

§ 19. THE ROMAN PROCURATORS A.D. 44-66

Sources

Josephus, *Ant.* xx 1 (1-16); 5-11 (97-258); *B.J.* ii 11-14 (204-308).
Tacitus, *Ann.* xv 44; *Hist.* v 9-10.

Bibliography

- Derenbourg, J., *Essai sur l'histoire et la géographie de la Palestine* (1867), pp. 220-59.
Graetz, H., *Geschichte der Juden* III (1905-6), pp. 359-63, 414-53.
Jackson, Foakes and Lake, Kirsopp, *The Beginnings of Christianity I: The Acts of the Apostles I-V* (1920-33).
Meyer, E., *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums* III (1923), pp. 42-54.
Abel, F.-M., *Histoire de la Palestine* I (1952), pp. 455-79.
Stern, M. 'The Description of Palestine by Pliny the Elder and the Administrative Division of Judea, at the End of the Period of the Second Temple', *Tarbiz* 37 (1967-8), pp. 215-29 (in Hebrew with an English summary).

It might be thought, from the record of the Roman procurators to whom, from now on, public affairs in Palestine were entrusted, that they all, as if by secret arrangement, systematically and deliberately set out to drive the people to revolt. Even the best of them—to say nothing of the others who totally disregarded every law—had no idea that a nation like the Jews required above all consideration for their religious customs. Instead of showing moderation and indulgence, they severely clamped down on any manifestation of the people's national character. The least guilty in this respect were the first two procurators, who by refraining from any interference with ancestral customs, kept the nation at peace'.¹

1. The first procurator whom Claudius sent to Palestine was Cuspius Fadus (A.D. 44-?46).² He had the opportunity as soon as he assumed office to show his determination to maintain order. When he arrived in Palestine, the inhabitants of Peraea were in a state of open war with the citizens of Philadelphia.³ The conflict had arisen over disputes about the boundaries of their respective territories. As the Peraeans were at fault, Fadus had one of the three ringleaders executed and the other two banished from the country. But for all his love of justice, Fadus had no understanding of the peculiar characteristics of the Jewish

1. *B.J.* ii 11, 6 (220).

2. *B.J.* ii 11, 6 (220); *Ant.* xix 9, 2 (363).

3. *Ant.* xx 1, 1 (2).

people, as was proved by his demand that the vestments of the High Priest, which in earlier times (A.D. 6-36) had been kept in Roman custody but had then been released by Vitellius (see above, p. 388), should again be committed to the Romans for safe keeping.⁴ Thus the feelings of the people, so sensitive in matters of this sort, were unnecessarily outraged by petty vexations. Fortunately, Fadus and the governor of Syria, Cassius Longinus, who had gone to Jerusalem in connexion with this important affair, were at least considerate enough to allow a Jewish delegation to proceed to Rome. There through the mediation of the younger Agrippa, a directive was obtained from Claudius that in the affair of the vestments matters should remain as they were.⁵

A later conflict was more serious and led to open war and bloodshed. A self-styled prophet called Theudas gathered a large crowd of followers around him and marched down to the Jordan, asserting that at his command the waters would part and let them pass across to the other bank. This was probably only to serve as proof of his divine mission; the main issue, namely the contest with Rome, would follow. Fadus in any case became suspicious. He sent a detachment of cavalry against Theudas, which attacked him by surprise, killed or captured some of his followers, and captured and subsequently beheaded Theudas himself. His head was carried to Jerusalem as a military trophy.⁶

2. Fadus's successor was Tiberius Iulius Alexander (A.D. ? 46-48), a scion of one of the most illustrious Jewish families of Alexandria, the

4. *Ant.* xx 1, 1 (6).

5. *Ant.* xx 1, 1-2 (7-14); cf. xv 11, 4 (403-8). The letter of Claudius to the city authorities of Jerusalem, in which the emperor communicated his decision to them, is dated 28 June, A.D. 45, *Claud. tribunic. potest. V*, during the consulship of Rufus and Pompeius Silvanus (on these *consules suffecti*, see A. Degraffi, *I Fasti Consolari* (1952), pp. 12-13).

6. *Ant.* xx 5, 1 (97-9) = Eusebius, *HE* II 11. The name *Θευδᾶς* also occurs elsewhere (CIG 2684, 3563, 3920, 5698; BCH II (1887), pp. 213, 214, 215; W. Bauer, *Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des N.T., s.v.*). In rabbinical writings we find the form תודוס; however, the best MSS., such as the Cambridge MS. and Codex de Rossi 138, spell the name of the physician mentioned in mBekh, 4:4 תודרוס i.e. *Θεδρωπος*. Cf. H. L. Strack, P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch* II (1924), p. 639. Some writers think that *Θευδᾶς* represents the short form of a name compounded with *θεός* and is of Greek origin; others suggest a Semitic etymology deriving the word from the root *עוד* (nominal form תעודיה). See JE XII, p. 140; Foakes Jackson, Kirsopp Lake, *The Beginnings of Christianity I: Acts IV, ad loc.*; J. W. Swain, *HThR* 37 (1944), pp. 341-9; P. Winter, *EvTh* 17 (1957), pp. 398 f.; S. B. Hoenig, *IDB* IV, p. 629. A similar-sounding name, *Θευδιών*, occurs in Josephus, *Ant.* xvii 4, 2 (70, 73), xx 1, 2 (14); *B.J.* i 30, 5 (592).

Our rebel chief Theudas is also mentioned in Acts 5:36, in a speech attributed to Gamaliel I and apparently delivered long before the actual appearance of Theudas; indeed, in the speech itself, his appearance is mentioned as preceding that of Judas of Galilee (A.D. 6). A few authors have assumed the existence of

son of the alabarch Alexander and a nephew of Philo the philosopher.⁷ He had abandoned the religion of his fathers and taken service under the Romans. During the period of his government Palestine was afflicted by a severe famine.⁸ The one fact of importance recorded of him is that he ordered James and Simon, the sons of Judas the Galilean, to be crucified—presumably because they followed in their father's footsteps.⁹

two different rebels named Theudas, but such an assumption is not justified in view of the slight authority of the Acts in such matters. See M. Krenkel, *Josephus und Lucas* (Leipzig, 1894), pp. 162 ff.; Jackson-Lake, *op. cit.* I: *Acts IV, ad loc.*, the commentaries by A. Wikenhauser, E. Haenchen, H. Conzelmann and others; P. Winter, 'Miscellen zur Apostelgeschichte', *EvTh* 17 (1957), pp. 398 f.

