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Forward

The purpose of this thesis is to evaluate the reasons for the success of the client kingdom in Judaea under Antipater and his son Herod in relation to the Roman Empire. The first two chapters assess the difficulties that both Antipater and Herod faced in creating a client kingdom that was subservient to the Roman Empire, yet could still enjoy the political and religious freedoms that Jews secured after achieving independence from the Seleucid Empire. The challenges that Antipater faced in establishing the client kingdom under Hyrcanus II, the Hasmonean heir, were twofold. While Judaeans had enjoyed a friendly relationship with Rome in the mid second century BCE, by the early sixties BCE, the Roman agenda had changed. Pompey had set his eyes on Judaea for its riches as well as for its geographical location on the Eastern frontier. Judaeans were set on retaining their freedom, but Rome was not willing to leave Judaea, an unstable and disunited state, independent, while situated in such a politically delicate location between the Romans and the Parthians. Additionally, as Pompey prepared to invade Jerusalem, Aristobulus II and Hyrcanus II fought for the throne of Judaea. The succession crisis further stressed the already religiously fractured state. The first challenge Antipater faced, as the supporter and strategist behind Hyrcanus II, was that he needed to reconcile the factions in Judaea, while also showing his support for the Roman Empire, which he understood would inevitably acquire Judaea as a client state.

The second challenge Antipater faced, and later Herod, was the cultural differences between Romans and Judaeans. Compared to the Pagan practices of
the Romans, Jewish customs were often considered strange and even barbaric. Though the Roman literature describing the nature of the Jewish people is not extensive, the little that they gathered about Jewish customs raised suspicions, especially with respect to the loyalty of the Jewish people towards the Roman Empire. This suspicion served as a backdrop to the interactions between Rome and the Jews in Judaea, as well as Jews in communities throughout the Roman Empire. Jews did not easily adapt to Hellenistic customs, which often isolated them from their neighbors. Jews needed to issue requests to the Roman Empire to send decrees to the cities the Jews inhabited, enabling the Jews to practice their religious customs freely. Antipater and Herod therefore needed to ensure that their relationship with the Roman Empire was secure, so that they could intercede successfully on the behalf of Jews throughout the empire and in Judaea.

The next two chapters describe the reigns of Antipater and Herod, the policies they enacted to strengthen their relationship with Rome, and how these policies paved the way to their success. Antipater encouraged positive relations with whichever Roman leader was in power. He sought opportunities to meet with Roman leaders and develop personal relationships that he could later lean on should he need assistance. Using his skills in diplomacy, Antipater tried to change the image of the Jews in Roman eyes. Antipater then positioned his son Herod to carry out his policies, and to continue to uphold the relationships that Antipater secured between Rome and Judaea.

After Antipater successfully reframed the relationship with Rome, that relationship needed to be nurtured. Herod did not face the same challenges that
his father had faced--namely changing the Roman perception of Judaea--but he did have to see to the client kingdom’s continued amity with Rome. Herod retained his father’s practices by keeping his policies and increasing the population they reached. Herod met with imperial leaders, and sent support and gifts to Roman cities and kingdoms that needed financial help. He hosted important Roman leaders, and was able to boast of the magnificence of Judaea. Through Herod, Judaea gained a strong reputation among Romans as generous and loyal, as seen by the close relationship Herod had with Augustus. Herod led building projects, sponsored events, and brought Hellenistic culture to Judaea without encroaching too heavily on the religious practices of the Jews. Herod’s success in his ability to stabilize Judaea economically and support Jews throughout the Roman Empire was a result of the Roman support he obtained. Because he kept Judaea stable and prosperous in Roman eyes, he was able to protect Judaea.

In the final chapter I analyze the transition from Herod’s reign to that of his sons, with Archelaus taking the title of ethnarch in Judaea proper. Archelaus did not fully comprehend the intricacies of the relationship that Herod nurtured, and therefore could not procure the same support for Judaea during his own reign. Judaeans, who historically were prone to uprisings, needed more than a mediocre leader to keep themselves in Rome’s good graces. Without the ongoing care and contributions of Antipater and Herod, Rome was not consistently reminded of the benefits that Judaea could produce for them. As a result, the life of the client kingdom was cut short, and Judaea became a Roman province. Jewish
communities throughout the empire could no longer rely on the help of Judaea. Archelaus did not possess the diplomatic skills as Antipater and Herod had, and his inability to uphold past policies caused the decline of the kingdom that Archelaus’ predecessors had built.
Chapter 1: The Roman View of the Jews

The relationship between the Jews in Judaea and the Roman Empire in the first century BCE was complicated for several reasons. Rome absorbed Judaea into its empire, as well as many other kingdoms in the east. Judaeans overcame Greek rule, with Roman support, only to lose the complete autonomy they fought so hard to secure a few generations earlier. Another difficulty in the relationship lays in the differences between the two cultures. Rome encouraged a Hellenistic approach to government and daily life, while the Jews were accustomed to living according to interpreted laws set by the Jewish religion. In Judaea, Jews had a court system and abided by Jewish law as accorded by the high priest. The differences between the Jews and the Romans were conspicuous, and, consequently, Jews became the subject of various stereotypes. Some of these stereotypes were based on knowledge acquired through the research of historians into the origin story of the Jews and the identity of their god, while others were based on observation of everyday customs. Some of these customs consisted of practices such as keeping the Sabbath, upholding the dietary laws, and performing circumcision. These primary aspects of Jewish practice aroused both wonder and suspicion since they were so different from, and often contradictory to, Roman customs. The opinions of historians and other commentators range from curiosity to clear disgust, and this reaction subjected the Jewish-Roman relationship to instability even before Judaea became an imperial client state.

One of the most comprehensive researchers and compilers of the origin stories of the Jews was first century Roman historian, Tacitus. Upon arriving at
the subject of how Titus Caesar took over Jerusalem, he tangentially reviews the multiple origin stories of Jewish people that he had collected. He quotes various sources that suggest over five different stories recorded to date.¹ That Tacitus reports so many different ideas on the formation of the Jewish people is uncommon, considering that he usually recorded only one or two origin stories for other nations in his historiographical texts.² While the Jews did not come close to forming the most important or prestigious people from the Roman point of view, the Jewish people and their practices still must have left a significant impression to merit such an elaborate exploration into their history. Romans were curious as to where these people with such contrasting customs may have originated. They used these explanations to further understand the nature of the Jews with whom they interacted with at home and heard about from afar.

The most widely accepted Jewish origin story is that the Jews immigrated to Palestine from Egypt. The written legend begins with Manetho, an Egyptian historian from the third century BCE, and was transmitted by his students and other followers known for their anti-Semitic views, including Chaeremon, Lysimachus, and Apion.³ In the story as told by Manetho, a priest named Osarsiph was expelled from Egypt with a group of lepers.⁴ The Egyptian king Amenophis

⁴ Radin explains that the characterization of the Jews as lepers is significant because according to Romans, bodily defects were viewed as signs of divine disapproval. See Max Radin, *The Jews
forced all the unclean persons and lepers to work in the stone quarries with the other criminals along the Nile River. When they were finally allowed to leave, these people were given the city of Avario to settle. From within this group, Osarsiph—who later renamed himself Moses—successfully led the former lepers to war against Egypt, and ruled there for thirteen years. Following their victory over the Egyptians, the former lepers also conquered other lepers in Syria. The origin of the Jewish nation as told by Manetho was one of barbarity and contamination: the Jews were equated with common criminals and were banished as diseased and immoral people who were hateful to society. He describes the leader Moses as power hungry and bloodthirsty. Even after the Egyptians freed Moses and his people from their servitude in the stone quarries, and gave them land for sustenance and habitation, they still continued to conquer more land and fight gory wars.

In later versions recorded by Manetho’s successors, the details of the story evolve. Lysimachus of Alexandria, a second century BCE mythographer notorious for his prejudice against the Jews, identified the plague that struck Moses and his followers as scurvy or leprosy. He also describes these lepers as beggars, which, along with astrologers and fortunetellers, was a stereotypical Jewish occupation. Lysimachus implies that the Jews were not a respectable
people, but an impoverished, sickly mob, who only caused the rest of the country to suffer. Diodorus Siculus, a Greek historian in the first century BCE, agrees that the Jews were driven out of Egypt for their impiety which caused the gods to hate the Jewish people. He adds that the people who were driven out were cursed with a disease of white marks. The Jews deserved the curse because the gods hated them, so they were therefore responsible for their banishment. The expulsion of such a repulsive people could only be a commendable effort by the Egyptians that would garner favor with the gods for the rest of the country.

Tacitus, a younger contemporary to Josephus, describes the plague in vague terms, and focuses on the departure of the Jewish people and how they formed a community. He first corrected the previous legend and revealed that the king who drove the Jews out of Egypt was not Amenophis, but Bocchoris. The oracle Ammon visited the king and advised him to purge the city of all Jews in order to preserve the welfare of his country, and to stop other Egyptians from catching the Jewish diseases. As stated by the previous ancient scholars, Egyptian gods hated the Jews, and therefore association with them reflected poorly on the Egyptian people. The banishment of the Jews would eliminate the plague that had seized Egypt.

While Tacitus agrees with much of the legend as interpreted by earlier historians, he does not reiterate the description of the plague that struck the Jews.

---


Slingerland, Claudian Policymaking and the Early Imperial Repression of Judaism at Rome, 25


Feldman, Studies in Hellenistic Judaism, 400-407
Instead, he focuses on the lessons of Moses, the most prominent figure of the Jewish people after they became refugees. According to Tacitus, Moses instructed the Jews to hold sacred everything that Romans abhor, and abhor everything that Romans hold as sacred. He also advised the Jews not to trust anyone, and, when asked questions by foreigners, to only give misleading and unhelpful advice. Moses also led the Jews to mistreat their neighbors in the desert by plundering their lands and burning their temples. From the time the Jews gathered as a people, Moses instructed them not only to separate themselves from their gentile neighbors, but also to instigate confusion and prolong difficulties for those who came in contact with them. In Tacitus’ opinion the real characteristics of the Jews can be understood through their leadership and laws. The fact that the Jewish people were diseased only proves that they were predisposed towards this type of behavior. Their distasteful nature was of their own creation through the education of their people.

Tacitus lists other claims that the origin of the Jewish nation was related to Cretan and Ethiopian antiquity. In one such story, the claim was that the Jews originated in Crete, but were exiled, and therefore settled in Libya. Again, the association with Cretans established a certain prestige, since the Romans admired Cretan civilization. The legend also states that at the same time that the Jews were banished, Jupiter deposed Saturn, who was considered to be a just god. Through a connection to the great god Saturn, Romans may have seen a parallel injustice between the Egyptians banishing the Jews and Jupiter deposing Saturn. Tibullus,

---

12 Tacitus, The Histories, 5
13 Feldman, Studies in Hellenistic Judaism, 363-364
a first century BCE poet and writer, and Cassius Dio, a second century historian, connect Saturn with power and influence, as the planet in the highest orbit, as well as with the Sabbath, the seventh day of the week. The move to Africa connects them to yet another civilization, Ethiopia. The Ethiopians were known for their bravery, piety and wisdom. As descendants of these people, the story implies that the Jews inherited these characteristics. Here too, however, the Jews were forced to leave by Cepheaus, the Ethiopian ruler, as a result of fear and hatred of the Jews.

While these authors generally vilify the Jewish nation, there is an element in each that still elevates the status of the Jews above other nations. As noted with Saturn and the Ethiopians, the Jews were regularly associated with nations and deities respected for their histories. The fact that the Jews were connected so early with nations that could claim such a long heritage implies that the Jews must have also had a far-reaching lineage. Pompeius Trogus, a first century BCE historian, suggests that the Jews were in contact with the legendary Semiramis, the founder of Babylon and Nineveh. Tacitus puts the date of the Jewish departure from Egypt during the reign of the Egyptian goddess Isis, whom Romans regarded as the greatest deity of the Egyptians. Apion surprisingly also connects the Jews to Greek gods, Inachus, king of Argos, the ancestor of Dionysus and son of the Titans. He believed the gathering of the Jews as a people, was simultaneous with

---

15 Feldman, Studies in Hellenistic Judaism, 395-398
16 Ibid., 548.
17 Tacitus, The Histories, 5
the founding of Rome. Jews are also connected to the Solymi, a celebrated people in Homer’s poems who founded the city Hierosolyma, which is associated with Jerusalem and was considered a glorious city.\textsuperscript{18} However, even with the redeeming quality of a well-connected and long established ancestry that appears in many of the tales, the Jews were always regarded as a nation that caused harm to others and needed to be marginalized, regardless of their origin.

