

§ 17. FROM THE DEATH OF HEROD THE GREAT TO AGRIPPA I
4 B.C.—A.D. 41

The Sons of Herod

I. Philip 4 B.C.—A.D. 33/4

Sources

Josephus, *Ant.* xviii 2, 1 (27–8); 4, 6 (106–8); 6, 10 (237); *B.J.* ii 9, 1 (167–8); 6 (181).

On the coins, see n. 9 below.

Bibliography

Brann, M., *Die Söhne des Herodes* (1873), pp. 77–87.

Schalit, A., 'Herodes und seine Nachfolger', *Kontexte*, III *Die Zeit Jesu* (1966), pp. 34–42.

Jones, A. H. M., *The Herods of Judaea* (21967), pp. 156–66.

The extent of the territory which Philip received is variously stated by Josephus in different passages.¹ Altogether, it comprised the regions of Batanaea, Trachonitis, Auranitis, Gaulanitis, Panias, and, according to Lk. 3:1, Ituraea also.² The areas named were not ancient tribal
[Text continues on p. 338]

1. *Ant.* xvii 8, 1 (189); 11, 4 (319); xviii 4, 6 (106); *B.J.* ii 6, 3 (95). In the latter passage there follows after Batanaea, Trachonitis and Auranitis, *καὶ μέρος τι τῆς τοῦ Ζήνωνος οἴκου τὰ περὶ Ἰάμναιαν*. So the printed common text supported by two manuscripts; in place of Ἰάμναιαν three manuscripts have Ἰνναῶ, two Ἰναν. It should certainly read Πανειάδα in accordance with *Ant.* xvii 8, 1 (189).

2. Batanaea corresponds to the Old Testament Bashan, Euseb. *Onomast.*, ed. Klostermann, p. 44, Βασάν . . . αὕτη ἐστὶ Βασανίτις, ἡ νῦν καλουμένη Βατανάια. Yet ancient Bashan was of larger extent than the later Batanaea, comprising as it did the whole region beyond the Jordan, between Hermon in the north and the district of Gilead in the south, and extending eastward as far as Salcah (on the southern slope of the Hauran); see Dt. 3:10, 13; Jos. 12:4; 13:11 f.; 13:30 f.; 17:1, 5; 1 Chr. 5:23. But within this region lay the later provinces of Trachonitis, Auranitis and Gaulanitis; Batanaea was therefore only a part of ancient Bashan. However, the expression is sometimes used even by later writers in the wider sense, e.g. Jos. *Vita* 11 (54) μετὰ τῶν ἐν Βατανάια Τραχωνιῶν. Since the cities of Ashtaroth and Edrei are named as the chief cities of Bashan (Jos. 12:4; 13:11 f.; 13:30 f.) it may be assumed that these marked the centre of the later Batanaea also. Edrei, later Adraa, the modern Der'a, lies almost exactly halfway between the southern point of Lake Gennesaret and the southern end of the mountains of Hauran. That Ashtaroth and Adraa lay in Batanaea is stated by Eusebius, *Onomast.*, ed. Kloster-

mann, p. 12, s.v. Ἀσταρόθ (cf. p. 112 s.v. Καρνείμ). The Greek Βατανάια appears also in Polybius, xvi 39 = Jos. *Ant.* xii 3, 3 (135–6) and Ptolemy, V 15, 26. For the most detailed available maps of this area see H. C. Butler, F. A. Norris, E. R. Stoeber, *Syria: Publications of the Princeton University Archaeological Expeditions to Syria in 1904–5 and 1909 I: Geography and Itinerary* (1930).

Trachonitis or ὁ Τράχων (so Josephus, *Ant.* xiii 16, 5 (427); xv 10, 1 (343); *B.J.* ii 6, 3 (95), and the inscription from Phaena) is the rugged plateau south of Damascus extending towards Bozra now called the Lejah. It therefore lies north-east of Batanaea proper. Proof of this is afforded by the following data. On an inscription at Phaena, in the north of the Lejah, this place is characterized as μητροκομία τοῦ Τράχωνος (OGIS 609 = IGR III 1119. Strabo mentions the Τράχωνες as two hills in the neighbourhood of Damascus, Strabo, xvi 2, 20 (756) ὑπέρεκωνται δ' αὐτῆς δύο λεγόμενοι λόφοι Τραχῶνες. Cf. xvi 2, 16 (755). Eusebius consistently assigns Trachonitis to the immediate neighbourhood of Bozra (*Onomast.*, s.v. Ἰτουραία, ed. Klostermann, p. 110 Τραχωνίτις δὲ καλεῖται ἡ παρακειμένη χώρα τῇ ἐρήμῳ τῇ κατὰ Βόστραν τῆς Ἀραβίας; *ibid.*, s.v. Κανάθ, p. 112 κείται δὲ εἰς ἐπὶ καὶ νῦν ἐν Τραχῶνι πλησίον Βόστρων; *ibid.*, s.v. Τραχωνίτις, p. 166 ἔστιν δὲ καὶ ἐπέκεινα Βόστρων κατὰ τὴν ἔρημον πρὸς νότον ὡς ἐπὶ Δαμασκόν. Also, a rabbinical passage concerning the boundaries of Palestine reads: 'Trakhon, in the neighbourhood of Bozra' (ySheb. 36c.; tSheb. 4:11, ed. Zuckermann, p. 66; Siphre-Dt. (51); the Jerusalem Talmud has לַבְצָרָה לְבַתְחֹמֶם לְטְרַחֹן ('Trakhon, which borders on Bozra'); likewise a Tosephta MS.; another reads: ט' דְּבַתְחֹמֶם ב' ('Trakhon, on the border of Bozra'); cf. A. Neubauer, *Géographie du Talmud*, pp. 10–21, and especially I. Hildesheimer, *Beiträge zur Geographie Palästinas* (1886) (on Trakhon, pp. 55–7); on the rabbinical passages, see S. Krauss, *Griechische u. lateinische Lehnwörter im Talmud* . . . II, p. 275. The Targums identify טְרַחֹן with the Biblical Argob (cf. Onk. Dt. 3:4, 13 f.; Ps.-Jon. reads טְרַחֹן). Pliny refers to Trachonitis as being in the neighbourhood of Panias (Plin. *NH* V 16/74). Ptolemy mentions the Τραχωνίται Ἀραβες as east of Batanaea (Ptolem. V 15, 26). Regarding Lk. 3:1, it is of interest to note that Philo, or rather Agrippa in the letter quoted by Philo, uses the abbreviated designation τὴν Τραχωνίτων λεγομένην for Philip's territory as a whole (just as he employs for the territories of Herod Antipas the designation τὴν Γαλιλαίαν both a *partie meilleure*, as in Luke; see Philo, *Leg.* 41 (326). Similarly, Josephus also, *Ant.* xviii 5, 4 (137) Φιλίππῳ . . . τῷ τετραρχῆϊ τῆς Τραχωνίτιδος, immediately after, of Antipas, τὴν δὲ Γαλιλαίαν τετραρχίαν οὗτος εἶχεν.

Auranitis is the אורן of Ezek. 47:16, 18, which is also mentioned in the Mishnah (mR. Sh. 2:4) as one of the stations for the fire signals from Judaea to Babylon. Since from the context of the Mishnah, Hauran must be a mountain, Auranitis is undoubtedly the country around the mountain peak called Jebel Hauran. For a map see Butler, Norris, Stoeber, *Syria* (see above), p. 17. See also R. E. Brünnow, A. von Domaszewski, *Die Provincia Arabia* III (1909); M. Dunand, 'Rapport sur une mission archéologique au Djebel Druze', *Syria* 7 (1926), pp. 326–35; D. Sourdel, *Les cultes du Hauran à l'époque romaine* (1952); note pp. v–xiv for a full bibliography of the region.

Gaulanitis has its name from the place Golan, considered in the Bible to be in Bashan (Dt. 4:43; Jos. 20:8; 21:27; 1 Chr. 6:56; Euseb. *Onomast.*, ed. Klostermann, p. 64). Josephus distinguishes Upper and Lower Gaulanitis, and remarks that Gamala lay in the latter, *B.J.* iv 1, 1 (2); the same passage locates Gamala east of Lake Gennesaret. According to *B.J.* iii 3, 1 (37), Gaulanitis provided the eastern boundary of Galilee. Gaulanitis is therefore the same area as the lowlands east of the Jordan, from its source to the southern tip of Lake Gennesaret. For a map see ZDPV 22 (1899), pp. 178–88.

The district of Panias, at the sources of the Jordan (see vol. II, § 23, 1, on the town of Panias) belonged in earlier times to Zenodorus, and before that, to the

possessions of the Jewish people, but were for the most part added to Jewish territory in later times. The population was mixed, and the non-Jewish (Syrian or Greek) element prevailed.³ Philip himself was

kingdom of the Ituraeans (see Appendix I). In this respect, Luke's statement that Philip also ruled over Ituraea is not altogether incorrect. But that region constituted only a small portion of what had formerly been the kingdom of the Ituraeans. The Ituraeans proper inhabited the Lebanon (see Appendix I) and during the period A.D. 38-49 were under the sovereignty of a certain Soaemus (Dio lix 12, 2; Tac. *Ann.* xii 23) while at the same time Agrippa I possessed the entire tetrarchy of Philip, *Jos. Ant.* xviii 6, 10 (237); xix 8, 2 (351). The bulk of the Ituraean territory cannot therefore have belonged to the domain of Philip.

Cf. on the areas mentioned above: H. Reland, *Palaestina* (1714), pp. 106-10, 193-203; Waddington, CRAI (1865), pp. 82-9, 102-9; G. Schumacher, *Across the Jordan, being an Exploration and Survey of Part of Hauran and Jaulan* (1886), and his *Northern Ajlûn* (1890); Schumacher, 'Der Dscholan, zum ersten Male aufgenommen u. beschrieben, mit Karte', ZDPV 9 (1886), pp. 165-363; and ZDPV 22 (1899), pp. 178-88; *idem*, 'Das südliche Basan, zum ersten Male aufgenommen u. beschrieben, mit Karte', ZDPV 20 (1897), pp. 65-227; Guthe, ZDPV 12 (1889), pp. 230 ff.; H. Fischer, *ibid.*, 248 ff. (good survey of exploration work in the Hauran region); F. Buhl, *Studien zur Topographie des nördlichen Ostjordanlandes* (1894); G. A. Smith, *Historical Geography of the Holy Land* (1894), pp. 538-47, 554, 665 ff. (with bibliography); W. Ewing, PEFQSt (1895), pp. 73-82 (the borders between Auranitis and Arabia); R. Dussaud, *Topographie historique de la Syrie antique et médiévale* (1927), pp. 523-412; A. H. M. Jones, *Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces* (1937; 1971), esp. pp. 284-91; M. Avi-Yonah, *The Holy Land* (1966), pp. 164-8.

With regard to the southern borders of the tetrarchy of Philip, the region around present-day Bozra and Salcah (south of the Hauran) did not belong to his domain, as is proved by inscriptions with the names of the Nabataean kings Malchus and Aretas, discovered in these cities. See M. de Vogüé, *Syrie centrale, Inscriptions sémitiques* (1868), p. 103 p, 107=CIS II *Aram.*, n. 174, 182. On the other hand, Hebrân on the southern slope of the Hauran still belonged to his territory for an Aramaic inscription found there is dated, not according to the regnal years of a Nabataean king but of Claudius: ('in the month Tishri in the 7th year of the Emperor Claudius'=A.D. 47; see de Vogüé, *loc. cit.*, p. 100=CIS II *Aram.*, n. 170). From this one may conclude that Hebrân belonged to the domain of Philip, which in A.D. 37 was given to Agrippa I and after his death placed under Roman administration; cf. remarks in P. Le Bas, H. Waddington, *Inscriptions III*, n. 2286.

3. During the last years of his reign Herod the Great settled Jewish colonists from Babylon in Batanaea under the leadership of a certain Zamaris, and conferred on them the privilege of complete freedom from taxation, which was in all essential points also respected by Philip; see *Ant.* xvii 2, 1-3 (23-30). For the history of this colony, cf. also Josephus, *Vita* 11 (56-7); F. de Saulcy, 'Monnaies des Zamarides'; *Num. Chron.*, 11 (1871), pp. 157-61; these 'coins of the Zamaridae' are in the highest degree problematical. In Trachonitis, Herod the Great had likewise settled 3,000 Idumaeans, to whom he assigned the task of maintaining the peace of the district against the robber bands that inhabited it; see *Ant.* xvi 9, 2 (285). The majority of the inhabitants were Gentiles, as is proved by the great number of Greek inscriptions still preserved in that region. Cf. also in general, *B. J.* iii 3, 5 (56-8) *οικοῦσαι δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν μισθῶν Ἰουδαῖοι τε καὶ Ἕθνη*, and vol. II, § 22, i.

certainly an exception among the sons and grandsons of Herod. Whereas all the others, in imitation of their father and grandfather, were ambitious, domineering, harsh and tyrannical toward their subjects, of Philip only praiseworthy reports are given. His reign was mild, just and peaceful. He was faithful to the traditions of his father only in so far as he sought fame in the construction of great edifices. He is reported in particular to have raised two cities. He rebuilt and enlarged ancient Pnias, at the sources of the Jordan north of Lake Gennesaret, and named it Caesarea in honour of the emperor. To distinguish it from the better known Caesarea on the coast, it was called Caesarea Philippi, under which name it appears in the Gospels (Mt. 16:13; Mk. 8:27). The other city he rebuilt was Bethsaida,⁴ situated at the point where the Jordan enters Lake Gennesaret; he named it Julias, in honour of the daughter of Augustus.⁵ Josephus writes that it was he who first discovered and proved that the supposed source of the Jordan at Pnias obtained its water by an underground stream from the so-called Phiale. Philip demonstrated this by throwing chaff into Phiale which reappeared at Pnias.⁶

Otherwise nothing more is known about his reign beyond Josephus's observation on the occasion of his death: 'He showed himself in his government to be of a modest and peace-loving disposition. He spent his whole life in his own land. When he went on circuit, he was accompanied only by a few chosen companions and he always had with him the throne on which he pronounced judgment. Whenever he encountered anyone needing his help, he had the throne set up immediately, wherever it might be. He took his seat and heard the case, sentenced the guilty and released those unjustly accused.'⁷ All that is known of his private life is that he married Salome, daughter of Herodias, and that there were no children by the marriage.⁸ Politically, he was a consistent friend of the Romans and attached great value to imperial favour. This may be gathered not only from the names he gave to the cities of Caesarea and Julias, but also from the images of Augustus and Tiberius impressed on his coins. This was for the first time that human effigies

4. See vol. II, § 23, i.

5. *Ant.* xviii 2, 1 (28); *B. J.* ii 9, 1 (168). On both cities, the date of their reconstruction and earlier history, see vol. II, § 23, i.

6. *B. J.* iii 10, 7 (509-15). From Josephus's description Phiale should be Birket er-Ram. But his story is impossible owing to the relative water levels. See Guérin, *Galilée II*, pp. 329-31; Schumacher, ZDPV 9 (1886), pp. 256 f. (with map).

7. *Ant.* xviii 4, 6 (106-7). The seating of a judge upon the *sella* was a necessary formality without which his words had no validity. For examples, see Mt. 27:19; Jn. 19:13; Acts 25:6; *Jos. B. J.* ii 9, 3 (172)—Pilate; ii 14, 8 (301)—Florus; iii 10, 10 (532)—Vespasian. On the *sella curulis* of the magistrates in Rome cf. Mommsen, *Röm. Staatsrecht III*³, p. 399; RE s.v. 'sella curulis'.

8. *Ant.* xviii 5, 4 (139).

H.J.P.—12*

including, it now seems, his own, were engraved on the coins of a Jewish prince.⁹

Philip died, after a reign of 37 years, in the 20th year of Tiberius (=A.D. 33/34) and was buried in a tomb built by himself.¹⁰ His territory was added to the province of Syria but retained the right of administering its own revenues¹¹, and after a few years was again made over to a prince of the Herodian family. The emperor Caligula, immediately after his accession to the throne (March, A.D. 37), bestowed the tetrarchy of Philip on Agrippa, a son of the Aristobulus executed by his father Herod, and therefore a grandson of Herod and Mariamme.¹²

2. Herod Antipas 4 B.C.—A.D. 39

Sources

Josephus, *Ant.* xviii 2, 1 (27); 3 (36-8); 4, 5 (101-5); 5, 1-3 (109-29); 7, 1-2 (240-56); *B.J.* ii 9, 1 (167-8); 6 (181-3).
New Testament: Mt. 14:1-12; Mk. 6:14-29; Lk. 3:19-20; 9:7-9; 13:31-2; 23:6-12.
On the coins, see n. 16 below.

9. It should of course be borne in mind that Philip's domain was predominantly pagan. Cf. on the coins, Madden, *History*, pp. 100-2; Madden, *Coins of the Jews* (1881), pp. 123-7; *BMC Palestine*, pp. xcvi, 228; A. Reifenberg, *Ancient Jewish Coins* (1947), pp. 19, 43-5; Y. Meshorer, *Jewish Coins of the Second Temple Period* (1967), pp. 76-7. The coins have on the one side the name of Philip ΦΙΛΙΠΠΟΥ ΤΕΤΡΑΡΧΟΥ together with the image of a temple and the year numbers 5, 9, 12, 16, 19, 30, 33, 34, 37. The year numbers 26 and 29 given by Mionnet are regarded by de Saulcy as erroneous readings. The coin of the year 37 (first communicated by Madden, *History*, p. 102) is from the last year of Philip = A.D. 33/34. The coins of the years 12 and 16 (=A.D. 8/9 and 12/13) have on the obverse the head of Augustus and on the reverse the inscription ΚΑΙΣΑΡΙ ΣΕΒΑΣΤΩ (fragmentary); those of the years 19, 30, 34 and 37 the head of Tiberius and the full name ΤΙΒΕΡΙΟΣ ΣΕΒΑΣΤΟΣ ΚΑΙΣΑΡ. The temple engraved on all the coins is doubtless the temple of Augustus at Pnias which Herod the Great had built, *Ant.* xv 10, 3 (363); *B.J.* i 21, 3 (404). The type is therefore wholly pagan. The image and name of the emperor are also found on the coins of many other dependent kings from the time of Augustus onward; but there are also instances in which all allusion to the supreme imperial authority is lacking; see Bohn, *Qua condicione juris reges socii populi Romani fuerint* (1877), pp. 45-9.

See now A. Kindler, 'A Coin of Herod Philip—the Earliest Portrait of a Herodian Ruler', *IEJ* 21 (1971), pp. 161-3.

10. *Ant.* xviii 4, 6 (106, 108). The 20th year of Tiberius was probably calculated subsequently from the day of Augustus's death, 19th August A.D. 33; but see D. M. Pippidi, *Autour de Tibère* (1944), pp. 125-32. The 37th year of Philip ends (reckoning from Nisan to Nisan; cf. p. 327) in the spring of A.D. 34. Philip therefore died in the winter of A.D. 33/34.

11. *Ant.* xviii 4, 6 (108).

12. *Ant.* xviii 6, 10 (237); *B.J.* ii 9, 6 (183).

Bibliography

- Brann, M., *Die Söhne des Herodes* (1873), pp. 17-76.
Otto, W., RE s.v. 'Herodes' (4).
PIR² A 746 (Antipas Herodes).
Abel, F.-M., *Histoire de la Palestine I* (1952), pp. 440-4.
Bruce, F. F., 'Herod Antipas, Tetrarch of Galilee and Peraea', *ALUOS* 5 (1963-65), pp. 6-23.
Jones, A. H. M., *The Herods of Judaea* (1967), pp. 176-83.
Hoehner, H. W., *Herod Antipas* (1972).

In the partition of their father's possessions, a larger share was allotted to Antipas, or Herod—as he is frequently called by Josephus and always on coins and in the New Testament—than was given to his half-brother Philip. But like him, he received the title of tetrarch.¹ His territory (Galilee and Peraea) was divided into two parts by the so-called Decapolis, which formed a wedge between Galilee and Peraea.² But for this he was amply compensated by the fact that half of it consisted of the beautiful, fertile and densely populated Galilee, with its vigorous, stalwart and freedom-loving inhabitants.³ In character, Antipas was a true son of his father, astute, ambitious and a lover of luxury; but he was less able than Herod the Great.⁴ Jesus is said to

1. He is thus correctly described in Mt. 14:1; Lk. 3:19, but incorrectly in Mk. 6:14, βασιλεύς. Since Herod Antipas is the only Herod to have borne the title of tetrarch, the two following inscriptions undoubtedly refer to him and testify at the same time of his foreign travels.

(a) On the island of Cos (Paton and Hicks, *Inscriptions of Cos*, no. 75 = OGIS 416):

Ἡρώδην
Ἡρώδου τοῦ βασιλέως υἱόν,
τετράρχην,
Φίλων Ἀγλαοῦ, φύσει δὲ Νικωνος,
τὸν αὐτοῦ ξένον καὶ φίλον.

(b) On the island of Delos (OGIS 417 = *Ins. de Délos* no. 1586):

Ὁ δῆμος δ' Ἀθ[η]ν[αίων καὶ οἱ]
κατοικοῦ[ν]τ[ε]ς τῆ[ν] νῆσον]
Ἡρώδην βασιλέω[ς] Ἡ[ρ]ο[ύ]δου υἱόν]
τετράρχην ἀρετῆς [ἔνεκεν καὶ εὐνοί-]
ας τῆς εἰς ἑαυτοῦ[ς] . . . ἀνέθηκαν?].

2. See e.g. *The Macmillan Bible Atlas* (1968), p. 145. On the Decapolis (Mt. 4:25; Mk. 5:20; 7:31), see vol. II, § 22.

3. Cf. the description of Galilee in *B.J.* iii 3, 2-3 (41-7); 10, 8 (516-21); see in general S. Klein, *Galiläa von der Römerzeit bis 67 n. Chr.* (1928); cf. *Galilee: Geography and History of Galilee from the Return from Babylonia to the Conclusion of the Talmud* (1967) (in Hebrew), and G. Vermes, *Jesus the Jew* (1973), ch II. On the borders of Galilee and Peraea, see vol. II, § 22, i.

4. Josephus, *Ant.* xviii 7, 2 (245), characterizes him as ἀγαπῶν τὴν ἡσυχίαν.

have testified to his cunning when he called him 'that fox'.⁵ Astuteness was in any case necessary if the Galileans were to be kept in order and the frontiers of Peraea guarded against Nabataean raiders. To make Galilee safe, he rebuilt Sepphoris which had been destroyed by fire at the hands of the soldiers of Varus (see above, p. 332), and surrounded it with strong walls. And for the defence of Peraea he fortified Betharamphtha and named it Livias after the emperor's wife, and later Julius.⁶ It was undoubtedly for political motives also that he married the daughter of the Nabataean king Aretas.⁷ He believed that in doing so he would provide a better protection for his land against the inroads of the Nabataeans than any amount of fortifications; and perhaps it was Augustus himself who persuaded him to enter into this marriage.⁸

Like all the Herods, Herod Antipas delighted in magnificent architecture. Particularly excellent in this respect was the splendid capital which he built during the time of Tiberius.⁹ He selected for it 'the best locality in Galilee' (Josephus: *τοῖς κρατίστοις . . . τῆς Γαλιλαίας*), the western bank of the lake of Gennesaret, near the warm springs of Emmaus. The choice of site was in one sense unfortunate, for, as became apparent from the sepulchral monuments exposed by the building operations, it was an ancient burial ground and as such forbidden to observant Jews as a place of habitation: any contact with graves rendered them ritually impure for seven days.¹⁰ To people the city, Herod was therefore obliged to colonize it by force with many foreigners, adventurers and beggars; the population was consequently of a very mixed character. But the magnificence of the buildings left nothing to be desired. It had, among other public edifices, a *στάδιον*¹¹ and a royal palace, which gave offence because of its animal images

5. Lk. 13:32. A. R. C. Leaney, *Commentary on . . . Luke* (1958), p. 209, considers 'that fox' not as a symbol of craftiness but of destruction. See, on the other hand, W. Manson, *The Gospel of Luke* (1937), p. 169. In the Talmud the fox is expressly described as 'that which is called the most cunning of beasts'—*שׂוֹמְרִים עֲלֵי פֶקֶח*—*שבחיות* (bBer. 61b). (Cf. Str.-B. II, pp. 200–1, showing that the term may indicate slyness, but more often insignificance (the fox is proverbially contrasted with the lion). Cf. also H. W. Hoehner, *Herod Antipas* (1972), pp. 343–7.

6. *Ant.* xviii 2, 1 (27); *B.J.* ii 9, 1 (168). On both cities and on the change of name from Livias to Julius, see Hoehner, *op. cit.*, pp. 84–91, and vol. II, § 23, i.

7. *Ant.* xviii 5, 1 (109). On Aretas and the Nabataean kings generally, see Appendix II.

8. Cf. Suet. *Div. Aug.*, 48 'Reges socios etiam inter semet ipsos necessitudinibus mutuis iunxit, promptissimus affinitatis, cuiusque atque amicitiae conciliator et fautor'.

9. On the date of the building of Tiberias, see Hoehner, *op. cit.*, pp. 93–5, and vol. II, § 23, i.

10. Num. 19:16; Jos. *Ant.* xviii 2, 3 (38). For more details concerning impurity caused by graves, see mOhol. 17–18.

11. *B.J.* ii 21, 6 (618); iii 10, 10 (539); *Vita* 17 (92); 64 (331).

and fell victim to Jewish zeal at the time of the war with the Romans.¹² There was also a Jewish *προσευχή*, a *μέγιστον οἴκημα*.¹³ The city's constitution was modelled entirely on the Hellenistic pattern. It had a council (*βουλή*) of 600 members, with an *ἄρχων* and a council of the *δέκα πρόωτοι*, as well as hyparchs and an agoranomos. In honour of the emperor the new capital was named Tiberias.¹⁴

During the time of Pilate (A.D. 26–36), Antipas, together with his brothers, brought a successful complaint against him over the erection of an offensive votive shield in the palace at Jerusalem.¹⁵ And just as he represented Jewish demands on this occasion, so—despite his heathen buildings at Tiberias—he dared not evade the claims of Judaism entirely in other respects also. Here, too, he was a true son of his father. According to the Gospel tradition, he went up to Jerusalem for the feasts (Lk. 23:7) and his coins, like those of the elder Herod, bear no image.¹⁶

The complaint against Pilate was possibly not made before A.D. 31.¹⁷ All that is otherwise known of Herod Antipas also belongs to the same

12. *Vita* 12 (65–7).

13. *Vita* 54 (277).

14. On the building of Tiberias in general, see *Ant.* xviii 2, 3 (36 ff.); *B.J.* ii 9, 1 (168); *Vita* 9 (37–9); cf. M. Avi-Yonah, 'The Foundation of Tiberias', *IEJ* (1951), pp. 160–9. For further details concerning the city and its institutions, see Hoehner, *op. cit.*, pp. 91–100, and vol. II, § 23, i.