Curious is the fact that the followers of Jesus in Acts 5:36-7 (the speech ascribed to Gamaliel is a Christian composition) are aligned with the followers of Judas the Galilean, and of Theudas, both of whom had clashed with Rome's political interests in Palestine.

7. *Ant.* xx 5, 2 (100); xviii 8, 1 (259). On the office of *alabarch*, see vol. III, § 31.

8. Compare on this, besides *Ant.* xx 5, 2 (101), also *Ant.* iii 15, 3 (320); xx 2, 5 (51); Acts 11:28-30. Josephus mentions the famine in the time of Tiberius Iulius Alexander, but states that it began in the days of his predecessor: *ἐπὶ τοῖσι δὲ καὶ τὸν μέγαν λιμὸν κατὰ τὴν Ἰουδαίαν συνέβη γενέσθαι*. Instead of *ἐπὶ τοῖσι*, Niese reads in accordance with the *Epitome*, *ἐπὶ τούτου*. But the reading *ἐπὶ τοῖσι*, found in all the manuscripts, is confirmed by Eusebius, *EH* ii 12, 1. It is certainly not to be rendered *propter haec*, nor even *ad haec* or *post haec*, but by *horum temporibus*, as in the Old Latin. The account in Acts is in agreement with this when it describes the famine as having occurred at about the time of Agrippa's death (A.D. 44). In all three passages Josephus speaks only of Judaea being affected by the famine (xx 5, 2 (101), *Judaea*; iii 15, 3 (320), *our country*; xx 2, 5 (51), *the city*). The author of the Acts of the Apostles speaks of a world-wide famine (11:28). This is a generalization, and as unhistorical as the similar expression used of the census under Quirinius. The writer of Acts, perhaps using a source in this instance, may have seen in the 'famine in diverse places' a sign of 'the things which are coming upon the world' (cf. Lk. 21:11, 26). The reign of Claudius was certainly afflicted by *assiduae sterilitates* (Suet. *Div. Claud.* 18), including, besides the famine in Palestine, the following: (1) a famine in Rome at the beginning of Claudius's reign (Dio lx 11, 1; Aurelius Victor, *De Caes.* 4, 3); (2) a famine in Greece in the 8th or 9th year of his rule (Euseb. *Chron.*, ed. Schoene II, pp. 152-3, in the Armenian, and according to Jerome); (3) a famine in Rome in the 11th year of his rule (so Tac. *Ann.* xii 43, 1; or, according to Euseb. *Chron.*, *loc. cit.*, in the 10th or 9th year; Orosius vii 6, 17, also gives the 10th year as the date). But a famine extending over the whole world is as improbable in itself as it is unattested by any of our historical sources. K. S. Gapp, 'The Universal Famine under Claudius', *HThR* 28 (1935), pp. 258-65, considers the words *ἐφ' ὅλην τὴν οἰκουμένην* in Acts 11:28 justified because of the spread of famine over various parts of the Roman Empire, even if this did not occur all at once.

9. *Ant.* xx 5, 2 (102). Tiberius Iulius Alexander served later under Corbulo against the Parthians (Tac. *Ann.* xv 28, 4), and was then made Prefect of Egypt (Jos. *B.J.* ii 15, 1 (309), 18, 7 (492); iv 10, 6 (616); Tac. *Hist.* i 11, 2; ii 74, 2; 79, 1; Suet. *Div. Vesp.* 6). He was Titus's most distinguished adviser during the siege of Jerusalem, *B.J.* v 1, 6 (45); vi 4, 3 (237). He was possibly later Praetorian

If the years of these first two procurators did not pass without disturbances, they were totally insignificant in comparison with what followed. Already under the next governor, Cumanus, and not without faults on both sides, popular uprisings broke out on a more formidable scale.

3. The first rebellion with which Ventidius Cumanus (A.D. 48-c.52)¹⁰ had to contend was triggered off by the insolence of a Roman soldier. At the feast of Passover, when a detachment of Roman soldiers was regularly stationed on the outskirts of the Temple¹¹ to maintain order, one of them had the temerity to insult the festive gathering by committing an indecency.¹² The angry crowd demanded satisfaction from the procurator, but when he tried to pacify them he was so overwhelmed with abuse that in the end he called in his forces, who routed the excited crowds so completely that (according to Josephus's estimate) 20,000 people lost their lives in the ensuing stampede.¹³

The fault in this case lay with the Romans; but in the next upheaval the provocation came from the people. An imperial slave named Stephanus was attacked on the public highway not far from Jerusalem and robbed of his possessions. As a punishment, the villages in the

Prefect. His full name is given in an edict which he issued as Prefect of Egypt, CIG 4957 = OGIS 669 = IGR I 1263 = G. Chalou, *L'édit de Tibérius Iulius Alexander* (1964). On Tiberius Iulius Alexander and his family see E. G. Turner, 'Tiberius Iulius Alexander', *JRS* 44 (1954), pp. 54-64; CPJ nos. 418-20; V. Burr, *Tiberius Iulius Alexander* (1955); PIR² I 139.

The family of Tiberius Alexander, completely alienated from Judaism, continued in later times to serve the Roman administration. A certain Iulius Alexander, probably a son or grandson of the one mentioned, served as legate under Trajan in the Parthian war (Dio lxviii 30, 12); an Alexander, probably identical, was consul in A.D. 117, and in 118, one Tiberius Iulius Alexander appears among the *Fratres Arvales*; see PIR² I 142; but cf. RE s.v. 'Julius' (61). One Τιβέριος Ἰούλιος Ἀλέξανδρος, commander of the *Cohors Prima Flavia* and former *eutheniarch* of the second district of Alexandria, erected a monument to the goddess Isis in the 21st year of Antoninus Pius, OGIS 705 = IGR I 1044.

10. *B.J.* ii 12, 1-7 (223-46), *Ant.* xx 5, 2 (103); 5, 3-6, 5 (105-36). His name was Ventidius Cumanus according to Tac. *Ann.* xii 54, 3; Josephus calls him simply Cumanus. The date of Cumanus's introduction into office may be assessed, though only approximately, from Josephus's reference to the death of Herod of Chalcis, which occurred in the 8th year of Claudius's reign, i.e. in A.D. 48, *Ant.* xx 5, 2 (103). See F. D. Gerlach, *Die römischen Statthalter*, p. 71; P. v. Rohden, *De Palaestina et Arabia* (1885), p. 35; RE s.v. 'Ventidius' (7); M. Aberbach, 'The conflicting Accounts of Josephus and Tacitus concerning Cumanus' and Felix' Terms of Office', *JQR* 40 (1949-50), pp. 1-14.