Once passed the establishment of the Jewish people as a nation, ancient authors often explore the character of the Jewish god, a divinity both condemned and revered. One of the sticking points between Romans and Jews was that Jews refused to associate with the Roman gods, while Romans were accepting of foreign deities. Rumors circulated relating to who this god was that caused the Jews hate all other gods. Democritus, a Greek philosopher in the third and fourth centuries BCE, claimed that the Jewish god was an ass. According to the legend, a herd of animals led the Jews to a source of water after years of wandering in the desert without sufficient sustenance. In recognition of the relief and guidance the herd brought the Jews, they worshipped the ass as their savior ever since, and to sanctify this relationship, every seventh year the they caught a foreigner and sacrificed him to the ass.\textsuperscript{19} Democritus specifically describes the supposed Jewish customs of human sacrifice and cannibalism to demonize the Jewish religion. Especially from the Roman perspective, these practices were considered barbaric: those who celebrated these practices should not be tolerated.

\textsuperscript{18} Feldman, \textit{Studies in Hellenistic Judaism}, 398 - 400
\textsuperscript{19} Slingerland, \textit{Claudian Policymaking and the Early Imperial Repression of Judaism at Rome}, 17
As proof of the claim that the Jewish god was an ass, Apollonius Molon and Posidonius of the first and second centuries BCE report that according to their sources, Antiochus Epiphanes, king of the Seleucid empire in 175 BCE, was curious about the Jewish god, and therefore went to the temple and entered the Holy of Holies. There, he found a Greek man captured by the Jews and living in the sanctuary. The man explained that during his stay in the Temple, the Jews served him large amounts of food in order to fatten him up so he would be a respectable sacrifice for their god. At the ceremony, the Jews would swear oaths of hatred against the Greeks. In a close variation, Apion claimed that Antiochus found an ass’ head in the Holy of Holies. Combining the two ideas, Diodorus Siculus writes that Antiochus found a bearded man sitting on an ass in the Holy of Holies. The ancient authors appear to piece together whatever they knew of the Jews through rumors and word of mouth in order to present theories on the practices of the Jewish religion. Though these stories may reflect a genuine curiosity, the details of the stories suggest that they were highly influenced by personal biases in their depictions of Jewish origins and beliefs.

Several other writers identify the Jewish god with Greek and Roman divinities, a common practice among Romans called religious syncretism. Since Romans often fused their own beliefs with those of other foreign polytheistic religions, the idea the nature of the Jewish god might be revealed by this approach.

---

21 Slingerland, *Claudian Policymaking and the Early Imperial Repression of Judaism at Rome*, 19
seemed probable. Plutarch, a Greek philosopher of the first and second centuries, suggested that the Jewish god was Adonis or Bacchus. If Adonis were the Jewish god, it would explain why the Jews abided by the strange custom of abstention from pork: since Adonis was killed by a wild boar, such a practice would be an appropriate commemoration of his death. Feldman explains that the word “adon” was the Semitic word for lord, thereby making Adonis the general name for God. Ovid also makes a connection between Adonis and the Jewish god in his *Ars Amatoria*. He advised, “Don’t miss the shrine of Adonis, mourned by Venus,/ or the synagogue - Syrian Jews / worship there each Shabbat.” The parallel structure of the shrine of Adonis and the synagogue of the Syrian Jews indicates a relationship between the two. Josephus explains that the connection to Bacchus may be based on the golden vine that resided in the Temple, an object that may symbolize wine. Pompeius Trogus connects the Jews to Udaeus, the spartoi of Thebes and military companion of Dionysus, the Greek counterpart to Bacchus. Though these are the two main gods that the Romans associate with the Jewish god, they also compared him with Zeus: Josephus quotes the Letter of Aristeas, a Hellenistic work from the second century BCE, which says that the god of the Jews is identical to Zeus. In an attempt to comprehend the customs of a nation

---

22 Some examples of immigrant gods that Romans used included the Greek god Heracles, renamed Hercules, Apollo, Castor, and Pollux. Another religion that arrived in Rome was the cult of Mithras from Persia, a mystery religion whose participants kept their practices a secret. See Hilary Swain and Mark Everson. Davies, “Religion,” in *Aspects of Roman History, 82 BC - AD 14: A Source - Based Approach* (London: Routledge, 2010), 318 - 319.


24 Feldman, *Studies in Hellenistic Judaism*, 539


26 Feldman, *Studies in Hellenistic Judaism*, 537
so completely separate in belief, the Romans tried to make connections with the figures that they did understand.\textsuperscript{27}

The fact that the Jews believed in only one god and refused to worship any others made many Romans hesitant and defensive towards the spread of Judaism. Valerius Maximus reveals that the reason that the Jews were expelled in 139 BCE was because of the fear that they were spreading oriental ideas. He declared, “The same Hispalus banished the Jews from Rome because they attempted to transmit their sacred rites to the Romans, and he cast down their private altars from public places.”\textsuperscript{28} According to some Roman historians, the Jews were spreading the customs of the cult of Jupiter Sabazius, or Dionysus. Since the cult of Dionysus was suppressed by a decree from the senate in 186 BCE, the extreme measure taken by the Roman government to banish them is not surprising.\textsuperscript{29} However if the Roman government did have knowledge of the religion the Jews were spreading, they understood that in order to convert, one must accept the Ten Commandments, including the commandment that “You shall have no other gods besides me.”\textsuperscript{30} Hispalus exiled the Jews for fear that they would spread their foreign ideas and simultaneously discredit the Roman deities, leading to political

\textsuperscript{27} There is a debate as to whether there was syncretism, the act of melding foreign beliefs or practices to one’s own, between the Sabazius-cult and Judaism as Hengel suggests, or if there was simply a confusion of the words Sabazius and Sabbath as Stern explains. Lewy agrees that the reason for the association between the two was a result of confusion, but he identifies the confusion in the way that Valerius Maximus understood his source, Livy. Maximus confused two senatus consulta, one dealing with Jews and the other with Sabazius. See Lane, Eugene N. "Sabazius and the Jews in Valerius Maximus: A Re-Examination." The Journal of Roman Studies 69 (1979): 35-38.

\textsuperscript{28} Valerius Maximus, "Facta Et Dicta Memorabilia," in Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism, trans. Menahem Stern, vol. 1 (Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1974), 358.

\textsuperscript{29} Feldman, Studies in Hellenistic Judaism, 542

\textsuperscript{30} Exod. 20:3.
and religious unrest in Roman cities. If Romans accepted these new laws, they would desert their pagan practices, an act which could easily be perceived as betrayal.

From the Roman perspective the Jews’ offensive characteristics were not limited to the spread of their religion and detachment from all Pagan practices. Romans claimed that Jews were also guilty of specifically spreading prejudicial ideas and hostility towards anyone that did not practice as the Jews demanded. Tacitus argues that the first thing that Jews teach to new followers is to hate all other gods, and to believe that the Jewish god is superior to all others. What was originally a call for monotheistic practices became for Romans a barbaric institution based on separation and contempt of all others. Philostratus later reflects:

The Jews have long fallen away, not from the Romans alone, but from all mankind; for a people that devises an uncompanianable life, declines to associate at a table with others, as well as partake in drink offerings,

32 Tacitus, The Histories, 4
34 According to Kraemer, it is difficult to know for sure the extent to which all Jews observed the dietary laws described in Leviticus and Deuteronomy. Even so, it was possible for Jews to dine and socialize with non-Jewish neighbors while still observing the biblical prohibitions. Some Jews who were nervous about losing their Jewish identity through mixing with the gentiles observed stricter dietary laws, which created a greater degree of separation by designating certain foods as “Jewish foods,” and others as “gentile foods.” Again here, it is difficult to know the exact numbers, but it appears that enough Jews observed the stricter set of laws that gentle commentators noted it. See David Charles. Kraemer, Jewish Eating and Identity through the Ages (New York: Routledge, 2007), 37.
prayers and incense offerings, stands further removed from us than Susa and Bactra, and yet more distant dwelling Indians.\textsuperscript{35}

Jews separated themselves from the customs that created unity and fellowship between the Roman people as well as other nations. They lived among Romans, but were like foreigners in many other aspects of their lifestyle. In earlier texts, Apollonius Molon notes that the Jews did not produce any inventions of any use,\textsuperscript{36} indicating that they were a worthless to society and therefore unwelcome. With even more ferocity, Quintilian insists that it is a disgrace for the founders of a city to have any people hurtful to others in their community, and specifically cites the Jews as an example.\textsuperscript{37}

Though these opinions of Jewish separatism were popular, Jewish proselytism did actually increase. There was a large enough community of proselytes to cause authors to take note of the religious activity taking place. Horace, a first century BCE poet, refers to the missionary zeal of the Jews in a dialogue, “We, like the Jews will compel you to be one of our throng.”\textsuperscript{38} Seneca in the next generation observed that, “Meanwhile the customs of this accursed race have gained such influence that they are now received throughout the world. The vanquished have given laws to the victor.”\textsuperscript{39} Though to Seneca the result of Jewish proselytism was unsavory, he still had to admit that there were many who


\textsuperscript{37} Askowith, \textit{The Toleration and Persecution of the Jews in the Roman Empire}, 71.


were receptive toward these ideas, regardless of whether it was of short duration, the true adoption of some customs, or a complete conversion. The types of proselytes ranged from people who adopted monotheism and were considered “god fearers,” to those who took upon themselves all of the Jewish practices and fully converted. These people were referred to as “proselytes of righteousness.” Wherever a person may have lain on this spectrum, the hateful practice of accepting only one god and rejecting all others was essential. A requirement that was so antithetical to the Roman way of life was gaining significant ground.

When Philo describes the population of Jews he asserts that the Jews comprise half the world. Though this statistic is clearly an exaggeration, it does shed light on the significance of the proselytizing activity, even if only a small population actually fully converted.

Even if most Romans were not involved in the conversion process and did not care to learn about Jewish customs, there was still an awareness of the main, or at least most noticeable, Jewish customs, such as the commemoration of the Sabbath. For a people that are so infrequently mentioned in Roman and Greek literature, when Jews are brought up, it is often in relation to this holiday. Horace for example writes, “I mind it well, but I’ll tell you at a better time. Today is the thirtieth day, a Sabbath. Would you affront the circumcised Jew?”

---

41 Philo, "On the Life of Moses II," in *The Works of Philo: Complete and Unabridged*, trans. Charles Duke Yonge ([Peabody, Mass.]: Hendrickson, 1993), 5.27. A full conversion would involve a circumcision. Many Romans considered altering this part of the body to be causing a defect, and would therefore only accept some of the Jewish customs. This can also explain why there were more female converts than male converts. See Rabello, "The Attitude of Rome towards Conversions to Judaism (Atheism, Circumcision, Proselytism),” 40
42 Horace, "Sermones," 324-325
recognizes the Jewish custom of circumcision, and more specifically is aware of
the fact that Jews avoided work and all business transactions on the Sabbath. Ovid
even lists the Sabbath as one of the ideal days to pursue young women since the
stores were closed, thereby pausing the regular hustle and bustle that would
normally keep them occupied. Romans noticed that Jews refrained from traveling
on the seventh day and were mostly found on their homes or in the synagogues.