15. Philo, *Leg.* 38 (299–305). Philo does not mention the name of Antipas, but states that *τοὺς τε βασιλέως [Ἡρώδου] υἱεῖς τέτταρας οὐκ ἀποδέοντας τὸ τε ἀξίωμα καὶ τὰς τύχας βασιλέων* made themselves especially prominent in the business. Philip and Antipas were primarily intended by this statement (Archelaus was no longer in Palestine after A.D. 6). But the identity of the other two is uncertain. We know of course from *Ant.* xvii 1, 3 (19–22); *B.J.* i 28, 4 (562–3) of three other sons of Herod who might be named in this connexion: (1) Herod, son of Mariamme; (2) Herod, son of Cleopatra; (3) Phasael, son of Pallas; on the identity of the sons see E. M. Smallwood, *Leg. ad Galium* (1961, 1969), *ad loc.*

16. On the coins of Herod Antipas, Madden, *History*, pp. 95–9; *BMC Palestine*, pp. xcvi, 229; Reitenberg, *Ancient Jewish Coins* (1947), p. 19; *Coins of the Jews* (1881), pp. 118–22; Y. Meshorer, *Jewish Coins of the Second Temple Period* (1967), pp. 72–5, 133–5. The coins fall into two categories: (1) One class has the inscription *ἩΡΩΔΟΥ ΤΕΤΡΑΡΧΟΥ* with the year numbers 24, 31?, 33, 34, 36, 37, 38; on the other side the name of the city *TIBERIAS*; (2) The second class has the inscription *ἩΡΩΔΗΣ ΤΕΤΡΑΡΧΗΣ*; on the other side, *ΓΑΙΩ ΚΑΙΣΑ[Ρ]Ι ΓΕΡΜΑΝΙΚΩ*. Of this (second) class, only three examples can be identified with certainty, all with the year *ΜΓ*=43 (i.e. A.D. 39/40). The coins of Antipas bearing the name of the emperor (without his image) occupy a middle position between those of Herod the Great, which carry neither the emperor's name nor his image, and those of Philip, which have both.

17. As may be suggested by Philo, *Leg.* 24 (159–61), according to which Tiberius was unfavourably disposed towards the Jews during the lifetime of Sejanus (died A.D. 31) but after his death behaved with great indulgence towards their religious peculiarities. Cf. E. M. Smallwood, 'Some Notes on the Jews under Tiberius', *Latomus* 15 (1956), pp. 314–29.

period, the last ten years or so of his reign. During that time he was almost entirely under the influence of a woman who caused him a whole series of misfortunes: Once, shortly before he made a journey to Rome—we do not know why, nor exactly when—he visited his half-brother Herod, the son of Mariamme the High Priest's daughter, who had been designated eventual successor to the throne in Herod's first will (see above, p. 324). This Herod was married to Herodias, a daughter of the Aristobulus who had been executed in 7 B.C.¹⁸ From the marriage of these two was born Salome, the wife of the tetrarch Philip, who was therefore not, as the Gospels report, the first husband of Herodias, but her son-in-law.¹⁹ When Antipas visited the house of his brother, he was attracted to Herodias and proposed marriage to her, which the ambitious woman readily accepted. It was arranged that on his return from Rome, Antipas should divorce his wife, the daughter of Aretas, and marry Herodias. With this promise, he set off on his journey to Rome. On his return, his wife, who had meanwhile heard of these arrangements, begged him to have her sent to Machaerus, the fortress east of the Dead Sea. Since Antipas did not suspect that his wife knew about his secret plans, he granted her wish. But scarcely had the daughter of Aretas reached Machaerus than she escaped from there to her father and told him of her husband's unfriendly intentions towards her. From then on, the Nabataean king was on bad terms with Herod Antipas.²⁰ He nevertheless seems to have proceeded immediately with his marriage to Herodias.

18. On Herodias, see RE s.v. 'Herodias' Supp. II, cols. 202-5; PIR² H 161.

19. *Ant.* xviii 5, 4 (136-42). Philip is named as the first husband of Herodias in Mk. 6:17. In the parallel passage, Mt. 14:3, the name is absent from cod. D., and is placed in brackets by Tischendorf. In Lk. 3:19, on the other hand, where the name similarly appears in the *textus receptus*, it is deleted by Nestle and Aland. Since according to Josephus it was not the tetrarch Philip, but the Herod mentioned above, who was the first husband of Herodias, Mark's statement must be an error. Many, it is true have tried to explain the mistake by assuming that the person referred to in Mark as Herod Philip was distinct from the tetrarch. But it would be very remarkable that one designation should have been chosen by Josephus and another by the New Testament writers, and still more peculiar that the elder Herod should have had two sons called Philip. If by way of analogy it is pointed out that several of his sons bore the name of Herod, the argument is not conclusive for this was the family name. And the analogy of the two brothers Antipater and Antipas is just as inconclusive for these are in fact quite different names.

20. *Ant.* xviii 5, 1 (113). On Machaerus, see above, p. 308 and § 20. According to the traditional Josephus text, Machaerus must at that time have belonged to the Nabataean king for it states that the princess, intending to flee, had previously sent (messengers) *eis tōn Machairoūnta tōte patrī autēs ūpoteleḗ* (thus all editions from *ed. princ.*: to Hudson, Havercamp and Dindorf inclusive; only Bekker conjectured *tōn tō* instead of *tōte*). This seems very strange, for Machaerus both earlier and later belonged continuously to Jewish territory (Alexander Jannaeus

It was at this time, or soon afterwards, that John the Baptist and Jesus made their appearance, both of them carrying on their work in territories belonging to Antipas, the Baptist in Peraea²¹ and Jesus in Galilee. Of John the Baptist, Josephus gives the following account:²² 'He was a good man, and exhorted the Jews to lead righteous lives, practise justice towards one another and piety towards God, and so to join in baptism. In his view this was a necessary preliminary if baptism was to be acceptable to God. They must not use it to gain pardon for whatever sins they committed, but as a consecration of the body, implying that the soul was thoroughly purified beforehand by right behaviour. When many others joined the crowds about him, for they were greatly moved on hearing his words, Herod feared that John's great influence over the people would lead to a rebellion (for they seemed ready to do anything he might advise). Herod decided therefore that it would be much better to strike first and be rid of him before his work led to an uprising, than to wait for an upheaval, become involved in a difficult situation and see his mistake. Accordingly John was sent as a prisoner to Machaerus, the fortress mentioned before, because of Herod's suspicious temper, and was there put to death.'

fortified it, and so did Herod the Great, *B.J.* vii 6, 2 (171-7); Herod Antipas imprisoned John the Baptist there; in the war under Vespasian it was one of the last places of refuge for the rebels, *B.J.* ii 18, 6 (486); vii 6 (163-209)). Also, it is unlikely that Antipas would so unsuspectingly have allowed his wife to go to a fortress he did not possess. Actually, there is nothing in the text of Josephus to indicate that Machaerus belonged to the Nabataean king at that time for all the manuscripts (according to Niese) have *eis tōn Machairoūnta tō te patrī autēs ūpoteleḗ* (not *ūpoteleḗ*). This can only mean 'to Machaerus and to the subjects of her father' (that is, to the tribes subject to her father). For surveys of the site of Machaerus, and the archaeological indications that it lay near, but not beyond, the Nabataean border, see N. Glueck in *BASOR* 68 (Dec. 1937), pp. 15-16, and *AASOR* 18/19 (1937/9), pp. 131-5. On the journey through Nabataean territory, the daughter of Aretas was supported by her father's military officers (*στρατηγοί*). The title *מלך* occurs frequently on Nabataean inscriptions; see vol. II, § 22, ii.

21. The scene of the Baptist's activity may have been mostly on the West bank of the Jordan, and therefore in Judaea. He did, however, also operate on the East bank, in Peraea, as is shown not only by the Fourth Gospel (11:28; 3:26; 10:40) but especially by the fact of his arrest by Antipas.

22. *Ant.* xviii 5, 2 (117-19) *κτείνει γάρ δὴ τοῦτον Ἡρώδης ἀγαθὸν ἄνδρα, καὶ τοὺς Ἰουδαίους κελεύοντα ἀρετὴν ἐπασκοῦσιν καὶ τὰ πρὸς ἀλλήλους δικαιοσύνη καὶ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν εὐσεβεῖα χρωμένους βαπτισμῶ σονεῖναι οὕτω γὰρ δὴ καὶ τὴν βάπτισιν ἀποδεκτὴν αὐτῷ φανεῖσθαι, μὴ ἐπὶ τινῶν ἀμαρτῶν παρατήσῃ χρωμένων, ἀλλ' ἐφ' ἀγγελία τοῦ σώματος, ἀτεδὴ καὶ τῆς ψυχῆς δικαιοσύνη προεκεκαθααρμένης. καὶ τῶν ἄλλων συστρεφόμενων, καὶ γὰρ ἤρθησαν ἐπὶ πλείστον τῇ ἀκροάσει τῶν λόγων, δέσας Ἡρώδης τὸ ἐπὶ τοσούτῳ πιθανὸν αὐτοῦ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις μὴ ἐπὶ ἀποστάσει τιλ φέροι, πάντα γὰρ ἐψέκασαν συμβουλή τῇ ἐκείνου πράζοντες, πολὺ κρείττον ἡγεῖται, πρὶν τι νεώτερον ἐξ αὐτοῦ γενέσθαι, προλαβὼν ἀνελεῖν τοῦ μεταβολῆς γενομένης εἰς πράγματα ἐμπεσῶν μετανοεῖν. καὶ ὁ μὲν ὑποψία τῇ Ἡρώδου δέσμιος εἰς τὸν Μαχαιροῦντα πεμπθεῖς, τὸ προειρημένον φρούριον, ταύτῃ κτίννυται. Cf. L. H. Feldman's translation and comments in *Josephus* (Loeb) IX, pp. 82-5.*

This report by Josephus and the New Testament accounts of the Baptist and his relation with the tetrarch Herod complement each other. Josephus's version of John's preaching seems to be adapted to Graeco-Roman taste. From this point of view, the short statements of the synoptic Gospels may strike a more genuine note.²³ On the other hand, it is highly probable that the real motive for the imprisonment of the Baptist by Antipas was, as Josephus states, fear of political unrest. The powerful preacher undoubtedly caused a great stir which was indeed primarily religious but was certainly not without a political impact. For at that time the mass of the people were unable to differentiate between their religious and political hopes. It is therefore quite credible that Antipas feared political troubles from the Baptist's preaching and that he ordered his arrest when he extended his activity to Peraea. Nevertheless, the evangelists may be right (Mt. 14:3 f.; Mk. 6:17 f.; Lk. 3:19 f.), when they state that he did this because John condemned his marriage with Herodias. The two statements are not inconsistent.²⁴ The place of John's imprisonment is not named by the evangelists. According to Josephus, it was at Machaerus, the fortress east of the Dead Sea. From his account, the Baptist's imprisonment seems to have been followed immediately by his execution. But from the evangelists' it appears that Herod kept the Baptist in prison for a protracted period, uncertain what to do with him.²⁵ In the end, a decision was precipitated by Herodias, the principal enemy of the austere preacher of repentance. At a great banquet in celebration of Antipas's birthday²⁶ in the palace of Machaerus—for it was there that

[Text continues on p. 348

23. For literature on the Josephus passage cf. L. H. Feldman, *op. cit.*, Appendix M, p. 577. For modern discussions see C. H. Kraeling, *John the Baptist* (1951) and IDB s.v. 'John the Baptist'.

24. The passage of Josephus was known to Origen (*c. Cels.* I, 47). Eusebius quotes it in full (*HE* i 11, 4-6; *DE* ix 5, 15). Its genuineness is rarely disputed. In its favour is the fact that the motives for the imprisonment and execution of the Baptist are entirely different from the Gospel version. But since the text of Josephus has certainly been retouched by Christian scribes in other passages, the theory of an interpolation cannot be absolutely excluded. Suspicion is aroused by the favourable verdict on John, but against this it should be borne in mind that as an ascetic and moral preacher, he might have been viewed sympathetically by Josephus.

25. Mt. 14:5; Mk. 6:20; Mt. 11:2-6.

26. The meaning of *γενέσια* (Mt. 14:6; Mk. 6:21) is a matter of controversy. Instead of the ordinary meaning 'birthday', many commentators understand it to mean 'the anniversary day of his accession to the throne'. But this sense is not positively demonstrable in the field of Greek literature. Thus if occasionally the anniversary of the day of accession to the throne is called *γενέθλιος διαδήματος* (OGIS 383 = IGLS I ll. 83-4 (see below); cf. however, H. Dörrie, *Der Königskult des Antiochus von Kommagene im Lichte neuer Inschriften-Funde* (1964), p. 65-274) or *natalis imperii* (SHA *Vita Hadr.* 4; SHA *Vita Pert.* 15); this does not prove that *γενέθλιος* or *γενέσιος* without addition can also have this meaning (for *natalis* or

natalicia this usage is traceable only in the fourth-century calendar of Philocalus; see Mommsen, *Staatsrecht* II³, 2, pp. 812 f.). Rabbinical support is also very weak. The principal passage is m.A.Z. 1:3, 'The following are the festivals of the heathen: the *Calendae* and the *Saturalia* and the *κρατήσεις* (קְרָטִישִׁים) and the day of the *γενέσια* (גְּוִישִׁים) of the kings and the day of birth and the day of death. Thus R. Meir.' (Cf. W. A. L. Emslie, *The Mishna on Idolatry 'Aboda Zara* (1911), pp. 4-6.) No explanation of the expressions used is given in the Mishnah. In the Palestinian Talmud (y.A.Z. 39c) יוֹם גְּוִישִׁיא is interpreted by יוֹם הַלִּידָה 'birthday'. The Babylonian Talmud (b.A.Z. 10a) presents a detailed discussion on the meaning and reasons are advanced in favour of the interpretation 'birthday', but preference is finally given to the interpretation שְׂמַעְמֵידִין בּוֹ מַלְךְ 'the day on which the king ascended the throne' (see J. Levy, *Neuhebr. Wörterb.* I, 349a; M. Jastrow, *Dictionary*, p. 240 and the English translation of the text of the whole discussion in the Soncino Talmud, ed. I. Epstein, *Nezikhin* VII (1935), pp. 39-50). It is substantially on the basis of this that the interpretation 'anniversary of accession to the throne' is adopted by many modern scholars. But since the Palestinians were doubtless better informed about such matters than the Babylonians, who mostly guessed without knowing, the interpretation of the latter should not be accepted when it is opposed to all other instances (so also G. Dalman, *ThLZ*, 1889, p. 172). Also, the context in the Mishnah favours the interpretation 'birthday', for קְרָטִישִׁים is the anniversary of attainment to power (cf. S. Lieberman, *Greek in Jewish Palestine* (21965), pp. 9-10; for *κρατήσεις* in the sense of 'prohibition', see *ibid.*, pp. 10-12). יוֹם גְּוִישִׁיא must thus be distinguished from it. But the 'day of birth' mentioned nearby, is not, as further investigation of the Mishnah shows, the anniversary of a birth but simply the day on which a child is born. In the Palestinian Targum (Ps.-Jon. and Neof.) also, in Gen. 40, 20, יוֹם גְּוִישִׁיא appears with the meaning 'birthday'. On rabbinic linguistic usage generally, cf. S. Krauss, *Griechische und lat. Lehnwörter im Talmud* . . . II (1899), p. 180; L. Blau, *REJ*, 27 (1893), pp. 298 f.; E. E. Urbach, 'The Rabbinical Laws of Idolatry in the Second and Third Centuries', *IEJ* 9 (1959), pp. 240-1; see also pp. 149-65; 229-45.

The custom of celebrating the birthday of princes and private persons is very old. Already in Genesis, there is reference to the Pharaoh's birthday (Gen. 40:20). King Amasis of Egypt, when still a private individual, is said to have presented a splendid wreath of flowers to his predecessor, King Patarmis, on his birthday (*γενέθλια ἐπιτελοῦντι Πατάρμυδι*; thus Hellenicus, in FGrH 4 F 55. Plato remarks that all Asia celebrated the birthday of the Persian king (Plato, *Alcib.* i, 121c: βασιλέως γενέθλια ἅπαντα θύει καὶ εὐορτάζει ἢ Ἀσία). Cf. K. F. Hermann *Lehrbuch der griech. Privatalterthümer* (21882), ed. Blümner, pp. 285 f., 501; *RE* s.v. 'γενέθλιος ἡμέρα'; Marquardt, *Das Privatleben der Römer* I (1879), pp. 244 f.; Ernst Curtius, *Geburtstagsfeier im Alterthum, Feste (Monatsberichte der Berliner Akademie*, 1876, pp. 31-7 = *Alterthum u. Gegenwart, Gesammelte Reden u. Vorträge* II, pp. 15-21). As birthday celebrations with great banquets are mentioned in the Bible only in connexion with Pharaoh and Herod Antipas, Origen and Jerome were of the opinion that only wicked persons did this. Origen on Matthew 10:22 (*Origenes-Werke* X, ed. Klostermann, GCS (1935), p. 30; Jerome, *Opp.*, ed. Vallarsi, VII, 101 (PL xxvi, col. 97)—both in their notes on Mt. 14:6). The Herodian princes celebrated not only their birthdays—besides Herod Antipas see also Agrippa I, *Jos. Ant.* xix 7, 1 (321)—but also the anniversary of their accession to the throne, *Ant.* xv 11, 6 (423). These two customs were very widespread. The decree of Canopus (under Ptolemy III, 239/238 B.C.) relates to priests, who assembled εἰς τὴν πέμπτην τοῦ Διού, ἐν ἣ ἄγεται τὰ γενέθλια τοῦ βασιλέως, καὶ εἰς τὴν πέμπτην καὶ εἰκάδα τοῦ αὐτοῦ μηνός, ἐν ἣ παρέλαβεν τὴν βασιλείαν παρὰ τοῦ πατρός. (Strack, *Die Dynastie der Ptolemäer*, 1897, pp. 227 ff. = OGIS 56 ll. 5-6.) The

the whole business took place²⁷—Salome the daughter of Herodias (she was still a κοράσιον, Mt. 14:11; Mk. 6:22, 28 and therefore not yet married to Philip) so delighted the tetrarch by her dancing that he promised to fulfil any wish she might express. At the instigation of her mother, she demanded the head of the Baptist. And Herod was weak enough to gratify her desire immediately and had him beheaded then and there.²⁸

Rosetta Stone (under Ptolemy V, 196 B.C.) mentions τὴν τριακ[κ]άδα τοῦ Μεσορῆ, ἐν ἣ τὰ γενέθλια τοῦ βασιλέως ἀγεται, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ [τὴν] ἑπτακαιδεκάτην τοῦ Φαωφί, ἐν ἣ παρέλαβεν τὴν βασιλείαν παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς (Letronne, *Recueil des inscr. grecques et lat. de l'Égypte* I, 241 ff.=Strack, pp. 240 ff.=OGIS 90, ll. 46-7; cf. on both decrees also Niese, *Gesch. der griech. u. makedon. Staaten* II, pp. 171, 673). According to both decrees, the days were celebrated not only yearly but also monthly (Canoús, ll. 33-4, Rosetta, line 48). King Antiochus I of Commagene (1st cent. B.C.) tells us in the inscription he composed for his own tomb: σώματος μέγα γὰρ ἐμοῦ γενέθλιον Ἀδναίου ἑκκαιδεκάτην, διαδήματος δὲ Λύου δεκάτην ἀφιέρωσα μεγάλων δαιμόνων ἐπιφανείας. (IGLS I, ll. 83-6). The celebration of these days was also both yearly and monthly (ll. 99-105; cf. also on monthly birthdays, 2 Mac 6:7; E. Rohde, *Psyche* (1894), p. 235 and ZNW 2 (1901), pp. 48-52, on the arguments of H. Willrich, *Judaica*, p. 164. In Rome the emperor's birthday and the anniversary of his accession were celebrated as public festivals (CIL I², pp. 301-3; Mommsen, *Röm. Staatsrecht* II, 2 (1887), pp. 812 f.); G. Wissowa, *Religion und Kultus der Römer* (1911), pp. 344 f.; W. F. Snyder, 'Public Anniversaries in the Roman Empire', YCS 7 (1940), pp. 223-317.

The birthdays of the dead were also celebrated; on the frequency of this custom, see the literature cited, and Rohde, *Psyche* I, pp. 235 f. On the inscription of Antiochus I of Commagene already mentioned, the king stipulates precisely how his birthday is to be celebrated yearly and monthly after his death for all time.

Attic linguistic usage distinguished between γενέθλια and γενέσια in such a way that the former was employed in connexion with the living and the latter in connexion with the dead (Ammonius, *de adf. vocab. differentia*, 116: γενέθλια τάσσεια ἐπὶ τῶν ζώντων . . . γενέσια δὲ ἐπὶ τῶν τεθνηκότων, ἐν ἣ ἕκαστος ἡμέρα τετελεύτησε cf. Stephanus, *Thes.*, s.v. γενέσιος.) In later Greek, however, γενέσια is also used of the living (Alciphron, *Εἰρη.* II, 15; III, 19 (Schepers); Josephus, *Ant.* xii 4, 7 (196); xii 4, 9 (215); in the last-mentioned passage some codices have γενέθλιω). In Philo, *de opif. mundi* 30 (89), one manuscript and the editions before Mangey have τοῦ κόσμου γενέσιον but the correct reading here is γενέθλιον. Cassius Dio uses γενέσια only in connexion with the dead, but γενέθλια in connexion with the living. Cf. W. Nawijn, *Cassii Dionis Cocceiani Historiarum Romanarum Index Graecitatis* (1931), p. 158.

27. The Gospels (Matthew and Mark) evidently assume that the banquet was given at the place where the Baptist lay imprisoned, i.e., Machaerus. And in fact the banquet may have taken place there, in the beautiful palace which Herod the Great had built, *B.J.* vii 6, 2 (175). The Gospels are silent in regard to the place; for from Mk. 6:21 it is not necessary to conclude that Mark assumes Galilee (i.e. Tiberias) to be the scene of action (cf. e.g. E. Klostermann, *Das Markusevangelium* (1950), p. 60).

28. Mt. 14:6-11; Mk. 6:21-8; Lk. 9:9. In Mk. 6:22 some very important MSS. (the Hesychian text and D) read τῆς θυγατρὸς αὐτοῦ Ἡρωδιάδος. According to this, the young woman herself was called Herodias and was a daughter of Herod

Even before John disappeared from the scene, Jesus had already made his appearance and begun to preach the gospel in Galilee. He, too, could not remain unnoticed by the tetrarch. But Antipas did not hear of his activities until after the Baptist had been put to death, and conscience-stricken, imagined that the Baptist had risen again and was continuing his great work.²⁹ To make sure, he wished to see the miracle-worker who was preaching in Capernaum and converting the multitudes.³⁰ He meant apparently to get rid of him also.³¹ Subsequently, Jesus left Galilee to make his last journey to Jerusalem. And there, according to Luke's Gospel alone, Antipas, who was staying in the city for the Feast of Passover, had the satisfaction of meeting his enigmatic subject. Pilate sent the prisoner to him so that as ruler of Galilee he might pronounce sentence on him. But Antipas refused to

Antipas, and not just of Herodias. But a child of the marriage of Antipas with Herodias could at that time have been only a year or two old; on the other hand, it is known from *Ant.* xviii 5, 4 (136), that Herodias had a daughter called Salome by her first marriage. Moreover, in the Gospel narrative itself the young woman figures simply as a daughter of Herodias. Hence, such a reading of Mark (however ancient) can in no case be historically correct. On the imprisonment and execution of the Baptist in general, see the literature cited in n. 23 above. The Gospel narrative contains much that arouses suspicion, for instance that Salome is still designated as κοράσιον whereas one would think from Josephus that in A.D. 28-30 she had been for a long time married to the tetrarch Philip, who began his reign in 4 B.C. and died in A.D. 33/4 (see above, p. 340). But careful investigation shows that even on this weak point the narrative is not unlikely. The facts emerging from Josephus are summarised by Gutschmid (*Kleine Schriften* II, p. 318): Aristobulus, Salome's second husband, was a son of Herod of Chalcis by Mariam, the daughter of Joseph and Olympias, a sister of Archelaus, who married after 7 B.C. but before 4 B.C. Therefore Mariam can have been born not earlier than 5 B.C., and her son Aristobulus, scarcely before A.D. 14. This gives an approximate clue to determining the age of Salome, who should not necessarily be regarded as much older than Aristobulus since her second marriage, by which she had three sons, evidently took place while she was still young. Philip, her first husband, was of an age to rule in 4 or 3 B.C., and must therefore have been born in 21 B.C. at the latest. However great the disparity between them, there is nevertheless little likelihood of it having exceeded 30 years. This would give A.D. 10 as the latest date for the birth of Salome. Gutschmid therefore assumes that Salome was born in about A.D. 10 and regards it as quite possible that she was still a κοράσιον in A.D. 28 and married the forty-nine-year-old Philip when she was nineteen. On a coin of Aristobulus there is also an image of his wife Salome (cf. PIR² A 1052). See Appendix I below.

29. Mt. 14:1 f.; Mk. 6:14-16; Lk. 9:7-9.

30. Lk. 9:9. Among the women followers of Jesus was the wife of one of Antipas's officials (Lk. 8:3 Ἰωάννα γυναῖχ Ἰουζᾶ ἐπιτρόπου Ἡρώδου). The name Ἰωάννα occurs on a Nabataean epitaph (F. C. Burkitt, *Expositor* 9 (1899) pp. 118-22; CIS II 1, p. 227). Cf. Hoehner, *op. cit.*, pp. 303-4.

31. Lk. 13:31-2.

co-operate and was content to ridicule Jesus and return him to Pilate.³²

His union with Herodias brought Antipas little good. The Nabataean king Aretas could not forget that Antipas had repudiated his daughter because of her. The enmity thus generated was aggravated by boundary disputes about Gabalitis—this, rather than 'Galaaditis', is the most probable correction of the manuscript readings 'Gamalitis' or 'Gamalia'.³³ At last, in A.D. 36, it came to a war between the two neighbours, which ended in the total defeat of Antipas.³⁴ The only resort now left to the conquered tetrarch was to bring a charge against his victorious opponent before the emperor Tiberius.³⁵

When Tiberius heard of the Nabataean prince's bold enterprise, he gave Vitellius, governor of Syria, express orders to capture him, dead or alive. Vitellius decided on the venture somewhat unwillingly for he was not greatly drawn to Antipas. But since he could not disobey the imperial command, he prepared for war against Aretas. Ordering his army to march against Petra with a detour round Judaea, he himself went on a visit to Jerusalem, where a feast was being celebrated, probably Passover. He stayed there for three days. On the fourth day, he received news of the death of Tiberius (16 March A.D. 37). He considered himself thereby relieved of his task and turned back with his army to Antioch.³⁶ The defeat of Antipas remained therefore unavenged.