11. *B.J.* v 5, 8 (244); *Ant.* xx 8, 11 (192).

12. *B.J.* ii 12, 1 (224); *Ant.* xx 5, 3 (108).

13. *B.J.* ii 12, 1 (224-7); *Ant.* xx 5, 3 (105-11). In the *B.J.* passage some manuscripts read, 'more than myriads', ὑπὲρ τοῦς μυριάδων. Niese, on good testimony, gives the figure 30,000; the same figure in Euseb. *Chron.*, ed. Schoene II, pp. 152-3, and *HE* ii 19, 1, proves that Eusebius is here following *B.J.*; see Schürer *ZWTh* (1898), p. 34.

neighbourhood of the place where the assault was committed were looted. Unfortunately, a new disaster very nearly resulted from this looting, in that a soldier tore up in the sight of the people a scroll of the Torah which he had found, accompanying his action with open insults. A mass deputation set off to Cumanus at Caesarea to demand revenge, and this time the procurator found it advisable to punish the culprit with death.¹⁴

Far more bitter and violent was a third incident under Cumanus which, although it did not cost him his life, lost him his office. Some Galilean Jews passing through Samaria on their way to a festival at Jerusalem were murdered in a Samaritan village. Since Cumanus, who had been bribed by the Samaritans, made no move to punish the guilty, the Jews took revenge into their own hands. An armed band led by two Zealots, Eleazar and Alexander, invaded Samaria and massacred old men, women and children, and laid the villages waste. But Cumanus with part of his troops then fell on the Zealots, and many were slain and others taken prisoner and carried off. Meanwhile, Samaritan envoys appeared before Ummidius Quadratus, the governor of Syria, and charged the Jews with robbery. Simultaneously, however, a Jewish delegation to Quadratus accused the Samaritans, and Cumanus, who had accepted a bribe from them. On hearing this, Quadratus himself went to Samaria and carried out a strict investigation. All the rebels captured by Cumanus were crucified; five Jews convicted of having taken part in the fighting were beheaded; and the ringleaders, Jewish and Samaritan, were sent to Rome, together with Cumanus, to answer for their conduct. Thanks to the intercession of the younger Agrippa who happened to be in Rome at the time, the Jews obtained their rights. Claudius decided that the Samaritan leaders should be executed as guilty, and that Cumanus should be removed from office and sent into exile.¹⁵

4. At the request of the High Priest Jonathan, one of the Jewish

14. *B.J.* ii 12, 2 (228-31); *Ant.* xx 5, 4 (113-17).

15. *B.J.* ii 12, 3-7 (232-46); *Ant.* xx 6, 1-3 (118-36). There is a divergence in essential points between Josephus's account and that of Tacitus, *Ann.* xii 54. According to Tacitus, Cumanus was only procurator of Galilee, while Felix was administrator of Samaria and apparently of Judaea also—'Felix . . . iam pridem Iudaeae impositus . . . aemulo ad deterrima Ventidio Cumano, cui pars provinciae habebatur, ita divisae, ut huic Galilaeorum natio, Felici Samaritae parerent'. Tacitus also reports that Felix and Cumanus shared the blame for the sanguinary excesses which took place, but that Quadratus charged Cumanus only, and even appointed Felix to sit in judgment over him at his trial.

It is impossible to resolve the contradiction between the reports of Tacitus and Josephus. According to Tacitus, the province was divided, with Felix as governor of Samaria (and apparently Judaea), and Cumanus concurrently in charge of Galilee. According to Josephus's exposition, Cumanus and Felix were appointed successively to rule over an undivided Palestine, the first in A.D. 48, the second

nobles whom Quadratus had sent to Rome,¹⁶ the Emperor Claudius handed over the administration of Palestine to one of his favourites, Felix (A.D. c.52-60?),¹⁷ the brother of the influential Pallas. Felix's term of office manifestly constitutes the turning-point in the drama which started in A.D. 44 and reached its bloody climax in A.D. 70. Whereas the period of the first two procurators was comparatively peaceful, and under Cumanus more serious uprisings occurred only sporadically set off by individual malcontents, under Felix rebellion became permanent.

Like his brother Pallas, Felix was a freedman of the imperial family,¹⁸ and probably of Antonia, the mother of Claudius, whence his full name Antonius Felix.¹⁹ The conferring of a procuratorship with military

after his recall in A.D. 52/53. Josephus states that the High Priest Jonathan, who was in Rome at the time of Cumanus's deposition from office, requested the Emperor Claudius to appoint Felix (see below). The detailed narrative of Josephus is clearly to be preferred to the vague remarks of Tacitus. Cf. R. Hanslik, RE s.v. 'Ventidius Cumanus' and E. M. Smallwood, 'Some Comments on Tacitus, Annals xii 54', Latomus 18 (1959), pp. 560-7.

16. B.J. ii 12, 5 (240); cf. Ant. xx 7, 1 (137); 8, 5 (162).

17. B.J. ii 12, 8 (247); Ant. xx 7, 1 (137); Suet. Div. Claud. 28. It seems probable that Felix's appointment fell in A.D. 52 because immediately after mentioning it, Josephus reports that Claudius, after ruling for twelve years, i.e. after the 24th January, A.D. 53, presented Agrippa II with Batanaea and Trachonitis, Ant. xx 7, 1 (138). Admittedly, A.D. 53 is also a possibility, and some writers actually adopt it. But it is an argument in favour of A.D. 52 that Tacitus, Ann. xii 54, reports the deposition of Cumanus among the events of that year; presupposing, of course, that Felix had already administered part of Palestine earlier, at the same time as Cumanus, see above, note 15. Although this assumption can hardly be right, the dating of the deposition of Cumanus in A.D. 52 may be accepted.

On Felix see P. v. Rohden, RE s.v. 'Antoninus' (54); A. Stein, PIR² A 828.