Although this awareness was present, the Jews’ reasons for these
restrictions were not as widely known, and therefore often confused and ridiculed.
Knowing that the Jews did not perform the regular activities of the day, some
claimed that they were lazy. Seneca remarked that the Sabbath was simply an
excuse for indolence. It of course did not help that the Sabbath was on the day of
Saturn, a cursed day when Jupiter expelled Saturn.\textsuperscript{43} Jews were in effect
celebrating a holiday on the day of the expulsion of one of the most revered
Roman deities. In a similarly uncomplimentary explanation, Apion claims that the
Sabbath originated to commemorate the seventh day following the six-day march
once the Jews had departed from Egypt. He explained that the Jews had tumors in
their groins, and therefore called the seventh day a “sabbaton”, preserving the
Egyptian terminology for disease of the groin.\textsuperscript{44} Even Plutarch, who tended to
take a more positive approach to the Jewish religion,\textsuperscript{45} attacked the observance of
the Sabbath as resembling a superstition worse than atheism.\textsuperscript{46} Only a few authors

\textsuperscript{43} Feldman, \textit{Studies in Hellenistic Judaism}, 363
\textsuperscript{44} Flavius Josephus, "Flavius Josephus Against Apion," in \textit{The Complete Works}, trans. William
the groin was called “sabbo”. See Slingerland, \textit{Claudian Policymaking and the Early Imperial
Repression of Judaism at Rome}, 25-26
\textsuperscript{45} Louis H. Feldman, \textit{Studies in Hellenistic Judaism}, 552
\textsuperscript{46} Ibid., 537-538
such as Cassius Dio and Nicholas of Damascus took a more positive point of view and identified the Sabbath as a day of rest, dedicated to learning, sacred rights, religious customs, and meditations on the laws of Moses. Of the two, Nicolaus of Damascus may have only understood these customs as a result of his stay in Judaea under the rule of Herod. Otherwise, many of the true reasons behind the celebration of the Sabbath were a mystery to Romans.

The most common misconception about the Jewish Sabbath was that it was a day to mourn and fast. Pompeius Trogus explained that Moses returned to his ancestral home in Damascus and went to Sinai where he consecrated the seventh day as Sabbath, and that it should be a day of fasting to commemorate the seventh day that ended their hunger and wandering. The error in associating the Jewish Sabbath with a fast day is not a surprising assumption. If the Sabbath was considered a holiday, Jews definitely did not celebrate their holidays as the Romans did. When Romans celebrated a holiday, there were massive festivals and excited crowds in the streets. Jews, however, remained at home for a day of study and prayer, and refrained from manual labor. When the streets of the Roman neighborhoods would be loud, crowded, and exhilarated, the Jewish neighborhoods were quiet. This divergence in celebrations may account for the idea that the Sabbath was a day that the Jews designated for fasting. Additionally, Jews did not light fires or cook on the Sabbath, nor did they collect their corn dole. Meleager of Gadara refers to the dullness or coldness of the Sabbath when he

---

47 Askowith, *The Toleration and Persecution of the Jews in the Roman Empire*, 88-90
49 Askowith, *The Toleration and Persecution of the Jews in the Roman Empire*, 86
muses,” If your lover is some Sabbath keeper, no great wonder! Love burns even on the cold Sabbaths."

The reference to the Sabbath as being cold may reflect the fact that the Jews did not light fires or heat up food on this day. On other days of the week Jews would eat with gentiles, but on the Sabbath they did not. Each of these abstentions could reasonably lead to the conclusion that one could not eat on the Sabbath.

Augustus, addressing his stepson Tiberius, wrote, “No Jew, my dear Tiberius, observes his Sabbath fast so scrupulously as I have kept fast today.”

Augustus’ knowledge of the Sabbath, like that of Nicolaus of Damascus, may have resulted from a close relationship with Herod, the client king of Judaea, or possibly from his household slaves, many of whom were Jewish and observed the Sabbath. Given that Augustus had the opportunity to learn the Jewish customs simply through association, it is surprising that he still understood the Sabbath to be a day of fasting. If this assumption was solely based on the knowledge gained from his relationship with Herod, the mistake is logical. Though Herod did keep some Jewish customs, this was only to keep appearances before the more religious groups within the Judaea. Herod quite possibly did not observe the Sabbath as zealously as other religious Jews did, and may have not celebrated it as regularly. Additionally, Augustus was responsible for the allocation of the corn

---

50 Feldman, Jew and Gentile in the Ancient World: Attitudes and Interactions from Alexander to Justinian, 162
to the Jews on the day following the Sabbath. He must have instructed the
distributors to save the corn for the following day without fully comprehending
the reason that the Jews did not pick it up on the scheduled day for allotments.

As described by Horace in conjunction with the Sabbath, another
identifying Jewish custom that was often ridiculed was the practice of
circumcision. For many Romans, the idea of repressing circumcision was a matter
of public safety rather than a form of religious oppression. Circumcision was also
viewed as a mutilation, and circumcised men were not allowed to participate in
the Olympic games. Though this custom was distasteful to the Romans, they did
understand that it was essential for Jewish males. In one of the fragments of
Petronius’ writings, he notes, “The Jew may worship the pig-god and clamor to
the high heaven, but unless he also cuts back his foreskin with the knife, he shall
go forth from the people and emigrate to the Greek cities, and shall not tremble at
the fasts of Sabbath imposed by the law.” The conjunction of the Sabbath fast
day and the custom of circumcision emphasizes that to an outsider’s point of view,
these are the most essential customs in the Jewish religion. Specifically, Petronius
perceives that without the act of circumcision, a Jewish male would not be
accepted in any Jewish community. Tacitus explains that Jews performed
circumcision in order to distinguish themselves as a people. He does not record,
however, that Jews were not alone in performing circumcisions, which, as Philo
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53 Philo, "On the Embassy to Gaius: The First Part of the Treatise on Virtues," in *The Works of
Philo: Complete and Unabridged*, trans. Charles Duke Yonge ([Peabody, Mass.]: Hendrickson,
1993), XXIII.
54 Feldman, *Jew and Gentile in the Ancient World: Attitudes and Interactions from Alexander to
Justinian*, 155
explains, was also an Egyptian custom. Diodorus Siculus, a Greek historian in the first century BCE, cites the origin of circumcision as Egyptian.

In Petronius’ passage describing the importance of circumcision, he also refers to the Jewish god as a “pig-god,” subscribing to the popular opinion that there was an association between the dietary restriction of eating pork and the identity of the Jewish god. Though he attacks this aspect of the religion in passing, he does take note of yet another custom that distinguished the Jews from their neighbors. The observance of the Jewish dietary laws, and especially refraining from pork was not only strange to Romans who ate it regularly, but for some was even perceived as attacking the values of Rome. Plutarch quotes his grandfather, who proclaimed that the Jews refrained from the most legitimate meat. On the other hand, Plutarch also tries to understand the reason that Jews abstain from eating pork and offers two explanations. First he claims that the Jews abstain from pork for medical reasons. He observes that every pig is covered on the under side by lepra and scaly eruptions. If there is a general weakness in a person’s health, this can spread all over the body. Plutarch suggests another theory, that the Jews removed the pig from their diet in recognition of its usefulness, for having taught them to sow and plow. Just as they honor the ass for showing them where the water was, they also honor the pig for showing them the ways of agriculture.

Though there was a definite range of opinions on this Jewish restriction, the fact

58 Plutarch, "Quaestiones Convivales," 550 - 562
59 Feldman notes that the Egyptians and the Cretans had a similar philosophy towards the pig. The Egyptians abstained from eating pork because like with the Jews, the pig taught them agricultural practices. For the Cretans, the people abstained from eating pork because the pig did a favor for Zeus. See Feldman, *Studies in Hellenistic Judaism*, 533-536 n. 32
that it created yet another separation between the Jews and their surrounding communities is what put it on the Roman radar.

The customs that Romans became the most aware of, including celebrating the Sabbath, circumcision, dietary restrictions, and laws against worshipping other gods were so noticeable because of the distinctions they made on an everyday basis. For example, during a Roman holiday, an observant Jew could not praise the Roman deities, nor feast with fellow Romans. On Saturdays Jews were found either in their homes or in synagogues, no longer working in the usual fashion with the larger community. Historians and philosophers have tried to understand the reasons for such practices and each has constructed a general analysis of the religion, which encouraged the transmission of inaccurate and often prejudicial theories towards Jews. These regular practices are even more distinct because they specifically interrupt the regular Roman customs. Earlier in the second century BCE Jews were banished for proselytizing and spreading their ideas, and later Jews often needed to request exemptions from aspects of Roman law in order to uphold their own laws. The strong contrasts between the nations, and the suspicions and confusion regarding Jewish customs created strains in the Roman relationship to the Jews.
Chapter 2: From an Independent State to a Client Kingdom

In addition to the cultural misconceptions that Romans held about Jewish practices and people, political interactions between Judaea and Rome also set the stage for the relationship that would later develop between Antipater and Herod, and Julius and Augustus Caesar. The first formal interaction between the two sides occurred in the second century BCE, following the Jewish victory over the Greeks in Judaea. The Jews of Judaea wanted to establish an autonomous state that could provide its own judicial and legislative bodies without seeking approval from foreign powers. The leaders of Judaea had the foresight to recognize, however, that they were still vulnerable to stronger states, even if they were independent for the moment. Judaeans therefore sought an alliance with Rome, a powerful empire and an impressive ally, which could easily intimidate the Jews’ enemies. As Roman interests in the East became more extensive, however, the benefit of this relationship declined. Rome could not possibly leave such a small and troublesome state free from Roman control, and the Jews were adamant in

---

60 In response to the harsh laws set upon the Jews by Antiochus IV, the Hasmonean family, a group of radical reformists fought against the Seleucids in 161 BCE, and lost. Schwartz disagrees with Tcherikover’s view that the revolt was an effort by the general population, as well as Sievers opinion that the rebel group was made up of several factions that joined together for this cause. Schwartz explains that sometimes the Hasmoneans had the support of the larger Jewish community, but not consistently. See Seth Schwartz, Imperialism and Jewish Society, 200 B.C.E. to 640 C.E. (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2001), 32 - 33. It was only during the reign of Simon in 142-1 BCE, Judas Maccabeus’ brother who led the revolt after Judas and Jonathan, that the Jews attained their independence in Judaea. According to Schürer, when the Jews were successful, it was partially a credit to their own organization, but their victories and defeats were also dependent on stability and internal organization of the Syrian empire. See Schürer, The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ I, 164 - 199

61 Under the Seleucid dynasty in 167 BCE, Antiochus IV enacted several laws prohibiting Jews from observing their religious customs and replaced these Jewish observances with Pagan rituals. If one did not conform to this law, he was put to death. Jews were forced to sacrifice to Pagan gods in each town, and an altar for such sacrifices was built in Jerusalem. Greeks overseers were sent to each city to see that Jews followed these ordinances, and enact punishments when they refused. See Schürer, The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ I, 155
their demands to rule their country through self-government and by the requirements of Jewish law. The lack of strong leadership in Judaea, which was dependent on Roman assistance, in such a fractured state split along political and religious lines, heightened Jewish vulnerability. Judaeans resented that Roman support for either side in the Judaean fight for control of the throne was in truth self-serving. Eventually, when Rome took over Judaea as a new client kingdom, the resentment turned into resistance, which Rome would not tolerate.

According to the text of Maccabees I, the relationship between the Jews of Judaea and the Romans was initiated by the Jews in 161 BCE through a declaration of friendship backed by the Roman senate. In the eighth chapter, Judas Maccabeus sends representatives to Rome in an attempt to establish diplomatic relations between the two nations. He is impressed by Rome’s victories abroad against enemies such as the Gauls, Macedonians, and Spaniards, and hears about the heavy casualties these nations incurred when fighting against the Roman army. Aware of the terrors felt by Roman enemies, Judas understands that it is better to have the Roman government support Judaea than one day feel its wrath. The benefits of protection gained through this friendship, and the ability to avoid the harsh fates of other enemy nations, made the attempt at an alliance a worthwhile endeavor. The text also suggests that Judas wanted to make an alliance with Rome because he admired its governing body. He praises the fact that the ruling consul was chosen by the citizens of Rome, rather than by one self-

62 E. Mary. Smallwood, The Jews under Roman Rule: From Pompey to Diocletian (Leiden: Brill, 1976), 5 - 7. The relationship established was not a formal alliance sanctioned by the law of the assembly, but rather a decree by the senate. Additionally, Smallwood notes that the it is unclear how long this treaty would last since Judas Maccabaeus was not chosen as the leader through Judaean law and therefore did not have the authority to initiate treaties with foreign governments.
serving senator who forced his rule on the rest. He declares, “Yet for all this none of them wore a crown or was clothed in purple, to be magnified thereby.”

Judas attempts to create an alliance with a nation that he respects for its great power and admires for its style of governance.