At about this time, the tetrarch was once present on the Euphrates during important negotiations between Vitellius and the king of the Parthians. But it seems that Josephus's account of this is not free from error. It is known for instance that in A.D. 35 and 36 the Parthian king Artabanus had repeated dealings with the Romans. His affairs seemed to be taking a favourable turn when the threats of Vitellius and the defection of his own subjects obliged him to flee to the remoter provinces. Vitellius then went to the Euphrates in the summer of A.D. 36

32. Lk. 23:7-12. On the chronology of the ministry of John the Baptist and the corresponding question of the date of Jesus' death, see now the detailed discussion in H. W. Hoehner, *Herod Antipas* (1972), pp. 307-12.

33. The district of Gamala belonged to the former tetrarchy of Philip and cannot therefore have been a subject of dispute between Aretas and Antipas. The province of Galaaditis (Gilead) lay on the borders of their territories; ΓΑΛΑΑΔΙΤΙΣ could have become ΓΑΜΑΛΙΤΙΣ. But ΓΑΒΑΑΙΤΙΣ is palaeographically even more likely, and the area in question east of the southern half of the Dead Sea is also more probable as the subject of a dispute. Undoubtedly the text of the passage *Ant.* xviii 5, 1 (113) is defective. Cf. L. H. Feldman in *Josephus* (Loeb) IX, *ad loc.*

34. The date is derived from the fact that the defeat of Antipas occurred, as is shown by what follows, about six months before the death of Tiberius (March A.D. 37).

35. *Ant.* xviii 5, 1 (115).

36. *Ant.* xviii 5, 1 (115); 3 (120-6).

together with the pretender appointed by the Romans, Tiridates, and established the latter as ruler over the Parthian kingdom. However, before the end of that same year Artabanus returned, drove out Tiridates and regained power.³⁷ Subsequently Vitellius arranged a meeting on the Euphrates with Artabanus at which Artabanus concluded a peace with the Romans, leaving as a pledge his son Darius as hostage.³⁸ According to Josephus, Herod Antipas was also present at this encounter. He entertained Vitellius and Artabanus in a sumptuous tent erected on the Euphrates bridge, and as soon as the negotiations were concluded hastened to communicate in person the favourable result to the emperor—an officiousness that annoyed Vitellius exceedingly because Antipas thereby anticipated his official report.³⁹ Josephus places this meeting in the reign of Tiberius and considers the tension it engendered between Vitellius and Herod Antipas as the reason why Vitellius abandoned the campaign against Aretas immediately after the death of Tiberius. But Suetonius and Cassius Dio say expressly, and the silence of Tacitus in the 6th Book of his *Annals* attests it indirectly, that the meeting between Vitellius and Artabanus took place under Caligula. Josephus is therefore wrong in one particular. But which one? If it is correct that Herod Antipas took part in Parthian negotiations on the Euphrates in the reign of Tiberius, these must have been the negotiations between Vitellius and Tiridates in the summer of A.D. 36 (*Tac. Ann.* vi 37). But if it is correct that he took part in the negotiations between Vitellius and Artabanus, it cannot have been before the time of Caligula. The second supposition is the most likely. For in the summer of A.D. 36 Herod was engaged in the war against Aretas.⁴⁰

If Antipas had his passion for Herodias to thank for the losses he sustained at the hands of Aretas, in the end it was his wife's ambition that cost him his position and his freedom. One of the first acts of the new emperor Caligula on taking office was to assign Agrippa, the brother of Herodias, Philip's former tetrarchy and the royal title. Agrippa at first remained in Rome. But in the second year of Caligula (March A.D. 38-March 39) he went to Palestine and made his appearance there as king. The success of the once penurious adventurer, who had even sought aid from Antipas, excited the envy of Herodias and

37. *Tac. Ann.* vi 31-7; 41-4 (with respect to the date, cf. also vi 38, beginning); *Dio* lviii 26; *Ant.* xviii 4, 4 (100). The establishment of the date is based on the statements of Tacitus.

38. *Suet. Cal.* 14; *Vit.* 2; *Dio* lix 27; *Jos. Ant.* xviii 4, 5 (101-3). Besides Josephus, *Dio* lix 17, 5, and *Suet. Cal.* 19, also mention Darius as being in Rome in A.D. 39.

39. *Ant.* xviii 4, 5 (104-5).

40. On Parthian history generally, cf. N. C. Debevoise, *A Political History of Parthia* (1938); M. A. R. Colledge, *The Parthians* (1967); for modern discussions of the date of the meeting on the Euphrates see K.-H. Ziegler, *Die Beziehungen zwischen Rom und dem Partherreich* (1964), p. 62.

she urged her husband to petition the emperor for a royal title for himself. Herod Antipas was disinclined but finally succumbed to his wife's insistence and set off with her for Rome to plead his cause. They were followed, however, by Agrippa's freedman, Fortunatus, with a list of charges against Herod Antipas accusing him of old and new offences, of collusion with Sejanus (who died in A.D. 31) and with the Parthian king Artabanus. As evidence of this, Antipas's store of weapons was referred to. Both parties arrived simultaneously in Baiae before Caligula. After the emperor had heard the petition and the indictment, he asked Antipas about the stockpile of weapons. And when Antipas could not deny it, Caligula credited him with the remaining charges, deposed him from his tetrarchy and banished him to Lugdunum in Gaul.⁴¹ He wished to allow Herodias, as a sister of Agrippa, to live on her private estate. But the proud woman scorned the imperial favour and followed her husband into exile. As further proof of imperial benevolence, the accuser Agrippa was awarded the tetrarchy.⁴²

41. So Josephus, *Ant.* xviii 7, 2 (252); on the other hand, *B.J.* ii 9, 6 (183): εἰς Σπανίαν or Ἰσπανίαν (which Niese corrects against all manuscript evidence to Γαλλίαν). Since besides the well-known Lugdunum (Lyons), there was another Lugdunum in Gaul, on the northern slopes of the Pyrenees in the territory of the Convenae (whence Lugdunum Convenarum), it could be this that is meant. The erroneous statement in *B.J.* (corrected in *Ant.*) would then be most easily explained, for it lay on the Spanish border. So e.g., H. Schiller, *Gesch. der röm. Kaiserzeit* I, 383; O. Hirschfeld, *Kleine Schriften*, p. 173, n. 2; so also Otto, 'Herodes Antipas', cols. 195-6.

42. *Ant.* xviii 7, 1-2 (252); *B.J.* ii 9, 6 (183). According to the latter passage, Agrippa himself followed Herod Antipas; according to *Ant.*, he sent Fortunatus. On the discrepancy regarding the place of banishment, see the previous note. The date of the deposition of Antipas is determined partly from *Ant.* xviii 71-2 (240-56); cf. 6, 11 (238), partly from xix 8, 2 (351). In the latter passage it is said of Agrippa: τέτταρας μὲν οὖν ἐπὶ Γαίου Καίσαρος ἐβασίλευσεν ἐνιαυτούς, τῆς Φιλίππου μὲν τερταρίας εἰς τριετίαν ἄρξας, τῷ τετάρτῳ δὲ καὶ τὴν Ἡρώδου προσεληφθῶς. As Caligula reigned from March A.D. 37 to January 41, Agrippa will thus have obtained the tetrarchy of Antipas at the beginning of A.D. 40. But according to *Ant.* xviii 6, 11 (238), Agrippa returned to Palestine in the second year of Caligula (March A.D. 38-39) with the benefit of the trade winds, ἐρησία—Philo, *In Flaccum* 5 (26), which blow from the 20th July for 30 days (Pliny, *NH* II 47/124). Consequently, since he visited Alexandria on the way (Philo, *loc. cit.*), he may have arrived in Palestine about the end of September in A.D. 38. As Antipas's deposition was closely connected with this, it would seem to have occurred, if not in A.D. 38, at least in 39. In fact, it can be proved that it occurred not earlier and not later than the summer of A.D. 39. Not earlier, for the 43rd year of Antipas, from which we have coins, did not begin till 1st Nisan A.D. 39. But not later either for Caligula was out of Rome from the autumn of 39 to the 31st August A.D. 40 on an expedition to Gaul, Germany and Britain (Dio lix 21-25; Suet. *Cal.* 17, 43-9; for his entry into Rome, 'natali suo' i.e., 31st August, see Suet. *Cal.* 8). Bearing in mind, therefore, that Antipas was deposed while Caligula was at Baiae, and further that according to Josephus, *Ant.* xix 8, 2 (351) (which states that Agrippa had already reigned for one year under Caligula), it could not have taken place after the

Herod Antipas died in exile. A confused statement in Dio seems to imply that he was put to death by Caligula.⁴³

3. (I) Archelaus 4 B.C.—A.D. 6

Sources

Josephus, *Ant.* xvii 13 (339-55); xviii, 1-4 (1-108); *B.J.* ii 7, 3-9, 4 (111-17). Philo, *Legatio ad Gaium* (ed. Smallwood, 1961, 1969).

On the coins, see n. 4 below.

Bibliography. (I): Archelaus

- Graetz, H., *Geschichte der Juden* III (1905-6), pp. 252-3, 315-17, 341-4.
 Brann, M., 'Die Söhne des Herodes' (1873), pp. 1-16.
 Otto, W., RE s.v. 'Herodes Archelaos'.
 Abel, F.-M., *Histoire de la Palestine* I (1952), pp. 417-20.
 Jones, A. H. M., *The Herods of Judaea* (1967), pp. 166-8.

German campaign (which is also impossible for the reason that Agrippa was again with the emperor from autumn A.D. 40 until Caligula's death—Philo, *Legatio* 35 (261 ff.); Josephus, *Ant.* xviii 8, 7 (289-93); Dio lix 24—whereas he was in Palestine at the time of Antipas's deposition; as well as for the reason that according to Philo, *Legatio* 41 (326), he was in possession of Galilee in the autumn of A.D. 40—from which it may be concluded that Tiberias no longer belonged to Herod Antipas at that time)—the deposition must have occurred before the German expedition, that is, before the autumn of A.D. 39. In that year, Caligula was twice in Campania (Baiae and Puteoli), the one visit being referred to in Dio lix 13, 7, and the other in Dio lix 17; Suet. *Cal.* 19. But after his second absence, he was probably again in Rome for his birthday, the 31st August (Dio lix 20; Suet. *Cal.* 26), after which he went on the German expedition. In consequence, the deposition of Antipas in Baiae probably occurred before the 31st August A.D. 39. But since Agrippa probably only obtained the tetrarchy of Antipas at the beginning of A.D. 40, Josephus, *Ant.* xix 8, 2 (351), it may be assumed that an interval of several months separated the deposition of Antipas and the conferment of his tetrarchy on Agrippa, and that this latter event did not take place until the time of Caligula's Gallo-German campaign.

43. Dio lix 8, 2 (Caligula) Ἀγρίππαν τὸν τοῦ Ἡρώδου ἔγγονον λύσας τε . . . καὶ τῇ τοῦ πάππου ἀρχῇ προστάξας, τὸν ἀδελφὸν ἢ καὶ τὸν υἱὸν οὐχ ὄτι τῶν πατρώων ἀπεστέρησεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ κατέσφαξε. Although the relationship is incorrectly expressed, the reference can only be to Herod Antipas. The execution of those whom he banished was a habit of Caligula; see Suet. *Cal.* 28; Dio lix 18, 3; Philo, *In Flaccum* 21 (180-3). According to Josephus, *B.J.* ii 9, 6 (183), Antipas died in exile. On the contradiction regarding the location in *B.J.* ii 9, 6 (183) and *Ant.* xviii 7, 2 (252), see above, p. 352. Since according to *B.J.*, Antipas was banished to Spain from the first and died there, we have no right to combine Josephus's contradictory statements by suggesting that he was later transferred from Lyons to Spain.

- Derenbourg, J., *Essai sur l'histoire et la géographie de la Palestine* (1867), pp. 195-204.
- Graetz, H., *Geschichte der Juden* III (1905-6), pp. 259-316.
- Jackson, Foakes and Lake, Kirsopp, *The Beginnings of Christianity I: The Acts of the Apostles I-V* (1920-33).
- Abel, F.-M., *Histoire de la Palestine* I (1952), pp. 421-43.
- Lohse, E., 'Die römischen Statthalter in Jerusalem', *ZDPV* 74 (1958), pp. 69-78.
- Winter, P., *On the Trial of Jesus* (1961).
- Sherwin-White, A. N., *Roman Society and Roman Law in the New Testament* (1963).
- For works on the background of the Roman administration of Judaea, see note 16.

(I) Archelaus 4 B.C.-A.D. 6

Judaea proper, with Samaria and Idumaea (including the large cities of Caesarea, Samaria, Joppa and Jerusalem, but excluding Gaza, Gadara and Hippos), was awarded as his share of Herod's kingdom to Archelaus, the elder brother¹ of Antipas, though not with the title of king, as Herod had intended, but only that of ethnarch.² Yet Augustus promised him royal status too if he should prove himself worthy of it.³ Like Antipas, Archelaus adopted the family name of Herod on coins and elsewhere.⁴

Of all the sons of Herod, his reputation was the worst. His rule was brutal and tyrannical.⁵ He appointed and dismissed the High Priests at will.⁶ His marriage with Glaphyra, daughter of the Cappadocian king Archelaus, caused particular scandal. She had been married first to Alexander, the half-brother of Archelaus executed in 7 B.C. (see above, p. 324). After his death she married Juba, king of Mauretania.⁷ When

1. *B.J.* i 32, 7 (646); 33, 7 (664).
2. He is inaccurately styled βασιλεύς in Mt. 2:22 and *Ant.* xviii 4, 3 (93). On the title ἐθνάρχης, see above, p. 333.
3. *Ant.* xvii 11, 4 (317); *B.J.* ii 6, 3 (93).
4. Josephus never calls him Herod, but Dio does in lv, 27, 6. And there is no doubt that the coins inscribed ΗΡΩΔΟΥ ΕΘΝΑΡΧΟΥ are his, for no other Herodian bore the title ἐθνάρχης (cf. Eckhel, *op. cit.* III, p. 484). Noteworthy is the fact that the coins of Archelaus, also, do not bear an image. On the coins, cf. de Saulcy, *Recherches*, pp. 133 f.; Madden, *History*, pp. 91-5; *Coins of the Jews*, pp. 114-18; Reifenberg, *Ancient Jewish Coins* (1947), p. 20, 45-6; Meshorer, *Jewish Coins of the Second Temple Period* (1967), pp. 69-70, 130-2.
5. Ὀμότης καὶ τυραννίς are attributed to him in *Ant.* xvii 13, 2 (342). Cf. also *B.J.* ii 7, 3 (111).
6. *Ant.* xvii 13, 1 (339-41).
7. This king Juba was also a well-known scholar. Testimonia and fragments in Jacoby, *FGIH* 275. Cf. also RE s.v. 'Iuba' (2); F. Susemihl, *Gesch. der griech. Literatur in der Alexandrinerzeit* II (1892), pp. 402-14 (with extensive literary references); *PIR*² I 65. As a child (βρέφος, Appian; κομίδῃ νήπιος, Plutarch) Juba was led in triumph by Caesar in 46 B.C. (*App. BC* II 101/418; *Plut. Caesar*, 55). In 29 B.C. he received from Augustus his father's kingdom of Numidia (*Dio* li 15, 6). Four years later, in 25 B.C., Augustus gave him instead the lands of Bocchus and

this marriage was dissolved⁸ Glaphyra went to live in her father's house. There Archelaus became acquainted with her, fell in love, and eventually married her, after divorcing his first wife Mariamme. As Glaphyra had children by Alexander, the marriage was unlawful and therefore gave great offence.⁹ But it did not last long, for Glaphyra died soon after her arrival in Judaea¹⁰ after a remarkable dream in which her first husband Alexander appeared to her and announced her approaching death.¹¹

It goes without saying that Archelaus, as a son of Herod, also embarked on great building projects. The palace in Jericho was magnificently restored. An aqueduct was constructed to bring water from the village of Na'ara to the newly-planted palm-groves in the plain north of Jericho. He founded in his own honour a place to which he gave the name of Archelais.¹²

Bogus (*Mauretania Tingitana* and *Caesariensis*) and part of Gaetulia (*Dio* liii 26, 2). The numismatic evidence shows that he did not die until A.D. 23 (*PIR*² I 65). The marriage with Glaphyra probably occurred some time in the years 1 B.C. to A.D. 4 if Müller's conjecture is correct (*Fragm. Hist. Graec.* III, 465-84), namely that Juba became acquainted with Glaphyra whilst accompanying C. Caesar on his eastern expedition. An inscription in Athens refers to Glaphyra, *OGIS* 363 = *IG* II/III² 3437/8:

Ἡ βουλὴ καὶ [δ δ]ῆμος
[β]ασιλευσσαν [Γ]λαφύραν βασιλεύ[σ]
Ἀρχελαίου θυγατέρα, βασιλέως Ἰοβ[α]
γυναικ[α ἀρε]τῆς ἐνε[κ]α.

8. Josephus says 'after the death of Juba', which is incorrect. See the previous note.

9. Cf. in general *Ant.* xvii 13, 1 (341) and 4 (349-53); *B.J.* ii 7, 4 (114-16).
10. *Mer'* ὀλίγον τῆς ἀφιξέως χρόνον, *B.J.* ii 7, 4 (116).
11. *Ant.* xvii 13, 4 (351-3); *B.J.* ii 7, 4 (116).
12. *Ant.* xvii 13, 1 (340). On the palm groves near Jericho, see above, p. 298; on the village of Archelais, vol. II, § 23, i. It was situated, according to the *Tabula Peutingeriana* (ed. Miller, 1888), on the road from Jericho to Scythopolis, 12 m.p. north from Jericho, 12 + 12 m.p. south of Scythopolis. As the actual distance between Jericho and Scythopolis is about 50 m.p., there is a mistake in the figures somewhere. If the distance of 12 m.p. between Jericho and Archelais is accepted as correct, Archelais must have lain a little to the south of Phasaelis (not to the north of it, as was once supposed). For its location at Hîrbet 'Auga et-Tahtani, seven miles N. of Jericho, see A. Alt, *Pal. Jahrb.* 27 (1931), p. 46; M. Avi-Yonah, *Map of Roman Palestine* (1940), p. 27; but Abel, *Géog. Pal.* II, p. 249 leaves the identification undecided. The mosaic map of Madaba shows Archelais lying between Phasaelis and Jericho. See M. Avi-Yonah, *The Madaba Mosaic Map* (1954), p. 36 and pl. 1. Archelais, like Phasaelis, was renowned for its palm-groves (Josephus, *Ant.* xviii 2, 2 (31); Pliny, *NH* xiii 9/44). The palm-groves newly laid out by Archelaus, for which he had water brought from Na'ara, should therefore be located in the immediate neighbourhood of the Archelais founded by him. Na'ara is most probably identical with the Naaratha mentioned by Eusebius (*Onomast.*, ed. Klostermann, p. 136), which is only 5 m.p. from Jericho; in which case it will not have been too far from Archelais either.

But these splendid and beneficial undertakings could not reconcile his subjects to his misgovernment. After tolerating his regime for more than nine years, a deputation of the Jewish and Samaritan aristocracy set out for Rome to lay their complaints against him before Augustus. Their accusations must have been very serious, for the emperor felt obliged to summon Archelaus to Rome. Having interrogated him, he dismissed him from office and banished him to Vienne in Gaul in A.D. 6. Like his wife, Archelaus also learnt of his fate in a remarkable dream.¹³

The territory of Archelaus was placed under direct Roman rule; as an annexe of the province of Syria it was provided with a governor of its own from the equestrian order.¹⁴ With this, Judaea's position underwent a radical change. Despite their friendship with the Romans, Herod the Great and his sons had such an understanding of their own people that, with the occasional exception, they did not wantonly injure their most sacred feelings. Common prudence demanded care and caution in this regard. The Romans, on the other hand, had practically no comprehension of the Jewish character. As they knew nothing of the religious views of the Jews or of the many laws governing daily life, so they had no idea either that for the sake of superficial and apparently unimportant things an entire people would be capable of offering the most extreme resistance, even to the point of death and self-annihilation. The Jews saw in the simplest administrative rulings, such as the initial census, an encroachment on their most sacred rights and came increasingly to believe that direct Roman rule, which they had desired at Herod's death,¹⁵ was incompatible with the principles of theocracy. Even with the best of intentions on both sides, tension and hostility were therefore inevitable. But such goodwill as existed was only partial. Except during the reign of Caligula, those at the head of government were ready to make concessions and exercise forbearance, sometimes in very large measure. But their good intentions were always foiled by the ineptitude of the governors, and not infrequently also by

13. *Ant.* xvii 13, 2-3 (342-3); *B.J.* ii 7, 3 (111-13); Dio, iv 27, 6. Without mentioning the name of Archelaus, Strabo, xvi 2, 46 (765), writes that a son of Herod ἐν φυγῇ διετέλει παρὰ τοῖς Ἀλλόβριξι Γαλάταις λαβῶν οἰκησιν. Vienne, south of Lyons, was the capital of the Allobroges. As regards the chronology, Dio, iv 27, 6, dates the banishment of Archelaus during the consulship of Aemilius Lepidus and Lucius Arruntius (A.D. 6). The statements of Josephus agree with this, *Ant.* xvii 13, 2 (342), in the 10th year of Archelaus; *B.J.* ii 7, 3 (111), in the 9th. According to Jerome, the grave of Archelaus was shown near Bethlehem (*Onomast.*, ed. Klostermann, p. 45: 'sed et propter eandem Bethleem regis quondam Iudæae Archelai tumulus ostenditur'); if this is correct he must have died in Palestine.

14. *Ant.* xvii 13, 5 (355); xviii 1, 1 (2); *B.J.* ii 8, 1 (117).

15. *Ant.* xvii, 11, 2 (314); *B.J.* ii 6, 2 (91).

gross miscarriages of justice on their part. These officials of lower rank were, like all petty rulers, above all conscious of their own arbitrary power, and through their infringements they in the end so aggravated the people that in wild despair they plunged into a war of self-annihilation.

(2) Judaea under Roman Governors A.D. 6-41

As the political situation in Judaea during the period A.D. 6-41 was essentially the same as that of Palestine as a whole during A.D. 44-66, the following discussion combines the two periods and makes use of evidence relating to both.¹⁶

Judaea (and subsequently all Palestine) was not in the strict sense of the term incorporated into the province of Syria. It had a governor of its own, of equestrian rank, who was only to some extent subordinate to the imperial legate, *legatus Augusti pro praetore*, in Syria.¹⁷ According to Strabo's classification,¹⁸ Judaea belonged to the third class of imperial provinces. And this third class must be considered an exception to the rule. For most of the imperial provinces were, like the senatorial provinces, administered by men of senatorial rank, the larger ones (like Syria) by former consuls, the smaller by former praetors.¹⁹ Only a few provinces were by way of exception placed under governors of equestrian rank, namely those in which, owing to a tenacious and individual culture, or a lack of it, the strict implementation of ordinary regulations

16. For the background see Th. Mommsen, *Römische Geschichte* V (1904); O. Hirschfeld, *Die kaiserlichen Verwaltungsbeamten* (1905); J. Juster, *Les Juifs dans l'Empire romain. Leur condition juridique, économique et sociale* I-II (1914); M. I. Rostovtseff, *Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire* (ed. P. M. Fraser, 1957); A. Momigliano, *Ricerche sull'organizzazione della Giudea sotto il dominio romano, Annali della Reale Scuola normale Superiore di Pisa*, 2nd ser., 3 (1934); G. H. Stevenson, *Roman Provincial Administration* (1939); H. G. Pflaum, *Les procurateurs équestres sous le Haut-Empire romain* (1950); *idem*, *Les carrières procuratoriennes équestres sous le Haut-Empire romain*, I-III (1960); A. H. M. Jones, *Studies in Roman Government and Law* (1960).

17. Josephus, *B.J.* ii 8, 1 (117): 'The territory of Archelaus was now reduced to a province, and Coponius, a Roman of the equestrian order, was sent out as procurator (ἐπίτροπος). *Ant.* xviii 1, 1 (2): 'Cophonius . . . a man of equestrian rank, was appointed governor (ἡγησόμενος) over the Jews with full authority'.

18. Strabo, xvii 3, 25 (840) 'to some, the Emperor sent to take charge (ἐπιμελησόμενοι) men of consular rank, to others men of praetorian rank, and to some of equestrian rank'.

19. To describe the imperial governor of Syria as a 'proconsul', a mistake which New Testament scholars have sometimes made, is not in accord with conditions under the Principate.

seemed impossible. The best-known example is Egypt. Otherwise it was in particular territories inhabited by semi-barbarous peoples that were administered in this manner.²⁰

Under Augustus and Tiberius, the usual title for a governor of equestrian rank, in Judaea as in Egypt and elsewhere, was *praefectus* (ἑπαρχος).²¹ An inscription discovered in Caesarea in 1961 shows that this was the official title by which Pontius Pilate was known.²² Very soon, however, at least from Claudius onwards, the title *procurator* (ἐπίτροπος) came to be used for the governors of provinces of this type, Egypt excepted. The designation *praefectus* stresses the military character of the post, whereas *procurator* was used in the earliest period of the Principate only of financial officials, in imperial as well as in senatorial provinces. Originally, in its ordinary and non-technical sense, the word denoted the administrator of an estate; occasionally it occurs in the New Testament with this meaning.²³ The procurator was someone who administered the revenue of imperial domains, the emperor's *res familiares*, and in senatorial provinces his function was (and remained) to act as the emperor's personal agent. With the gradual ascendancy of the *princeps* over the *senatus*, a title which originally applied to the emperor's agent came to replace that of a public official. The procurators in imperial provinces were in every sense the representatives of the

20. Egypt was governed by a prefect. Other provinces of this type are mentioned by Tac. *Hist.* I 11 'duae Mauretaniae, Raetia, Noricum, Thracia et quae aliae procuratoribus cohibentur'. A complete list is given by O. Hirschfeld, *SAB* (1889), pp. 419-23. See Pflaum, *Carrières*, pp. 1044-1103.

21. O. Hirschfeld, *op. cit.*, pp. 425-7, and *Die kaiserlichen Verwaltungsbeamten*², pp. 384 ff., and A. H. M. Jones, 'Procurators and Prefects', *Studies in Roman Government and Law*, pp. 115-25, maintained this even before the inscription mentioned in the next note was discovered.

22. The inscription reads:

TIBERIEVM
PON]TIVS PILATVS
PRAEF]ECTVS IVDA[EA]E

and was discovered in the Roman theatre of Caesarea by an Italian archaeological expedition under Professor Antonio Frova. See A. Frova, 'L'iscrizione di Ponzio Pilato a Cesarea', *Rendiconti dell'Istituto Lombardo, Academia di Scienze e Lettere, Classe di Lettere* 95 (1961), pp. 419-34; *idem*, 'Quattro campagne di scavo della Missione Archeologica Milanese a Caesarea Maritima (Israele) 1959-1962', *Atti del Convegno La Lombardia e l'Oriente* (1963), p. 175; B. Lifshitz, 'Inscriptions latines de Césarée (Caesarea Palaestinae) 1. Le Tibereum', *Latomus* 22 (1963), p. 783; C. B. Gerra in *Scavi di Caesarea Maritima* (1966), pp. 217-20; H. Volkmann, *Gymnasium* 75 (1968), pp. 124-35; E. Weber, *Bonner Jahrbücher* 171 (1971), pp. 194-200.