18. Tac. Hist. v 9; Suet. Div. Claud. 28.

19. The *gentilicium* of Felix is given by Tacitus (Hist. v 9) as Antonius, but by Josephus, Ant. xx 7, 1 (137) as Claudius. His brother, Pallas, was a freedman of Antonia, the Emperor Claudius's mother, Ant. xviii 6, 6 (182). (See Tacitus, Annales xi 29, xii 54, and H. Furneaux on these passages.) Felix may have borne the name Claudius. Fragments of an epitaph, discovered between Dora and Athlit in Israel, mention a Tiberius Claudius (? Felix), an *ἐπίτροπος*, as the employer of a certain Titus Mucius Clemens. M. Avi-Yonah, IEJ 16 (1966), p. 259 and pl. 28, restores the inscription as follows:

[Τ]ΤΩΙ ΜΟΥΚΙΩΙ ΜΑΡΚ[ΟΥ ΥΙΩΙ
[ΚΛ]ΗΜΕΝΤΙ ΕΠΑΡΧΩΙ ΕΠ[ΕΙΡΗΣ ΤΟΥ
ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΜΕΓΑΛΟΥ ΑΓΡΙΠΠΙΑ. ΕΠΙ
ΤΙΒΕΡΙΟΥ ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟΥ ΕΠΑΡΧΟΥ ΑΙΓΥΠΤΟΥ
ΕΠΑΡΧΩΙ ΣΠΕΙΡΗΣ ΠΡΩΤΗΣ ΛΕΠΙ
ΔΙΑΝΗΣ ΠΙΠΙΚΗΣ. Β[ΕΝΕΘΙΚΙΑΡΙΩΙ
ΤΙΒΕΡΙΟΥ ΚΛΑΥΔΙΟΥ ΦΗΛΙΚΟΣ?
ΕΠΙΤΡΟΠΟΥ ΣΕ[ΒΑΣΤΟΥ ΙΟΥΔΑΙΑΣ?
ΣΙΜΩΝΙΑΗΣ ΚΑΙ Τ (or Ε)
ΥΙΩΙ ΤΩ(Ν) ΕΑΥΤΩΝ
ΧΑ[ΙΡΕ]

command on a freedman was unprecedented, and can only be accounted for by the influence exercised by freedmen at the court of Claudius.²⁰ As procurator of Palestine, Felix was true to his origin. 'Practising every kind of cruelty and lust, he wielded royal power with the instincts of a slave.' Thus Tacitus's estimate of the man.²¹

Felix was married three times, and all his wives, two of whom are known to us, belonged to royal families.²² One was a grand-daughter of the triumvir M. Antonius and Cleopatra, and through her Felix was related to the Emperor Claudius.²³ Another was the Jewish princess Drusilla, a daughter of Agrippa I and sister of Agrippa II, and the way in which Felix married her confirms the opinion expressed by Tacitus. When Felix assumed office, Drusilla was about 14 years old.²⁴

The dead man is thus described as a b[eneficiarius] of Tiberius Claudiu[s Felix?], the im[perial?] procurator—but unfortunately the word 'Judaea' is not visible on the epitaph. Even the completion of ΣΕ as *αεβδωρον* is not definitely established. The Tiberius Claudius in question may have been an *ἐπίτροπος* but not an imperial one. If that were the case, we cannot be sure that the *cognomen* of Tiberius Claudius was 'Felix'. See the quite different restoration and interpretation in AE 1967 525.

P. v Rohden originally thought that Felix bore the name 'Claudius', *De Palestina et Arabia provinciarum Romanis questiones selectae* (1885), p. 35, but later changes his view. RE s.v. 'Antoninus' (54).

20. In Suet. Div. Claud. 28, the unusual nature of this appointment is singled out: 'Felicem, quem cohortibus et alis provinciaeque Iudaeae praeposuit'. See O. Hirschfeld, SAB 1889, p. 423; cf. F. Millar, *Historia* 13 (1964), pp. 181-2.

In the later years of Claudius's reign (A.D. 49-54), not only freedmen, but also his wife Agrippina exercised an unwholesome influence. Palestinian coins minted in the 13th and 14th year of Claudius afford evidence of her powerful position since the name 'Julia Agrippina' appears on them alongside that of the emperor (see above, § 17, p. 380, note 123). It is probable that a town, or fort, east of the river Jordan was named after her, viz. אגריפינה, Agrippina, between Mount Sartaba and Haurân (see the Cambridge manuscript of Mishnah Rosh-Hashanah II, p. 4, ed. H. Lowe; a Hamburg manuscript and the *editio princeps* have *Agropina*; the Jerusalem Talmud and Codex de Rossi 138 read *Gripina*, the printed text, *Gropina*). The locality is named only in this place in the Mishnah. The Greek form would have been *Αγριππίνιας* (cf. *Τιβεριδς* = טבריא). Cf. M. Avi-Yonah, *The Holy Land* (1966), p. 139.

21. Hist. v 9 'per omnem saevitiam ac libidinem ius regium servili ingenio exercuit'.

22. Suet. Div. Claud. 28, calls him 'trium reginarum maritum'.

23. Tac. Hist. v 9, 'Drusilla Cleopatrae et Antonii nepte in matrimonium accepta, ut eiusdem Antonii Felix progener, Claudius nepos esset'. The name 'Drusilla' is apparently due to a confusion with the other wife of Felix. Antonius had twins by Cleopatra, Alexander and Cleopatra Selene, and a son, Ptolemy Philadelphus (Dio xlix 32, 4). It is not known whose daughter the wife of Felix was. Cleopatra Selene married King Juba of Mauretania and died before 5 B.C., PIR² C 1148.

24. As is evident from Ant. xix 9, 1 (354), according to which she, the youngest of Agrippa I's daughters, was 6 years old when her father died.

Soon after, she was married by her brother Agrippa to Azizus, king of Emesa, after her first betrothed, a son of King Antiochus of Commagene, had declined to marry her because he did not wish to submit to circumcision.²⁵ Felix saw the beautiful queen soon after her wedding, desired her, and with the help of a magician from Cyprus called Simon, prevailed on her to marry him. In defiance of the law, which strictly forbade the marriage of a Jewess with a pagan, Drusilla became the wife of the Roman procurator.²⁶

In public affairs Felix behaved no better than in his private life. As brother of the influential Pallas, he believed that he could commit all kinds of enormities with impunity.²⁷ It is understandable that under a government such as his, hostility against Rome increased enormously. The various stages of its development under, and because of, Felix are easy to trace.²⁸

First of all, in consequence of his misgovernment, the Zealots, who hated the Romans fanatically, gained more and more support among the citizens. How far Josephus was justified in calling the Zealots simply 'bandits' may be left undecided.²⁹ In any case, as the sympathy they evoked from the ordinary people shows, they were not ordinary bandits; and they confined their robberies to their political opponents.

25. *Ant.* xx 7, 1 (139).