From the point of view of the Jews, having a secure title as friends of Rome was a point of pride. The alliance as described in Maccabees I provides that the Jews and Romans would protect each other, both militarily and economically.

If Rome entered a war, Judaea would not supply grain, money, ships, arms, or any other kind of support to Rome’s enemies, or to the allies of Rome’s enemies; Rome would do the same for Judaea. However, even with this alliance in place, there is no evidence that the Romans ever supported the Jews against their enemies militarily. Yet, while there was a lack of support from the Romans, the Jews still made a consistent effort to renew this alliance in future generations. Though in practice the Roman promises stated in the alliance may have just been a formality, it was clear to the Jews that the cultivation of a positive formal relationship with Rome, even if it was just in words alone, was preferable to no alliance at all. Since Roman power was undoubtedly stronger it was in the best
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63 According to Goldstein, Judas was not aware of the fact that there were actually two consuls elected. See Jonathan A. Goldstein, trans., *1 Maccabees* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1976), 8:16.

64 *1 Maccabees* 8:14.

65 It is also possible that Judas was convinced of the prophecy recorded in Daniel 2:22, that following the kingdom of the Greeks, there would be one last world kingdom. Since Rome was at this point a republic, Jews were more secure in feeling that their kingdom would be this last kingdom to rule. Judas therefore may have praised the Roman government thinking that according to the prophecy, Rome was not a threat. See Goldstein, *1 Maccabees*, 355

66 After Rome and Judaea established a treaty of friendship, Rome did send a letter to Demetrius I, the Syrian king, prohibiting him from taking any hostile actions against the Jews, since the Jews were allies of the Romans. The letter however arrived too late, and Judas already suffered a defeat. See Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ I*, 169 - 173

67 Smallwood, *The Jews under Roman Rule: From Pompey to Diocletian*, 7
interest for the Jews to establish a relationship on their own terms rather than have one forced upon them following a Judaean defeat. When the alliance was renewed in 143 BCE, the Romans felt the alliance was still harmless and that it would simply serve as an annoyance to the Syrian king whose garrisons were still stationed in Jerusalem in an attempt to reestablish control. Rome allowed Judaea a greater sense of independence through the continuance of alliances with Judaea, while the Syrian king still attempted to keep it as a dependent state.68

In chapter 14 of Maccabees I, there is another recorded communication with Rome following the death of Jonathan, Judas’ brother, who was named the new leader of the Jews following Judas’ death. Bereaved over the death of this great leader, Rome sent bronze tablets69 to Judaea expressing its desire to renew the friendship and alliance that was once established with Judah and Jonathan. In response to the letters sent to the Jews, Simon, the high priest, sent Numenius to Rome bearing a gift of a large golden shield to confirm the alliance.70 While it is recorded that Rome took the initiative to reinstate this friendship, it is improbable that the Romans were actually the first to pursue the alliance.71 The Jews were proud of this relationship and wanted to see it continue, while for the Romans the connection was not a necessity. The Jews therefore may have recorded that the

68 Smallwood, The Jews under Roman Rule: From Pompey to Diocletian, 6.
69 Josephus, “The Antiquities of the Jews,” 12.10.5. The creation of these bronze tablets was not a procedure specific to diplomatic relations with the Jews. The earliest of such tablets that survived is in the form of a letter in 186 BCE publishing a decree for the Teurani. Regarding whether or not bronze tablets actually existed, though the tablets cannot be identified today, it is definitely plausible that they were created. Another such tablet is mentioned in relation to a treaty between Rome and Kibyra. Josephus also writes about the existence of bronze tablets for the treaty established with Judah. Miriam Pucci Ben Zeev, Jewish Rights in the Roman World: The Greek and Roman Documents Quoted by Josephus Flavius (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 381 - 386.
70 Maccabees I 8:16-18
71 Smallwood, The Jews under Roman Rule: From Pompey to Diocletian, 7-10 note 15.
Romans sought to renew their friendship, an exaggeration resulting from the Judaean pride that the Romans accepted their extension of friendship.

Even though the first alliance brought few tangible benefits for Judaea, it persisted in renewing the state’s status as “socii et amici populi Romani.” As a virtually independent state, the ability to consort with such a powerful nation was a source of empowerment. In the generations immediately following, the relationship between Rome and Judea became less vital to Judaea, as far as one can judge from surviving documentation. Once Judea had been able to gain its full independence, it no longer felt the need to reinstate its alliance regularly, a relationship that had begun at the request of Judea. The short-lived euphoria that came with complete independence overpowered the feeling that it was necessary to nurture the relationship with Rome.

Before Pompey entered the scene and reconstructed the Judaean government, Judaea was politically and socially unstable. In future years, this instability would allow Pompey to take advantage of Judaea’s internal divisions and conquer it. The main sects that aroused controversies in Judaea were the Pharisees and the Sadducees. Though these groups were minorities within Judaea, they were centrally located near the Temple in Jerusalem. Because of their prominence in Jerusalem, Jewish leaders often needed to side with one or the other to gain political support. Schurer explains that the name Sadducees, צדוקים, comes from the name of the priest Zadok. His descendants had held the priestly

---

72 Ibid., 10-11
offices since the time of King Solomon.\textsuperscript{74} During this time period the Sadducees were the main aristocratic party that dealt with the political matters of the state. Sicker explains that originally, the Sadducees devoted themselves to the Maccabean party, the governing group of Judaea, and therefore became more involved in the political and military aspects of the state in the future. They were devoted to diplomatic affairs and therefore needed to speak Greek. By learning Greek, these diplomats were able to minimize apparent cultural differences and communicate with leaders foreign to their own country. This ability to assimilate with the culture of foreign leaders made the Sadducees a more cosmopolitan group, and as members of this culture, the Sadducees brought Hellenistic ideas back to Judaea. Even with these political strides, the sect tried to remain loyal to their religion. The Sadducees were committed to expanding the state as well as to upholding the religious standard that their ancestors had cherished.\textsuperscript{75}

As opposed to the Sadducees, of the aristocratic class, the most important consideration of the Pharisaic sect was Jewish law. Josephus remarks, “The Pharisees are those who are esteemed and most skillful in the exact explication of their laws.”\textsuperscript{76} The Pharisaic party included skilled interpreters who aimed to deduce the most accurate explanations from the traditional text. The Sadducees derived their position from the social standing of their ancestors, while the


\textsuperscript{75}Martin Sicker, \textit{Between Rome and Jerusalem: 300 Years of Roman-Judaean Relations} (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2001), 31 - 35.

Pharisees’ position was based on legal expertise.\textsuperscript{77} The Pharisees were guided by tradition and respect for the opinions of their elders, since they believed that God favored their elders. The term \textit{Pharisees}, or פרושים, meaning “separatists” was most probably given to them by the Sadducees. In Mishnaic sources, only the Sadducees refer to the Pharisees by this name, but there is no argument or rejection of this name in the Pharisaic sources. In fact, there may have even been an appreciation for the pun, as the Hebrew word \textit{perushim} or פירושים also refers to commentaries on religious texts.\textsuperscript{78}

These traditionalists rejected the synthesis of Hellenistic ideas with Judaism. The Pharisees saw themselves as protectors of Jewish life as defined by the teachings of Jewish law, and would not accept changes or threats to their tradition. The Pharisees specifically involved themselves in political matters when it was necessary to uphold Jewish law. They were well known for their study of Torah and were highly influential within urban society.\textsuperscript{79} Glatzer notes in Josephus’ text the extent of Pharisaic influence on the people was such that in some cases, if the Sadducees could not get the support they needed from the Jews, they would defer to Pharisaic teachings in order to relate to the general public so they would not be ignored.\textsuperscript{80}

Though these were the main political differences between the groups, the Sadducees and Pharisees also disagreed vehemently on some of the most

\textsuperscript{78} Emil Schürer, \textit{The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ: (175 B.C. - A.D. 135)}, 384-397
\textsuperscript{79} Sicker, \textit{Between Rome and Jerusalem: 300 Years of Roman-Judaean Relations} 31-33
\textsuperscript{80} Josephus, \textit{Jerusalem and Rome: The Writings of Josephus}, 43 - 44
foundational beliefs of Judaism, which caused even wider rifts between the two. The Sadducees were aware of the teachings of the Pharisees, but insisted that if one does not adhere to the oral laws as commanded by religious authorities, he cannot be punished in the same way that one would be if he did not follow the laws of the written text.\textsuperscript{81} Josephus in explaining the point of view of the Sadducees claims that they “...are to esteem those observances to be obligatory which are in the written word, but are not to observe what are from the tradition of our forefathers.” The Sadducees refused to follow any laws that were not written down because they did not come directly from Moses.\textsuperscript{82} This religious matter had practical importance, since the Judaean courts ruled according to religious law. Sadducees were insistent only on the letter of the law, while the Pharisees were more focused on the interpretation.\textsuperscript{83} Additional topics that caused arguments between the two sects included the longevity of the soul, the good and evil inclinations, the state of one’s soul following one’s death, and the relationship of God to Jews and foreign nations.\textsuperscript{84}

The division between the Pharisees and the Sadducees intensified when Salome Alexandra, the first queen regnant of the Hasmonean line, and wife of the former Alexander Jannaeus, became terminally ill. Though she tried to promote a

\begin{itemize}
\item[\textsuperscript{81}] Solomon Zeitlin, "The Pharisees: A Historical Study," \textit{Jewish Quarterly Review} 52 (1961): 102-104
\item[\textsuperscript{82}] Josephus. "The Antiquities of the Jews," 13.10.6
\item[\textsuperscript{83}] Schürer, \textit{The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ: (175 B.C. - A.D. 135)}, 409
\item[\textsuperscript{84}] The Sadducees believed that the choice between good and evil belongs entirely to man, and when he dies, his soul dies as well. According to Pharisaic doctrine, though man does have a choice between good and evil, fate is controlled by God; all occurrences in this world happen because of God. Souls are considered imperishable, but only the souls that have chosen to do good deeds throughout their lifetimes move into new bodies. Glatzer 41-45. Additionally, the Sadducees believed that God had chosen them and no one else, while the Pharisees believed that their god was everyone’s god. This is one of the reasons that the idea of proselytism was much more common in Pharisaic circles. Zeitlin, "The Pharisees: A Historical Study," 115 - 117
\end{itemize}
smooth succession through the appointment of her son Hyrcanus II as king, and her son Aristobulus II as high priest, these two did not uphold her wishes after her death in 67 BCE. 

After his mother passed away, Aristobulus II focused on establishing himself as both high priest and the king, since he believed he was significantly more capable of ruling in these positions than his brother Hyrcanus II. The decision to take both positions caused Aristobulus II to lose support of the Pharisees, but gain Sadducee followers, which helped fuel a short-lived civil war.

Aristobulus II did not want to incur the calamities that would come with fighting a full fledged war, and therefore settled on the idea of switching their original positions thereby awarding himself the position of king, and Hyrcanus II the high priesthood. The new arrangement also proved to be short lived as support grew for Hyrcanus II to reclaim his position. Antipater, the governor of Idumaea, saw the personal benefits he could acquire by ruling through such a known weak figure like Hyrcanus II and chose to support him. Hyrcanus II would serve as a figurehead of the Hasmonean line, while in reality Antipater retained control.

Judaea was divided across both political and religious lines. Pompey had a perfect opportunity to take advantage of the Judaean instability and establish his own rule in Judaea.

---

85 Sicker argues that though Salome Alexandra appointed Hyrcanus II as king, it was not clear if he was also meant to be the high priest. It is improbable that she would have assigned him both positions since she would have run into great resistance by the Pharisees who insisted on the separation of the political position of king and the religious position of high priest. Sicker resolves the problem through his assertion that Salome Alexandra did in fact appoint Aristobulus II as the high priest, which kept the separation between powers. Sicker, *Between Rome and Jerusalem: 300 Years of Roman-Judaean Relations*, 43. See Appendix A for the Hasmonean lineage.