23. Mt. 20:8, Lk. 8:3, Gal. 4:2. See W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* (1957), p. 303, s.v. ἐπίτροπος (1). The loan word אפיטרופוס is used in both meanings in Jewish Aramaic (cf. e.g. Tg. Neof. Gen. 39:4 and 41:34).

state. Besides taking care of financial affairs,²⁴ they also exercised military and juridical authority. Thus the difference between *praefectus* and *procurator* in imperial provinces was one in name only; by whatever title the bearer was known, his office combined military, financial and judicial powers. It is not surprising that our sources rarely distinguish properly between these two designations. Philo uses ἐπίτροπος,²⁵ even of the Prefect of Egypt. Josephus as a rule designates the governor of Judaea by the title ἐπίτροπος, occasionally ἑπαρχος or ἡγεμών, and also uses other names.²⁶ In the New Testament the term most often used is ἡγεμών,²⁷ i.e. *praeses*.²⁸ Tacitus uses the title *procurator* indiscriminately of Pontius Pilate²⁹ as well as of Cumanus and Felix.³⁰ Later writers, e.g. Justin Martyr, continue in the use of this expression (ἐπίτροπος), applying it also, as Tacitus had done, to officials who should have been called *praefecti*.³¹ Whereas the financial administrators in provinces governed by senators, and known by the title *procuratores*, were not in-

24. Cf. A. N. Sherwin-White, 'Procurator Augusti', *PBSR* 15 n.s. 2 (1939), pp. 11-26; H. G. Pflaum, *Les carrières procuratoriennes*, ch. 3, 'Le pouvoir des procurateurs-gouverneurs', pp. 110-60, and esp. 'Le pouvoir des procurateurs-gouverneurs en leur qualité d'agents financiers de l'Empereur', pp. 151-7. Further see F. Millar, *Historia* 13 (1964), pp. 180-7, and 14 (1965), pp. 362-7; cf. P. A. Brunt, 'Procuratorial Jurisdiction', *Latomus* 25 (1966), pp. 461-89.

25. *Legatio* 20 (132) (the word actually occurs in a letter written by Agrippa I), *In Flaccum* 19 (163) (here of the Prefect of Egypt).

26. ἐπίτροπος in the following passages: *B.J.* ii 8, 1 (117); 9, 2 (169), 11, 6 (220) (in the parallel passage *Ant.* xix 9, 2 (363) ἑπαρχος); 12, 8 (247); *Ant.* xx 1, 2 (14) (in a letter by Claudius to Cuspius Fadus); 6, 2 (132). ἑπαρχος in *B.J.* vi 5, 3 (303, 305); *Ant.* xviii 2, 2 (33); xix 9, 2 (363) (see above); xx 9, 1 (197). ἡγεμόσμενος in *Ant.* xviii 1, 1 (2). ἡγεμών in *Ant.* xviii 3, 1 (55). προσησόμενος in *Ant.* xx 7, 1 (137). ἐπιμελητής in *Ant.* xviii 4, 2 (89); Josephus gives the same title to Antipater, the father of Herod the Great, in his capacity of chief officer of Hyrcanus II; see *Ant.* xiv 8, 3 (139). ἑπαρχος in *Ant.* xviii 6, 10 (237).

In *B.J.* ii 8, 1 (117) Josephus calls Judaea an ἐπαρχία (in Augustus's reign, with Coponius as prefect; cf. n. 17 above). After the death of Agrippa I, when Palestine reverted to direct Roman administration, the region around Chalcis was bestowed on Agrippa II, and of the rest of the former kingdom Josephus says: τῆς δ' ἄλλης ἐπαρχίας διαδέχεται τὴν ἐπιτροπὴν ἀπὸ Ἀλεξάνδρου Κομμαῖός, *B.J.* ii 12, 1 (223), cf. *Ant.* xx 5, 1 (99).

27. Mt. 27:2, 11, 14, 15, 21, 27; 28:14; Lk. 3:1; 20:20; Acts 23:24, 26, 33; 24:1, 10; 26:30.

28. A more or less general title, strictly applied to governors of senatorial rank: 'praesidis nomen generale est eoque et proconsules et legati Caesaris et omnes provincias regentes licet senatores sint praesides appellatur' (*Dig.* I 18, 1). However, a distinction is made between *praeses* and *procurator Caesaris* (e.g. *Dig.* IV 4, 9).

29. *Ann.* xv 44, 4.

30. *Ann.* xii 54, 4.

31. 1 *Apol.* 13, 2 etc.

frequently chosen from among the emperor's freedmen,³² the governors of procuratorial provinces were normally chosen from among citizens of equestrian rank on account of the military command connected with such an appointment. It was an unprecedented innovation when in A.D. 52 a freedman, Felix, was appointed to the office of governor of Judaea (see below, § 19).

The governors of Judaea seem to have been subordinate to the legates of Syria only to the extent that it was the right and duty of the latter to exercise their superior authority whenever the need arose.³³ Ancient writers sometimes express themselves as if Judaea had been incorporated into the province of Syria, but they are not constant in this. Josephus, for instance, says that after the deposition of Archelaus (A.D. 6) Judaea became a *προσθήκη τῆς Συρίας*.³⁴ This must be taken with a grain of salt. Judaea remained until A.D. 70 an administrative unit with its own provincial government. Investing the prefect—or procurator, as the case may be—with a military command and independent jurisdiction, conferred on him a position which equalled in normal times that of the governors of other provinces. Only when there were grounds for fearing unrest, or when other serious difficulties arose, was it within the discretion of the legate of Syria to interfere. He would then take command in Judaea as the superior of the procurator.³⁵ Whether this superior authority went so far as to empower him to call the procurator to account seems questionable. In the two cases in which this happened,

32. Augustus's freedman, Licinus, appears to have been procurator in Gaul (Dio liv 21); cf. Millar in *Historia* 13 (1964), pp. 180–7.

33. Cf. Mommsen, *Röm. Gesch.* V, p. 509, note. Hirschfeld, SAB (1889), pp. 440–2.

34. *Ant.* xviii 1, 1 (2).

35. Josephus, *Ant.* xvii 13, 5 (355), writes: 'The territory subject to Archelaus was added to [the province of the] Syrians'. Immediately following on this passage in *Ant.* xviii 1, 1 (2), he calls Judaea a *προσθήκη* ('annex') of Syria and thus evidently does not intend to describe it as an integral part of that province, but only as being somehow attached to Syria. According to *B.J.* ii 8, 1 (117), the territory of Archelaus became a province, *ἐπαρχία*, hence directly subordinated to the emperor. Reporting on the state of affairs after the death of Agrippa, Josephus definitely affirms that the Syrian legate was not set over Agrippa's kingdom, *Ant.* xix 9, 2 (363). Subsequently, of course, he does mention that it became necessary for the legate to interfere in Judaeian affairs, *Ant.* xx 1, 1 (7). Tacitus mentions Syria and Judaea as being two provinces in A.D. 17 alongside one another, *Ann.* ii 42: 'provinciae Syria atque Iudaea', and says of the arrangements after the death of King Agrippa, *Hist.* v 9: 'Claudius . . . Iudaeam provinciam equitibus Romanis aut libertis permisit'. Hence when he reports the same fact in another place, *Ann.* xii 23, in the words 'Ituraeique et Iudaei defunctis regibus, Sohaemo atque Agrippa, provinciae Syriae additi', the expression *additi* might be understood in the same way as when Josephus, *Ant.* xviii 1, 1 (2) speaks of a *προσθήκη*. Suetonius also calls Judaea simply a province (*Div. Claud.* 28: 'Felicem, quem cohortibus et alis provinciaeque Iudaeae praeposuit').

the particular legates had probably been entrusted with a special commission.³⁶

The residence of the prefect or procurator of Judaea was not Jerusalem but Caesarea.³⁷ Since the dwelling of the commander-in-chief or governor was called *praetorium*, the *πραιτώριον τοῦ Ἡρώδου* in Caesarea (Acts 23:35) was presumably a palace built by Herod, which now served as the residence of the imperial representative. On particular occasions, especially during the main Jewish festivals, when more than ordinary precautions had to be taken on account of the crowds that poured into Jerusalem, the Roman governor went up to the city and resided in Herod's former palace. The *praetorium* in Jerusalem in which Pilate was staying at the time when Jesus was condemned (Mk. 15:16; Mt. 26:27; Jn. 18:28, 33; 19:9) was therefore almost certainly the palace of Herod in the west of the city.³⁸ It was not only a princely dwelling, but also a citadel, in which more than once (e.g. during the rebellions of 4 B.C. and A.D. 66) large detachments of troops were able to hold out against the attacks of the masses.³⁹ When the governor was in residence,

36. For instance Vitellius, who deposed Pilate, *Ant.* xviii 4, 2 (89). Tac. *Ann.* vi 32, explicitly says of him: 'cunctis quae apud orientem parabantur L. Vitellium praefecit', thus indicating the special emergency in this instance. Similarly, of Ummidius Quadratus who ordered Cumanus to report to Rome, Josephus *B.J.* ii 12, 6 (244); *Ant.* 6, 12 (132). Tacitus says in *Ann.* xii 54: 'Claudius . . . ius statuendi etiam de procuratoribus dederat'. The legates had in these cases a special commission. Only when serious disorder threatened to break out, or actually did break out in Judaea, and the procurator was unable to cope with the situation, did the governor of the neighbouring Syrian province come to his assistance—as to a client-king—and in such circumstances assumed command. Examples are: Petronius, *B.J.* ii 10, 1–5 (185–203); *Ant.* xviii 8, 2–9 (261–309); Cassius Longinus, *Ant.* xx 1, 1 (7); Cestius Gallus, *B.J.* ii 14, 3 (280–2) 16, 1 (333–5), 18, 9 (499–512), 19, 1–9 (513–55).

37. *Jos. B.J.* ii 9, 2 (171); *Ant.* xviii 3, 1 (55, 57) (Pilate). *B.J.* ii 12, 2 (230); *Ant.* xx 5, 4 (116) (Cumanus). Acts 23:23–33 (Felix), *ibid.* 25: 1–13 (Festus). *Jos. B.J.* II 14, 4 (288), 14, 6 (296), 17, 1 (407) (Florus). Tacitus, *Hist.* ii 78: 'Caesarea . . . Iudaeae caput'.

38. Josephus *B.J.* ii 14 8 (301) 15, 5 (328). Philo, *Legatio* 38 (299) calls the procuratorial residence in Jerusalem *τοῦ κατὰ τὴν ἱερὸπολιν Ἡρώδου βασιλείου*. F.-M. Abel, in H. Vincent et F.-M. Abel, *Jérusalem. Recherches de topographie, d'archéologie et d'histoire* I–III (1912–1926), vol. II, fasc. 3, pp. 562–71, remains undecided between Herod's palace and the Antonia. S. Marie-Aline de Sion, *La forteresse Antonia à Jérusalem et la question du prétoire* (1956), on archeological evidence, comes out in favour of the Antonia. P. Benoit, 'Prétoire, Lithostroton et Gabbatha', RB 59 (1952), pp. 531–50, re-states the reasons for identifying the *πραιτώριον* with Herod's palace. See now *idem*, 'L'Antonia d'Hérode le Grand et le forum oriental d'Ælia Capitolina', HTThR 64 (1971), pp. 135–67. The literary evidence points overwhelmingly in this direction. Cf. in general R. Egger, *Das Praetorium als Amissitz und Quartier römischer Spitzefunktionäre*, SAW 250 (1966) Abh. 4.

39. *Jos. B.J.* ii 31, 1 (44), 3, 4 (51–4), 17, 7 (430–2), 17, 8 (434–9), *Ant.* xvii 10, 2 (255), 10, 3 (265). Compare the description in *B.J.* v 4, 3–4 (156–83).

his accompanying detachment of troops would therefore also have been quartered there (cf. Mk. 15:16; Mt. 27:27).

As regards the military arrangements in the province, it should be borne in mind that under the Empire Roman troops fell into two distinct categories: the legions and the auxiliaries. The legions formed the real nucleus of the army and only Roman citizens served in them: provincials recruited to serve in the legions immediately obtained full citizenship rights. Each legion consisted of ten cohorts or 60 centuries comprising altogether 5,000–6,000 men. Auxiliary troops were made up of provincials who, at all events in the early days of the Empire, did not as a rule have rights of citizenship. Their weapons were lighter and less uniform than those of the legionaries; often they were allowed to keep their own national armoury. Their infantry was grouped into cohorts, the strength of which varied (500 or 1,000 men); the cavalry was formed into *alae* of similarly varying strength. Cohorts and *alae* were named after the ethnic groups from which they had been recruited.⁴⁰

Normally, only auxiliary troops were stationed in provinces administered by a prefect or procurator, and they served under his command.⁴¹ This was the case also in Judaea. Legions were stationed in Syria, three in 4 B.C. and four from Tiberius onward.⁴² But until Vespasian, only auxiliary troops were stationed in Judaea, and most of these were recruited in the country itself.⁴³ The honour and burden of this levy fell exclusively on the non-Jewish inhabitants of Palestine. The Jews were exempt. This is proved to have been so at least in the time of Caesar,⁴⁴ and, from all that is known of the Roman military organisation

40. To give only a few examples from Palestine and Syria: *cohors Ascalonitarum, Canathenorum, Damascenorum, Ituraeorum, Sebastenorum, Tyriorum*. See G. L. Cheesman, *The Auxilia of the Roman Imperial Army* (1914); K. Kraft, *Zur Rekrutierung der Alen und Kohorten am Rhein und Donau* (1951).

41. O. Hirschfeld, SAB (1889), pp. 431–7.

42. Three legions in 4 B.C.: Jos. *B.J.* ii 3, 1 (40), 5, 1 (66); *Ant.* xvii 10, 9 (286); four under Tiberius (and probably in the latter part of Augustus's reign): Tac. *Ann.* iv 5. Of the four Syrian legions, only two are known with certainty: the *legio VI Ferrata* (Tac. *Ann.* ii 79, 81; xiii 38, 40; xv 6, 26) and the *legio X Fretensis* (*Ann.* ii 57; xiii 40; xv 6). The other two were probably the *legio III Gallica* (*Ann.* xiii 40; xv 6, 26) which according to Tacitus, *Hist.* iii 24 had already fought under M. Antonius against the Parthians, and the *legio XII Fulminata* (*Ann.* xv 6, 7, 10, 26). See Ritterling in RE s.v. 'Legio'; R. Syme, 'Some Notes on the Legions under Augustus', *JRS* 23 (1933), pp. 13–33; A. Betz, 'Zur Dislokation der Legionen in der Zeit von dem Tode des Augustus bis zum Ende der Prinzipatsepoche', *Carmuntina*, ed. E. Swoboda (1956), pp. 17–24.

43. On the garrisoning of Judaea up to the time of Vespasian, see Th. Mommsen, in *Hermes* 19 (1884), p. 217, note; O. Hirschfeld, SAB (1889), pp. 433 f.; T. R. S. Broughton in Jackson and Lake, *Beginnings . . .*, Additional Note xxxiii.

44. *Ant.* xiv 10, 6 (204): 'No one, whether magistrate (*ἀρχων*) [or pro-magistrate (*ἀντιάρχων*)] or praetor (*στρατηγός*) or legate (*πρεσβευτής*) shall raise auxiliary troops in the country (*ἔθροι*) of the Jews'. Apart from the *cod. Pal.* all manuscripts give this text, as also the Old Latin (*ut nullus vel preses vel dux vel legatus in finibus*

in Palestine until the time of Vespasian, may be safely taken to apply to the early Principate. Jews were exempted from serving in the Roman armies to avoid conflict with their observation of Jewish festivals and the sabbath regulations.⁴⁵

For the years A.D. 6–41 there is no specific information concerning the troops stationed in Judaea. It appears, however, that the Sebastenes (i.e. soldiers recruited in and around Sebaste or Samaria), who will be encountered later, constituted even then a considerable part of the garrison. In the upheaval following the death of Herod in 4 B.C., the most proficient sector of Herod's troops, the *Σεβαστηνοὶ τρισχιλιοὶ*, fought alongside the Romans under the command of Rufus and Gratus, the former commanding the cavalry, the latter the infantry.⁴⁶ Archelaus undoubtedly retained the troops thus proved, and it is highly probable that after his deposition in A.D. 6 they were taken over by the Romans; then from A.D. 41–44 by Agrippa, and after his death by the Romans once more. This supposition is borne out by the following. When Agrippa died in A.D. 44, the king's troops stationed in Caesarea—the *Καίσαρεῖς καὶ Σεβαστηνοὶ*—expressed their joy in a very unseemly manner at the death of a ruler who had shown his sympathy for the Jews. To honour Agrippa's memory, the emperor wished these troops, namely the *ἡγετῶν Καίσαρῶν καὶ τῶν Σεβαστηνῶν καὶ αἱ πέντε σπέραι* (therefore an *ala* of cavalry and five cohorts), to be transferred as a punishment to Pontus. By means of a petition, however, they managed to stay in Judaea until eventually removed by Vespasian.⁴⁷ This shows that Agrippa's troops were simply taken over by the Romans.⁴⁸ It may consequently be assumed that the same happened when Archelaus was deposed. It is remarkable that the one cavalry *ala* and five cohorts of infantry (if these are assessed at 500 men each) together amount to 3,000 men, i.e., the same number of Sebastene troops as is attested for 4 B.C. These troops are frequently mentioned in the period from

Judeorum auxilia colligat). Niese accepts, however, the reading in the *cod. Pal.* The Jews of Asia Minor were exempt from conscription for military service when Pompey's party took to arms in 49 B.C., Jos. *Ant.* xiv 10, 13 (228); 10, 14 (232); 10, 16 (234); 10, 18 (237); 10, 14 (240) on account of their religious objections. Six years later, this exemption was confirmed by Dolabella at Ephesus, *Ant.* xiv 10, 12 (226): 'Those Jews who are Roman citizens and observe Jewish rites and practise them in Ephesus, I release from military service . . . in consideration of their religious scruples'. For Jewish soldiers in both Hellenistic armies and the Roman army after A.D. 70, see J. Juster, *Les Juifs dans l'empire romain II* (1914), pp. 265–76.

45. Cf. *Ant.* xiii 8, 4 (251–2).

46. *B.J.* ii 3, 4 (52); 4, 2 (58); 4, 3 (63). Cf. *Ant.* xvii 10, 3 (266).

47. *Ant.* xix 9, 1–2 (356–66).

48. Analogous cases are also known elsewhere. See Mommsen, 'Die Conscriptionsordnung der römischen Kaiserzeit', *Hermes* 19 (1884), pp. 1–79, 210–34, esp. pp. 51, 217 f.

A.D. 44 to 66. The procurator Cumanus led the *ala Sebastenorum* and four cohorts of infantry from Caesarea against the Jews.⁴⁹ In the conflicts between the Jewish and Gentile inhabitants of Caesarea, the latter relied on the fact that Roman troops in Caesarea consisted mostly of Caesareans and Sebastenes.⁵⁰ Finally, in A.D. 67 Vespasian was able to enlist in his army five cohorts and one *ala* of cavalry from Caesarea,⁵¹ the same units as had been stationed there in A.D. 44. They are probably identical with the *Sebasteni* so often referred to on inscriptions. The *σπεῖρα Σεβαστή*, mentioned in Acts 27:1 as having been stationed in Caesarea at the time of the imprisonment of the apostle Paul, about A.D. 60, may have been one of the five cohorts mentioned by Josephus. But many New Testament scholars have incorrectly supposed that the expression *σπεῖρα Σεβαστή* is synonymous with *σπεῖρα Σεβαστηνῶν*. This is unlikely (unless *Σεβαστή* is an inaccurate equivalent to 'Sebastena'). *Σεβαστή* seems rather to be the equivalent of *Augusta*, a title of honour very frequently bestowed upon auxiliary troops. The cohort in question may therefore have been named *cohors Augusta Sebastenorum*. In Caesarea it would simply be called *σπεῖρα Σεβαστή* since this was sufficient to distinguish it from the others.⁵² An inscription from

49. *B.J.* ii 12, 5 (236); *Ant.* xx 6, 1 (122).

50. *Ant.* xx 8, 7 (176).

51. *B.J.* iii 4, 2 (66).

52. Evidence exists of *ala I Flavia Sabastenorum* (EE V, p. 699), *ala gemina Sebastenorum* (CIL VIII 9358=ILS 2738, 9359), *ala Sebastenorum* (EE V 1000), *cohors I Sebastenorum* (CIL III 2916); whether the figure I is the correct reading is doubtful; see EE IV 370=CIL III 9984. A *cohors I Sebastena* was in Syria in A.D. 88 (CIL XVI 35); a *cohors I Seb(astenorum) miliaria* was stationed in Palestine in A.D. 139 (CIL XVI 87). Although there were other cities with the name of Sebaste, from the material supplied by Josephus it is nevertheless probable that these troops were drawn from Palestinian Sebaste. Cf. also Mommsen, 'Die Conscriptiionsordnung der römischen Kaiserzeit', *Hermes* 19 (1884), p. 217. In support of this view, Cichorius (RE I, col. 1260) asserts that two of the inscriptions mentioned testify to the presence of the *ala Sebastenorum* in Mauretania, while an *ala I Thracum Mauretana* went to Palestine in A.D. 86 (see below, note 67). The regiments therefore appear to have been exchanged. Mommsen's conjecture, that among the five cohorts in Caesarea were a *cohors Ascalonitarum* and a *cohors Canathenorum*, *Hermes*, l.c. and SAB (1895), pp. 501 f., cannot be reconciled with the definite statements of Josephus, for the latter says of the Caesarean garrison as a whole that it mainly consisted of Caesareans and Sebastenes, *Ant.* xx 8, 7 (176); *Ant.* xix 9, 1 (356); 9, 2 (361, 364-5). There cannot, therefore, have been one cohort of Ascalonites and one of Canathenians among the five cohorts. The honorific, *Augusta*, which was bestowed on three legions, is rendered by Ptolemy *Σεβαστή* (*Geog.* ii 3, 30, ii 9, 18, iv 3, 30). It is not surprising therefore that the same title should be similarly reproduced when attached to an auxiliary cohort. Since the *ala* referred to by Josephus, although consisting of Caesareans and Sebastenes, *Ant.* xix 9, 2 (365), was nevertheless named only *ala Sebastenorum*, *B.J.* ii 12, 5 (236), it may be assumed that other conditions being equal, the other *σπεῖραι* were also called *cohortes Sebastenorum*. This view is supported by surviving inscriptions.

Sebaste reads A R R [? . . .]/tesse[rarius] coh. V [Augustae?]/c(ivium R(omanorum) [Sebastenae?].⁵³ Considering that only auxiliary troops were stationed in peace time in Judaea, it is surprising to read (Acts 10:1) that a *σπεῖρα Ἰταλική* was garrisoned in Caesarea around A.D. 40, for this expression probably means a cohort consisting of Roman citizens from Italy. Such a unit cannot have served in Caesarea under the Jewish king Agrippa from A.D. 41 to 44. But in the light of the above considerations it appears unlikely even before this. The story of the centurion Cornelius (Acts 10) is also open to suspicion in this respect, and it may be that circumstances prevailing at a later period were assumed to have existed at an earlier one. That a *cohors Italica* was stationed in Syria for some considerable time, from at least A.D. 69 to 157, is attested by three surviving inscriptions.⁵⁴

Besides that of Caesarea, small garrisons were stationed in other cities and towns of Palestine. At the outbreak of the Jewish war in A.D. 66 there were Roman garrisons in fortified places such as Jericho and Machaerus.⁵⁵ Various detachments were distributed throughout Samaria,⁵⁶ in the Great Plain a minor detachment was posted with a decurion in charge⁵⁷; in Ascalon (which was at least in the early period part of an imperial estate) there were a cohort and an *ala*.⁵⁸ In the

53. AE 1948, 150, cf. 151.

54. On inscriptions (Mommsen, EE V, p. 249), appear *cohors I Italica civium Romanorum voluntariorum* (CIL XIV 171), *cohors II Italica civium Romanorum . . . exercitus Syriaci* (CIL III 13483 a), *cohors II Italica civium Romanorum*, mentioned under the cohorts *quae sunt in Suria sub Arridio Corneliano legato*, A.D. 157 (CIL XVI 106), *cohors miliaria Italica voluntariorum quae est in Syria* (CIL XI 6117), *cohors II Italica* (CIL VI 3528). The last four are very probably identical. In a passage of Arrian (*Acies contra Alanos in Arriani Scripta minora*, ed. Roos, Wirth, 1968), the expression *ἡ σπεῖρα ἡ Ἰταλική* alternates with *οἱ Ἰταλοί* (3, 9, 13). For this reason, and with regard to the three inscriptions first mentioned, it is probable that a *cohors Italica* consisted mainly of Roman citizens from Italy. Of particular interest among the above inscriptions is the epitaph from Carnuntum in Pannonia, AE 1896 27=CIL III, 13483a=ILS 9168. It reads: *Proculus Rabilii f(ilius) Col(lina) Philadel(phia) mil(es) optio coh(ortis) II Italic(ae) c(ivium) R(omanorum) (centuria) Fa(s)u(stini, ex vexil(lariis?) sagit(tariis?) exer(citus) Syriaci stib(endiorum) VII. vixit an(nos) XXVI. Apuleius frater f(aciundum) c(ivavit)*. Since Proculus had served in the Syrian army, and since 'Rabilus' is a Syrian name ('Rabbula', Rab'ulla', 'Rabel') there is no doubt of the latter's having come from Philadelphia in Palestine (Amman). It is very probable that the epitaph was placed before A.D. 73. Hence the *vexillatio* belonged to the troops which Mucianus had led from Syria to the West towards the end of A.D. 69. However the existence of a *cohors Italica* in Syria around A.D. 69 does not prove that there was one stationed in Judaea in or around A.D. 40. Cf. RE IV, cols. 304-5, and E. Gabba, *Iscrizioni greche e latine per lo studio della Bibbia* (1958), nos. 25-6.

55. *B.J.* ii 18, 6 (484-5).

56. *B.J.* iii 7, 32 (309).

57. *Vita* 24 (115).

58. *B.J.* iii 2, 1 (12).

winter of A.D. 67/68, Vespasian placed garrisons in every conquered village and town, those in the villages under the command of decurions and those in the towns under centurions.⁵⁹ This was of course an exceptional measure, not to be assumed as applying to times of peace.