26. *Ant.* xx 7, 2 (141-3). Cf. Acts 24:24. Since Azizus died in the first year of Nero, *Ant.* xx 8, 4 (158), this must have taken place in the time of Claudius in A.D. 53 or 54. Drusilla bore Felix a son called Agrippa, who 'together with his wife' (certainly not Drusilla, but her daughter-in-law, the wife of Agrippa) perished in the eruption of Vesuvius, *Ant.* xx 7, 2 (144).

27. Tacitus, *Annales* xii 54, 'cuncta malefacta sibi impune ratus tanta potentia subnixo'.

28. Especially in the account given in *B.J.* ii 13, 2-6 (252-65), which is even more lucid than *Ant.* xx 8, 5-6 (160-72).

29. Josephus is the only source of information on this period of Jewish history. It is necessary to remember that he is not an impartial witness as far as the yearning for Jewish independence from Rome is concerned. His own conduct during the war provides clear evidence of this. He represents all Jewish political groups hostile to Roman rule as 'bandits' or 'robbers'. But expressions which he occasionally uses, such as for instance, *ληστρικός θόρυβος*, cf. *B.J.* ii 12, 2 (228-31), show that it is not clandestine 'robbery' of which he speaks, but a form of civil war. When he speaks of *γόητες και ληστρικοί*, 'impostors and brigands', *B.J.* ii 13, 6 (264), or says *ληστρικών γάρ η χάρα πάσαν ανεπλήσθη και γοήτων ανθρώπων*, *Ant.* xx 8, 5 (160), he equates the 'robber' (*ληστής*; Heb. פּרִיץ) and 'seducer' (*γόης*, מְסִית). And this shows that he regarded people who 'seduced'—or inveigled—others to revolt as gangsters.

Josephus consistently uses the word *ληστής* to describe the Zealots who had made armed resistance against Rome their aim in life', K. H. Rengstorff, *ThWNT* IV, pp. 262-7, on p. 263. See however B. S. Jackson, *Theft in Early Jewish Law* (1972), pp. 36-7. Compare also M. Hengel, *Die Zeloten* (1961), pp. 25-47; S. G. F. Brandon, *Jesus and the Zealots* (1967); also see above, pp. 381-2.

Felix, who was not very particular concerning his methods, contrived to get hold of Eleazar, the party leader, by treachery, and sent him to Rome with his companions, whom he had arrested also. 'But it is impossible to calculate the number of bandits whom he crucified, and of the citizens whom he tracked down and punished as their accomplices.'³⁰

Such perverse severity and cruelty only provoked further lawlessness.³¹ The 'bandits' of whom the country had been purged by Felix were replaced by the *sicarii*, an even more fanatical patriotic faction advocating the assassination of political opponents. Armed with short daggers (*sicae*), from which they received their name,³² they mingled with the crowds, especially during the festival seasons, and unseen, struck down their opponents (*τοὺς διαφόρους*, i.e. collaborators of the Romans), afterwards affecting grief and thereby evading detection. Political murder became so frequent that soon nobody in Jerusalem felt safe. Among those who fell victim to the daggers of the *sicarii* was the High Priest Jonathan who, as a man of moderate views, was hated by the *sicarii* no less than by the procurator Felix. For he had often urged Felix to administer his office more worthily so that he, Jonathan, would not be blamed by the people for having recommended the emperor to appoint him as governor. Felix, wishing to be rid of his troublesome critic, found the easiest way to be assassination; to which end the *sicarii*, normally Felix's deadly enemies, willingly allowed themselves to be used.³³

Political fanatics were joined by religious ones 'with cleaner hands but wicked intentions'.³⁴ Claiming to have been sent by God, they incited the people to frenzied enthusiasm and led them in crowds into

30. *B.J.* ii 13, 2 (253); *Ant.* xx 8, 5 (160).

31. Tac. *Ann.* xii 54.

32. *Ant.* xx 8, 10 (186).

33. In *B.J.* ii 13, 3 (254-7), Josephus does not implicate Felix in the murder of Jonathan, but he does so in *Ant.* xx 8, 5 (161-3). The *sicarii* are also mentioned during the war, when they occupied the fortress Masada; cf. *B.J.* ii 17, 8 (433); iv 7, 5 (404), 9, 5 (516); vii 8, 1-9, 2 (252-406). The author of Acts knew them as a political party: Acts 21:38 mentions 4000 *sicarii* as adherents of 'the Egyptian' for whom Paul of Tarsus was mistaken. According to *B.J.* ii 13, 5 (261-3), 'the Egyptian' brought his followers from the desert, assembled them on the Mount of Olives, and prepared to seize Jerusalem by force.

In Latin *sicarius* is the usual designation for 'assassin'. The law against assassins issued under Sulla is called 'Lex Cornelia de sicariis'.

In bGittin 56a, the expression *אבא סיקרא ריש בריוני* ('ringleader of the *sicarii*, headman of the baryoné') indicates the leader of a political resistance party. In other talmudic passages the word occurs in a general sense, meaning 'outlaw', or 'assassin'; See S. Krauss, *Griechische und lateinische Lehnwörter im Talmud II* (1899), p. 392; M. Hengel, *Die Zeloten* (1961), pp. 55-7.

34. *B.J.* ii 13, 4 (258).

the desert,³⁵ there to show them 'omens of freedom (*σημεία ἐλευθερίας*), a freedom which consisted in casting off the Roman yoke and establishing the Kingdom of God (or to use the language of Josephus, in reform and insurrection). Since religious fanaticism is always the most powerful and most persistent, Josephus is certainly right when he remarks that these visionaries and deceivers contributed no less than the 'bandits' to the downfall of the city. Felix also recognized the dangerous nature of the newly-formed sodalities and everywhere confronted them with the sword.³⁶

The most notorious case of this kind was that of 'the Egyptian', a demagogue also mentioned in Acts 21:38. A Jew from Egypt proclaiming himself a prophet, he assembled in the desert a large number of supporters (4,000, according to Acts; 30,000, according to Josephus's account in *B.J.* ii 13, 5 (261); no figure is given in the Antiquities, but Josephus says there that 400 of the Egyptian's followers were killed and 200 captured, *Ant.* xx 8, 6 (171). He intended to lead them to the Mount of Olives, promising that at his command the walls of Jerusalem would collapse and allow them to enter the city. They would then overpower the Roman garrison and assume control. Felix did not give the prophet enough time to stage the miracle, but attacked with his troops, slaughtered and scattered his followers or took them prisoner. But the Egyptian himself escaped the massacre and disappeared.³⁷

Abortive though it turned out to be, this incident led to a stiffening of the attitude of the anti-Roman forces. Religious and political fanatics (*γόητες καὶ ληστρικοί*) made common cause and 'incited many to revolt, exhorting them to assert their independence, and threatening to kill any who submitted willingly to Roman domination, and to suppress all those who would voluntarily accept servitude. Deploying in gangs throughout the country, they looted the houses of the nobles and killed their owners and set villages on fire, so that all Judaea felt the effect of their frenzy'.³⁸

The abuse of governmental authority by Felix thus ended in alienating a great part of the nation; from this time on, the preaching of resistance against Rome continued incessantly and the agitation to take up arms never stopped until that objective was reached.

