67. See H. J. Leon, *The Jews of Ancient Rome* (1960), ch. i, and vol. III, § 31, 1.

30. Contemporary Jewish Bible interpretation (Qumran commentaries on Habakkuk and Nahum) and religious poetry (Sibylline Oracles and Psalms of Solomon) shed indirect but valuable light on Palestinian society and its attitude towards Rome at the time of the conquest of Jerusalem by Pompey.

Today there is quasi-unanimity in identifying the victorious Kittim of Qumran literature with the Romans; see A. Dupont-Sommer, *The Essene Writings from Qumran* (1961), pp. 341-51; cf. G. Vermes, *Discovery*, pp. 79-84; *Dead Sea Scrolls*, p. 65). The one major divergence concerns the dating of the events described in the Habakkuk commentary to the period immediately following Pompey (Dupont-Sommer) or preceding it (Vermes). The main arguments in favour of the latter alternative are as follows. (1) In 1QpHab II-VI the Kittim are depicted as world conquerors about to invade Judaea. They are not associated with past history; in fact, none of the verbs used in relation to them appears in the perfect tense. The 'last Priests of Jerusalem' still commanding the Palestinian scene at the time of the composition of the Commentary are portrayed as their contemporaries whose riches the Kittim are to appropriate, see 1QpHab. IX 4-7. (2) In 4QpNah I 2-4, Demetrius, king of Greece is said to have failed to enter Jerusalem (see above, p. 224, n. 22) and the city was not to be subjugated by the Gentiles (the sense is

assured despite gaps in the text) from the time of Antiochus (IV Epiphanes) until the arrival of the rulers of the Kittim: מֵאֲנֹשֵׁי כוֹס עַד עֲמוּד מִוִּשְׁלֵי כַתִּיִּים. If therefore the occupation of Jerusalem was to mark a new era, the period dealt with in 1QpHab, during which the Kittim were not yet masters of Judaea, necessarily falls prior to 63 B.C.

Dupont-Sommer's argument (see RHR 137 (1950), pp. 149-50, 168-9; *Essene Writings*, pp. 166-7) that pHab. XI 6-8 hints at the actual fall of Jerusalem on the Day of Atonement: (see above, p. 239, n. 23) is far from cogent; it entails in particular an unnecessary and unjustified change of subject. In the first of two sentences this was the Wicked Priest. It is normal, therefore, to understand the key verb 'he appeared to them' (הוֹפִיעַ עֲלֵיהֶם) as indicating the Wicked Priest's sudden and unexpected visit to the Teacher of Righteousness and his followers. Dupont-Sommer, by contrast, applies it to a supernatural manifestation of the dead Teacher himself. See G. Vermes, *Cahiers Sioniens* 5 (1951), pp. 63-5; M. B. Dagut, *Biblica* 32 (1951), pp. 542-8; S. Talmon, *ibid.*, pp. 549-51.

If it is accepted that the Kittim of 1QpHab are the Romans of the mid-sixties B.C., the picture contained there points to a shift in Jewish attitudes towards the Romans compared with the praises showered on them in 1 Mac. (see above, pp. 171, 194). They are no longer depicted as benevolence incarnate, but as hard, cunning and cruel conquerors (1QpHab. II 12-VI 12), the 'remnant of the peoples' chosen by God to punish the 'last Priests of Jerusalem' (IX 4-7). However, since the writer hoped that his Hasmonaean opponents would be humiliated by them, he refrained from passing judgment on the Kittim.

A similar politically unbiased view of the conquering Romans is included in a perhaps somewhat earlier passage of the Jewish Sibylline Oracles (III, 75-80) mentioning that 'an empire . . . from the Western sea . . . shall frighten many kings . . . and rob much silver and gold from many cities'. On the Sibylline Oracles see vol. III, § 33.

The author of the Psalms of Solomon, possibly a Pharisee (see Eissfeldt, *Introduction*, pp. 612-13; cf. vol. III, § 32) writing around the middle of the first century B.C., is the first Jewish author to express unmitigated hostility to Rome. He and the party of 'the Pious' which he represents, were opposed to 'the sinners' guilty of profanation of the sanctuary (2:3; 8:12-14) and of the creation of a non-Davidic monarchy (17:7-8), i.e. the Sadducaean supporters of the Hasmonaeans. The Psalmist of Ps of Sol. 2 manifests bitter hatred towards Pompey, and reproaches this 'proud sinner' with the destruction of the walls of Jerusalem and the desecration of the altar in the Temple (2:1-2). He is 'the lawless one' who 'ravaged our land' killing all indiscriminately. (Note the reference to a 'massacre by אַמְלִיּוֹס, no doubt Aemilius Scaurus, Pompey's general, in the unpublished calendar from 4Q; see Milik, *Ten Years of Discovery*, p. 73.) Characterized as a 'dragon' (2:25), the Roman general's inglorious end is foretold in a pseudo-prophetic vision: 'I had not long to wait before God showed me the insolent one slain on the mountains of Egypt, esteemed of less account than the least on land and sea' (2:26). 'He reflected not that he was but a man . . . He said, I will be lord of land and sea, and recognized not that God alone is great' (2:28-9; probably a pun on Pompey's epithet, Magnus). See G. B. Gray in Charles, *Apocr. and Pseudep.* II, pp. 628-30 and *ad loc.*

For an identification of the opponent of the Qumran Community as Hyrcanus II and Aristobulus II, see A. Dupont-Sommer, *The Essene Writings from Qumran* (1961), pp. 351-7; 'Observations sur le Commentaire de Nahum découvert près de la Mer Morte', *Journal des Savants* (1963), pp. 201-26.