In Jerusalem only one cohort was stationed. The *χιλιάρχος* referred to in the New Testament (Jn. 18:12 ἡ σπεῖρα καὶ ὁ χιλιάρχος; Acts 21:31 ὁ χιλιάρχος τῆς σπεῖρας = 'tribune of the cohort') appears throughout as the commander-in-chief in Jerusalem.⁶⁰ This is in accord with Josephus's statement that a *τάγμα* of Romans was permanently stationed in the Antonia,⁶¹ for *τάγμα* implies here not a legion, as it often does, but, as in the passage quoted above in n. 49, a cohort. The Antonia citadel described by Josephus as the permanent quarters of this unit, lay north of the Temple. At two points, steps (*καταβάσεις*) led down from the fortress to the Temple-court.⁶² This is precisely the situation that emerges from the Acts. For when Paul was taken into custody by the soldiers during the uproar in the courtyard of the Temple, and was led away to the barracks (*παρεμβολή*), he was carried up the steps (*ἀναβαθμοί*) by the soldiers to protect him from the crowd, and from there, with the permission of the 'chiliarch', addressed the people once more (Acts 21:31-40). The officer in command of the Antonia, who is certainly identical with the chiliarch, is also called *φρούραρχος* by Josephus.⁶³ The direct connexion between citadel and Temple court was of importance, for the latter had to be under constant surveillance. At the high festivals, guards were posted in the arcades surrounding the Temple-courts.⁶⁴ Acts 23:23 also indicates that a cavalry detachment accompanied the cohort in Jerusalem, a not uncommon arrangement.⁶⁵ But it is a puzzle to know who are meant by the *δεξιολάβοι* (from *λαβή* = 'grip'; therefore 'those who grasped their weapons by the right hand') mentioned in the same passage with the ordinary foot-soldiers and the cavalry. As this expression occurs only twice elsewhere, and even then without explanation, it is not possible to explain it. But it certainly seems to describe a particular kind of

59. *B.J.* iv 8, 1 (442).

60. Acts 21:31, 37; 22:24, 29; 23:10, 15, 22; 24:7, 22. The normal title of the commander of an auxiliary cohort was *praefectus* (*ἐπαρχος*). Therefore either the writer of Acts has made a slip, or this was in fact a *cohors Italica* (see above) or a *cohors milliaria* (a cohort of double the normal size), both of which were commanded by *tribuni*. See RE s.v. 'tribunus cohortis' (XII, cols. 304-5). Cf. A. N. Sherwin-White, *Roman Society*, p. 155.

61. *B.J.* v 5, 8 (244).

62. *B.J.* v 5, 8 (243).

63. *Ant.* xv 11, 1 (408); xviii 4, 3 (93).

64. *B.J.* v 5, 8 (244); *B.J.* ii 12, 1 (223) = *Ant.* xx 5, 3 (106); *Ant.* xx 8, 11 (192).

65. There was a distinction between *cohortes peditatae* and *equitatae*. See RE IV, col. 235.

light-armed soldiery (javelin-throwers or foot-soldiers using other missiles).

After the great war of A.D. 66-73/4, a radical change took place in the garrisoning of Palestine. The governor was no longer a procurator of the equestrian order but a legate of senatorial rank (in the first period, a former praetor, and later a former consul). A legion (*Legio X Fretensis*) was quartered on the site of the destroyed city of Jerusalem (see below, § 20). The native troops who for decades had formed the garrison of Caesarea were transferred by Vespasian to other provinces.⁶⁶ Their place was taken by auxiliary troops of foreign origin, some of them from the farthest West.⁶⁷ Under Hadrian, the garrison in Palestine was substantially reinforced. Instead of one legion, it was given two,⁶⁸ and the number of auxiliary troops was likewise considerably increased.⁶⁹

In addition to the standing army, the provincial governors occasionally organized a militia when the need for reinforcements arose. Those of the population, that is to say, who were capable of bearing arms were temporarily drafted into military service without becoming permanently part of the army. A case in point was the arming of the Samaritans by Cumanus to assist in fighting the Jews.⁷⁰

Like the governors of senatorial rank, the prefects or procurators exercised supreme judicial authority as well as the military command within their province.⁷¹ The procurators of Judaea did so only in

66. *Ant.* xix 9, 2 (366).

67. On a *diploma* from A.D. 86 (CIL XVI 33) veterans are mentioned who served in Judaea, namely, *in alis duabus quae appellantur veterana Gaetulorum et I Thracum Mauretana et cohortibus quattuor I Augusta Lusitanorum et I et II Thracum et II Cantabrorum*.

68. See below, p. 514.

69. On a *diploma* from A.D. 139, CIL XVI 87 (ad lacum Tiberiadem), there is mention of *alae III et cohortes XII quae . . . sunt in Syria Palaestina*, namely (1) the *alae Gallorum et Thracum et Antoniniana Gallorum et VII Phrygum*, and (2) the *cohortes I Thracum milliaria et I Sebastenorum milliaria et I Damascenorum et I Montanorum et I Flavia civium Romanorum et I et II Galatarum et III et IV Bracarum et IV et VI Petraeorum et V Gemina civium Romanorum*.

70. *Ant.* xx 6, 1 (122): 'Cumanus . . . took over the squadron of the Sebastenes and four infantry units, and armed the Samaritans.' With regard to the provincial militia, see Th. Mommsen, 'Die Conscriptiionsordnung der römischen Kaiserzeit', *Hermes* 19 (1884), pp. 219 ff.; 22 (1887), pp. 547 ff.

On the prefect's, or procurator's, authority as commander-in-chief of troops, see H. G. Pflaum, 'Les attributions militaires des procurateurs-gouverneurs' in *Les procurateurs équestres* (1950), pp. 124-34; and F.-M. Abel, *Histoire de la Palestine I* (1952), pp. 426-8.

71. On prefectorial (and procuratorial) jurisdiction, see O. Hirschfeld, in SAB (1899), pp. 437-9, and H. G. Pflaum, 'L'indépendance des procurateurs-gouverneurs' in *Les procurateurs équestres* (1950), pp. 146-8; on the governor's right of punishment in general, Th. Mommsen, *Röm. Strafrecht* (1899), pp. 229-50; particularly, H. G. Pflaum, 'Le pouvoir judiciaire des procurateurs-gouverneurs',

exceptional cases, for the ordinary administration of the law, both in criminal and civil matters, was left to the native and local courts (see vol. II, § 23).⁷² The governor's judicial competence included the *ius gladii* or *potestas gladii*, the right of decision over life and death.⁷³ Several inscriptions testify that governors of procuratorial rank were vested with the same authority as governors of higher status.⁷⁴ With reference to Judaea, Josephus states explicitly that the emperor delegated to Coponius, Judaea's first Roman prefect, the power to rule on his behalf, and exercise his authority, including the right to inflict capital punishment.⁷⁵ He does not, however, imply that there existed in the country no other judiciary authority besides that of the

op. cit., pp. 110-17; F.-M. Abel, *op. cit.*, pp. 428-9; A. H. M. Jones, 'I Appeal unto Caesar' in *Studies in Roman Government and Law*, pp. 51-65; F. Millar, *Historia* 13 (1964), pp. 180-7; 14 (1965), pp. 362-7; P. A. Brunt, 'Procuratorial Jurisdiction', *Latomus*, 25 (1966), pp. 461-89.

72. This applies generally also to the administration of law in the provinces; see Th. Mommsen, *Röm. Staatsrecht* II, p. 244: 'The ordinary jurisdiction in criminal cases was left in the provinces to their inhabitants, whilst the courts of the governor, like consular courts in Italy, are to be regarded, at least in the formal sense, as being an exception'. See especially: J. Juster, *Les Juifs dans l'Empire romain* II (1914), 'Jurisdiction en Palestine', pp. 93-109, 127-49.

73. *Dig.* I 18, 6, 8 (from Ulpian, beginning of 3rd century A.D.): 'Qui universas provincias regunt, ius gladii habent et in metallum dandi potestas eis permissa est'. The *ius gladii* is also called *potestas gladii*, *Dig.* I 16, 6 *pr.* = L 17, 70, II 1, 3 (all from Ulpian). There is no proof that either expression was in use as a *terminus technicus* before the beginning of the 3rd century A.D. (the Acts of Perpetua and Felicitas belong to A.D. 203. The inscriptions scarcely go back beyond this time). On the *ius gladii*, see H. G. Pflaum, 'L'évolution du *jus gladii* sous le Haut-Empire', in *Les procurateurs équestres* (1950), pp. 117-25; further A. Berger, *Encyclopedic Dictionary of Roman Law* (1953), p. 529, and the literature quoted there.

74. See the treatments by Th. Mommsen, *Röm. Staatsrecht*, II 1, p. 246; *Röm. Strafrecht*, p. 244; O. Hirschfeld, *op. cit.*, p. 438. Only two inscriptions belong here: CIL IX 5439 *proc. Alpium Atractianar[um] et Poeninar[um] iur[e] gladii*, and CIL VIII 9367, cf. EE V, no. 968: *praeses (scil. Mauretaniae Caesariensis) iure gladii*. The following two cases belong to different categories: (1) CIL II 484 = ILS 1372 *proc. prov. M[oe]siae inferioris, eiusdem provinciae ius gladii*; this is the temporary replacement of a senatorial legate as governor by the procurator of the province, Pflaum, *Carrières*, no. 330. (2) CIL III 1919 (with add.) = ILS 2770: *proc. centenarius provinciae Li[burniae] iure gladii*. This is an exceptional *ad hoc* procuratorial governorship of an area normally part of a province governed by a senatorial legate, Pflaum, *Carrières*, no. 196.

A third situation is represented by the *Acta Perpetuae et Felicitatis* 6, 2 (Knöpf-Krüger-Ruhbach, *Ausgewählte Martyrerakten* (1965), p. 38) 'Hilarianus procurator tunc loco proconsulis Minuci Timiniani defuncti ius gladii acceperat'. This is the temporary replacement of a deceased proconsul by the (in principle) private financial procurator of the province.

75. *B. J.* ii 8, 1 (117).

prefect empowered to administer the death penalty. The exact extent of the *ius gladii* delegated to provincial governors in the early Principate is not known for certain; at least from the third century A.D. onwards it embraced even the right over life and death of Roman citizens (with the reservation that these could appeal to the emperor against the governor's sentence), but in the early days of the Principate, provincial governors were perhaps not entitled to impose the death penalty upon persons possessing Roman citizen-rights, or, at all events, not if they appealed. Such persons, when accused of an offence constituting a capital charge, might at the beginning of the proceedings, or at any subsequent stage of their trial, request that the investigation be carried out in Rome and judgment passed by the emperor himself.⁷⁶ The governor's absolute penal jurisdiction probably extended therefore only to non-citizens. But Florus, in Jerusalem in A.D. 66, ordered the crucifixion of Jews who were of Roman equestrian rank.⁷⁷ Even non-citizens might be sent by the governor to Rome for trial, if on

76. Acts 25:10 f., 21; 26:32. Cf. Pliny, *Epp.* x, 96: 'fuerunt alii similis amentiae, quos quia cives Romani erant adnotavi in urbem remittendos'. There is very little clear evidence on the limits which existed in the early Empire on the powers of governors to execute citizens. For relevant cases see Suet. *Galba* 9; Dio lxiii 2, 3; Pliny, *Epp.* ii, 11, 8. Consequently, there is no general agreement on either the legal background or the current practice in this period. See Th. Mommsen, *Röm. Strafrecht* (1899), pp. 235-6; A. H. M. Jones, 'I appeal unto Caesar', *Studies in Roman Government and Law* (1960), pp. 51-65; A. N. Sherwin-White, *Roman Society* (1963), pp. 58-70; *The Letters of Pliny* (1966), pp. 164-5; P. Garnsey, 'The *Lex Iulia* and Appeal under the Empire', *JRS* 56 (1966), pp. 167-89; *idem*, *Social Status and Legal Privilege in the Roman Empire* (1970), pp. 260-71.

The most important case known is that of Paul. It would be possible to deduce from it that the governor was not in all circumstances obliged to send accused citizens to Rome for judgment, for the procurator on his own authority takes up the case of Paul, although Felix at least was aware of Paul's Roman citizenship (Acts 22:25 f., 23:27), and in the beginning Paul allowed matters to proceed without protest. Only after two years does he speak the word that determines the trial's future course: 'I appeal to Caesar' (Acts 25:11). It might therefore be supposed that the procurator could judge even a Roman citizen unless the latter lodged a protest. But if the accused made the claim to be judged in Rome, the governor was obliged to give effect to his request. Cf. *Sententiae Pauli* V 26, 1: 'Lege Iulia de vi publica damnatur qui aliqua potestate praeditus civem Romanum, antea ad populum, nunc ad imperatorem appellentem, necaverit, necarive iusserit, torserit, verbaverit, condemnaverit'. In the half century between Porcius Festus's procuratorship in Palestine and Pliny's term of office in Bithynia, a change in Roman procedural law may have taken place: Pliny did not wait for the accused Roman citizens to lodge objections to his judicial competence, but sent them to Rome on his own initiative.

77. *B. J.* ii 14, 9 (308): 'Florus ventured to do what none had done ever before, namely, to scourge before his tribunal and nail to the cross men of equestrian rank who, though Jews by birth, were none the less invested with that Roman dignity'.

account of the difficulty of the case, he wished to refer the decision to the emperor.⁷⁸ The procurator of Judaea's customary right, mentioned in the Gospels, to release a prisoner at the feast of Passover, is not known from any source of Roman law. Provincial governors had no right to grant a pardon.⁷⁹

Although the governor as sole judge had to make his own decision, he normally took counsel with his *comites*. These were in part higher officials from his entourage, and in part younger people who accompanied the governor for the sake of their own training. They not only supported him in the exercise of his office, but also assisted him in the discharge of legal duties as a *consilium*, *συμβούλιον*. In certain instances, dignitaries from the native population of the province had a voice in the deliberations of the *consilium*.⁸⁰

The death sentence was as a rule executed by soldiers.⁸¹ For the

78. E.g. *B.J.* ii 12, 6 (243); *Ant.* xx 6, 2 (131-2); Ummidius Quadratus sent prominent Samaritans and Jews to Rome; *B.J.* ii 13, 2 (253); *Ant.* xx 8, 5 (161); Felix sent Eleazar and other Zealots to Rome; *Jos. Vita* 3 (13); Felix sent some Jewish priests; *Acts* 27:1; Festus despatched Paul and other captives; cf. *JRS* 56 (1966), p. 156.

79. See O. Hirschfeld, *SAB* (1889), p. 439. Also P. Winter, *On the Trial of Jesus* (1961), p. 97. *Dig.* XLVIII 19, 31: 'Ad bestias damnatos favore populi praeses dimittere non debet, sed principem consultare debet' (Modestinus, 3rd cent.).

80. Such consultants or assessors are found attached to various officials; see e.g. *Jos. Ant.* xiv 10, 2 (192); Philo, *Legatio* 33 (244); ILS 5947. Of interest is the composition and authority of the *συμβούλιον* (*Acts* 25:12) which advised Festus. If it was identical with the group of persons who in addition to Festus and Agrippa II interrogated Paul once more after he had lodged his appeal (*Acts* 25:53), it would have consisted partly of high-ranking Roman military officers and partly of civilians from the local population ('the principal men of the city').

Philo, *Legatio* 33 (244), uses the word *συνέδρος* to designate an individual member of the governor's council; Josephus, *c. Ap.* ii 18 (177), uses the term *ἐπιστάτης*. Philo, *l.c.*, mentions that Petronius, the Syrian legate, when faced with the difficult decision how to evade complying with Caligula's order to erect the emperor's statue in the sanctuary in Jerusalem—see below, pp. 394-6—took advice with his assessors (*μετὰ τῶν συνέδρων ἐβουλεύετο*) on the course of action he should take. Josephus, *B.J.* ii 16, 5 (199), merely mentions Petronius's private conferences with the Jewish leaders (*οἱ ἄρχαι*) and public meetings with the ordinary petitioners (*τὸ πλῆθος*).

In *c. Ap.* ii 18 (177), Josephus speaks generally of 'the holders of the highest gubernatorial offices' employing assessors (*ἐπιστάται*).

On *comites*, in general, see RE s.v. 'adessor' and 'consilium'; cf. G. Cicogna, *I consigli dei magistrati romani e il consilium principis* (1910); Adolf Berger, *Encyclopedic Dictionary of Roman Law*, p. 408; W. Kunkel, *Zeitschr. d. Sav. Stiftung, Röm. Abt.* 84 (1967), pp. 218-44.

81. See, e.g. Suet. *Caligula* 32: 'Saepe in conspectu prandentis vel comissantis miles decollandi artifex quibuscumque e custodia capita amputabat'. Tertullian, wishing to prove the incompatibility of the Christian faith with military

imperial governors were military officers, and their individual power derived from their military office.⁸² The numerous executions of noble Romans carried out in the reigns of Claudius and Nero were without exception effected by military personnel, often by high-ranking officers.⁸³ Not infrequently *speculatores* are mentioned as carrying out executions.⁸⁴ These were military men; occasionally they are explicitly described as holding military rank, in other cases they are definitely characterized as soldiers.⁸⁵ Those mentioned elsewhere by the same title and as discharging the same functions must also have been soldiers. The New Testament names the agents entrusted with the

pursuits, asks in *De corona militis* 11, 2: 'et vincula et carcerem et tormenta et supplicia administrabit, nec suarum ultor iniuriarum?' The passage indicates that the execution of death sentences was one of the duties of soldiers. See O. Hirschfeld, 'Die Sicherheitspolizei im römischen Kaiserzeit', *Kleine Schriften* (1913) pp. 376-612. Cf. G. Lopuzanski, 'La police romaine et les Chrétiens', *Ant. Class.* 20 (1951), pp. 5-46.

82. Dio liii 13; cf. Th. Mommsen, *Röm. Staatsrecht* II 1, p. 245. Compare however P. Garnsey, 'The Criminal Jurisdiction of Governors', *JRS* 58 (1968) pp. 51-9.

83. *Tac. Ann.* i 53; xi 37, 38; xii 22; xiv 8; 59; xv 59-61, 64, 65, 67, 69.

84. Mk. 6:27: 'The king sent forth a σπεκουλάτορ and ordered him to bring [John the Baptist's] head'. Seneca, *De ira* I 18, 4: 'Tunc centurio supplicio praepositus condere gladium speculatorem iubet'; the same, *De ben.* III 25: 'speculatore toribus occurrit nihilque se deprecari, quominus imperata peragerent; dixit e deinde cervicem porrexit'; Firmicus Maternus, *Mathes.* VIII 26, 6: 'faciet spiculatores, sed his ipsis gladio cervices amputabuntur'; *Dig.* XLVIII 20, 6 (from Ulpian): 'neque speculatores ultro sibi vindicent neque optiones ea desiderent quibus spoliatur, quo momento quis punitus est' (hence soldiers who carried out executions in later times were no longer allowed to divide among themselves the garments of the executed person as they had been in the time of Jesus. Cf. RE s.v. 'speculatores'). In rabbinical literature ספקלטור or אספקלטור is encountered in the sense of 'executioner'. See especially the passage quoted in Eevy, *Neuhebr. Wörterbuch* III, p. 573; *Chald. Wörterbuch* II, p. 182, add Tg. Neof. Gen. 37:36 40:3 f.; 41:10 ff.; cf. also S. Krauss, *Griechische und lateinische Lehnwörter in Talmud* II (1899), p. 409. The form *spiculator* is a corruption from *speculator*, as is proved by many inscriptions, see for example ILS 2375; 2380-2.

85. See Seneca, *De ira* I 18, 4 (mentioning the execution of a soldier). The *optiones* and *commentarienses* referred to with the *speculatores* as carrying out executions, were also frequently, though not exclusively, military appointment (for *optiones*, see *Dig.* XLVIII 20, 6; for *commentarienses*, *Acta Claudii, Asterii et aliorum*, 4, 5).

The terms *speculator* and *licitor* are used by some writers as though synonymous. Cf. Jerome, *Ep. I ad Innocentium*, 7, 8. The *licitor* however was not a soldier but belonged to the class of *apparitores*. But already in republican times he carried out death sentences on Roman citizens only, and under the Empire his duties in this direction probably extended no further (Mommsen, *Röm. Staatsrecht* I pp. 301 f.).

arrest,⁸⁶ scourging,⁸⁷ and crucifixion⁸⁸ of Jesus as military personnel. Likewise, those charged with the imprisonment of Paul⁸⁹ are plainly described as soldiers.

The third main duty of procuratorial governors, besides the command of troops and the exercise of judiciary functions, was the administration of financial affairs.⁹⁰ It is in fact from this office that the title *procurator*, given generally to imperial finance officers, derives. Since everything of consequence concerning the different sorts of revenue and methods of taxation will be considered in the section dealing with the Census of Quirinius (Excursus I to this chapter), it is only necessary to mention here that revenues from Judaea, though an imperial province, will still have gone to the public treasury (*aerarium*) rather than to the imperial treasury (*fiscus*).⁹¹ None the less, people in Judaea spoke of paying taxes 'to Caesar' (Mk. 12:14 ff.; Mt. 22:17 ff.; Lk. 20:22 ff.). It was probably for the purposes of tax collection that Judaea was divided into eleven toparchies (see vol. II, § 23). In collecting the revenue, the Romans seem to have made use of the Jewish authorities, as was in any case usual (see vol. II, § 23). Taxation was oppressive, as may be seen from

86. Jn. 18:3, 12. The word *σπεῖρα* has here precisely the same meaning as in Mk. 15:16; Mt. 27:27; Acts 10:1; 21:31; 27:1. It always denotes a detachment or unit of soldiers in the Roman service. When J. Blinzler, *Der Prozess Jesu* (1960), pp. 67-73, argues that the Evangelist uses the word *στρατιῶται* for soldiers in the Roman service and that therefore *σπεῖρα* in Jn. 18:3, 12 must refer to Jewish troops, his explanation is far-fetched. The *σπεῖρα* indicates the detachment as a whole; it consists of individual *στρατιῶται* (cf. Mk. 15:16, Mt. 27:27). While the Fourth Gospel undoubtedly states that Jesus was arrested by military personnel in the Roman service, the designation of the unit which carried out the arrest as a *σπεῖρα* is clearly an exaggeration. Not 500 or 600 men were despatched to apprehend Jesus, but a small detachment commanded perhaps by a *decurio* rather than a *tribunus* or *χιλιάρχος* (see P. Winter, *On the Trial of Jesus*, p. 29). On the possible identification of the *σπεῖρα* in Jn. 18:3, 12 with the *ὄχλος μετὰ μαχαίρων* in Mk. 14:43, see *idem*, 'Zum Prozess Jesu', in *Antijudaismus im Neuen Testament? Exegetische und systematische Beiträge*, ed. W. P. Eckert (1967), pp. 95-104, esp. on pp. 97 f.

87. Mk. 15:15, 16, 19; Mt. 27:26, 27; Lk. 23:36.

88. Mk. 15:20; Mt. 27:31.

89. Acts 21:35; 22:25, 26; 23: 23; 27:31, 32, 42; 28:16. On Paul's arrest and detention, see e.g. Jackson and Lake, *op. cit.*, *ad loc.*, and Additional Note xxvi; P. Winter, *On the Trial of Jesus*, pp. 76-87; Sherwin-White, *op. cit.*, pp. 48-70.

90. On this, see H. G. Pflaum, 'Le pouvoir des procurateurs en leur qualité d'agents financiers de l'empereur', *op. cit.*, pp. 151-7; further F.-M. Abel, *op. cit.*, pp. 429 f.

91. On these distinctions, which are the subject of debate, see O. Hirschfeld, *Die kaiserlichen Verwaltungsbeamten* (21905), pp. 1 ff. Cf. especially A. H. M. Jones, 'The Aerarium and the Fiscus', *Studies in Roman Government and Law*, pp. 99-114; F. Millar, 'The Fiscus in the First Two Centuries', *JRS* 53 (1963), pp. 29-42; P. A. Brunt, 'The "Fiscus" and its Development', *JRS* 66 (1966), pp. 75-91.

the fact that the provinces of Syria and Judaea complained of it in A.D. 17.⁹²

From taxes in the proper sense of the word, must be distinguished customs, i.e., irregular and indirect duties, particularly those imposed on goods in transit.⁹³ Such customs were levied in all the provinces of the Roman Empire. The classic case in this respect was Egypt, where a system was devised of exceptional complexity. No object, and no sector of the country's economic life, remained untaxed; even its position as an entrepot for the lucrative trade between India and Europe was exploited. But in Palestine also, tolls and other levies were not unknown from as early as the Persian era (Ezra 4:13, 20; 7:24). The territorial units in which the same tariffs applied varied according to circumstances; it may not even be supposed that each province of the Roman Empire constituted a self-contained customs district.

Cities and client-kingdoms recognised as autonomous by the Romans, and their number was considerable, were also entitled to levy tolls on their borders.⁹⁴ Evidence of these matters was greatly amplified by the discovery of a lengthy inscription in Greek and Aramaic containing the customs tariff of the city of Palmyra in the time of Hadrian.⁹⁵ From this it appears that Palmyra, although at that time a Roman city in the same sense as many other self-governing cities within the Empire, nevertheless administered its own customs independently and profited from their revenues. It therefore goes without saying that the kings and tetrarchs who were 'allied' to Rome could levy customs on their

92. Tac. *Ann.* ii 42: 'provinciae Syria atque Iudaea, fessae oneribus, deminutionem tributi orabant'.

93. See RE s.v. 'portorium', 'publicanus', 'vectigal', and S. J. de Laet, *Portorium* (1949). L. Herzfeld, *Handelsgeschichte der Juden des Ailherthums* (1879), pp. 159-62; J. Levy, *Neuhebr. Wörterbuch* III (1883), pp. 113-15 (art. מכס, מכס, etc.); L. Goldschmid, 'Les impôts et droit de douane en Judée sous les Romains', *REJ* 34 (1897), pp. 192-217 (especially on the various kinds of taxes: *גולגולת מכס, דמוסא, annona, ἀγγαρεία, סק* = census); M. Avi-Yonah, *Geschichte der Juden im Zeitalter des Talmud* (1962), pp. 92-102.