Side by side with this wild ferment among the-ordinary people went

35. Retreat into the desert as a prelude to military action is characteristic of Jewish resistance groups from Maccabean times onwards.

36. *B.J.* ii 13, 4 (259-60); *Ant.* xx 8, 6 (167-8).

37. *B.J.* ii 13, 5 (261-3); *Ant.* xx 8, 6 (169-72). Undoubtedly the people believed in a miraculous deliverance and hoped for a return, to which Acts 21:8 also refers. See above, note 33 and Hengel, *op. cit.*, pp. 236-8; cf. also G. Vermes, *Jesus the Jew* (1973), p. 98.

38. *B.J.* ii 13, 6 (264-5); *Ant.* xx 8, 6 (168).

internal conflict amongst the priesthood. The chief priests were at odds with the rest,³⁹ and in the lawless conditions prevailing under Felix's government in Palestine, were even able to send their stewards to the threshing-floors to seize the tithes due to the other priests, many of whom died of starvation.⁴⁰

The imprisonment of the Apostle Paul in Caesarea, an account of which is given in Acts 23-24, occurred during the last two years of Felix's governorship. Paul also had a personal encounter with the procurator and his wife Drusilla in which he did not fail to talk to them of what he thought they needed to hear—of righteousness, chastity and future judgment (Acts 24:25).

While Paul was held prisoner in Caesarea, a dispute arose there between the Jewish and the Syrian inhabitants over equality of citizenship (*ισοπολιτεία*). The Jews claimed precedence because Herod had founded the city. The Syrians, understandably, were reluctant to concede this priority to them. For some time there was street fighting between the two parties. In the end, Felix stepped in on an occasion when the Jews had won the upper hand, quelled them by force and handed over some of their houses to be plundered by the soldiers. When the rioting nevertheless continued, he sent notables from both sides to Rome for the emperor to decide the legal issue.⁴¹ But before the matter could be settled, Felix was recalled by Nero, probably in A.D. 60, but possibly a year or two earlier.⁴² [Text continues on page 467]

39. S. G. F. Brandon, *Jesus and the Zealots* (1967), pp. 114, 118, 121, 125 f., 189, suggests that the latter were in alliance with both the Jewish adherents of Jesus and the Zealots.

40. *Ant.* xx 8, 8 (180-1); 9, 2 (206). Talmudic tradition complains of the violence of High Priestly cliques at this time. In bPes. 57a (a slightly different text also in bYom. 35b; tMen. 13:21, ed. Zuckerman, p. 533, lines 33 ff.) we find the following song: 'Woe is me because of the house of Boethus; woe is me because of their staves! Woe is me because of the house of Hanin; woe is me because of their whisperings! Woe is me because of the house of Cantheras; woe is me because of their pens! Woe is me because of the house of Ishmael ben Ph(i)abi; woe is me because of their fists! For they are High Priests, and their sons are treasurers, and their sons-in-law are trustees, and their servants beat the people with staves!' (M. Freedman, *The Babylonian Talmud, Pesahim* (1938), p. 285). Cf. J. Jeremias, *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus* (1969), pp. 195-6.

41. *B.J.* ii 13, 7 (266-70); *Ant.* xx 8, 7 (173-7). At the time, Caesarea may have had some 50,000 inhabitants, most of whom were Hellenized Syrians. The Jewish population—more than 20,000 according to *B.J.* ii 18, 1 (457)—was in the minority.

42. The exact dates of Felix's recall and the arrival of Festus are disputed. A.D. 60 may be suggested to be the most probable date. A. von Harnack, *Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur* II/1 (1897), pp. 233-9, prefers an earlier date at the very beginning of Nero's reign, some time between A.D. 54 and 56. The grounds for this hypothesis are: (1) In the Chronicle of Eusebius according to the Armenian text, the recall of Felix is said to have taken place in the last year of Claudius,

i.e. A.D. 54 (Euseb. *Chron.*, ed. Schoene II, p. 152); in the Chronicle of Jerome, it is placed in the second year of Nero (Euseb. *Chron.*, ed. Schoene II, p. 155). (2) When after his recall Felix was accused in Rome by the Jews, Pallas secured his acquittal, *Ant.* xx 8, 9 (182). Pallas therefore still had great influence; but he fell into disfavour already at the beginning of Nero's reign, A.D. 55 (Tac. *Ann.* xiii 14). These statements have less force if the following facts are considered: (1) The statements in the Chronicle of Eusebius concerning the history of Judaea in this period are derived entirely from Josephus and so have no independent value. Where Eusebius finds no definite chronological data in Josephus, he uses his own judgment. He places the recall of Felix in the second year of Nero (for Jerome, not the Armenian, has the genuine text of Eusebius here; see ZWTh 1898, p. 35), probably because Josephus had previously, *Ant.* xx 8, 4 (158), mentioned the first year of Nero. (2) The dismissal from office of Pallas had already occurred by 13 February A.D. 55 (viz. before the birthday of Britannicus, Tac. *Ann.* xiii 15, 1; see ZWTh 1898, p. 39; on the evidence of Tacitus the year is quite definite), only a few months, therefore, after Nero's accession on 13 October A.D. 54. It is impossible that everything reported by Josephus on the administration of Felix during the reign of Nero could have happened in this short period, *B.J.* ii 12, 8 (247-70); *Ant.* xx 8, 5-8 (160-81). The above conclusion on the history of Pallas is consequently wrong. The contrary must rather be inferred from the history of Felix, namely that Pallas in spite of his dismissal remained influential—a conclusion which agrees completely with Tacitus's statement (cf. ZWTh, 1898, p. 40). A further argument against an early date for the recall of Felix arises from the revolt of 'the Egyptian' which, according to Josephus, *B.J.* ii 13, 5 (261-3); *Ant.* xx 8, 6 (169-72), occurred under Nero, and not at the beginning of his reign. But this revolt already belonged to the past, to the time when Paul was imprisoned under Felix (Acts 21:38). Paul then spent two years in prison, and it was only afterwards that Felix was recalled.

