

§ 16. DISTURBANCES AFTER HEROD'S DEATH 4 B.C.

Sources

Josephus, *Ant.* xvii 9-11 (206-323); *B.J.* ii 1-6 (1-100).
 Nicolaus of Damascus, FGrH 90 F 136 (8)-(11).

Bibliography

Graetz, H., *Geschichte der Juden* III (1905-6), pp. 245-53.
 Brann, M., *De Herodis qui dicitur Magni filiiis patrem in imperio secutis* I (1873)
 (deals only with the events of 4 B.C.).
 Jones, A. H. M., *The Herods of Judaea* (1938, 21967), pp. 156-66.
 Kennard, J. S., 'Judas of Galilee and his Clan', *JQR* 36 (1945-46), pp. 281-6.
 Abel, F.-M., *Histoire de la Palestine* I (1952), pp. 407-14.
 Hengel, M., *Die Zeloten: Untersuchungen zur jüdischen Freiheitsbewegung in der Zeit von Herodes I bis 70 n. Chr.* (1961), esp. pp. 331-6.

In Herod's last will and testament Archelaus had been named as successor to the throne. His first business therefore was to secure the emperor's confirmation of his father's instruction and, with this end in view, he resolved to journey to Rome. But before starting, he had to quell another rebellion in Jerusalem. The people could not easily forget the execution of the two rabbis, Judas and Matthias, and clamoured for the punishment of Herod's counsellors. Archelaus tried at first to conciliate the people. But when this had no effect other than to cause an increased uproar, and since the matter was disquieting on account of the approaching Passover festival when great crowds gathered in Jerusalem, he sent a detachment of soldiers against those assembled in the Temple to put down the riot by force. But the detachment was too weak to do anything against the infuriated masses. Some of the soldiers were stoned; the rest fled, together with their leader. It was not until Archelaus called out his whole force that he was able, amid great bloodshed, to suppress the rebellion.¹

After he had thus restored peace by force, Archelaus hastened to Rome, leaving his brother Philip as administrator of the kingdom. Scarcely had he gone, when Antipas also started for Rome to press his own claims there. By Herod's third and last will he had received only Galilee and Peraea, whereas in the earlier second will he had been appointed successor to the throne. He therefore wished to point out to the emperor that the kingdom properly belonged to him and not to

1. *Ant.* xvii 9, 1-3 (206-18); *B.J.* ii 1, 1-3 (1-13).

Archelaus. Many other members of the Herodian family were also present in Rome at the same time as Archelaus and Antipas, and they too opposed Archelaus and expressed a strong desire that Palestine should be put under direct Roman government; if not, they would rather have Antipas than Archelaus.²

The sons of Herod thus plotted and schemed against one another in Rome. Augustus, in whose hands the decision lay, meanwhile convoked at his palace a council at which the brothers were called on to argue their conflicting claims. A certain Antipater spoke on behalf of Antipas, while Nicolaus of Damascus, Herod's former minister, appeared on behalf of Archelaus. Each sought to win over the emperor, partly by reasoning, partly by casting suspicion on his opponent. When Augustus had heard both parties, he inclined more to Archelaus and declared him to be the most worthy of the two to mount the throne. Yet he did not wish to decide the matter immediately, and dismissed the council without pronouncing final judgment.³

But before the question of the succession to the throne was settled in Rome, new troubles broke out in Judaea. The Jews had again risen in revolt soon after Archelaus's departure, but had been restored to order by Varus, the governor of Syria. Varus had then returned to Antioch, leaving behind in Jerusalem a legion to maintain the peace. But no sooner had he gone than the storm broke out afresh. After Herod's death, pending the settlement of the question of his successor, the emperor had sent into Judaea a procurator, Sabinus. This person oppressed the people in every sort of way, and generally behaved most recklessly. As a result, immediately Varus left, there was another rebellion. It was the season of the Feast of Weeks (Pentecost) and crowds of people were present in Jerusalem. They divided into three bands and attacked the Romans at three different points: north of the Temple, south beside the hippodrome, and west of the city near the royal palace. The keenest struggle took place first of all near the Temple. The Romans pressed forward successfully into the Temple court, but the Jews offered stiff resistance, climbing on to the roofs of the buildings surrounding the Temple court and hurling down stones upon the soldiers. These were obliged to resort to fire; they set the buildings alight and in this way finally gained the Temple mount. The Temple treasure fell to them as loot, of which Sabinus took 400 talents for himself.⁴

This first defeat was merely the signal for a further spread of the rebellion. In Jerusalem some of Herod's soldiers joined the rebels, and

2. *Ant.* xvii 9, 3-4 (218-27); *B.J.* ii 2, 1-3 (14-22). Nic. Dam., FGrH 90 F 136 (9).