94. Mommsen, *Röm. Staatsrecht* III 1, p. 691. See especially Livy xxxviii 44: 'senatus consultum factum est, ut Ambraciensibus suae res omnes redderentur; in libertate essent ac legibus suis uterentur; portoria quae vellent terra marique caperent, dum eorum immunes Romani ac socii nominis Latini essent'. For the plebiscite for Termessus in Pisidia of 71 B.C., cf. CIL I 204 = ILS 38 = FIRA² I no. 11, col. II, lines 31 ff.: *Quam legem portoriis terrestribus maritumisque Termenses maiores Phisidae capiundis intra suos fineis deixerint, ea lex iis portoriis capiundis esto, dum nei quid portori ab iis capiatur, quei publica populi Romani vectigalia redempta habebunt.*

95. The inscription was discovered in 1881. For an edition of the Aramaic text see CIS II, 3, 1, no. 3913. For the Greek text see IGR III 1056 = OGIS 6298. Both texts, with an English translation and an explanation of the Aramaic text, appear in G. A. Cooke, *A Text-book of North Semitic Inscriptions* (1903), pp. 313-40.

borders to their own advantage⁹⁶: it is uncertain whether Roman citizens were exempt.⁹⁷ The customs levied at Capernaum, close to the frontier of Galilee, in the time of Jesus (Mk. 2:14; Mt. 9:9; Lk. 5:27) undoubtedly went into the treasury of Herod Antipas, and not into the imperial treasury. In Judaea, on the other hand, customs were levied at that time in the interests of the emperor. It is known from the Gospels that an ἀρχιτελώνης (Lk. 19:1, 2) was established in Jericho, on Judaea's eastern border. In the seaport of Caesarea there is mention, among the influential men of the local Jewish community in A.D. 66 of a τελώνης by the name of John.⁹⁸ From Pliny it is known that merchants who exported incense from Central Arabia through Gaza had to pay high duties, not only to the Arabs on passing through their territory, but also to the Roman customs officers stationed, presumably in Gaza.⁹⁹ In addition to import and export duties, in Judaea as elsewhere indirect duties of another sort had to be paid: for instance, a market toll in Jerusalem, introduced by Herod but abolished by Vitellius in A.D. 36.¹⁰⁰

The customs were not collected by civil servants, but by lessees, the so-called *publicani*, who leased the customs of a particular district for a fixed annual sum. Whatever the revenue yielded in excess of that sum was their gain, but if the revenue fell short of the rental, they had to bear the loss.¹⁰¹ This system was prevalent in ancient times and

96. Suet. *Caligula* 16: whenever he [i.e. Caligula] restored kings to their thrones adiecit et omnem fructum vectigaliorum et redditum medii temporis'. Only the last point was unusual.

97. See Mommsen, *Röm. Staatsrecht* III 1, p. 691, and the passages quoted above in note 94. The Romans made arbitrary exceptions in favour of their nationals or others at certain times. Thus according to the *senatus consultum* given in Jos. *Ant.* xiv 10, 22 (248-51) (applying probably to Hyrcanus I, see above, p. 206), the Jews were allowed to levy customs within their own borders on condition that the king of Egypt was exempt.

98. Jos. *B.J.* ii 14, 4 (287).

99. Pliny, *NH* xii 32/63-5: 'Evehi non potest nisi per Gebbanitas, itaque et horum regi penditur vectigal . . . iam quacumque iter est aliubi pro aqua aliubi pro pabulo aut pro mansionibus variisque portoriis pendunt, ut sumpus in singulos camelos * DCLXXVIII ad nostrum litus [i.e. as far as Gaza] colligat, iterumque imperi nostri publicanis penditur', cf. de Laet, *Portorium*, pp. 333-4. There is also mention elsewhere of duties levied by uncivilized tribes. Thus, merchants trading between Syria and Babylon were forced to pay customs to the tribes through whose country they passed; and the σκηνῆται i.e. tent-dwellers of the desert, were actually more reasonable in their demands than the φύλαρχοι on both sides of the Euphrates (Strabo, p. 748).

100. Jos. *Ant.* xvii 8, 4 (205); xviii 4, 3 (90): 'Vitellius remitted to the inhabitants of the city all taxes'.

101. Cf. RE s.v. 'Publicani'; Prax, *Essai sur les sociétés vectigaliennes précédé d'un exposé sommaire du système fiscal des Romains* (1884); Rémondrière, *De la levée des impôts en droit romain* (1886); Deloume, *Les manières d'argent à Rome jusqu'à l'empire. Les grandes compagnies de Publicains* . . . (1892); F. Ziebarth, *Das*

was frequently applied, not only to customs, but even to taxes proper. Thus, for instance, during the Ptolemaic rule in Palestine, each city's tax collection was annually leased out to the highest bidder.¹⁰² In Roman imperial times the system of leasing out was no longer used for direct taxes (the land tax and poll-tax). These were collected by state officials: in senatorial provinces by the quaestor; in imperial provinces by an imperial procurator¹⁰³ attached to the governor. In provinces, like Judaea, administered by an equestrian, the governor himself was procurator as well. Customs, on the other hand, were still commonly leased out to *publicani*, even under the Principate. This was undoubtedly the case in Judaea. The passage cited from Pliny (n. 99) states explicitly that duty had to be paid to the Roman *publicani*, among others, on incense exported from Arabia via Gaza. The general application of this system suggests that minor potentates such as Herod Antipas would also have adopted it. Even in city communes such as Palmyra, customs were not collected by municipal officials but were rented out to lessees.¹⁰⁴ These in turn naturally had their underlings,

griechische Vereinswesen (1896), pp. 19-26; U. Wilcken, *Griechische Ostraka*, I, pp. 513-630. See further M. Rostovtzeff, *Geschichte der Staatspacht in der römischen Kaiserzeit bis Diocletian* (1902); S. J. de Laet, *Portorium* (1949); E. Badian, *Publicans and Sinners* (1972).

102. Jos. *Ant.* xii 4, 3 (169): 'It so happened that at that time all the chief men and magistrates of the cities of Syria and Phoenicia were coming to bid for the tax-farming rights which the king used to sell every year to the wealthy men in each city'; *ibid.*, xii 4, 4 (175); cf. also xii 4, 5 (184). From the latter passage it is plain that taxes (φόροι) are alluded to, and not customs. The most important of these was the poll-tax, *Ant.* xii 4, 1 (155): 'prominent men purchased the right to farm taxes in their own respective provinces, and collecting the fixed poll-tax (τὸ προστεταγμένον κεφάλαιον) paid it to the kings'. But there were other taxes too; the Jerusalem priesthood had been freed by Antiochus the Great from the duty to pay 'the poll-tax' the crown tax and other (ἄλλων, perhaps to be emended to read ἀλών = salt) taxes'. Cf. C. Præaux, *L'économie royale des Lagides* (1939), pp. 420, 450 f.

103. This is confirmed for Egypt also. In Ptolemaic times all taxes were farmed out; in the days of the Empire a mixed system prevailed, partly farming out and partly direct collection; U. Wilcken, *Griechische Ostraka*, I, pp. 515-55, 572-601; S. L. Wallace, *Taxation in Egypt from Augustus to Diocletian* (1938).

104. In the decree of the Council of Palmyra concerning the city's customs tariff in Hadrian's time (see n. 95 above) we read that the older customs tariffs had omitted a number of items; it was therefore always stipulated in an agreement of tenancy or lease that the amount of taxes to be levied by the tax-collector (τελώνης) would be determined in accordance with tariff and traditional usage. This, however, had led to disputes between merchants and collectors. The Council therefore decided that the municipal authorities would make a list of the items previously omitted and have them inserted in future lease-contracts in addition to the 'customary' taxes. If this tariff was then accepted by the lessee, it should be made publicly known, as was formerly done, by engraving it on stone tablets. But the authorities should see to it that the lessee exacted nothing illegally.

usually chosen from the native population. But even the principal lessees were by no means necessarily Romans. The above-mentioned tax-collectors of Jericho and Caesarea, Zacchaeus and John by name, were apparently Jews. Since they are described as well-to-do and respectable people, they certainly did not belong to the lowest class of publicans.¹⁰⁵ The amount of customs to be levied was indeed laid down by the authorities, but as is clear from the case of Palmyra, as these tariffs were in earlier times often very indefinite, there was plenty of scope for the arbitrariness and rapacity of the tax-collectors. The exploitation of such opportunities and the not infrequent overcharges made by these officials caused them, as a class, to be loathed by the people. As the poet Herodas had stated it: 'every door shudders before the tax-collectors'.¹⁰⁶ In the New Testament, 'publicans and sinners' appear almost as synonyms, and similar opinions are expressed in non-Jewish literature.¹⁰⁷ Rabbinical writings, too, display a marked aversion for customs officials.¹⁰⁸

Within the limits set by the institutions themselves, the Jewish people none the less enjoyed a considerable measure of freedom in home affairs and self-government. The oath of allegiance to the emperor which the people were obliged to take, presumably on every change of reign, was, to judge from analogous cases, couched in fairly general terms, as was mandatory already in the days of Herod.¹⁰⁹ The internal constitution during the time of the procurators, in contrast to the monarchical rule of Herod and Archelaus, is characterized by

105. Tertullian's statement that all tax-gatherers were pagans, *De pudicitia*, 9, was contested already by Jerome, *Ep. 21 ad Damasum* 3.

106. Herodas (1892) vi 64: τοὺς γὰρ τελῶνας πᾶσα νῦν θύρῃ φρίσσει. Cf. Wilcken, *Griechische Ostraka* I, p. 568.

107. E.g. Lucian, *Necyomanies* 11.

108. According to mB.K. 10:1, money may not be cashed from the cashbox of tax-gatherers, or alms accepted from them (because their money counts as stolen goods). But if a tax-gatherer has taken a person's ass and given another in exchange, or if a robber has deprived a person of his robe and given another in exchange, they may be kept, since the lawful owner has given up hope of recovering them (mB.K. 10:2). According to mNed. 3:4, it is permitted to swear to a robber or tax-gatherer that a certain thing belongs to the priests or the king, even if this is not so. (It was hoped that such an oath might induce the tax-gatherer or robber to desist from his unlawful demand for the property concerned). Tax-gatherers (מִוֹכְסִין) are throughout equated with robbers. See J. Levy, *Neuhebr. Wörterbuch* III, p. 114; I. Abrahams, 'Publicans and Sinners', *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels*, 1st Ser. (1917), pp. 54-61. The meaning of the term is confirmed by the appearance of cognate expressions (מִוֹכְסִיא, מִוֹכְסִיא) on the Palmyrene tax-law.

109. The taking of the oath of allegiance on the accession of Caligula is attested by Jos. *Ant.* xviii 5, 3 (124). For the inscriptional evidence compare S. Weinstock, 'Treueid und Kaiserkult', *Ath. Mitt.* 77 (1962), pp. 306-27; P. Herrmann, *Der römische Kaisereid* (1968).

Josephus as follows: 'the constitution became an aristocracy, and the High Priests were entrusted with the leadership of the nation'.¹¹⁰ Josephus sees in the change which took place after the deposition of Archelaus a transition from monarchic to aristocratic rule, and considers, not incorrectly, the Roman governor only as an overseer, while the aristocratic Sanhedrin acted as the real governing body. The holder of the office of High Priest at any given time, who also held the presidency of the Sanhedrin, is called by Josephus *προσάρτης τοῦ ἔθνους*. True, these High Priests were installed and deposed at the arbitrary pleasure of the Roman governor. But even in this respect the Romans observed certain bounds. In the years A.D. 6 to 41, appointments to the High Priestly office were made by the Roman governors (either by the legate of Syria or the prefect of Judaea), but during the period A.D. 44-66 the right of nomination was transferred to Jewish client-kings (Herod of Chalcis and Agrippa II), even though they did not reign in Judaea. In neither period were appointments to the office of High Priest purely arbitrary but were respectful of the precedence of certain old-established houses (Phiabi, Boethus, Ananus, Camith).¹¹¹

More importantly, the Sanhedrin exercised a very wide range of legislative and executive powers, certainly much wider than in non-autonomous communities within the Roman Empire.¹¹² The legal position in general was that communities recognized by Rome as 'free' or 'autonomous' had the right to their own legislative and judicial organs, in principle exercising these rights even over resident Roman citizens. In Judaea the situation was practically the same,¹¹³ with two reservations: (1) the state of public affairs existing *de facto* was not guaranteed; and (2) resident Roman citizens had their own law and their own jurisdiction. The existence, side by side, of a dual organization in the country, Jewish and Roman, each with its own legal system and its own judiciary institutions, occasionally had irregular results. The juridical competence of the local authorities was recognized by the

110. *Ant.* xx 10, 5 (251).

111. For the evidence, see vol. II, § 23. Cf. E. M. Smallwood, 'High Priests and Politics in Roman Palestine', *JThSt* 13 (1962), pp. 14-34; J. Jeremias, *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus* (1969), pp. 147-81. On the High Priest as president of the Sanhedrin see vol. II, § 23.

112. On the status of non-autonomous communities, see Mommsen, *Röm. Staatsrecht* III 1, pp. 716-64, especially pp. 744 ff. L. Mitteis, *Reichsrecht und Volksrecht in den östlichen Provinzen des römischen Kaiserreichs* (1891), pp. 90 ff. (showing that even the *civitates non liberae* exercised their own jurisdiction). Cf. D. Nörr, *Imperium und Polis in der hohen Prinzipatszeit* (1966).

113. Mommsen, *Röm. Staatsrecht* III 1, p. 748: 'In regard to the extent of their jurisdiction, native magistrates in communities subject to Rome's rule were more or less in the same position as the magistrates of associate communes. As in administration and civil jurisdiction, the same principles were applied in the procedure governing criminal law cases.'

suzerain power, yet the governor could, if he wished, bring certain cases before his own tribunal whenever he thought that imperial interests were involved. On the whole this seems to have happened rarely. A decision of this type was taken, on the procurator's behalf, by the commander of the Roman garrison in Jerusalem, Claudius Lysias, who on learning that Paul claimed Roman citizenship, prevented the Sanhedrin from carrying the case to its conclusion and despatched the prisoner on his own initiative from Jerusalem to Caesarea (Acts 23:23-24). Felix, procrastinating, kept the apostle in a Roman prison and neither handed him back to the Jewish authorities nor took a decision of his own.

Crimes of a political nature came within the jurisdiction of the governor. Otherwise the Romans refrained from interfering in the customary functioning of the native law courts. Jurisdiction in cases of civil law was wholly in the hands of the Sanhedrin and subordinate tribunals. Jewish courts decided in accordance with Jewish law. Even in cases of criminal law the same situation almost always prevailed, with the exception, however, of political offences. It is still debated whether Jewish law courts were entitled to pass and administer sentence of death without endorsement by the Roman governor. This problem will be dealt with in connexion with the trial and condemnation of Jesus.¹¹⁴ Even Roman citizens were not totally exempt from complying with the requirements of the Jewish law. A Jewish ordinance prevented Gentiles (*ἀλλογενεῖς*) from entering the inner courtyards of the Temple. Anyone acting contrary to this prohibition was punished with death, even if he was a Roman citizen. The Romans confirmed Jewish capital jurisdiction in such cases even over non-Jews.¹¹⁵ When the procurator Festus proposed dealing with Paul in accordance with Jewish law, only Paul's appeal to the emperor (*provocatio*) prevented this from happening (Acts 25:9-12—see above p. 369).

Jewish cult and worship were not merely tolerated, but enjoyed the

¹¹⁴. For more details, see vol. II, § 23.

¹¹⁵. Josephus, *B. J.* vi 2, 4 (125-6), confirmed by two inscriptions, the more complete of which was found by C. Clermont-Ganneau in 1871; on its discovery and the text see Clermont-Ganneau, 'Un^e stèle du Temple de Jérusalem' in *Rev. arch.* 23 (1872), pp. 214-34, 290-6 = OGIS 598 = Frey, *Cl. J.* 1400; the second copy, *SEG VIII* 109. See E. Gabba, *Iscrizioni greche e latine per lo studio della Bibbia* (1958), no. 4 (cf. P. Winter, *On the Trial of Jesus*, p. 155 f., n. 37). This point is of considerable importance in assessing the charges in the trial of Paul. The main charge brought against him by the Jewish authorities was that he had facilitated entry into the inner Temple Courts by a 'Greek', Trophimus (Acts 21:28-9). The accusers wished to impress the procurator that Paul was punishable even under Roman law, namely the ordinance referred to in Titus's speech, *B. J.* vi 2, 4 (125-6). Cf. Acts 24:6. It is not certain whether Paul actually took Trophimus with him into the inner Temple Court. Acts 21:29 leaves this in doubt: ἐνδύζων οὐκ εἰς τὸ ἱερόν εἰσήγαγεν ὁ Παῦλος [τὸν Τρόφιμον].

protection of the Roman State, as is shown by the ordinance concerning trespass on the Temple Mount.¹¹⁶ The cosmopolitan trend characteristic of pagan piety of that time even made it easy for noble Romans to present votive gifts to the Jewish Temple and have sacrifices offered there on their behalf.¹¹⁷ State supervision of the Temple, especially of the administration of its vast finances, seems from A.D. 6-41 to have been conducted by the Roman authorities. In the years A.D. 44-66 it was transferred to the same Jewish rulers to whom the prerogative of appointing High Priests had been entrusted, namely, Herod of Chalcis first, and then Agrippa II.¹¹⁸ A restriction on freedom of worship, small in itself but regarded as oppressive by the Jews, was removed in A.D. 36. From A.D. 6 the High Priest's costly stole had been in the keeping of the Roman military commander of the Antonia and was brought out for use only four times a year (on the three main festivals and the Day of Atonement). At the request of the Jews, Vitellius ordered in A.D. 36 that the High Priest's vestments should be handed over to them. And when in A.D. 44 the procurator Cuspius Fadus wished to bring the vestments back into Roman keeping, a Jewish delegation went to Rome and secured a letter from the Emperor Claudius confirming the order of Vitellius.¹¹⁹

Great deference was shown to Jewish religious sensitivity. Whereas in some provinces (Gaul and Britain, for instance) emperor-worship was instituted, and in others at least encouraged, no demands of this sort were ever made of the Jews except in Caligula's time. Out of respect for Jewish religious customs, the Roman authorities exempted the Jews from appearing before a magistrate on a sabbath or Jewish holiday, not in Judaea alone but throughout the Empire. The Romans were satisfied with a sacrifice offered by the Jews twice daily in the Temple 'for Caesar and the Roman nation'. The sacrifice consisted of

¹¹⁶. This protection extended in practice to synagogue services and the Torah. When the pagan inhabitants of Dora erected a statue of the emperor in the Jewish synagogue of that town, the legate Petronius ordered the town council to surrender the culprits and ensure that such outrages did not recur, cf. *Jos. Ant.* xix 613. (308). A soldier who capriciously tore up a Torah scroll was put to death for this by the procurator Cumanus, *B. J.* ii 12, 2 (231); *Ant.* xx 5, 4 (115-17).

¹¹⁷. Augustus and his wife sent wine vessels as their gift to the Temple in Jerusalem, *B. J.* v 13, 6 (562), and other costly presents, Philo, *Legatio* 23 (157), 40 (319). Marcus Agrippa gave presents on the occasion of his visit to Jerusalem, *Legatio* 37 (297), and offered 100 oxen in sacrifice, *Ant.* xvi 2, 1 (14). Vitellius also sacrificed there, *Ant.* xviii 5, 3 (122).

¹¹⁸. On the exercise of this prerogative by Herod of Chalcis, see *Ant.* xx 1, 3 (15); by Agrippa *Ant.* xx 9, 7 (222). On the administration of the finances of the Temple; see vol. II, § 24.

¹¹⁹. *Ant.* xviii 4, 3 (95); xx 1, 1 (6); cf. xv 11, 4 (403-8). Cf. P. Winter, *On the Trial of Jesus*, pp. 16-19. When Titus took Jerusalem, the High Priest's robes fell into the hands of the Romans, *B. J.* vi 8, 3 (389).

two lambs and an ox per day—provided either by Augustus himself out of his own revenue, or by the Jews, according to the conflicting testimony of Philo and Josephus.¹²⁰ On special occasions the Jews showed their loyal sentiments by a great offering in honour of the emperor.¹²¹ In the Diaspora, donations in his honour were exhibited in the *aula* of synagogues.¹²² Next to the worship of the emperor, the Jews took particular offence at portraits of him on coins and military standards. Here, too, their scruples were respected. The circulation in Judaea of Roman *denarii* bearing the emperor's image could not be avoided (Mk. 12:16; Mt. 22:20; Lk. 20:24), for gold and silver coins were not minted in the province. But the copper coins manufactured in the country carried no human portrait in the time of Roman rule (as under the Herodians) but only the emperor's name and inoffensive emblems.¹²³ Roman troops dispensed with their standards, which bore the emperor's image, when entering Jerusalem. Pilate's wilful attempt to contravene

120. Philo, *Legatio* 23 (157); 40 (317). Jos. *B.J.* ii 10, 4 (197); 17, 2 (409-10); 17, 3 (412-17). *C. Ap.* ii 6 (77). For further details see vol. II, § 24.

121. Three times in Caligula's time; see Philo, *Legatio* 45 (356), cf. 32 (232): an offering presented on the occasion of Caligula's accession.

122. Philo, *Legatio* 2 (133): Along with the synagogues, the Alexandrians also destroyed 'the tributes to the emperors, the shields and gilded wreaths, the slabs with dedicatory inscriptions'. In *Flaccum* 7 (48): 'The Jews . . . by losing their synagogues (*προσευχὰς*), were also losing . . . their means of showing reverence to their benefactors, since they no longer had the sacred buildings where they could offer their thanksgiving'; *ibid.* 49: by depriving the Jews of their synagogues no honour was rendered to the *κυριοί* (i.e. the Roman emperors), but honour was taken away from them. For the synagogues are to the Jews *δρηγήρια τῆς εἰς τὸν Σεβαστὸν οἶκον διοτήτος* . . . *ὅν ἡμῶν ἀναρθροῦσάν τις ἕτερος ἀπολείπεται τόπος ἢ τρόπος τιμῆς*; on the placing of honorific dedications in the forecourts of synagogues, see vol. III, § 31.

123. On the coins minted in Judaea in the time of the procurators, see Th. Mommsen, *Geschichte des römischen Münzwesens* (1860), p. 719; J. Levy, *Geschichte der jüdischen Münzen*, pp. 74-9; F. W. Madden, *History of Jewish Coinage* (1864), pp. 134-53; *Jewish Numismatics* (1874-6); *Coins of the Jews* (1874), pp. 170-87. F. de Saulcy, *Numismatique de la Terre Sainte* (1874), pp. 69-78, plates III-IV. See now A. Reifenberg, *Ancient Jewish Coins* (1947), pp. 54-7. Y. Meshorer, *Jewish Coins of the Second Temple Period* (1967), pp. 102-6. On the coins of Augustus with the superscription *Καίσαρος* the years 36, 39, 40, 41 are engraved. The coins of Tiberius (with the name *Τιβερῖου Καίσαρος* in most cases given in abbreviated form) are dated by the years of Tiberius's reign; we have examples of the numbers 2-5, 11. On many coins the name of Julia is mentioned with that of Tiberius, until the 16th year of Tiberius, i.e. A.D. 29, when Julia Livia died. Some coins have Julia's name alone. Coins of Claudius exist from the 13th and 14th year of his reign, and coins of Nero from his 5th year. The latter bear only the emperor's name; those of Claudius, the name of his wife also, Julia Agrippina.

On the coinage minted in the interval between the last prefect and the first procurator in Judaea, see J. Meyshan, 'The Coinage of Agrippa I', *IEJ* 4 (1954), pp. 186-200 = *Recent Studies and Discoveries on Ancient Jewish and Syrian Coins* (1954), pp. 50-64.

this custom was frustrated by the people's fierce opposition and he found himself compelled to withdraw the standards from Jerusalem.¹²⁴ When Vitellius, the legate of Syria, embarked on a campaign against Aretas, king of Nabataea, he yielded to Jewish entreaties and ordered the troops carrying images of the emperor on their standards not to march through Judaeian territory.¹²⁵

As regards the general institutions and principles of government, the Jews had therefore no cause to complain of any lack of consideration. But in practice they worked out rather differently. Roman officials on the spot were constantly inclined to treat these niceties with indifference. Unfortunately, also, Judaea, especially in the last decades before their rebellion against Rome, had to endure more than one governor lacking all sense of right and wrong. Moreover, despite the careful attention of Roman officials to the feelings of the Jews, their condition may itself have been viewed by many as an insult to the rights of God's chosen people, who instead of paying tribute to the emperor in Rome should themselves have been called to rule over the pagan world.¹²⁶

The difficulty of the task which the Romans had set for themselves when they incorporated Judaea into the Empire became apparent with their first administrative act in that country. Contemporaneously with the appointment of Coponius as first prefect of Judaea, the emperor despatched a new legate to Syria in the person of Quirinius. It became his task to take a census of the population of the newly acquired territory so that taxes could be levied in accordance with Roman usage. But no sooner had Quirinius, in A.D. 6 or 7, begun to carry out this measure than he met with opposition from every quarter. It was only due to the mild persuasion of the High Priest Joazar, who evidently realised that open rebellion would lead nowhere, that the initial opposition was gradually abandoned. The people submitted in silent resignation to the inevitable, and the census was allowed to proceed.¹²⁷ No permanent peace was gained, however, but only a truce of uncertain duration. Judas of Gamala in the Golan, called the Galilean (he is no doubt identical with Judas son of Hezekiah mentioned on p. 332), made it his mission in company with a Pharisee named Zadduk to

124. *B.J.* ii 9, 3 (174); *Ant.* xviii 3, 1 (59). See below, p. 384.

125. *Ant.* xviii 5, 3 (121-2).

126. Such, at least, was the popular sentiment. From the same religious premises the contrary conclusion could have been drawn, namely, that the pagan government had also been sent by God and should be obeyed for as long as God willed. (In the third century, Simeon b. Lakish interpreted Gen 1:31 'Behold, it was very good' as applying to the Roman empire; cf. Gen. R. 9:15.) But from A.D. 6-41 and A.D. 44-66 this view was held by an ever-diminishing minority.

127. According to Jos. *Ant.* xviii 2, 1 26, in the 37th year of the *æra Actiaca*, i.e. in the autumn of A.D. 6/7. The Actian era begins on 2nd September 31 B.C. On its use in Syria, see above p. 257. Josephus's statement is confirmed by Dio *lv* 27, 6: Archelaus was deposed in A.D. 6 (see above, p. 327).

rouse the people to resistance and preach revolt and insurrection in the name of religion. They met with no significant success at first, but were nevertheless responsible for the emergence, as an offshoot from the Pharisees, of a stricter and more fanatical party of resolute patriots, or as they called themselves, activists or Zealots, unwilling to wait in quiet submission for the fulfilment, with God's help, of Israel's messianic hope, but desirous rather of bringing it to reality by means of the sword in battle against the godless enemy.¹²⁸ It was due to their activities that the spark of rebellion continued to smoulder for sixty years, when it finally burst into flame.¹²⁹

Of Coponius and some of his successors little more is known than their names. Altogether there were seven—possibly only six—prefects who held office as governors of Judaea from A.D. 6 to 41: (1) Coponius, about A.D. 6 to 9, *B.J.* ii 8, 1 (117); *Ant.* xviii 2, 2 (29–31); (2) Marcus Ambibulus, named in our manuscripts Ambibuchus, about A.D. 9 to 12, *Ant.* xviii 2, 2 (31); (3) Annius Rufus about A.D. 12 to 15, *Ant.* xviii 2, 2 (32–3);¹³⁰ (4) Valerius Gratus A.D. 15 to 26, *Ant.* xviii 2, 2 (33);

128. *Zēlōtai*, see Lk. 6:15; Acts 1:13; Jos. *B.J.* iv 3, 9 (160); 4, 6 (291); 5, 1 (305); 6, 3 (377); vii 8, 1 (268). Instead of the קנא of Biblical Hebrew, later Hebrew and Aramaic use also קנאי and קנאן (see Levy, *Neuhebr. Wörterbuch*, and Jastrow, *Dictionary*, s.v.). From the plural of the latter form (קנאנים) is derived the Greek *Kanavaios* which should be read in Mt. 10:4 and Mk. 3:18 rather than *Kanavirns*. For recent treatments of the subject see W. R. Farmer, *Maccabees, Zealots and Josephus* (1957); M. Hengel, *Die Zeloten* (1961)—the major modern study; S. G. F. Brandon, *Jesus and the Zealots* (1967); M. Smith, 'Zealots and Sicarii: their Origins and Relations', *HThR* 64 (1971), pp. 1–19; S. Applebaum, 'The Zealots: the Case for Revaluation', *JRS* 61 (1971), pp. 156–70; M. Borg, 'The Currency of the Term "Zealot"', *JThSt* 22 (1971), pp. 504–12.