It is more possible to accept a date before A.D. 60 for Felix's dismissal though one cannot be quite certain about the year. It occurred in the summer, anyway, since Paul, who embarked for Rome not long after Felix's departure, arrived in Crete about the time of the Day of Atonement (i.e. in September/October; see Acts 27:9). But this cannot have been a later summer than that of A.D. 60. As Felix's second successor, Albinus, came to Palestine at the latest in the summer of A.D. 62, see Jos. *B.J.* vi 5, 3 (300-9), only one year, assuming that Felix did not leave till the summer of A.D. 61, would be left for Festus's procuratorship, which in view of the numerous incidents reported from his time, *Ant.* xx 8, 9-11 (182-96), seems too short. The argument in favour of A.D. 61, drawn from *Ant.* xx 8, 11 (193-5), is not convincing. Because Poppaea, in an incident which occurred some time after Festus had taken up office, is described as the wife of Nero, *Ant.* xx 8, 11 (195), which she became only in A.D. 62, Tac. *Ann.* xiv 60; it is argued that Festus's appointment cannot have taken place before A.D. 61. But nothing prevents us from placing that occurrence a year or so after Festus had taken up office. Moreover, Nero's marriage with Poppaea occurred around the time of Festus's death, perhaps even somewhat later. Since the incident referred to in *Ant.* xx 8, 11 (193-5) happened under Festus, Josephus has proleptically described Nero's concubine as his wife.

Some uncertainty remains concerning the year of the imprisonment of Paul in Caesarea. A.D. 57 or even 56 is not impossible. Since Paul was Felix's prisoner for two years, the latter's recall would fall at the earliest in A.D. 58 or 59. For the reasons stated, the date of A.D. 60 is preferable. Note that it was in A.D. 63/4 that Josephus went to Rome to assist priests who had been sent there by Felix, *Vita* 3 (13-14). Cf., for a different view, Ch. Saumagne, 'Saint Paul et Félix, procureur de Judée', *Mélanges Piganiol* III (1966), pp. 1373-86.

5. As successor to Felix, Nero sent Porcius Festus (?A.D. 60-62)⁴³ to Palestine, a man of honest intentions but quite unable to undo the harm caused by his predecessor.

Soon after Festus's assumption of office, the dispute between the Jewish and Syrian townsmen in Caesarea was decided by an imperial rescript to the Syrians' advantage. The Jewish envoys in Rome were unable to press their complaint against Felix because Pallas used his influence on his brother's behalf. The two Syrian envoys, on the other hand, were able to win over by means of bribery a certain Beryllus who was in charge of Nero's Greek correspondence,⁴⁴ and thereby procure an imperial rescript which not only deprived the Jews of the equality with the Syrians with which they were dissatisfied, but declared the 'Hellenes' masters of the city. The bitterness caused by this decision among the Jewish inhabitants of Caesarea found an outlet a few years later, in A.D. 66, in seditious actions which Josephus regards as the beginning of the great war.⁴⁵

Paul, whom Felix had left as a prisoner in Caesarea (Acts 24:27), was interrogated repeatedly by Festus; and in the end was sent, as a Roman citizen and at his own request, to be judged before the emperor in Rome.⁴⁶

Disturbances caused by the *sicarii* were as bad under Festus as they were under Felix. Once again an impostor (this at any rate is what Josephus calls him) led the people into the desert, promising his followers redemption and deliverance from all evils. Festus proceeded

43. *B.J.* ii 14, 1 (271); *Ant.* xx 8, 9 (182). On Festus, see the extremely detailed treatment in RE s.v. 'Porcius' (39).

44. Instead of the name 'Beryllus' given in all manuscripts in *Ant.* xx 8, 9 (183) from Hudson and Haverkamp onward, some printed editions read 'Burrus'. Niese restored the traditional *Βήρυλλος*, while Naber resorted to *Βούρρος* again. This conjecture, which even induced some authors to engage in risky chronological speculations, is particularly regrettable since the characterization 'Nero's tutor who had been appointed secretary of Greek correspondence' does not fit Burrus, the well-known *praefectus praetorio*, who, by the way, was known as such to Josephus; cf. *Ant.* xx 8, 2 (152).

45. *B.J.* ii 14, 4 (284); *Ant.* xx 8, 9 (183-4). The two statements given by Josephus are inconsistent with one another. According to *Ant.* xx 8, 9 (182), the Jewish representatives from Caesarea did not travel to Rome to lodge their complaint against Felix until after Festus's accession to office. According to *B.J.* ii 13, 7 (270), both parties were despatched to Rome by Felix himself. This appears to have been the case, since even *Ant.* xx 8, 9 (183) reports that the Syrian representatives were also in Rome. From *B.J.* ii 14, 4 (284) it would appear that the emperor's decision was not given before A.D. 66. But this is impossible; Pallas, who died in A.D. 62 (Tac. *Ann.* xiv 65), played an important part in the proceedings.

46. Cf. e.g. P. Winter, *Trial*, pp. 83-5; A. N. Sherwin-White, *Roman Society and Roman Law*, pp. 48-70; P. Garnsey, *JRS* 56 (1966), pp. 182-5.

against him with the utmost severity, but it was too late to pacify the country permanently.⁴⁷

The conflict which arose between the priests and King Agrippa II, in which Festus took Agrippa's side, will be discussed in detail in the section dealing with the history of that king.

Festus died in office after scarcely two years as procurator. He was succeeded by two men who, as true followers of Felix, did everything in their power to inflame the situation and bring on the final conflagration.

In the interval between the death of Festus and the arrival of his successor (A.D. 62), total anarchy reigned in Jerusalem. The High Priest Ananus profited from this to secure the death sentence for his enemies, whom he ordered to be stoned. He was a son of the elder Ananus or Annas known from the Gospel history of Jesus' passion. His despotism, however, did not last long, for King Agrippa deposed him even before the new procurator arrived, after he had been in office for barely three months.⁴⁸ Among those executed by Ananus was James, the brother of Jesus.⁴⁹

6. Of the new procurator, Albinus (A.D. 62-64),⁵⁰ Josephus reports that he left no wickedness unexplored. His guiding principle, however, seems to have been to obtain money from any source. He plundered both public monies and private funds; the whole population suffered from his exactions.⁵¹ But he also discovered that it was to his advantage to take bribes from both political parties in the country, from the pro-Roman faction and from their opponents. His venality knew no limits: he accepted presents from the collaborating High Priest Ananias, who although no longer in office was yet a man of considerable influence, and from his enemies, the *sicarii*, and then allowed them both to do as they liked. It is true that he gave the appearance of curbing the

47. *B.J.* ii 14, 1 (271); *Ant.* xx 10, 10 (188).