3. *Ant.* xviii 9, 5-7 (228-49); *B.J.* ii 2, 4-7 (25-38).

4. *Ant.* xvii 10, 1-2 (250-64); *B.J.* ii 3, 1-3 (39-50).

they were in consequence able to subject Sabinus and his detachment to a formal siege in Herod's palace.⁵ In the neighbourhood of Sepphoris in Galilee, Judas, son of the Hezekiah/Ezekias with whom Herod had once, to the great indignation of the Sanhedrin, made such short shrift (see above, p. 275), collected around him a group, gained possession of the weapons stored in the royal arsenal, distributed these among his followers and made the whole of Galilee unsafe. He is even said to have coveted the royal crown.⁶ In Peraea, a former slave of Herod called Simon assembled a band and had himself proclaimed king by his followers; but he was defeated by a Roman detachment soon afterwards, and put to death.⁷ Finally, it is reported that a former shepherd named Athronges put on the royal crown and, with his four brothers, for a long time made the country insecure.⁸ It was a period of general upheaval from which each tried to obtain the maximum benefit for himself.

When Varus was informed of these events, he hastened from Antioch, with the two legions which he still had to restore order in Judaea. On the way, he was joined by Nabataean auxiliary troops sent by King Aretas, as well as by other auxiliaries. With this force he first of all cleared Galilee. Sepphoris, where Judas had been causing mischief, was set on fire and its inhabitants sold as slaves. From there, Varus proceeded to Samaria, which he spared because it had not taken part in the revolt, and thence marched towards Jerusalem, where the legion stationed there was still being besieged by the Jews in the royal palace. Here, Varus had an easy task, for when the besiegers saw the powerful Roman forces approach, they lost courage and fled. With this, he became master of the city and the country. But Sabinus, whose conscience was uneasy because of the Temple robberies and other misdeeds, made off as quickly as possible. Varus then sent his troops up and down through the country to capture those rebels who were still wandering about in small groups. He had two thousand of them crucified, but he granted pardon to the mass of the people. After stamping out the rebellion in this way, he returned to Antioch.⁹

5. *Ant.* xvii 10, 3 (265-8); *B.J.* ii 3, 4 (51-4).

6. *Ant.* xvii 10, 5 (271-2); *B.J.* ii 4, 1 (56). Concerning the identity of this Judas and Judas the Galilean, see below p. 381. Cf. also J. S. Kennard, 'Judas of Galilee and his Clan', *JQR* 36 (1945-6), pp. 281-6.

7. *Ant.* xvii 10, 6 (273-7); *B.J.* ii 4, 2 (57-9).

8. *Ant.* xvii 10, 7 (278-84); *B.J.* ii 4, 3 (60-5).

9. *Ant.* xvii 10, 9-10 (286-98); *B.J.* ii 5, 1-3 (66-79). This war of Varus is also referred to in *c. Ap.* i, 7 (34) as one of the most important between the conquest of Pompey and that of Vespasian. The name Varus is therefore probably to be restored in a corrupt passage in *Seder Olam*, in which it is said that 'from the war of Asveros to the war of Vespasian there were eighty years'. Although the number eighty is somewhat too high, and although the best texts give אסוריוס, it is

While this was going on in Judaea, Archelaus and Antipas were still in Rome awaiting the emperor's decision. Before it was given, yet another embassy from the people of Judaea appeared before Augustus, asking that none of the Herodians should be appointed king, but that they should be permitted to live in accordance with their own laws. About the same time, Philip, the last of the three brothers to whom territories had been bequeathed by Herod, made his appearance in Rome to press his own claims, and so support those of his brother Archelaus.¹⁰ Augustus was finally obliged to make a decision. In a council which he called for this purpose in the temple of Apollo he heard first the delegation of the Jewish people. These presented him with a long list of Herod's scandalous misdeeds and sought thereby to buttress their demand that no Herodian should again rule in Palestine, but that they should be permitted to live according to their own laws under Roman suzerainty. When they had finished, Nicolaus of Damascus rose and spoke on behalf of his master Archelaus.¹¹ A few days after Augustus had thus heard both sides, he issued his decision. The will of Herod was confirmed in all its essential points. Archelaus was awarded the territory assigned to him: Judaea, Samaria, Idumaea. But the cities of Gaza, Gadara, and Hippus were detached from it and joined to the province of Syria. And instead of the title of king, he was given that of ethnarch. Antipas obtained Galilee and Peraea, with the title of tetrarch; Philip, also as tetrarch, received the regions of Batanaea, Trachonitis, and Auranitis. Archelaus was to derive from his territories an income of 600 talents, Antipas 200 talents, and Philip 100 talents. Salome, the sister of Herod the Great, also obtained the portion bequeathed to her, the cities of Jamnia, Azotus, Phasaelis, and 500,000 pieces of silver, in addition to the palace of Ascalon.¹² Salome