86 Sicker, *Between Rome and Jerusalem: 300 Years of Roman-Judaean Relations*, 43 - 44

The Judaean relationship with Rome was revived in the sixties BCE, as Pompey campaigned through the countries in the Near East. In the years 66 - 67 BCE, Pompey was granted full rights through the Lex Manilia to begin a campaign against Mithridates of Pontus. \(^{88}\) After Pompey defeated Tigranes the Great, king of Armenia, ally to Mithridates, and reorganized Anatolia, he moved to Syrian lands and began reorganizing there as well. \(^{89}\) Appian explains that Pompey reasoned that according to the rules of war, since Tigranes defeated the Seleucids in Syria, and Rome defeated Tigranes, Rome became the ruler over the Seleucids. \(^{90}\) He instituted what Sicker coined as a modern day “Rimland Strategy.” Pompey wanted to create a buffer between Rome and the Parthian states, and therefore needed to secure the provinces from Pontus on the Black Sea to the newly annexed Syria to the South to ensure that other kingdoms with strong resources would not side with the Parthians. \(^{91}\) Within these safeguards, Syria and Judaea were the most delicate links: should either of the two choose to align itself with the Parthians, the alliance would cause Egypt to be isolated from Asia Minor. One of the feared consequences of Judaea or Syria siding with the Romans’ enemy was that it could cut the supply lines from the granaries in Alexandria to the Roman armies operating in Asiatic countries. \(^{92}\) Pompey therefore took a


\(^{89}\) Pompey was not yet able to defeat Mithridates who hid in Crimea. See Sartre, *The Middle East under Rome*, 37

\(^{90}\) Appianus, “The Syrian Wars,” in *Roman History: In Four Volumes.*, trans. Horace White (London: Heinemann [u.a., 1972], VIII.

\(^{91}\) Josef Dobias claims that the annexation of Syria actually had little to do with Roman interests against the Parthians. Sartre argues that there is a relationship between the two since Parthian and Roman interactions continued for the next decade. Pompey often intervened in Armenia and Anatolia, especially since authority of the Parthian king was often unstable in these areas. See Sartre, *The Middle East under Rome*, 39

\(^{92}\) Sicker, *Between Rome and Jerusalem: 300 Years of Roman-Judaean Relations*, 46- 48
special interest in Judaea, and sent Marcus Aemilius Scaurus there to assure that he would have Judaean support.

The Romans’ decision to interfere in Judaea and create a client relationship was not initially based on the desire to conquer Judaea. The country happened to have been caught in the middle of a war between two greater powers. While Judea was not directly involved in the war at first, leaving the country behind as an independent entity might be dangerous to Rome, or perhaps an embarrassment. The potential wealth available in such an unstable and therefore vulnerable country only made the temptation stronger. Josephus claims, “Upon his hearing how the affairs in Judea stood, he made haste thither as to a certain booty.” Pompey knew that if he left the Judaea as an independent state, it would pose a military danger as long as Parthia was still a threat, but he was also attracted to the benefits that could be amassed for him and his army.

Upon hearing Pompey’s decision to come to Judaea, both Aristobulus II and Hyrcanus II traveled with delegations bearing gifts to rally Roman support for their ascension to the throne. Pompey told each of the delegations to return to him in Damascus, after his war with the Nabataeans, for his final decision. For this meeting in 63 BCE, Aristobulus II brought the golden vine from the Temple,

---

93 Smallwood, *The Jews under Roman Rule: From Pompey to Diocletian*, 21-26
94 Josephus “The Wars of the Jews” 1.6.2
95 Sullivan, *Near Eastern Royalty and Rome, 100-30 BC*, 216
96 Damascus was the main juncture for ancient transportation routes. The city also happened to have a very large Jewish community where Hyrcanus II and Aristobulus II could potentially campaign for support with Roman leaders. See Peter Richardson, *Herod: King of the Jews and Friend of the Romans* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 1996), 86 - 87.
97 Sullivan, *Near Eastern Royalty and Rome, 100-30 BC*, 216
worth approximately 500 talents, as well as other gifts. Hyrcanus II came empty
handed, but was joined by over a thousand prominent Jews sent by Antipater to
show that Hyrcanus II had the support of the people. Antipater also strategically
accounted for the fact that Pompey had taken great pride in his success of ending
piracy in the Mediterranean. He therefore publically claimed that Aristobulus II
was levying taxes on imports by arrogating the right to inspect vessels coming to
and from the Palestinian coast. This tactic was to suggest that Aristobulus II was a
threat to Roman policy and advancement, and therefore could not be trusted.
Antipater knew that Roman leaders still saw Hyrcanus II as the weaker of the two
candidates, but chose to use this apparent disadvantage in his favor. Antipater
presented a ruling figure that could be controlled, a feature that Romans could
exploit.

Even without the help of Antipater, Aristobulus II sealed his fate when he
departed for the Hasmonean fortress in Alexandrion, rather than helping the
Roman army, as he had promised Pompey. He realized that though he and
Hyrcanus II were not told of the decision, Pompey had already chosen Hyrcanus
II, and Aristobulus II no longer had the potential to be king. In the last hope of
retaining some independence from Roman rule and power for himself,
Aristobulus II then went to Jerusalem to fight off the Romans. While the
supporters of Aristobulus II denied Pompey’s army entrance into the gates of the
city, Hyrcanus II’s supporters, having gained the support of the Romans, opened

---

the gates to the upper city for their new Roman ally.100 Hyrcanus II made an effective ally, but the consequences for Jewish independence and religious practices would soon be alarming.

Pompey’s siege of Jerusalem highlights how knowledgeable the Romans were about the Jews and gives insight into life under Roman rule. The Romans were aware of some religious practices, and others continued to be a mystery. As the Romans tightened the siege, they had to fill in the deep valleys north of the temple that prevented them from being able to attack Jerusalem. Rather than wasting energy and resources fighting each day, the Romans continued to work on the construction of the siege on the Sabbath, and refrained from battle. They knew that even under siege, the Jews would not fight on the Sabbath unless specifically threatened, which, as self-defense, would be justifiable.101 The Romans had an appreciation for how insistent the Jews were about their religious laws, and used it against them. The Jews were so careful that they even continued to prepare sacrifices after Pompey had broken through the walls of Jerusalem.102

This decision to abide by the rules of Jewish customs ended, however, when Pompey entered the Holy of Holies in the temple. Only the high priest was allowed in this area, and even he was banned from entering except on the Day of Atonement. The specific reason why Pompey entered is unknown, but it was most likely simply to appease his curiosity and find out the truth about this mysterious section of the Temple. There were various rumors that circulated relating to what was in this infamous room. One such rumor was that there was a head of an ass or

100 Sicker, Between Rome and Jerusalem: 300 Years of Roman-Judaean Relations, 47 - 49
101 Ibid., 49 - 50
102 Josephus, Jerusalem and Rome: The Writings of Josephus, 73-74
a ram stored there, which represented the Jewish god. In exchange for this curiosity, Pompey branded himself as an enemy of the Jews who lacked any respect for Jewish religious practices.\footnote{Smallwood, \textit{The Jews under Roman Rule: From Pompey to Diocletian}, 27} In the psalms of Solomon, the writer laments that Pompey, “...rammed through the surrounding wall with a battering ram, and you did not stop it. Strange peoples went up to your altar, stomping with their sandals in pride...”\footnote{Heerak C. Kim, \textit{Psalms of Solomon: A New Translation and Introduction} (Highland Park, NJ: Hermit Kingdom Press, 2008), 2.1 - 2.} To the extent that the Romans knew these practices, they used them strategically against the Jews, but their transgression of other customs added insult to injury.

Given the considerable death and destruction that took place during this attack, it is surprising that Pompey did not rob the Temple of its treasures. One of the reasons he was attracted to Judaea to begin with was because of the rumors of its wealth. Askowith suggests two explanations for why he did not actually steal anything. One is that he was in such awe of the simplicity of the Holy of Holies that he did not want to commit further destruction. The more likely theory is that in an already unstable environment, he did not want to aggravate the situation by robbing the Temple of 2,000 talents of sacred money in addition to the valuable religious ornaments kept inside.\footnote{Askowith, \textit{The Toleration of the Jews under Julius Caesar and Augustus}, 111-112} Cicero suggests that the true reason that Pompey resisted was one of honor. He claims that “In a state so given to calumny he left his critics no opportunity for gossip. But I do not think that illustrious general was hindered by the religious feelings of the Jews and his enemies, but by
his sense of honor.” According to Cicero, Pompey’s decision to leave the treasury of the Temple untouched was not a religious matter, but the right thing to do. Josephus regarded Pompey as a man of virtue, an opinion that was only strengthened by his decision to allow the Jews to cleanse the temple after the war.

Though Pompey took the city with the help of Hyrcanus II and his supporters, the issue of instability in Judaea did not disappear. Pompey began to introduce changes in Judaea to make it clear that the state was no longer an independent entity, but rather was subject to Roman demands. He imposed taxes and made Jerusalem tributary to the Romans. Pompey also permanently installed a garrison in Judaea. Greek cities were removed from Judaea, significantly reducing Judaea’s size and resources. While Pompey traveled back Rome to celebrate and present his victory in a triumph, he assigned Scaurus as the governor of Syria, which included control over Judaea, thereby taking the next steps to secure the area as a client kingdom under Rome.

Another consequence of the Pompeian victory in Jerusalem was that thousands of Jews from Judaea were transported to Rome as prisoners of war. Though originally brought as slaves, their Jewish coreligionists in Rome later freed them. According to Jewish law, there is an obligation to free Jewish
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107 Josephus, *Jerusalem and Rome: The Writings of Josephus*, 75
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109 Sicker, *Between Rome and Jerusalem: 300 Years of Roman-Judaean Relations*, 50-52. See Appendix B for a map of the new boundaries of the Judaean state.

prisoners of a foreign nation if it does not prove to be dangerous to the greater community. Philo explains that these Jews later became the nucleus of the Roman Jewish community.\textsuperscript{111} Though it seems unlikely that these were the first Jews in Rome, as signified in Cicero’s speech in defense of Flaccus,\textsuperscript{112} the community undoubtedly became significantly larger than it had been. In Cicero’s speech, he criticizes the Jews as a rowdy bunch that pressure people to do what they want by gathering as mob.\textsuperscript{113} It is improbable that this type of reputation, even if not completely true, could be at all credible if there had only been a Jewish community in Rome after Pompey’s victory in Judaea. If there was a Jewish community present in Rome, Pompey only made its connection and loyalty to Judaea from abroad stronger. The thousands of Jews brought to Rome later helped preserve the state of Judaea once Rome took over.

Following Pompey’s exit and Scaurus’ governorship, Gabinius was assigned as proconsul of Syria in 57 BCE. Predictably, the Jews were no quieter or more stable now than before. The acceptance of Roman rule after being free did not come easily, which led to several rebellions against Rome. In the first rebellion, in 57 BCE, Aristobulus II’s son Alexander escaped Rome and collected a following and fought near Jerusalem. In 56 BCE, Aristobulus II himself escaped from Rome and led another rebellion.\textsuperscript{114} After putting an end to these rebellions,


\textsuperscript{112} Flaccus was accused of stealing money meant as the temple tax to be sent to Jerusalem. Cicero defended Flaccus for this offense as well as others. See Cicero, \textit{The Speeches: With an English Translation. In Catilinam I-IV--Pro Murena--Pro Sulla--Pro Flacco.}, xxxviii 66-67.

\textsuperscript{113} Ibid.

and sending Aristobulus II back to Rome, Gabinius still struggled to create an atmosphere that would pacify Judaea and prevent more uprisings.\footnote{According to Sullivan, the four uprisings following Pompey’s victory in Jerusalem mainly consisted of factional resistance rather than a national effort. Though the majority of the country was not involved, the rebels still stirred trouble in Judaea and wanted to eliminate these factions. See Sullivan, \textit{Near Eastern Royalty and Rome, 100-30 BC}, 220}

Gabinius’ solution was to divide Judaea into five separate districts. By creating these districts, Gabinius hoped to loosen the ties that allowed for the Jews to band together by creating rivalries between the cities. In order to strengthen this separation, he had a city council or synedrion placed in each district which could rule with complete autonomy.\footnote{Sicker, \textit{Between Rome and Jerusalem: 300 Years of Roman-Judaean Relations}, 55-56} In the past, the highest Sanhedrin court in Jerusalem would send out circulars describing new laws enacted, which were read aloud in synagogues abroad as well as a yearly calendar.\footnote{Askowith, \textit{The Toleration of the Jews under Julius Caesar and Augustus}, 54} Now each district was only responsible for itself, and did not have to answer to a higher religious authority. Following Gabinius’ departure to Egypt, however, Aristobulus II’s son, Alexander, led another rebellion in Judaea. The Judaeans’ feeling of resentment over their lack of independence and inspired desire for self rule could not be countered by this district system, especially when it was left unguarded. The level of resentment felt by the Jews of Judaea with each additional Roman presence was a constant reminder of Roman dominance.