129. Cf. in general *B.J.* ii 8, 1 (118), *Ant.* xviii 1, 1 (4–10), Acts 5:37. The descendants of Judas also distinguished themselves as Zealots. His sons Jacob and Simon were executed by Tiberius Julius Alexander, *Ant.* xx 5, 2 (102); his son (or grandson?) Menahem (Manaim) was one of the principal leaders at the beginning of the rebellion in A.D. 66, *B.J.* ii 17, 8–9 (433–48). A descendant of Judas and relative of Menahem by the name of Eleazar directed the defence of Masada in A.D. 74, *B.J.* ii 17, 9 (447); vii 8, 1 (253); 8, 2 (275); 8, 6–7 (320–88); 9, 1 (399). See Yigael Yadin, *Masada: Herod's Fortress and the Zealots' Last Stand* (1966), and below pp. 511–12. See also Vermes, *Jesus the Jew* (1973), pp. 46–7.

130. The term of office of the first three Roman prefects cannot be precisely dated. That of the following two is fixed by the fact that Valerius Gratus held office for 11 years, *Ant.* xviii 2, 2 (35) and Pontius Pilate for 10 years, *Ant.* xviii 4, 2 (89). Pilate was deposed before Vitellius made his first visit to Jerusalem, i.e. shortly before Easter A.D. 36, as a comparison of *Ant.* xviii 4, 3 (90) with 5, 3 (122–3) shows. The period during which the last two were in office can be deduced from the fact that Marullus was installed immediately after Caligula's accession in March A.D. 37, *Ant.* xviii 6, 10 (237). Eusebius *HE* i 9, 2 states that Josephus sets the date of Pilate's assumption of office in the 12th year of Tiberius (A.D. 25/26), which is correct only in that such a dating may be inferred from Josephus. In his *Chronicle* (ed. Schoene II, p. 147); Eusebius dates Pilate's instalment in office in the 13th year of Tiberius.

(5) Pontius Pilate A.D. 26 to 36, *B.J.* ii 9, 2 (169); *Ant.* xviii 2, 2 (35); Tacitus, *Ann.* xv 44; (6) Marcellus in A.D. 36 or 37, *Ant.* xviii 4, 2 (89); and (7) Marullus A.D. 37 to 41, *Ant.* xviii 6, 10 (237). It is debatable whether the two last-named were really two different persons. The reading *Μαρκέλλος* in *Ant.* xviii 4, 2 (89) may be corrupt for *Μαρούλλος* which appears in *Ant.* xviii 6, 10 (237). Marullus may have been appointed acting High Commissioner for Judaea by Vitellius, the appointment being later confirmed by Caligula in Rome. It is true that Josephus writes that the emperor 'sent' Marullus, and that this seems to indicate that he was someone else than Marcellus, who apparently was already in Judaea at the time. But the word *ἐπέμπευ* need not be taken literally; Josephus could have used it as a stereotype phrase simply to denote official appointment.¹³¹ The long term of office held by Valerius Gratus and Pontius Pilate corresponded to the general rules adopted by Tiberius when appointing provincial governors. For the good of the provinces concerned, he left them as long as possible in their posts because he thought governors behaved like flies on a wounded body: once sated, they then temper their extortions, whereas new men would start with a keen appetite.¹³²

Among those named, Pontius Pilate is of special interest, not only as the judge of Jesus, but also because he is the only one discussed in

131. The reading in *Ant.* xviii 4, 2 (89) is: 'Vitellius, having despatched (*ἐπέμψας*) one of his friends, *Μαρκέλλος*, whom he had made governor (*ἐπιμελητής*) over the Jews, ordered Pilate to return to Rome'. From this it appears that Marcellus, one of Vitellius's subalterns, was staying in Syria before he was appointed in Pilate's place to become the governor of Judaea. Subsequently, in *Ant.* xviii 6, 10 (237), the appointment of Marullus is reported as follows: '[The emperor] despatched (*ἐπέμπευ*) Marullus as cavalry commander (*ἑπιπάρχης*)', which *prima facie* indicates that Marullus was sent to Judaea from Rome. Hence Marcellus and Marullus would be two different persons. As Marcellus is otherwise unknown, it has been suggested by S. L. de Laet, 'Le Successeur de Ponce-Pilate', *Ant. class.* 8 (1939), pp. 418 f., that we have in *Ant.* xviii 4, 2 (89) a scribal error, and that instead of *Μαρκέλλος* Josephus actually wrote *Μαρούλλος* in both places. De Laet is followed by E. M. Smallwood in 'The Date of the Dismissal of Pontius Pilate from Judaea', *JJS* 5 (1954), pp. 12–21. In view of the fact that Josephus uses the term *ἐπέμπευ* when reporting Marullus's appointment, de Laet's explanation can be accepted only if it is assumed that Josephus used figurative language, meaning by *ἐπέμπευ* no more than that Marullus was appointed, or rather that the earlier provisional appointment made by Vitellius was confirmed by the emperor. It is not possible to arrive at a definite conclusion, but de Laet's suggestion sounds attractive, as it was not the Syrian legate's prerogative to make definite appointments in Judaea; on the other hand, it can be assumed that the emperor would in such a situation heed the legate's recommendation to appoint an experienced officer for the post.

132. *Ant.* xviii 6, 5 (172–6). Tac. *Ann.* i 80; iv 6 also mentions the long periods which the emperor allowed his governors. That Tiberius had the well-being of the provinces in mind is attested by Suet. *Tib.* 32 'praesidibus onerandas tributo provincias suadentibus rescipsit: boni pastoris esse tondere pecus, non deglubere'.

any detail in the writings of Philo and Josephus.¹³³ Philo (or rather Agrippa I, in his letter which Philo reproduces) describes him as unbending and callously hard by nature, 'a man of inflexible disposition, harsh and obdurate', and has a low opinion of the manner in which Pilate discharged his official duties. He charges Pilate with greed, vindictiveness and cruelty. As Agrippa's testimony on Pontius Pilate's conduct of affairs in Judaea is the only one extant from any of the prefect's own contemporaries, it cannot be dismissed.¹³⁴

The very first action with which Pilate began his term of office as governor of Judaea was characteristic of a man who treated Jewish customs and privileges with contempt. In order not to offend Jewish religious feelings, care had always been taken by previous prefects to provide that troops entering Jerusalem should not carry ensigns bearing the image of the emperor (see above, p. 381). Pilate, however, to whom such tolerance may have appeared as an unworthy weakness, ordered the Jerusalem garrison to enter the city by night with their standards. When the people learned what had happened, they flocked in crowds to Caesarea and besieged the governor for five days and nights with entreaties to remove the abomination. At last, on the sixth day, Pilate admitted the people into the stadium, into which he had at the same time ordered a detachment of his soldiers. When the Jews continued their complaints here too, he gave a signal and the soldiers surrounded the people on all sides with drawn swords. But the Jews stood firm, bared their necks, and protested that they would rather die than submit to a breach of the law. Pilate may have thought it dangerous to insist further, for he ordered the offensive images to be removed from Jerusalem.¹³⁵

133. On Pontius Pilate see RE XX, cols. 1322-3; S. Sandmel in IDB s.v. 'Pilate, Pontius'.

134. Philo, *Legatio* 38 (302).

135. *B.J.* ii 9, 2-3 (169-74). *Ant.* xviii 3, 1 (55-9). In *HE* ii 6, 4, Eusebius quotes Josephus; according to his *Dem. Ev.* viii 2, 123 (403), the episode of the standards was also related by Philo in the latter's work on the persecutions of the Jews under Tiberius and Caligula. Of this work, only the treatises *Legatio* and *In Flaccum* are extant, whilst other sections no longer exist. Cf. vol. III, § 34.

That the standards bearing images were erected within the Temple area (*ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ*) is known only from Eusebius's report in *Dem. Ev.*, *loc. cit.*, referring to Philo's lost work as Eusebius's source. Josephus, less definite on this point, speaks of Jerusalem as the place where it occurred.

It is due to an inexact recollection of his reading that Origen says of Pilate that, like Caligula later, he wished to force the Jews *ἀνδραποδῆσαι ἀναθεῖναι ἐν τῷ ναῷ*, *Commentary on Matthew* xvii, 25, on Mt. 22:15 ff. (GCS, *Origenes Werke* X, pp. 653-4). So also Jerome on Mt. 24:15: 'pōtest autem simpliciter aut de Antichristo accipi aut de imagine Caesaris quam Pilatus posuit in templo' (PL xxvi, col. 177). See C. H. Kraeling, 'The Episode of the Roman Standards at Jerusalem', *HThR* 35 (1942), pp. 263-89.

A new storm erupted when he applied the rich treasures of the Temple to the very useful purpose of building an aqueduct to Jerusalem. Such an appropriation of the sacred treasures seemed no less offensive than setting up images of the emperor. Consequently, when he once visited Jerusalem while building was in progress, he was again surrounded by a complaining, shrieking mob. But he had been told of the expected outburst, and had given orders to his soldiers to mingle with the demonstrators in civilian dress and armed with clubs. Then when the crowd's complaints and entreaties turned to abuse, he gave the agreed signal and the soldiers pulled the clubs from under their garments and lashed into the people without mercy. Many lost their lives in the ensuing panic, and although resistance was crushed, hatred for Pilate was stirred up anew.¹³⁶

The New Testament contains hints of other outrages in the time of Pilate. 'There were present at that time', runs the narrative in Luke 13:1, 'some who had told Jesus of the Galileans whose blood Pilate had mingled with their sacrifices'. This statement is to be understood as indicating that Pilate put to the sword a number of Galileans who were preparing to present their offerings at Jerusalem. Nothing more definite is known of this incident. There is no record of it outside the third Gospel.¹³⁷

Just as little is known of 'the rebels who had committed murder in the insurrection' (Mk. 15:7) with whom Barabbas¹³⁸ was thrown into prison, to be released at the time of Jesus' trial.

136. *B.J.* ii 9, 4 (175-7); *Ant.* xviii 3, 2 (60-2); Eusebius, *HE* ii 6, 6-7. The length of the aqueduct is given by Josephus in *Ant.* xviii 3, 2 (60) as 200 stadia; in *B.J.* ii 9, 4 (175) as 400 stadia; the Latin Josephus, and Eusebius, *HE* ii 6, 6 make it 300 stadia. It is noteworthy that the Slavonic Josephus, which is essentially based on *Bellum*, gives the same figure of 200 stadia as do the *Antiquities*.

From these measurements there can be no doubt that the construction referred to is an aqueduct from the so-called Pool of Solomon southwest of Bethlehem. In the Jerusalem Talmud it is stated that an aqueduct led from Etam to the Temple (*yYoma* 41a). In fact 'Etam was according to 2 Chron. 11:6 situated between Bethlehem and Tekoa, without any doubt near the spring now called 'Ayin Atan, in close vicinity to Solomon's Pool.

137. For discussion of the possible setting of this episode see J. Blinzler, 'Die Niedermetzlung von Galiläern durch Pilatus', *NT* 2 (1957), pp. 24-49 and Winter, *Trial*, pp. 54, 176 f., nn. 8-10.

138. *בַּר אֲבָא*: cf. Str.-B. I, p. 1031; Bauer, Arndt, Gingrich, *Lexicon*, p. 132. CIJ no. 1285 reproduces an inscription in which the words *בַּר רַבִּין*, apparently a patronym, can be made out. This spelling agrees with that given in Mt. 27:17 in Codex Koridethi: *IΗΣΟΥΣ ΒΑΡ ΠΑΒΒΑΝ*. The name may not have been uncommon at the time. See Winter, *Trial*, p. 95. The reading Rabban is supported by the Gospel according to the Hebrews quoted by Jerome (*in Mt.* 27:16-8): 'filius magistri eorum'. For the Beth Shearim inscription of *BAPABAI*, see CIJ no. 1110; M. Schwabe, *B. Lifshitz, Beth She'arim* II (1967), no. 89.

An event mentioned in the letter, reproduced by Philo, from Agrippa I to Caligula, probably took place in the latter days of Pilate's governorship.¹³⁹ Pilate had realised from the outburst at Caesarea that the erection of images of the emperor in Jerusalem was impossible because of Jewish obduracy but he thought he might try to introduce votive shields without images but carrying the emperor's name. He raised such shields, richly gilt, in Herod's former palace, now his own residence; 'less to honour Tiberius than to annoy the people'. But even this the people would not tolerate. First, they approached Pilate in company with the aristocracy of Jerusalem and Herod's four sons (who happened to be in the city, probably to attend a feast) to induce him to remove the shields. As this met with no success, the notables amongst them, including, certainly, the four sons of Herod, addressed a petition to the emperor asking him to order the removal of the offending shields. Tiberius, who probably perceived that it was simply a piece of arbitrary bravado on the part of Pilate, ordered him with tokens of extreme displeasure to remove the shields from Jerusalem at once and to set them up in the temple of Augustus at Caesarea. This was done. And thus were preserved both the honour of the emperor, and the ancient customs of the city.¹⁴⁰

In the end, Pilate's recklessness caused his downfall. It was an ancient belief among the Samaritans that the sacred Temple vessels had been buried since the time of Moses on Mount Gerizim.¹⁴¹ A Samaritan pseudo-prophet promised (in A.D. 35) to produce these vessels if the people would assemble on that mountain. The credulous listened to him and great crowds of armed Samaritans flocked to the village of Tirathana at the foot of Mount Gerizim ready to climb the mountain and see the holy spectacle.¹⁴² But before they could carry out their intention, they were attacked by a strong force in the village, as a result of which some were killed, some put to flight, and still others

139. The argument that the incident connected with the introduction of votive shields into Jerusalem occurred later than the incident of the standards rests on rather shaky ground: The prefect, it is argued, having failed in his effort to persuade the citizens of Jerusalem to allow imperial standards among them, tried to get his own back by taking image-less votive shields into their city. This interpretation may well be right, but it remains speculative. As Philo (or Agrippa) reports only the incident of the shields and Josephus only that of the standards, there is no certainty in regard to the chronological sequence of these two happenings.

140. Philo, *Legatio* 38 (299-306). See Smallwood *ad loc.* and P. L. Maier, 'The Episode of the Golden Roman Shields at Jerusalem', *HThR* 62 (1969), pp. 109-21.

141. *Ant.* xviii 4, 1-2 (85-9). On this tradition see M. Gaster, *The Samaritans* (1925), p. 9.

142. Tirathana is possibly present-day Tire, see J. A. Montgomery, *The Samaritans* (1907), p. 146, n. 15. Cf. Abel, *Géog. Pal.* II, p. 484.

were captured. Of these, Pilate executed the most respected and distinguished.¹⁴³ The Samaritans, who knew that there was no revolutionary motive in the pilgrimage to Mount Gerizim, accused Pilate before Vitellius, the legate in Syria at that time, with the result that Vitellius sent Pilate to Rome to answer for his conduct, and handed over the administration of Judaea to Marcellus.¹⁴⁴

143. *Ant.* xviii 4, 1 (87).

144. *Ant.* xviii 4, 2 (89). See E. M. Smallwood, *op. cit.* n. 131 above. It may have taken Pilate about a year to travel from Judaea to Rome, for he did not arrive in the capital until after Tiberius's death. Josephus says nothing of his subsequent fate. With the spread of Christianity in the Roman Empire, Pilate's personality caught the imagination of historiographers. A spurious letter dating from the second century makes Pilate the author of a report to the emperor Claudius (whose Principate fell in the years A.D. 41-54, after Pilate had been recalled from office). The report describes in some detail Pilate's unsuccessful attempt to save the life of Jesus. On epistles supposed to have been written by Pilate, cf. M. R. James, *The Apocryphal New Testament* (1924), p. 146. Tertullian speaks of Pilate as being at the time of Jesus' trial a secret Christian, *Apologeticum* 21, 24, and he mentions an official despatch in which the prefect suggested to the emperor Tiberius that Jesus should be included in the Pantheon, *ibid.*, 5, 2; see T. D. Barnes in *JRS* 58 (1968), pp. 32-3. The fourth-century *Gospel of Nicodemus*, sometimes called *The Acts of Pilate*, purports to contain official records of the governor's dealings with Jesus, M. R. James, *op. cit.*, pp. 94-145; P. Vannutelli, *Actorum Pilati textus synoptici* (1938); E. Hennecke, *New Testament Apocrypha I* (1963), pp. 444-84; S. Brock, 'A Fragment of the *Acta Pilati* in Christian Palestinian Aramaic', *JThSt* 22 (1971), pp. 157-8; Pilate's fame, however, reached its zenith when the Prefect of Judaea became a saint in the monophysite Coptic Church. He is still venerated as such.

From Eusebius, *Chron.* II, ed. Schoene, pp. 150-1, and *EH* ii 7, onward, a different but equally legendary tradition begins to gain circulation. The story now goes that Pilate ended his own life by suicide, or suffered death at the hands of the emperor as a punishment for his iniquitous proceedings against Jesus. According to Jerome, 'Romanorum historici scribunt [quod] in multas incidens calamitates; Pontius Pilatus propria se manu interficit' (Schoene, *op. cit.*, p. 151; R. Helm, *Die Chronik des Hieronymus*, p. 178). From what sources Jerome derived this piece of intelligence is not known. The legend of Pilate's suicide is further expanded in the *Mors Pilati (Evangelia apocrypha)*, ed. C. Tischendorf (1876), pp. 456-8). Demons crowding around Pilate's corpse utter dreadful shrieks and his body is transported from Rome to Vienne on the Rhone, but the waters of the Rhone refuse to receive it, the river starts to boil and spits out the corpse. It is then transported to Lausanne on Lake Geneva, or to Lucerne on Lake Lucerne, but the inhabitants of whatever the city may be cannot stand the proximity of Pilate's dead body and 'a se removerunt eum et in quodam puteo montibus circumsepto immerserunt, ubi adhuc . . . diabolicae machinationes ebullire dicuntur'. The place can still be visited by tourists and other interested persons on Mount Pilate (*Pilatusberg*) in the lovely surroundings of Lake Lucerne. According to another form of Christian legend, Pilate was executed by Nero (this is reported by John Malalas, ed. Dindorf, pp. 250-7) or by Tiberius (thus in a text edited by Tischendorf in *Evangelica apocrypha*, pp. 449-55), having at last repented of his misdeeds and dying a convinced Christian.

Soon after, on the Feast of Passover A.D. 36,¹⁴⁵ Vitellius himself came to Jerusalem and won the goodwill of the inhabitants of the capital by remitting the taxes on fruit sold in the city, and by handing over for free use the High Priest's vestments kept in Roman custody since A.D. 6.¹⁴⁶

After he had meanwhile been occupied with the Parthian expedition, the campaign against the Nabataean Aretas which he had been ordered by Tiberius to undertake in the spring of A.D. 37 brought Vitellius to Jerusalem once more (see above, pp. 349-50). On this occasion, too, he proved his understanding of Jewish sentiments. The route from Antioch to Petra would have led him and his army through Judaea proper. But Roman standards were a notorious cause of offence to the Jews. The Jewish authorities therefore sent an embassy to Vitellius at Ptolemais, beseeching him not to lead his army through their land. Vitellius was reasonable enough to see their point of view; he ordered his army to march across the Great Plain and went to Jerusalem alone. On the fourth day of his stay there he received news of Tiberius's death, whereupon he returned with his whole army to Antioch.¹⁴⁷

After the reign of Tiberius, that of Caligula (A.D. 37-41) was at first

^{145.} Josephus, *Ant.* xviii 4, 3 (90); cf. xv 11, 4 (403-8), writes that it was at the time of Passover. That it was the Passover of A.D. 36 may be deduced, partly from the fact that Vitellius only arrived in Syria in the summer or autumn of A.D. 35 (*Tac. Ann.* vi 32), partly from the fact that on his second visit to Jerusalem he received the news of the death of Tiberius (died 16 March A.D. 37), Josephus *Ant.* xviii 5, 3 (122-3). We must suppose that some time elapsed between the first and second of Vitellius's visits to Jerusalem.

^{146.} *Ant.* xviii 4, 3 (90); cf. xv 11, 4 (405).

^{147.} *Ant.* xviii 5, 3 (120-5). The expression 'the Great Plain' was used for two different plains in Palestine; see Abel, *Géog. Pal.* I (1933), pp. 411-13 and 425-9. (1) It is most commonly applied to the plain beginning at Acco-Ptolemais and stretching south-eastwards along the north side of Mount Carmel. At its south-east end lies the battlefield of Jezreel (יְזְרְעֵל or Esdrelon) which has also given its name to the plain as a whole. Cf. Judith 1:5, 8; τὸ μέγα πεδίων Ἐσδρήλομ. 1 Mac. 12:49; Jos. *B. J.* ii 10, 2 (188); Ptolemais κατὰ τὸ μέγα πεδίων ἐκτισμένη. *Ant.* v 1, 22 (83); viii 2, 3 (36); xv 8, 5 (294); xx 6, 1 (118); *B. J.* iii 3, 1 (39); 4, 1 (59); *Vita* 24 (115); 26 (126); 62 (318). (2) The same expression is however also used for the Jordan Valley between the Sea of Galilee and the Dead Sea. Jos. *B. J.* iv 8, 2 (455) τὸ μέγα πεδίων καλεῖται, ἀπὸ κώμης Γινναβρίν διήκων μέχρι τῆς Ἀσφαλτίτιδος λίμνης (Ginnabris is beyond doubt identical with the place named Sennabris (or Ennabris) in *B. J.* iii 9, 7 (447) which lay near Tiberias. (See A. Schalit, *Namenwörterbuch*, p. 110). *Ant.* iv 6, 1 (100) ἐπὶ τῷ Ἰορδάνῳ κατὰ τὸ μέγα πεδίων Ἰεριχοῦτος ἀντικρῖ. It is also the Jordan Valley which is referred to in 1 Mac. 5:32 = *Ant.* xii 8, 5 (348).

A third plain, that of Asochis north of Sepphoris, also seems to be designated as 'the Great Plain' in *Vita* 41 (207). But this joined the plain of Jezreel and was probably reckoned as part of it. This supposition would explain *B. J.* iv 1, 8 (54) where Mt. Tabor is described as lying between Scythopolis and the Great Plain.

In the passage under discussion the plain referred to is that beginning at Ptolemais. Vitellius made his army-march through it south-eastwards, and then presumably across the Jordan and further southward.

greeted joyfully by all the nations of the empire, the Jews among them. As Vitellius happened to be in Jerusalem when news of the change of government arrived, the Jews were the first of the peoples of Syria to swear allegiance to the new emperor and offer sacrifice for him.¹⁴⁸ The first eighteen months of his government passed peacefully for them.¹⁴⁹ But in the autumn of A.D. 38 a bloody pogrom broke out in Alexandria, apparently staged by the Alexandrian mob, but actually instigated by the emperor himself.¹⁵⁰ In his conceit and mental derangement, he took the idea of his divine office as Caesar very seriously. To him, worship of the emperor was not just a form of homage inherited from the Greek kings; he actually believed in his divinity, and regarded the refusal to worship him as a proof of hostility towards his person.¹⁵¹ During the second year of his reign this fixed belief seems to have taken complete hold of him and to have become known in the provinces. Their inhabitants showed appropriate zeal. The Jews, unable to follow suit, fell under suspicion of hostility towards Caesar. To the anti-Jewish Alexandrians this was a welcome opportunity to give free rein to their hatred; for they could assume that by persecuting the Jews they would earn the emperor's favour. The then governor of Egypt, A. Avillius Flaccus, was weak enough to fall in with the plans of the Jew-haters to suit his own advantage. He had been governor of Egypt under Tiberius for five years (A.D. 32-37) and according to Philo had carried out his duties blamelessly during that time.¹⁵² Under Caligula, he lost his grip more and more. As an intimate friend of Tiberius he was a priori in disfavour with Caligula. With the death of the young Tiberius Gemellus (grandson of the emperor Tiberius) and of the prefect of the praetorian guard, Sutorius Macro, both driven to suicide

^{148.} Philo, *Legatio* 32 (231-2): 'When Gaius succeeded to the sovereignty, we were the first of the inhabitants of Syria to show our joy. Vitellius . . . during his stay in [our] city [received the news], and it was from our city that the glad tidings spread. Our Temple was the first to accept sacrifices on behalf of Gaius's reign.' On the sacrifices *ibid.* 45 (356); on the oath of loyalty, see Jos. *Ant.* xviii 5, 3 (124). Further on this point, above p. 376.

^{149.} *Ant.* xviii 7, 2 (256).

^{150.} On the persecution of the Jews under Caligula, see Graetz, *Gesch. der Juden* III (1905-6), pp. 322-40; Mommsen, *Röm. Geschichte* V, pp. 515-19; J. P. V. D. Balsdon, *The Emperor Gaius* (1934), pp. 111-41. For further bibliography see L. H. Feldman, *Josephus* (Loeb) IX, pp. 580-1.

^{151.} Philo, *Legatio* 11 (75-7); 13-16 (93-118); 43 (346); Jos. *Ant.* xviii 7, 2 (256); xix 1, 1 (4-5); 1, 2 (11); Dio lix 26, 28; Suet. *Caligula* 22. On emperor worship generally see vol. II, § 22.