[Text continues on p. 335]

nevertheless highly probable that אוריוס should be read, that is, Varus (so Graetz, *op. cit.*, pp. 249, 714 ff. (note 18); Derenbourg, *Histoire*, p. 194. On the textual tradition, see A. Neubauer, *Mediaeval Jewish Chronicles II (Anecdota Oxoniensia, Semitic Series, vol. I, Part vi)*, 1895, p. 66, and B. Ratner, *Seder Olam, die grosse Weltchronik* (1897), p. 145. The whole passage will be quoted below, p. 534, n. 92.

10. *Ant.* xvii 11, 1 (299-303); *B.J.* ii 6, 1 (83). The facts here related may have provided the framework for the Parable of the Pounds (Lk. 19:12-27). Cf. especially v. 12: 'A nobleman [Archelaus] went into a far country [Rome] to receive a kingdom [Judaea] and then returned;' v. 14: 'But his citizens hated him, and sent an embassy after him, saying, "We do not want this man to reign over us".'

11. *Ant.* xvii, 11, 2-3 (304-16); *B.J.* ii 6, 2 (92).

12. *Ant.* xvii 11, 4-5 (317-23); *B.J.* ii 6, 3 (93-100); cf. also Nic. Dam. FG+H 90 F 136 (11); Strabo, xvi 2, 46 (765). On the cities mentioned above (Gaza, Gadara, Hippus, Jamnia, Azotus, Phasaelis), see vol. II, § 23, 1. The title of ἐθναρχης evidently signifies a rank somewhat higher than that of τετραρχης. The Hasmonaean princes, for example, bore the former before assuming the royal