The Judaeans’ attitude towards the Romans only became more agitated and defensive with Crassus’ entrance into Judaea. Crassus was the only member of the first triumvirate, formed in 56 BCE with Julius Caesar and Pompey, who did not have a military reputation. While he was undoubtedly the richest of the three, he...
was determined to create a name for himself in the military, allowing him to align himself with his fellow triumvirs. In order to accomplish this goal and gain the respect he desired, he made entered the Temple of Jerusalem to gather money to fund his war. Josephus expounds, “Now Crassus, as he was going upon his expedition against the Parthians, came into Judaea, and carried off the money that was in the Temple, which Pompey had left, being two thousand talents.” The fact Crassus marched into the Temple and, unlike Pompey, took everything of value that he could find made even Pompey preferable to the Jews. He stole the 2,000 talents that Pompey had left untouched, in addition to about 8,000 talents worth of gold ornaments stripped from the temple. Crassus was killed in battle against Parthia in 53 BCE; the sacred money had gone to waste.

For the Judaeans, Crassus’ blatant robbery of and disregard for the Temple had two very strong consequences. For one, this abuse was ingrained in the hearts of the Jews as an offense that even Pompey did not risk. Their hatred for Rome had strengthened, and it gave the Jews another cause around which to rally. Jewish nationalist support sided with Parthia, with a cry to extricate themselves from Roman rule. For these nationalists, joining the Parthians was yet another opportunity to retrieve their independence. While it seemed like an ideal opportunity to attack Rome, which had just suffered the end of the first triumvirate and was militarily outnumbered in Syria compared to the Parthians, the Parthian invasion evaporated. Cassius Longinus who overcame the Parthian
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attack then dealt with the Jewish rebels. He sent 30,000 Jews to be sold as slaves, resulting in an intensified Jewish animosity against this foreign rule.\textsuperscript{122}

The Jews began their relationship with Rome believing that they could benefit from such an ally. Romans were agreeable towards this relationship, but changed its terms once they began to expand eastward into the Asiatic countries. Rome no longer needed Judaea as a friend, especially given the nation’s internal fragmentation and proclivity for rebellion. Rome needed to establish a hold on Judaea that would keep them from siding with the Parthians, Rome’s greatest enemy at the time. To establish this grip on Judaea, Rome took away the Jews’ dearest possession, their freedom, and replaced it with a client kingdom subject to Roman rule. While the Jews were unsettled by their new status, Aristobulus II exacerbated the situation by continuing to fight the Romans in an attempt to drive them out of Judaean land. The repeated rebellions by Aristobulus II and his sons only signalled to Romans that they needed to keep a stronger grip on Judaean affairs. Judeans hated the Roman presence in Judaea, but if they did not abide by Roman rules, the consequences proved dire. Judaea, now a client kingdom, still sought autonomy, but to succeed economically, politically, and religiously, it needed to concede its complete independence at least in name, an effort led by Antipater.

\textsuperscript{122} Sicker, \textit{Between Rome and Jerusalem: 300 Years of Roman-Judaean Relations}, 58-59
Chapter 3: Antipater’s Strategy

When Antipater, the Idumaean governor, entered Judaean politics, he recognized that although he did not have the religious and royal background needed to wield any real influence in Judaea, he did have invaluable skills that Aristobulus II and Hyrcanus II lacked. Antipater was a natural politician who knew how to manipulate the Judaean government in his favor, and the Roman government to benefit the Jewish people. He was a visionary who prepared the Jews for their new status under Rome by commandeering the rule of the inadequate heir, Hyrcanus II. To overcome the difficulty of not being a descendent of the Hasmonean line, and the even great difficulty of not being a fully recognized Jew on account of the recent conversion of Idumaea, Antipater used Hyrcanus II as a figurehead, while retaining all real power. By supporting Hyrcanus II, Antipater was able to satisfy the Jews by providing an appropriate Jewish leader, but still pull all the strings himself. He was distinct from other Judaean politicians in his understanding of the Roman Empire’s goals and needs. While Judaean politicians assumed Roman jurisdiction was temporary, Antipater
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123 Under the leadership of Hyrcanus I, son of the Hasmonean Simon Maccabeus, who reigned as the high priest in Judaea from 135 - 104 BCE, the Judeans conquered the Idumaeans in the south in an effort to extend the borders of Judaea. Subsequently, the Judeans enforced a mass religious conversion of all the Idumaean people. However, although they were adequately converted for the purposes of their Judaean neighbors in that generation, there was still a distinction between who was considered completely Jewish, and who was only a half Jew in later years. See A. H. M. Jones, *The Herods of Judaea*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1938), 15. Regarding the nature of the conversion process, there is debate as to whether or not it was actually forced upon the Idumaeans. To institute a forceful conversion would be against Jewish law according to the Talmudic tractate Gerim 7, and therefore impossible. See Aryeh Kasher, *King Herod: A Persecuted Persecutor a Case Study in Psychobiography and Psychobiography* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2007), 19, note 3. Feldman does not fully subscribe to this line of thinking, and argues that the Talmudic tractate that Kasher refers to dates only to the fourth century, and would therefore not be at this point in time. See Feldman, *Jew and Gentile in the Ancient World: Attitudes and Interactions from Alexander to Justinian*, 326
accepted that Rome would not disappear, as Judaeans hoped, and he knew that the only way to preserve whatever independence existed in Judaea, and to protect the rights of Jews abroad, was for Judaeans to comply with Roman requests and maintain a stable environment in Judaea. For the sake of Jews at home and abroad, Judaea needed to present itself as an asset, rather than an annoyance, to the Roman Empire.

Antipater needed to solidify the already tenuous relationship between Jews and Romans. If Antipater could establish good relations with Rome for Judaea, he could also request that the rights of Jews abroad to practice their religious customs be protected. However with inlaid tensions already plaguing the stability of Judaea, the fact that Jewish religious values were so foreign to Hellenistic Roman beliefs generated additional unease and distrust towards Judaea. In Cicero’s speech in support of Flaccus, he remarks, “Still the religious ceremonies and observances of that people were very much at variance with the splendor of this empire, and the dignity of our name, and the institutions of our ancestors.”

He claims that the very existence of Judaism undermined the values that Romans and their forefathers held dear, because unlike other communities that adopted gods from the Roman pantheon, the Jews remained steadfastly monotheistic. Romans were suspicious of the Jews’ commitment to their religion. Because of their ardent allegiance to their own god, Romans felt that they could not depend on complete Jewish support.
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One of Antipater’s greatest challenges in gathering support related to the lack of unity within Judaea, a legacy from the succession crisis. Combined with Judaea’s geographically precarious position between Rome and Parthia, Rome had reason to question Judaean loyalty.126 Jewish disunity weakened Judaea’s most valuable potential contribution to their alliance with Rome: should Rome need Judaean help, a coalition of the disparate Jewish factions seemed unlikely. This weakness in loyalty was proven problematic in 40 BCE, when the Parthians invaded Syria. Antigonus, Aristobulus II’s son who was in exile at the court of Chalcis, convinced Lysanias, Ptolemy’s successor, to volunteer one thousand talents and five hundred female captives to the Parthians in exchange for a position as both the king and high priest in Judaea.127 Parthian promises of independence attracted Judaeans who had previously supported Aristobulus II. These Judaeans fought against Rome with the support of its greatest enemy. Rome could not depend on an ally that would so easily betray its own people, and more importantly betray Rome, in an effort to acquire more power and rewards for itself. Antipater therefore needed to prove that given the appropriate leadership, Judaea could still be an asset in the wars between Rome and Parthia, as well as a dependable ally during future engagements on the eastern front.

Before Antipater could start to shape the new face of Judaea for Rome, he needed to relieve the suspicion with which Judaeans and Romans alike regarded him, as he was a foreigner to both parties. Antipater would earn Roman citizenship following interactions with Julius Caesar, but even then he would not

126 Sicker, *Between Rome and Jerusalem: 300 Years of Roman-Judaean Relations*, 59 - 60
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be fully recognized as Roman. On the other hand, Judaeans would never recognize Antipater as a Jew, and especially not a Jew who had the right to rule as king of Judaea. In order to control the course of Judaean politics, Antipater hid himself behind the facade of Hyrcanus II, who was known to be weaker than his brother, Aristobulus II. Though Aristobulus II may have been charismatic and ready to fight, he was also hot tempered and would not be willing to settle for being a pawn in Judaea’s dynastic battle. Hyrcanus II, on the other hand, was happy to have Antipater’s support. He understood that he was in a weaker position, and that in order to retain power in Judaean politics he needed a powerful and cunning figure to guide him. The two established a mutually beneficial relationship. Hyrcanus II could represent Judaea as the Hasmonean heir, and Antipater had the know-how, connections and monetary resources to properly gain the trust of Rome as well as reestablish the governmental power structure in Judaea that had been disassembled by the succession crisis. Antipater was the governor of Idumaea following the appointment of his father under the Jewish king Alexander Jannaeus, and he was the descendent of a prestigious Idumaean family line-- a lineage that Romans could appreciate. Aside from his occupation in civil duties, Antipater also acquired great wealth through caravan trade between Petra and the southern Palestinian ports. He was skilled in international relations, familiar with the workings of trade, and knew how to use both of these to his advantage.\textsuperscript{128}

The first setback Antipater faced, following Pompey’s attack on Jerusalem, was Gabinius’ appointment as proconsul of Syria. Gabinius redistricted Judaea

\textsuperscript{128} Jones, \textit{The Herods of Judaea}, 16
and created five independent autonomous sections, each with its own council. Gabinius was apparently displeased with the current governing bodies and decided it would be easier to create a stable environment, which could be more easily controlled if it were divided. To soften the blow for Judaea, Gabinius also sent away the *publicani*, the Roman tax collectors, and replaced them with Judaean residents. The tax collecting profession was a right usually auctioned off to the financial societies in Rome. Collectors were usually able to skim enough money off the top of their collections to make the bid worthwhile. From Antipater’s standpoint however, the division of powers meant that his own hold on Judaea would be weakened as well. While Antipater’s position was threatened, the Judaean position was improved, making it slightly more difficult to thwart the redistricting effort.

For the sake of maintaining positive diplomatic relations, rather than act rashly by trying to regain the influence he once enjoyed in Judaea, Antipater bided his time. In 55 BCE, as Gabinius made his way towards Egypt for more profitable endeavors, Antipater ensured safe travels by using his connections, and those of Hyrcanus II, abroad. He took advantage of his relationship with the garrison in Pelusium, an area populated with Jewish mercenaries to allow Gabinius to complete his journey without any troubles. Antipater was able to make a good impression on Gabinius, and show off his far-reaching influence,

129 Cicero claimed that Gabinius rid the Syrian provinces of the *publicani* because the Syrian communities bribed him. Cicero however hated Gabinius who received the position as governor of Syria from Clodius, the tribune who also exiled Cicero in 59 BCE. See Sartre, *The Middle East under Rome*, 45 - 46
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which would benefit Romans traveling between foreign lands. As a reward for these efforts, Josephus reports that Gabinius settled affairs in Jerusalem, and that the powers of both Antipater and Hyrcanus II were increased. Antipater became the superintendent of the Jews, and Hyrcanus II was granted secular authority over the district controlled by the court in Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{133} The power awarded to Hyrcanus II was really exercised by Antipater, who had organized this positive intercommunication between Romans, Judaeans, and the Jewish connections abroad.