^{152.} Philo, *In Flaccum* 3 (8). The name is given as Φλάκκος Ἀουλλίος in *In Flaccum* 1 (1) and Eusebius, *Chron.*, ed. Schoene II, p. 150. For the full name see OGIS 661. Cf. PIR² A 1414; A. Stein, *Die Präfekten von Agypten* (1950), pp. 26 f., and H. A. Murusillo, *The Acts of the Pagan Martyrs* (1954), text II (P. Oxy. 1089) = CPJ no. 154.

by Caligula, he lost all support at court. From then on, he had no other aim but to secure by any means he could the favour of the young Caesar. It was this that determined his attitude towards the Jews.¹⁵³

The visit of the Jewish king Agrippa to Alexandria was the signal for the outbreak of the pogrom. He arrived there in August, A.D. 38, on his way home to Palestine from Rome. Although, according to Philo's assurance, he avoided any provocative action; nevertheless the very sight of a Jewish king was a vexation to the Alexandrians. First Agrippa was exposed to taunts and insults in the gymnasium and then made to look ridiculous in a pantomime performance. A lunatic called Carabas was decked out in imitation royal state and paid mock homage as king, the people addressing him in Aramaic as *מָלְכָא*, Lord.¹⁵⁴ Not content with this, the enraged crowds next demanded that statues of the emperor should be placed in Jewish synagogues (always called *προσευχαι* by Philo). Flaccus dared not oppose them but on the contrary agreed to all their increasingly impudent requests. Having permitted the images to be set up in the synagogues, he went on to promulgate an edict depriving the Jews of their rights of citizenship and finally sanctioned a general persecution.¹⁵⁵ Dreadful sufferings now afflicted the Jewish population of Alexandria. Their houses and shops were looted and the people themselves ill-treated, murdered, and their bodies mutilated; others were publicly burned and yet others dragged alive through the streets. Some of the synagogues were destroyed, others profaned by the erection of a statue of Caligula as a god; in the largest synagogue, Caligula's image was placed on an old dilapidated quadriga dragged there from the gymnasium.¹⁵⁶ The governor Flaccus not only allowed all this to go on without interference, but himself

153. Philo, *In Flaccum* 3 (8-11, 14-18); 4 (20-4). For commentaries on the *In Flaccum* see H. Box, *Philonis Alexandrini In Flaccum* (1939) and A. Pelletier, *Les Oeuvres de Philon d'Alexandrie* 31, *In Flaccum* (1967).

154. Philo, *In Flaccum* 61 (36-9). On Carabas, see A. Loisy, *L'évangile selon Marc* (1912), p. 454; P. Winter, *Trial*, pp. 94 f. For a detailed account of the position of the Jews in Alexandria, the 'Jewish question' there in the first century, and the events under Caligula see V. Tcherikover and A. Fuks, *Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum* (CPJ) I-II (1957, 1960); see the general survey in vol. I, pp. 48-78; II, pp. 1-24 (Jews in Alexandria in the Early Roman period) and pp. 25-81 'The Jewish Question' in Alexandria). For *מָלְכָא* = *מלך*, cf. Dalman, *Grammatik* (21905), p. 152, n. 3. See also Vermes, *Jesus the Jew*, p. 248, n. 55.

155. Philo, *In Flaccum*, 6-7 (40-7, 52-7). Philo distinguishes three stages in Flaccus's anti-Jewish measures: (a) he permitted the installation of emperor images in the synagogues (43); (b) a few days afterwards, he issued a proclamation depriving the Alexandrian Jews of their rights of citizenship (54); (c) he allowed the plunder of Jewish property, treating Jews as if they were the inhabitants of a conquered city (54).

156. Plundering of houses: *In Flaccum* 8 (56) = *Legatio* 18 (121-2). Killing of the Jews: *In Flaccum* 9 (65-72) = *Legatio* 10 (127-31). Destruction and profanation of synagogues (*προσευχαι*): *Legatio* 20 (132-4, 137).

adopted oppressive measures against the Jews in the city, for which, according to Philo, no other reason was given than that they refused to take part in emperor-worship. He had thirty-eight members of the Jewish gerousia bound and dragged into the theatre, there to be flogged before the eyes of their enemies so that some died under the lash and others after prolonged illness.¹⁵⁷ A centurion with a picked band was commanded to search the houses of the Jews for arms.¹⁵⁸ Jewish women were compelled to eat pork before spectators in the theatre.¹⁵⁹ Flaccus had already shown his hostility to the Jews by failing to fulfil his promise to despatch a letter from the Jewish community to Caligula in which the emperor was assured of the honour in which the Jews of the city held him. This letter was now sent off by Agrippa, with an explanation of the reason for its delay.¹⁶⁰

It is not known how the Alexandrian community fared after the severe persecution in autumn A.D. 38 until the emperor's death in January A.D. 41. In autumn 38, Flaccus was suddenly sent as a prisoner to Rome at the emperor's command, and banished to the island of Andros in the Aegean Sea, where he was later put to death together with other distinguished exiles on the order of Caligula.¹⁶¹ His successor was C. Vitrasius Pollio.¹⁶² It is very probable that the Jews did not

157. *In Flaccum* 10 (73-85).

158. The long-standing prohibition in Egypt on carrying arms had been emphasized by Flaccus in A.D. 34/5; see the edict partially preserved on a papyrus. L. Mitteis, U. Wilcken, *Grundzüge und Chrestomathie der Papyri* I, 2 (1912), no. 13.

159. *In Flaccum* 11 (86-96).

160. *In Flaccum* 12 (97-107).

161. *In Flaccum* 12-21 (97-191). The chronological data for the incidents recorded above all point to autumn A.D. 38. (1) Agrippa sailed to Alexandria with the aid of the Etesian winds, *In Flaccum* 5 (26), which blew for 30 days from July 20, Pliny *NH* ii 47/124, xviii 28/270. (2) The flogging of the 38 members of the Jewish gerousia took place on Caligula's birthday, *In Flaccum* 10 (81), see Box *ad loc.*, which was August 31 (Suet. *Calig.* 8). (3) The arrest of Flaccus soon after took place during the Feast of Tabernacles, *In Flaccum* 14 (116), i.e. September or October. The year is arrived at as follows: (1) Agrippa returned from Rome to Palestine in the second year of Caligula, Jos. *Ant.* xviii. 6, 11 (238). (2) The Jewish shops were plundered while they were closed on account of mourning for Drusilla, the sister of Caligula, *In Flaccum* 8 (56). Drusilla died on 10 June A.D. 38 (Dio lix 10-11; see PIR² I 668).

162. According to Dio lix 10, Caligula had appointed Macro prefect of Egypt (his full name, as is shown by AE 1957, 250, was Q. Naevius Cordus) Sutorius, not Sertorius, Macro). But he never took up his governorship, having fallen into disgrace with Caligula, and was replaced by Flaccus, Philo, *In Flaccum* 3 (14); 4 (16). The successor to Flaccus was C. Vitrasius Pollio, attested from 28 April A.D. 39 (ILS 8899) to A.D. 41, P. Lond. 1912 43 f. (=CPJ 153); Pliny *NH* xxxvi 11/57. See A. Stein, *Die Präfecten von Aegypten in der römischen Kaiserzeit* (1950), pp. 28 f.; O. W. Reinmuth in Bull. Am. Soc. Pap. 4 (1967), p. 80; cf. RE s.v. 'Vitrasius' (7).

receive back their synagogues in Caligula's lifetime and that emperor-worship continued to be a burning, and for the Jews a perilous, problem. However, from the fact that Vitrasius Pollio, the governor appointed by Caligula, remained in office under Claudius, it may be deduced that no further severe persecution occurred while he was governor, for otherwise Claudius, who ultimately settled the conflict in favour of the Jews, would not have left him in office. In A.D. 40, probably in the spring, the persisting disputes between the pagan and Jewish populations of Alexandria resulted in the sending of an embassy from each party to the emperor. The leader of the Jewish delegation was Philo and his opposite number the pamphleteer Apion. The outcome was unfavourable to the Jews. They were received ungraciously by the emperor and had to return without having achieved their object. Such is Josephus's brief report.¹⁶³ A few incidents connected with this embassy are also told by Philo in his work on Caligula. But it is difficult to determine much from these fragmentary notes. Without mentioning the despatch of either of the two delegations, Philo emphasises that the Alexandrian envoys won over completely the slave Helicon, a favourite of Caligula's. When the Jews noticed this, they made similar efforts, but in vain.¹⁶⁴ They then decided to hand the emperor a written statement (which was essentially the same as the petition sent 'shortly before' by Agrippa). Caligula first received the Jewish envoys in the Field of Mars, not far from Rome, and promised to hear them when he found it convenient.¹⁶⁵ The delegation then followed the emperor to Puteoli but was not received by him.¹⁶⁶ It was not until later—how much later is not known—that the promised audience took place in Rome, in the Gardens of Maecenas and Lamia on the Esquiline. The emperor kept the Jews trailing behind him while he inspected his building projects and gave orders concerning them, throwing out an occasional contemptuous remark amid the applause of the opposing delegates who were also there. Finally he dismissed them, declaring them more foolish than wicked since they would not believe in his divinity.¹⁶⁷

163. *Ant.* xviii 8, 1 (257). According to Josephus, the two embassies each consisted of three men; according to Philo, *Legatio* 46 (370), the Jewish embassy included five men.

164. Philo, *Legatio* 26 (166); 27 (172) (the Alexandrian ambassadors); *ibid.* 27 (174); 28 (178) (the Jewish ambassadors vainly entreated Helicon to secure them an audience); cf. Dio lix 5, 2. Caligula's courtiers, Helicon and Apelles, *Legatio* 30 (203-5) promoted the cause of the anti-Jewish party.

165. *Legatio* 28 (181) (the narrator speaks on occasion in the first person, evidently of himself).

166. *Legatio* 29 (185-94).

167. *Legatio* 44-6 (349-73). It is remarkable that Philo speaks of the ambassadors' exertions in Rome without having mentioned their departure from Alexandria. There may be some lacuna in the text. But this assumption is not

It appears that affairs in Alexandria remained unsettled until Caligula's death. One of the first acts of the new emperor, Claudius, was to issue an edict confirming the former privileges of the Alexandrian Jews and restoring to them unrestricted liberty in the practice of their

imperative, for Philo did not set out to tell the history of the embassy (as might be supposed from the misleading title, which is Philo's own). His theme is rather the same as that of Lactantius in the latter's treatise *De Mortibus Persecutorum*. He wishes to show that the persecutors of the pious do not escape God's punishment. As with Flaccus, so with Caligula: their evil deeds are enumerated, and the divine retribution then recorded (unfortunately, the second half of the treatise on Caligula is no longer extant). In *Legatio*, the principal figure is Caligula, not the Jews; the Jewish embassy from Alexandria is a totally secondary matter. This may also explain other difficulties. Caligula was absent from Rome on an expedition to Gaul and Germany from the autumn of A.D. 39 until 31st August A.D. 40 (see above, p. 352). Did the two receptions of the embassy take place before or after this expedition? According to Philo, *Legatio* 29 (190), the ambassadors made the sea journey in the middle of winter. Since the business on which they were engaged had already become urgent on account of the great persecution in autumn A.D. 38, it would seem at first that the date was winter 38/39. This view seems to be supported by the fact that the written apology handed over by ambassadors is said to have been similar in content to that sent to the emperor by Agrippa on the occasion of his Alexandrian visit, *Legatio* 28 (179). Some writers therefore place the departure of the embassy at the end of A.D. 38, its first reception in the Campus Martius and journey to Puteoli in the beginning of A.D. 39, before Caligula's campaign in Gaul and Germany, and the second audience in the gardens of Maecenas and Lamia after that campaign, in autumn A.D. 40. This time-sequence has its difficulties. It was at Puteoli that the ambassadors first received the news of Caligula's order to erect his statue in the Temple in Jerusalem (Philo, *Legatio* 29 (186-8)). This cannot have happened before the spring of A.D. 40. The first reception of the Jewish embassy by Caligula and their journey to Puteoli must therefore have occurred in the autumn of A.D. 40, after the Gallic-Germanic campaign. In any case, the second audience in the gardens of Maecenas and Lamia took place after the campaign, for the ambassadors there refer to the fact that the Jews had offered sacrifices for the emperor, *Legatio* 45 (356). If the audiences of the Jews with Caligula took place not earlier than in the autumn of A.D. 40, their winter journey would have been made that autumn. But such a date would be too late, for then how did the ambassadors hear for the first time in Puteoli of events in Palestine that had taken place after the beginning of the summer of A.D. 40? It is therefore preferable to date the ambassadors' journey to the end of the winter of A.D. 39/40, and assume that they waited in Rome for Caligula's return from his campaign and were received by him in the autumn of A.D. 40. But whichever combination is accepted, Philo's exposition not only fails to report the despatch of the Jewish-Alexandrian embassy, but also give no full, comprehensive account of what went on in Rome. It is even more surprising that Philo says nothing of the position in Alexandria itself from autumn A.D. 38 to Caligula's death. There is no explanation, either, of why the embassy did not set out until one and a half years after the great persecution. The justifiable suspicion remains that Philo's *Legatio* has not been transmitted intact. On the chronological problem see E. M. Smallwood, *Philonis Alexandrini legatio ad Gaum* (1961; 1969), esp. pp. 47-50 (arguing for 39/40; *contra*, P. J. Sijpestein, 'The Legationes ad Gaum', *JJS* 15 (1964), pp. 87-96 (not convincing).

religion.¹⁶⁸ The chief instigators of the Alexandrian Jew-baiting were brought to account: Philo names as such Isidorus and Lampo. From certain papyrus discoveries it emerges that the former was a gymnasiarch and that both were sentenced to death and executed under Claudius (see above, p. 40).

While the Alexandrian embassy to Rome waited for the imperial decision, storms blew up over the mother country, Palestine. They broke out at Jamnia, a town in the coastal plain at that time mainly inhabited by Jews. When the Gentile inhabitants of the place set up a crude altar to the emperor to show their zeal for Caesar and to annoy the Jews, the latter immediately destroyed it. The imperial procurator of the city, Herennius Capito,¹⁶⁹ reported this to the emperor, who avenged himself on the refractory Jews by giving orders that a statue with his effigy be set up in the Temple in Jerusalem.¹⁷⁰ As it was anticipated that such a demand would arouse fierce Jewish opposition, the governor of Syria, Publius Petronius, received the command that half of the army stationed 'on the Euphrates', i.e. in Syria,¹⁷¹ was to proceed to Palestine to enforce compliance with the emperor's will. It was with a heavy heart that Petronius, who was a reasonable man, obeyed this childish demand (winter, A.D. 39/40). While the statue was being prepared in Sidon, he sent for the Jewish leaders and tried to persuade them to yield with good grace, but without success.¹⁷²

The news of what was in store soon spread all over Palestine and the people gathered in great masses at Ptolemais, where Petronius had his headquarters. 'The multitude of the Jews covered all Phoenicia like a cloud.' Divided into six orderly groups (old men, men, boys, old women, women and girls), the large deputation appeared before Petronius. Their impassioned complaints made such an impression on

168. *Jos. Ant.* xix 5, 2-3 (279-8)7.

169. He was probably not, as Philo, *Legatio* 30 (199), calls him, 'the tax-collector for Judaea', but merely the financial procurator of Jamnia, a town belonging to the emperor's private domains; see Josephus, *Ant.* xviii 6, 3 (158). Should not *'Iauvelas* be read also in the text of Philo instead of *'Ioudatas*? (so Smallwood, *ad loc.*). Cf. PIR² H 103, Pflaum, *Carrières*, no. 9, and Millar in *JRS* 53 (1963), p. 33.

170. Philo, *Legatio* 30 (203).

171. According to *Ant.* xviii 8, 2 (262), two legions; according to *B. J.* ii 10, 1 (186), three. The first figure is the correct one for there were four legions in Syria (see above, p. 362).

172. Philo, *Legatio* 31 (207-23). The date is determined by the fact that the negotiations at Ptolemais took place at harvest time, therefore between Passover and Pentecost, in A.D. 40. But since according to *Ant.* xviii 8, 2 (262) Petronius had moved into winter quarters at Ptolemais, he must have gone there in the winter of A.D. 39/40. Josephus's words are certainly calculated to give the impression that this did not occur till the winter of A.D. 40/41. See above, p. 263.

Petronius that he resolved to try his utmost to postpone the decision, temporarily at least.¹⁷³ He dared not write the truth to Caligula, namely that he really wished to put a stop to the whole undertaking. Instead, he asked for respite, partly because time was needed for the preparation of the statue, and partly because the harvest was approaching and it was advisable to wait till it was gathered in case the exasperated Jews in the end destroyed it. If that happened, a famine might ensue which would endanger the emperor's proposed visit to Egypt via Palestine. When Caligula received this report, he was very annoyed at the slowness of his legate. But he dared not give expression to his anger. Instead, he wrote Petronius a letter of acknowledgment congratulating him on his prudence and merely urging him to proceed as quickly as possible with the erection of the statue, since the harvest would soon be completed.¹⁷⁴

Petronius still did not treat the matter urgently, but started fresh negotiations with the Jews. By the late autumn, at the sowing season (November), he was in Tiberias for forty days, besieged by people in their thousands imploring him more than ever to save the country from the threatened horror of profanation of the Temple. When Aristobulus, King Agrippa's brother, and other of his relatives joined their entreaties to those of the people, Petronius resolved on the decisive step of requesting the emperor to revoke his order. He led his army from Ptolemais back to Antioch, and pointed out in a letter to Caligula the advisability on grounds of equity and prudence of revoking the edict.¹⁷⁵

Meanwhile, affairs in Rome had taken a more favourable turn. King Agrippa I, who had left Palestine in the spring of A.D. 40, met Caligula in Rome or Puteoli in the autumn when the emperor had just returned from his German campaign.¹⁷⁶ He had as yet heard nothing

173. Philo, *Legatio* 32 (225-43); Josephus, *B. J.* ii 10, 3-5 (192-201); *Ant.* xviii 8, 2-3 (263-72).

174. Philo, *Legatio* 33 (248-9); 34-5 (255-69).

175. *B. J.* ii 10, 3-5 (193-202); *Ant.* xviii 8, 5-6 (279-88). The recall of the army is only mentioned in *Bellum*.

176. That Agrippa had already left Palestine in the spring may be deduced from the fact that on his arrival in Rome he knew nothing of what had been going on in Palestine. But he cannot have been with Caligula in Gaul (as Dio lix 24, 1 conjectures), but must have gone to Rome or Puteoli some time after Caligula's return from his campaign (31 August A.D. 40). For if Agrippa's successful intervention had already taken place in Gaul, the Alexandrian ambassadors would not, as was the case, have first heard the bad news of affairs in Palestine after Caligula's return and after following the emperor to Puteoli, Philo, *Legatio* 29 (188). The intervention of Agrippa must therefore have taken place after that time. It follows that Petronius asked for the edict to be revoked in the late autumn (the sowing season and not long before Caligula's death, i.e. in about November). So he had not yet received Caligula's decision, which cannot have

of what was going on in Palestine but could see from the emperor's expression that he was furious. While he looked in vain for the cause, Caligula observed his uneasiness and informed him in a very ungracious tone of the cause of his displeasure. The king was so alarmed by what he heard that he fell into a faint, from which he did not recover until the evening of the following day.¹⁷⁷ He then made it his first business to address a supplication to the emperor in which he endeavoured to persuade him to revoke his order, pointing out that none of his predecessors had ever demanded anything of that sort.¹⁷⁸ Contrary to every expectation, Agrippa's letter had the desired effect. Caligula caused a letter to be sent to Petronius, telling him that nothing was to be changed in the Temple at Jerusalem. The favour was admittedly not unmixed. For joined to it was an injunction that no one erecting an altar or temple to the emperor outside Jerusalem should be hindered from doing so. A good part of the concession granted was thus taken back, and it was only because no advantage was taken of this right that no new disturbances arose from it. In fact, the emperor soon regretted having made the concession at all, and as he had no further use for the statue at Sidon, he ordered a new one to be made in Rome which he planned to put ashore on the coast of Palestine while on his projected journey to Alexandria, and send secretly to Jerusalem.¹⁷⁹ Only Caligula's death, which occurred soon after, prevented this enterprise from being carried out.

The emperor's death was a stroke of good fortune for the inhabitants of Judaea as well as for Petronius. When Caligula received Petronius's letter begging him to revoke his edict after he had already decreed that this should be done, he fell into a furious rage over the disobedience of his officer and commanded him to commit suicide immediately in retribution. Soon afterwards, however, Caligula himself was murdered (on 24 January, A.D. 41). Petronius received the news twenty-seven days before the messengers arrived with the order for his own suicide; they had been three months on the way because of bad weather. There

been made in Rome earlier than about September or October. That the intervention of Agrippa took place in A.D. 40 is also plain on general grounds from the contents of his petition, in which he describes himself as already in possession of Galilee, Philo, *Legatio* 41 (326).

¹⁷⁷ *Legatio* 35 (261-9).

¹⁷⁸ *Legatio* 36-41 (276-329).

¹⁷⁹ *Legatio* 42 (331-7) (the intended journey to Alexandria is mentioned also by Suet. *Calig.* 40). A somewhat different account of Agrippa's intervention is given by Josephus, *Ant.* xviii 8, 7-8 (289-301). According to him, once when Agrippa had humoured Caligula with a luxurious banquet, the emperor told Agrippa to ask for any favour he desired; whereupon Agrippa petitioned for the revocation of the order to set up the emperor's statue in the Temple. The result, according to Josephus, was the same: the request was granted.

was now as little point in obeying the order to commit suicide as there was in setting up the statue in the Temple.¹⁸⁰

The Emperor Claudius, who was raised by the soldiers to the throne immediately after his succession bestowed Judaea and Samaria on Agrippa, besides the domain which he already received from Caligula

¹⁸⁰ *B.J.* ii 10, 5 (203). *Ant.* xviii 8, 8-9 (302-5, 307-8). On Jewish traditions (Meg. Taan. § 26, ed. Lichtenstein, pp. 344-5, cf. pp. 300-1; ySot. 24b; bSot. 33a), see Derenbourg, *op. cit.*, pp. 207 ff., also P. Winter, 'Simeon der Gerechte und Caius Caligula', *Judaica* 12 (1956), pp. 129-32.

The time-sequence of the events reported may be considered as follows (the transmission of news from Rome or Gaul to Jerusalem, and vice versa, is supposed to have normally required about two months):

Winter A.D. 39/40	Petronius receives Caligula's order to erect his statue in the Temple at Jerusalem and goes with two legions to Palestine.
April/May 40	(Not long before harvest-time), negotiations take place at Ptolemais. Petronius's first report to Caligula, <i>Legatio</i> 33 (248); Josephus, <i>B.J.</i> ii 10, 2-3 (188-92); <i>Ant.</i> xviii 8, 2 (262).
June	Caligula receives Petronius's first report and answers him, urging him to expedite matters, <i>Legatio</i> 34 (254-60).
August	Petronius receives Caligula's reply but still hesitates to make a decision.
End of September	Agrippa visits Caligula in Rome (or Puteoli), learns what has happened and intervenes. Caligula sends instructions to Petronius to stop the undertaking, <i>Legatio</i> 42 (333); Josephus, <i>Ant.</i> xviii 8, 8 (300-1).
Beginning of November	Negotiations take place at Tiberias at the season of sowing; Petronius begs the emperor not to erect the statue, <i>B.J.</i> ii 10, 3-5 (193-202); <i>Ant.</i> xviii 8, 4 (277), 8, 5 (283), 8, 6 (287).
End of November	Petronius receives instructions to abandon the undertaking.
Beginning of January A.D. 41	Caligula receives Petronius's petition not to have the statue erected and sends him the order to commit suicide, <i>Ant.</i> xviii 8, 9 (303-4).
24th January 41	Caligula murdered, <i>Ant.</i> xviii 8, 9 (307).
Beginning of March	Petronius receives the news of Caligula's death, <i>Ant.</i> xviii 8, 9 (308).
Beginning of April	Petronius receives the letter with the order to kill himself, <i>B.J.</i> ii 10, 5 (203), <i>Ant.</i> xviii 8, 9 (308).

This table may be regarded as essentially correct, even if the time taken for a letter to travel from Italy or Gaul to Palestine, and vice versa, may on occasion have been shorter than has been assumed. On average, it took between one and two months. It should be borne in mind, however, that in the summer of A.D. 40 Caligula was still in Gaul and that during winter news travelled slowly and irregularly. The main difficulty in plotting an exact chronology of events is that Agrippa, as well as the Alexandrian Jewish embassy, did not hear of Caligula's order in respect to the Jerusalem Temple until sometime in September A.D. 40, whereas according to Philo the affair was already a matter of common talk in

Consequently, all Palestine was now re-united in the hands of a Herodian just as it had been under Herod the Great.¹⁸¹

Meanwhile the divisions between Jews and Greeks in Alexandria were not yet ended. On the development of this issue in the reign of Claudius (A.D. 41-54) we have three papyrus documents, only one of which is of undisputed authenticity. This is the now famous letter of Claudius to the Alexandrians, first published in 1924.¹⁸² It is addressed to the city of Alexandria in response to an embassy, and was written in about October A.D. 41. The first part (ll. 1-72) concerns offers of honours to the emperor and requests for benefits to themselves made by the embassy. In lines 73-104 Claudius turns to the Jewish question and mentions that the Jews had sent two embassies (possibly that of Philo and another despatched after his accession). In the context of a strongly worded general warning to both sides to keep the peace, he orders the Alexandrians not to interfere with the customs of the Jews, and the Jews 'not to intrude themselves into the games presided over by the *gymnasarchoi* and the *kosmetai*, since they enjoy what is their own, and in a city which is not their own they possess an abundance of all good things'. This letter probably shows that the edict preserved by Josephus, *Ant.* xix 5, 2 (279-85) cannot be genuine as it stands, for it emphasises precisely the equal rights of the Jews in Alexandria—*τοὺς ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ Ἰουδαίους Ἀλεξανδρεῖς λεγομένους συγκατοικισθέντας τοῖς πρώτοις ἐν τῷ καιροῖς Ἀλεξανδρεῦσι καὶ ἰσῆς πολιτείας παρὰ τῶν βασιλέων τετευχότας*.¹⁸³ Finally, a number of papyri report parts of the hearing before Claudius in which the leading Alexandrian anti-Semite, Isidorus, accuses the Jewish king Agrippa—either Agrippa I in A.D. 41 or Agrippa II in about A.D. 53. The question whether this text, like the other 'Acts of the Alexandrian Martyrs' is documentary or fictional is not yet decided.¹⁸⁴

Palestine from the harvest season in April/May. Philo's statements in *Legatio* 34-5 (255-69) are too definite and detailed to be dismissed as unhistorical.

Another chronology has been suggested by E. M. Smallwood, 'The Chronology of Gaius' Attempt to Desecrate the Temple', *Latomus* 16 (1957), pp. 3-17. She places the events a few months earlier. See also J. P. V. D. Balsdon, 'Notes Concerning the Principate of Gaius', *JRS* 24 (1934), pp. 19-24, and *idem*, *The Emperor Gaius (Caligula)* (1934), pp. 135-40.

181. *B.J.* ii 11, 4 (215); *Ant.* xix 5, 1 (274).

182. P. Lond. 19, 2. H. I. Bell, *Jews and Christians in Egypt* (1924), pp. 23-4. For a full treatment listing the immense subsequent bibliography, see CPJ no. 153. The translation of lines 92-5 above is taken from CPJ.

183. Note, however, L. H. Feldman, *Josephus* (Loeb) IX, *ad loc.*, who argues that the two documents are not irreconcilable.

184. See H. A. Musurillo, *Acts of the Pagan Martyrs: Acta Alexandrinorum* (1954), Text IV (arguing for A.D. 53); CPJ no. 156 (arguing for A.D. 41).