title (1 Mac. 14:47; 15:1-2). It was also conferred upon Hyrcanus II by Caesar, *Ant.* xiv 10, 2 (191). The title *τετράρχης* is much more common. Herod the Great and his brother Phasaël had already received it from Antonius, *Ant.* xiv 13, 1 (326); *B. J.* i 12, 5 (244). In 20 B.C. Pheroras was made tetrach of Peraea, *Ant.* xv, 10, 3 (362); *B. J.* i 24, 5 (483). The expression *τετταρχία* is first attested in the fifth century B.C. with regard to Thessaly, which from ancient times was divided into four districts (Euripides, *Alcestis* 1154; Syll.³ 274; see Harpocration, *Lex.*, ed. Dindorf, s.v. *Τετταρχία*: . . . καὶ Ἀριστοτέλης δὲ ἐν τῇ κοινῇ Θετταλῶν πολιτείᾳ ἐπὶ Ἀλεῦα τοῦ Πύρρου διηρησθαί φησιν εἰς δ' μοίρας τὴν Θετταλίαν. When Philip of Macedon brought all Thessaly under his rule, he appointed an ἄρχων over each *τετράς* (Harpocration, *loc. cit.* = FGtH 115 F 208: *οἱ δὲ Φίλιππος καθ' ἑκάστην τούτων τῶν μοιρῶν ἄρχοντα κατέστησε δεδηλώκασιν ἄλλοι τε καὶ Θεόπομπος ἐν τῇ μὲδ*). In this connection Demosthenes states that Philip had established tetrarchies in Thessaly (Demosth. *Philipp.* iii, 26: *ἀλλὰ Θετταλία πῶς ἔχει; οὐχὶ τὰς πολιτείας καὶ τὰς πόλεις αὐτῶν παρήρηται καὶ τετταρχίας κατέστησεν*). Thus in Demosthenes *τετταρχία* means 'domination of a quarter' (government over a *τετράς*, whence is derived also *τετταδαρχία*). Similarly, the expression occurs in Galatia in this original sense. According to Strabo it was ruled by twelve tetrarchs, *viz.* four over each of three tribes of Trocmi, Tolistobogi and Tectosagi, Strabo, xii 5, 1 (566 ff.); less accurately, Pliny, *NH* v 42/146. As most of these were murdered by Mithridates (App. *Mith.* 46/178), Pompey so arranged things that he appointed one tetrach over each of the three races. Later, their number was reduced to two, and finally to one, Deiotarus (Strabo, xii 5, 1 (567); see the detailed account of these conditions in Niese, *RhMus*, 38 (1883), pp. 583-600, and B. A. Zwintscher, *De Galatarum tetrarchis et Amynta rege quaestiones* (1892), pp. 1-26.) However, although the title of tetrach had in this way completely lost its original meaning, it was still retained; for the title of king, which some assumed at the same time, did not apply to Galatia, but to other possessions, Strabo xii 3, 13 (547); xiii 4, 3 (625); Niese, *loc. cit.* Moreover, the title *τεττάρχη* completely denuded of its original meaning is encountered quite frequently in Roman times. It then denoted simply a minor dependent prince whose rank and political power were less than that of a king. There seem to have been many such tetrachs, especially in Syria. See Pliny, *NH* v 16/74 f. *intercurrent cinguntque has urbes (Decapoleos) tetrachiae, regnorum instar singulae*; *ibid.* 17/77: *Decapolitana regio praedictaeque cum ea tetrachiae*; *ibid.* 19/81: *Nazerinorum tetrachia*; *ibid.*: *tetrachias duas quae Granucomatitae vocantur*; *ibid.* 19/82: *tetrachiam quae Mammisea appellatur*; *ibid.*: *tetrachias in regna descriptas barbaris nominibus XVII*; Jos. *Vita* 11 (52) *ἔγγονος Σοέμου τοῦ περὶ τὸν Λίβανον τετταρχοῦντος*. Antonius gave away 'tetrarchies and kingdoms' (Plut. *Ant.* 36: *πολλοῖς ἐχαρίζετο τετταρχίας καὶ βασιλείας ἐθνῶν μεγάλων*). Varus's army in 4 B.C. included auxiliaries, whom *ἢ βασιλεῖς ἢ τινες τεττάρχηαι τότε παρεῖχον* (*Ant.* xvii 10, 9 (286)). In Nero's time, 'tetrarchs and kings' in Asia were instructed to obey the commands of Corbulo (Tac. *Ann.* xv, 25: *scribitur tetrarchis ac regibus praefectisque et procuratoribus . . . iussis Corbulonis obsequi*). And so generally in Roman times *tetrarchae* often appear as minor princes of subordinate rank beside the *reges*; (e.g., Cicero, in *Vatinius*, 12/29; *pro Balbo*, 5/13; *pro Milone*, 28/76; *Philipp.* xi 12/31; Caesar, *Bell. Civ.* iii 3; *Bell. Alex.* 78; Horace, *Sat.* i 3, 12; further examples may be found in the literature cited below). Better known than the Galatian tetrarchs and Herodian princes are the names of tetrarchs of Chalcis or Ituraea: Ptolemy, Lysanias, Zenodorus (for these see Appendix I). From the limited importance of these minor princes, it is not surprising that the title *τεττάρχη* figures comparatively seldom on inscriptions and coins. On inscriptions, see IGR III 200 = SEG VI 56; OGIS 349; 549 (on Galatian tetrarchs); OGIS 416, 417 (both refer to Herod Antipas); OGIS 606, IGLS 2851 (Chalcis dynasty);

lived to enjoy these possessions for some twelve or fourteen years. She died about A.D. 10, in the time of the procurator M. Ambivius, and bequeathed her property to the Empress Livia.¹³

The former kingdom of Herod was thereby divided into three territories, each of which had for a while its own history.

OGIS 543, 544. Of coins, besides those of Philip and Herod Antipas, only those of Ptolemy, Lysanias and Zenodorus need to be considered (see Appendix I). Cf. Stephanus, *Thesaurus*, s.v. *τεττάρχη* and *τετταρχία*; RE s.v. 'Tetrarch'; Bohn, *Qua condicione juris reges socii populi Romani fuerint* (1877), p. 9-11; Niese, 'Galatien und seine Tetrarchen', *RhMus.* 38 (1883), pp. 583-600; Zwintscher, *op. cit.*; D. Magie, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor* (1950), ch. xix, n. 8.

¹³ *Ant.* xviii 2, 2 (31).