After Gabinius, the next Roman official to play a role in Judaean affairs was Marcus Crassus, the proconsul of Syria during the first triumvirate. In an effort to raise his own status and establish himself as a military leader on par with Julius Caesar and Pompey, Crassus decided to challenge Parthia. Ancient authors such as Plutarch attribute Crassus’ decision to his belief that defeating the Parthians would be relatively easy. These sources assert that his greed overshadowed his military sense, because should he have won, the rewards would have been great.\textsuperscript{134} As a result of Crassus’ commitment to defeating Parthia, he needed to gather more funds. In addition to invading the Temple in Bambyce, Crassus plundered the Temple in Jerusalem. Antipater was forced to hand over the money from the temple treasury, which totaled the incredible sum of 10,000 talents.\textsuperscript{135} As mentioned earlier, even Pompey’s entrance into the Holy of Holies was trumped by Crassus’ act of robbery. The fact that Crassus was defeated at the Battle of Carrhae in 53 BCE, and squandered all the funds given to him, only

\textsuperscript{133} Ibid., 26
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added to the Jewish hatred towards him. Again, Antipater had to choose between an allegiance with Rome, and an allegiance to the Jews. Though the support of the Jews was clearly important to him, he also knew that disobeying a Roman official, especially one in Crassus’ position, could only have negative consequences. Had Crassus not been defeated, he would have been an important ally for the Jews. Though Antipater angered Judaeans at the moment, his reputation with Judaea was salvageable.

By 49 BCE, political affairs in the Roman world became significantly more complicated. The lack of clarity as to who would be the upcoming leader of Rome put Judaeans in the difficult position of trying to assess where to send support. During the civil war between Julius Caesar and Pompey, even if Judaeans were consistent in their support of a Roman leader, trying to figure out which side would prove successful was a gamble. The consequences, should they choose the wrong side, could have been disastrous. From the eastern standpoint, it appeared that Pompey had the upper hand. He was the Roman representative in the East, which made him a natural choice for support. As a response to Antipater’s choice of an allegiance to Pompey, Caesar set Aristobulus II, the enemy of Hyrcanus II, free, and sent him towards Judaea with two legions to counter the armies of Antipater and Hyrcanus II. Luckily for Antipater, Aristobulus II was poisoned on his way through Asia Minor by Pompeian supporters, and Pompey had Scipio, who was in charge of Syria, execute his son Alexander.136 Once Julius Caesar won the war, each of the client kingdoms that sided with Pompey needed to make amends. Though he knew that his position in
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Roman affairs was weaker than it had been, Antipater was determined to fix his damaged relationship with Julius Caesar. Antipater recognized that though he may have fought with the wrong side, he could still rectify the situation. Though Caesar was understanding of Antipater’s choice to align himself with the Roman ruler of the east, Antipater recognized that Caesar’s forgiveness could easily deteriorate. Antipater was cognizant of the fact that his new allegiance needed to be proven in a much more tangible way so that he could request Roman support in the future.

At the first opportunity, Antipater rushed to help Julius Caesar during his adventure in Alexandria. After Pompey had been killed, Achillas, an Egyptian commander, and his troops, attacked Caesar while waiting for the armies sent by Mithridates of Pergamum from Cilicia and Syria to arrive and supplement his own soldiers. Realizing that Caesar was ill prepared for battle, Antipater arrived with an additional 3,000 soldiers. He also used his connections and influence over the sheikhs to make sure that the troops sent by Mithridates would arrive safely, as he had done earlier in the case of Gabinius. Antipater secured even more support through his dual identity by harnessing the influence that Hyrcanus II could provide over Heliopolite and Memphis Jews. Hyrcanus II sent letters addressing the Jews in these areas urging them to support Julius Caesar. Antipater and Hyrcanus II also contacted the Egyptian Jews, requesting that they assist Julius Caesar. The large community of Egyptian Jews subsequently provided money, soldiers, and military supplies that were needed in Caesar’s camp. Even more
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importantly, Antipater, through Hyrcanus II, was able to gather the support of Alexandrian Jews who were previously ordered by Ptolemy XIV to oppose Caesar and his forces. Apart from Hyrcanus II’s direction, Jews in Egypt were also probably pleased to support Julius Caesar, who defeated Pompey, and had entered the Holy of Holies in the Temple of Jerusalem. Antipater was responsible for making sure that Julius Caesar had the supplies, manpower, funds, and safe transit needed to ensure a successful enterprise.

The success of this collaboration had far reaching rewards on both an individual and national level. Caesar showered Hyrcanus II and Antipater with gifts and promises of protection for siding with Rome. The previous tensions in their relationship with Julius Caesar caused by their earlier support for Pompey were relieved. Their past allegiance to Pompey was attributed to the fact that Pompey was the Roman representative in the East, and therefore the appropriate leader to support. Antipater, Hyrcanus II, and the people they represented were now regarded as trusted allies. For this reason, Judaea was granted a favorable position within the Roman Empire.

As a reward for Hyrcanus II’s assistance in Egypt, Caesar officially reinstated him as ethnarch. Hyrcanus II’s position as the high priest became hereditary once again, and he could hold secular authority as he did before. Caesar's decree also stated that the position would be, “with the same rights and under the same regulations as those under which their forefathers uninterruptedy
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held the office of priest.”¹⁴² In another letter from Julius Caesar to the magistrates, council, and people of Sidon, he announced that as a result of Hyrcanus II’s loyalty and zeal in assisting Roman effort, he and his children would retain his hereditary position according to the national customs of the Jews. He would be considered an ally and friend to Romans as well as to the empire. Hyrcanus II was given the right to collect tithes and had jurisdiction over matters of Jewish law.¹⁴³ The Sanhedrin of Jerusalem would once again exercise its judicial powers according to their national customs. Hyrcanus II was personally promoted as a result of his loyalty to Rome. As a representative of the Jews, this also put Judaea in very good standing with Rome, as Antipater had planned. As a result of Hyrcanus II and Antipater’s assistance, the extent of the jurisdiction of the religious judicial system was restored, which helped preserve the religious life that Judaea originally feared would suffer under Roman rule.

Following the victories of Julius Caesar, Josephus reports that Mithridates of Pergamum addressed Caesar and informed him that Antipater was responsible for the triumph over Caesar’s enemies. Antipater was energetic in his commitment to defeat Rome’s enemies by providing aid to Caesar.¹⁴⁴ His contributions inspired surrounding nations to be forthcoming with assistance, so

¹⁴³ Sicker, Between Rome and Jerusalem: 300 Years of Roman-Judaean Relations, 59
¹⁴⁴ In Josephus’ multiple texts that include a description of the Alexandrian War of 47 BCE, he varies how many times he references Antipater, Hyrcanus II, and Mithridates of Pergamum. According to the account in Josephus’ Wars, Antipater is depicted as the main force guiding the allies under Julius Caesar. Josephus writes that Mithridates of Pergamum lost 800 troops, and Antipater only lost 80. Antipater is praised for his valiant efforts, and Hyrcanus II is never even mentioned. In his Antiquities, Josephus notes that Hyrcanus II was the one who sent orders to the Egyptian Jews to help Caesar, and Josephus does not mention Antipater at all when Caesar confirms the awards for the assistance during the war. See Ben Zeev, Jewish Rights in the Roman World: The Greek and Roman Documents Quoted by Josephus Flavius, 39 - 48
as not to be outdone by Antipater. Consequently, Caesar awarded Antipater with Roman citizenship as well as a position as a Roman administrator. Caesar also appointed him as the financial representative of Rome in Judaea, which also absolved him of the obligation to pay taxes. Udoh explains that getting Roman citizenship as a foreign administrator was rare, and that because of this promotion, Antipater was able to exercise much more expansive influence over Judaea.

Julius Caesar realized the value of the benefits that Judaea brought to Rome and wanted to keep this support for the future. Caesar rewarded the Jews who allowed him to succeed in Egypt by establishing the protection of its religious customs throughout the empire. He addressed the empire and proclaimed, “if... any question shall arise concerning the Jews’ manner of life, it is my pleasure that the decision shall rest with them”. The fragment of a *senatus consultum* also declares that the laws protecting Jews in their various cities would be translated into Latin and Greek and published in all necessary locations.

Though the extent to which this proclamation was upheld is still debated, Jews
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150 Juster is of the opinion that this was actually an edict of rights for the Jews; a type of Magna Carta. However, Rajak more convincingly explains that this did not empower the Jews to the extent that Juster suggests. The Jews regularly had to request permission from the Roman Empire to perform their ritual rites since apparently the decrees did not always provide the long lasting assistance that Jews hoped they would. The fact that Jews regularly had to renew their rights points to the notion that without the Roman Empire none would exist. Jews needed Roman protection, but it was by no means guaranteed. Jews needed to keep the relationship with Rome strong in order to keep their religious communities afloat. They were able to attain such a relationship through the strong diplomatic skills of figures such as Antipater and Herod. See Tessa
now had a documented foundation for Roman support that they could rely on for present policies as well as for future decisions.

Caesar presented Rome as a generous protector for all people who offered their support, and he also encouraged strong economic growth in Judaea. As he had done for Greek cities, Caesar restored the lands that Pompey removed from their rule. These lands included the Plain of Esdraelon, Samaritan toparchies of Lydda, Ephraim, and Ramathaim, Seleucid territories, and, more importantly, Joppa. Joppa was Judaea’s oldest and most valuable trading post along the coast. When Judaea lost control of Joppa, its economy suffered from the decrease in trade. With the city back in their hands, they could once again trade internationally and acquire wealth as they had in the past. This wealth might one day have been needed to support Rome again, making it worthwhile for Caesar to restore the city to Judaea. Jews in Judaea were also given a tax break on the seventh sabbatical year. During this year the Judaeans did not irrigate the land, but instead rested from work as they did every seventh day of the week. Not only was their yearlong Sabbath recognized, but it was also not criticized as a year of laziness, as the weekly Sabbath often was. Judaeans were forgiven certain debts and received a regular tax break on the seventh year.
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According to Pucci, it is highly probable that the Jews did request this exemption on the seventh year, as they did during the time of Alexander the Great. Safrai argues that there is no way to know for sure whether or not the Jews actually received this tax break on the seventh year. He also states, however, that there is no other mention of a request for special dispensations, which would allow the Jews to gather crops in this seventh year in order to pay the government taxes, until after the Bar Kochba rebellion in 132 CE. Safrai assumes that since the Jews did not need to
Caesar also addressed the Jewish request for an exemption from military service with the Roman army. Letters beginning from 47 BCE, the year of Caesar’s triumph in the civil war against Pompey, were addressed to cities in the Roman Empire regarding this Jewish right. Asian Jews were absolved of their military obligations because of their religious customs. On the basis of this precedent, Piso, the Roman legate in Delos, expanded this right to Jews under his authority. Later, Alexander, son of Theodorus, the envoy of Hyrcanus, sent a letter to the Roman proconsul of Syria, P. Cornelius Dolabella, which listed the reasons that Jews could not perform their military service. Jews could not bear arms on the Sabbath, and the Roman army did not supply acceptable food according to the Jewish dietary laws. Jews were granted an exemption from Roman military service and were allowed to uphold their religious requirements. Jews could not be drafted from their communities in Judaea and in cities such as Delos, Ephesus and Sardis. Jews were also not required to provide winter quarters for Roman armies.