48. *Ant.* xx 9, 1 (199, 203). P. Winter, *op. cit.*, pp. 18 f.

49. Euseb. *HE* ii 23, 21-4 = Josephus, *Ant.* xx 9, 1 (200). Compare Excursus II to § 17 above, pp. 428-41.

Further, S. G. F. Brandon, *Jesus and the Zealots*, p. 121, and his 'The Death of James the Just: A New Interpretation', *Studies in Mysticism and Religion presented to Gershom Scholem* (1967), pp. 57-69.

50. The date of Albinus's succession to office may be gauged from *B.J.* vi 5, 3 (300-9). Albinus was already procurator four years before the outbreak of the war, and over 7 years and 5 months before the destruction of Jerusalem, when, at the Feast of Tabernacles, a certain prophet of doom, Jesus son of Ananias, made his appearance. These two dates point to the time of Sukkoth in A.D. 62. Albinus must therefore have assumed office at the latest during the summer of A.D. 62.

Our Albinus is probably identical with Luceius Albinus, procurator of Mauretania under Nero, Galba and Otho, and put to death in A.D. 69 as a result of the rivalry between Otho and Vitellius by Vitellius's party (*Tac. Hist.* ii 58-59). See Pflaum, *Carrières* no. 33; *PIR*² L 354

51. *B.J.* ii 14, 1 (272-3). Cf. Brandon *Jesus and the Zealots*, p. 127.

sicarii, but anyone taken prisoner could, if he commanded sufficient money, buy his freedom. 'The only persons left in gaol were those who failed to pay the price.'⁵² The *sicarii* soon found another method of setting free those of their party who were captured. They needed only to seize some of their opponents. Albinus, at the latter's request (by whom he was also bribed) would then exchange *sicarii* in return for the release of the pro-Romans. Once, the *sicarii* held the scribe of Eleazar, captain of the Temple guard and a son of the High Priest Ananias,⁵³ and in return for his liberation secured the release of ten of their own comrades.⁵⁴ In such conditions the anti-Roman party gained more and more power, or as Josephus puts it, 'the audacity of the revolutionaries was stimulated'.⁵⁵ And as their rivals also had a free hand to do as they liked, utter anarchy soon prevailed in Jerusalem. It was a free for all. Men of the 'middle-of-the-road',⁵⁶ of moderate views, were at the mercy of both the procurator and the insurrectionists. Ananias, the High Priest, behaved most outrageously. He quite openly ordered his servants to take the priests' tithes from the threshing-floors and those who dared to object were flogged.⁵⁷ Two worthy relatives of King Agrippa, Costobar and Saul, also tried their hand at banditry⁵⁸ and the man whose duty it was to maintain law and order, Albinus himself, vied with them in this game.⁵⁹ There was therefore nothing particularly remarkable in the fact that on one occasion a High Priest, Jesus son of Damnai, engaged in a pitched street-battle with his successor, Jesus son of Gamaliel, because he did not wish to relinquish his holy office.⁶⁰

To please the city's inhabitants (and make his successor's task more difficult), when Albinus was recalled he left all the prisons empty,

52. *B.J.* ii 14, 1 (273); cf. *Ant.* xx 9, 2 (205).

53. This Eleazar, although still a supporter of the pro-Roman party when his secretary was waylaid by *sicarii*, later gave the signal to revolt by refusing to accept gifts or sacrifices on behalf of the Emperor and the Roman people, *B.J.* ii 17, 2 (409-10). Cf. Winter, *op. cit.*, p. 145; Brandon, *op. cit.*, p. 130.

Instead of 'Avávov in *Ant.* xx 9, 3 (208), we should read 'Avávov with Niese (according to Codex Ambrosianus and the Vetus Latina) and Feldman (Naber retains the incorrect 'Avávov). Cf. J. Derenbourg, *Essai*, p. 248, n. 1, and E. M. Smallwood, 'High-Priests and Politics in Roman Palestine', *JThSt* n.s. 13 (1962), pp. 14-34, on pp. 27-8.

54. *Ant.* xx 9, 3 (208-9). Brandon, *op. cit.*, p. 126.

55. *B.J.* ii 14, 1 (274).

56. *B.J.* ii 14, 1 (275) οἱ μέτριοι.

57. *Ant.* xxx 9, 2 (206-7). On the violence and repression exercised by the High Priests, see above, p. 465 and n. 40.

58. *Ant.* xx 9, 4 (214).

59. *B.J.* ii 14, 1 (272-5).

60. *Ant.* xx 9, 4 (213).

having executed the major criminals and released the rest. 'The prisons were thus empty of inmates, but the country full of robbers'.⁶¹

7. The last of the procurators, Gessius Florus (A.D. 64-66)⁶² was also the worst. He came from Clazomenae and acquired the procuratorship of Judaea through the influence of his wife Cleopatra, who was friendly with the Empress Poppaea. Josephus is at a loss for words to describe the baseness which characterized his administration. Compared with him, Albinus was a 'most righteous' fellow (*δικαιότατος*). So measureless was his tyranny that the Jews regarded Albinus as benevolent by comparison. Whereas Albinus had committed his infamous deeds in secret, Florus was brazen enough to parade them openly.⁶³ The robbery of individuals seemed to him much too petty; he plundered whole cities and ruined whole communities. As long as bandits were willing to share their spoil with him, they could carry on without hindrance.⁶⁴

Such malevolence was beyond endurance. So inflammable was the situation that it now needed but one spark. And the explosion followed with elemental force.

61. *Ant.* xx 9, 5 (215).

62. *B.J.* ii 14, 2 (277); *Ant.* xx 11, 1 (252-3). When the Jews openly took up arms against Rome in May A.D. 66, *B.J.* ii 14, 4 (284), Florus had started the second year of his procuratorship, *Ant.* xx 11, 1 (257). He must therefore have been installed in A.D. 64. The name Gessius Florus, and the adversities the Jews had to suffer under his rule and that of his predecessors, is attested by Tac. *Hist.* v 10 'duravit tamen patientia Iudaeis usque ad Gessium Florum procuratorem'. Cf. PIR² G 170.

63. Cf. Tac. *loc. cit.* (n. 62).

64. *B.J.* ii 14, 2 (277-9); *Ant.* xx 11, 1 (252-7).