One of the most important protections that the Jews received from Julius Caesar concerned the preservation of the Sabbath. The Sabbath, as discussed in chapter one, was a subject of much contention and misconceptions among Romans, and therefore needed protection. Laws were needed to prevent ask to break the regular laws pertaining to the seventh year, it meant that they did not need to. The taxes were restored as punishment following the rebellion. See Ben Zeev, Jewish Rights in the Roman World: The Greek and Roman Documents Quoted by Josephus Flavius, 85 - 86

Receiving an exemption from the Roman military was actually not a privilege specific to Jews. Sulla gave this right to Dionysiac artists. After Sulla’s first war with Mithridates, Sulla also granted an exemption to cities who remained loyal to Rome during the war. See Ben Zeev, Jewish Rights in the Roman World: The Greek and Roman Documents Quoted by Josephus Flavius (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 63.
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purposeful malicious actions towards Jewish people by taking advantage of their adherence to Jewish laws.\textsuperscript{159} Because of the high regard with which Hyrcanus II was held, he was able to intervene on behalf of Jews around the empire. He strengthened the legal precedent that allowed the Jews to observe the Sabbath. Magistrates of Laodicea promised the Roman proconsul that they would uphold the right of the Jews to celebrate the Sabbath and perform their rights in accordance with their native laws.\textsuperscript{160} Another letter survived from the proconsul Publius Servilius Galba, confirming the right for Jews to observe the Sabbath. In Halicarnassus, in addition to the right to observe the Sabbath, Jews were also allowed to build synagogues near the sea and perform their sacred rites. Williams explains that the synagogue was a focal point for Jewish communities. The building served many functions including teaching law, a place of worship, and a social, legal, and administrative center for the community.\textsuperscript{161} Here, there is actually a formal punishment for anyone who violates these rights: such a person would have to pay a fine to the city.\textsuperscript{162} In Sardis, Jews were given the right to build and inhabit a place for prayers in their communities. They were also able to decide on religious lawsuits among their own people, and observe the Sabbath.\textsuperscript{163}

\textsuperscript{159} Williams, \textit{The Jews among the Greeks and Romans: A Diasporan Sourcebook}, 54. One way that Greek communities would attack Jews was requiring them to make an appearance in court on the Sabbath, a time they knew Jews would not come. Jews involved would have to forfeit their cases. These laws safeguarded the Jewish ability to observe their holidays without fearing the consequences of such commitments.
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Antipater worked tirelessly to create a relationship with the ruling Roman power, and now that he had secured this relationship he was able to guarantee these rights for Jews both abroad and in Judaea. Now he had to maintain them. He wanted to create a smooth transition for his sons, an endeavor which proved to be significantly more complicated. Antipater wanted to present his sons as rulers of Judaea without the Jewish Hasmonean facade that he needed for himself. Though Antipater’s service to Judaea had benefited Jews immensely, he was still a puppeteer behind a Hasmonean figurehead. While Josephus claims that Antipater was known by all for his piety, righteousness, and love of country, he was still not of Hasmonean lineage, regardless of the benefits he brought to Judaea.\(^{164}\) By assigning governing positions to his sons Herod and Phasael in Galilee and Jerusalem respectively,\(^ {165}\) the attention was on their Idumaean heritage, and more specifically, their lack of Hasmonean blood. Antipater’s challenge was to promote his sons, both of whom would be the necessary intermediaries Judaea needed to communicate with Rome.

In his first act as governor of Galilee Herod gained popularity with Rome, but made a poor impression on the Jews. Herod took upon himself the job of ridding the area of the bandits who were tormenting its inhabitants. He did in fact clean Galilee of these criminals, an act that the gentile inhabitants of Galilee, as well as the Syrian governor Sextus Caesar, the young cousin of Julius Caesar,\(^ {166}\) were quite pleased about. However, Herod’s next step led to immediate disapproval from the Jews, especially in Jerusalem. As a punishment for the
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\(^{164}\) Jones, *The Herods of Judaea*, 33  
\(^{165}\) Ibid., 29 - 30  
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crimes that these men committed, Herod had them executed. While Sextus Caesar saw this punishment as an end to an ongoing annoyance, the Sanhedrin in Jerusalem was horrified. From its point of view, one could not be killed simply on the command of the ruling governor. In order to receive such punishment, the court must find a person guilty and impose the punishment.\footnote{Jones, The Herods of Judaea, 28 - 30} For many Judaeans, this was blatant disregard of Jewish law, something that Herod, who was half Jewish, did not care for as he should have. As a response, Herod was brought to trial at the Sanhedrin.

Once again Antipater needed to balance the needs of both Judaea and Rome. On the one hand, Rome was appreciative of Herod’s efforts, and was not inflamed as the Judaeans had been. However, Antipater knew that Herod’s future as a ruler in Judaea was dependent upon his relationship with the Judaeans as well as the Romans. Though he accepted the fact that reconciling Herod with the Sanhedrin would be a complicated and lengthy process, he took the appropriate steps to at least begin this effort. From experience, Antipater knew how to approach the Jewish leaders, and understood that one thing he must do was make Herod appear as a friend. He insisted that Herod only appear with a small escort, so as not to intimidate those whom he was approaching. Though Herod understood the value of keeping Roman support as his father did, Antipater also saw that his son was a wild card in relation to the Jewish people. He insisted that Herod stay away from Jerusalem until Herod’s anger towards the Judaean court dissipated. Upon Herod’s return Antipater would teach him to tread carefully.
when assessing the needs of Judaea as well as those of Rome, as they were vital to his success.

In 44 BCE, after Herod had already returned as governor of Galilee, Cassius campaigned through the Syrian countries after murdering Julius Caesar. He demanded 700 talents from Antipater to fund his war against Mark Antony. To gather the support of the new Roman leader and prove the competency of his sons, Antipater split the responsibility of gathering this enormous sum among his sons, and other Syrian rulers. Herod was the first to produce the necessary funds desired, while other leaders did not procure as much. Herod understood, like his father did, the importance of succeeding in the fulfillment of Roman requests, and that failure would have serious consequences for his people. His efforts would not be forgotten, as the failure of his peers was also not forgotten. As a consequence of failing to acquire the money requested, the people of cities such as Gophna, Thamna, Lydda, and Emmaus were sold into slavery.\textsuperscript{168} Though the money taken represented a great burden to his people, he knew that the trade off for not receiving the money was far worse.

During Antipater’s reign in Judaea, he established a new direction in foreign affairs. His method of diplomacy was based on the idea that Roman rule in Judaea was inevitable, regardless of Jewish acceptance. Judaean independence was an idea of the past, and the only way to keep the freedoms that the state had accrued thus far, and build on them, was to become an ally of Rome. Antipater presented Judaea as reliable, with resources that would be willingly sent to Rome.

\textsuperscript{168} Ibid., 31 - 33
tensions in internal Judaean politics, the gains for Jews in Judaea and around the empire would outweigh those areas of difficulty. Additionally, without this policy, the consequences of not allying with Rome would have been dangerous.

Following Antipater’s reign, he assigned his sons to take over as governors in the hopes of continuing this strategy. Through an allegiance to Rome, Judaea would be able to retain its freedoms and the protection of the religious practices of all Jews. Julius Caesar set a standard for Jewish rights as a result of the careful political diplomacy of Antipater, and Augustus Caesar would continue this precedent in relation to Herod, the future client king of Judaea.
Chapter 4: Herod’s Kingdom

Though Antipater began to groom the future client king of Judaea when he was just a boy, the challenges Herod faced in ruling over his people and answering to Rome were tremendous. Being a client kingdom to Rome meant that the client state needed to be available and willing to comply with any requests Rome made. Should Rome no longer support the client king, his career was finished. The relationship between a client king and Rome was not an alliance, as Judaea proudly enjoyed in earlier years, but simply a financial and military support system. As long as the client king could create a stable environment and provide for the Roman empire when necessary, he was safe. Judaea, however, had even greater responsibilities, as it also supported Jews throughout the empire. If Judaea succeeded, so did the Jews. Herod recognized that in order to protect the practice of Jewish customs, he needed to make sure that Judaea was not an isolated state. Herod insisted on the participation in Rome’s imperial mission of Hellenizing the client kingdoms and ruled according to the system of euergetism, a philosophy based on generosity through civic benefaction in exchange for gifts which symbolically honored the benefactor, to boost public relations. Herod’s skills in diplomacy and his general wealth were legendary, and they carried him through the transitions between Roman rulers. The reputation
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169 Grant, Herod the Great, 97 - 98
Herod built for himself protected him as a king, and supported the Jewish people who were dependent on Roman decrees should they make any requests from the Roman government.\(^{172}\)

In Polybius'\(^{173}\) oration at the funeral of King Attalus I of Pergamon, he lists some of the most essential characteristics of an ideal Hellenistic king. A Hellenistic king should be wealthy, faithful to his allies, and always ready to fight for the freedom of his people. A Hellenistic king was a guardian and a protector for all the populations within his realm. He guaranteed their prosperity and brought peace to their neighbors. This king was also a patron of the arts and often surrounded himself with poets, philosophers, and historians.\(^{174}\) The practice of spreading Hellenism to the client kingdoms was a strategy used by Augustus, to whom Herod would answer following the war at Actium in 31 BCE. Instead of having to control the empire through military force alone, which would drain his resources, he would bring the people together in culture and spirit, and use the military only as necessary. Herod, aware of this set of expectations, strived for these achievements throughout his reign. With overwhelming generosity, Herod supported his people abroad monetarily and regularly sent gifts. Herod was committed to this style of rule, and tried to transform Judaea into the ideal Hellenistic client kingdom.
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\(^{172}\) Flavius Josephus, *Josephus, the Jewish War ; Newly Translated with Extensive Commentary and Archaeological Background Illustrations*, ed. Gaalyahu Cornfeld, Benjamin Mazar, and Paul L. Maier (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Pub. House, 1982), 91.


Before he actually became the client king of Judaea, Herod faced a number of obstacles. Traditionally, when choosing a king for a client kingdom, Rome chose the heir of the previous dynasty of that particular client kingdom.\footnote{Put note with examples of how Rome used this system for other client kingdoms} The heir was already familiar with the customs of his people, and his nation would be more responsive to him than to a foreign ruler. By this precedent, Rome should have chosen a descendent of the Hasmonean family to rule after Hyrcanus II as client king of Judaea.\footnote{Sicker, Between Rome and Jerusalem: 300 Years of Roman-Judaean Relations, 72} Antipater arranged for Herod to prove himself as a more worthwhile candidate, even if it did mean challenging the usual custom. His ongoing successes proved what a great asset he would be on the eastern frontier. In 46 BCE Herod served as the \textit{strategos}\footnote{According to Saddington, the term strategos implies that he had an administrative position with some military duties. Governors in the area believed that he could efficiently collect taxes and provide security for the area. See Denis B. Saddington, "Client Kings' Armies under Augustus: The Case of Herod," in \textit{Herod and Augustus: Papers Presented at the IJS Conference, 21st-23rd June 2005}, ed. David M. Jacobson and Nikos Kokkinos (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 308.} of Coele Syria, north of Galilee and Samaria. Four years later, Cassius again honored him with the position of \textit{strategos}, and put him in control of the army. Cassius awarded Herod this position because he was a competent, dependable, and, most importantly, ardent supporter of the Roman representative.

Herod was loyal to Cassius until just before his death, at which point he switched his allegiance to the next Roman representative in the east, Mark Antony. Herod’s connection to Antony was strengthened by Antipater’s commitment to Antony, which was then passed down to Herod.\footnote{Grant, \textit{Herod the Great}, 44} Antony reinstated Herod as a tetrarch, and he planned to promote him to the position of client king of Judaea. On several occasions, bands of Jews traveled to see Antony, requesting that he not
appoint Herod as king since they believed he was stealing the crown from Hyrcanus II.\textsuperscript{179} If Herod and his father had not been so dedicated to serving the needs of Rome, Antony would possibly have been more willing to hear the pleas of these Jews. Herod was able to remind Antony of his father’s extensive services to Julius Caesar and of his fifteen year friendship with Antipater. Most effectively, Herod presented Antony with a gold crown to pay him off. Antony did not want to destroy the friendship and lose the benefits of Herod’s loyalty and generosity. These Judaean protestors did not have nearly Herod’s wealth or connections. The first time a group came to denounce Herod in Daphne a suburb of Antioch, Herod paid Antony to thwart their efforts after they presented their case. At the third and last attempt, a group of one thousand men waited to meet Antony in Tyre. Antony refused to see this group yet again and ordered the Roman commander in Tyre to get rid of them prior to his arrival.\textsuperscript{180} While Herod lacked the support of these thousand men, he still tried to help them avoid trouble. Conscious of the pull he had with Antony, Herod knew that this group would not succeed. He attempted to have them withdraw quietly, so as not to cause an embarrassing and possibly fatal dismissal. The group however refused to disperse, and suffered casualties including several executions by the hands of the Roman troops as a result.\textsuperscript{181}

Herod’s insistence on constant allegiance to Rome worried Judaeans, who feared for Herod’s resolve to protect the Jewish way of life; this fear may have triggered the idea to petition Antony. Jews were suspicious of the role that Herod

\textsuperscript{179} Hyrcanus II defended Herod arguing that Herod actually prevented Antigonus from overthrowing his own rule. See Sicker, Between Rome and Jerusalem: 300 Years of Roman-Judaean Relations, 69
\textsuperscript{180} Sicker, Between Rome and Jerusalem: 300 Years of Roman-Judaean Relations, 68 - 69
\textsuperscript{181} Jones, The Herods of Judaea, 38 - 39
played in integrating Hellenistic ideas to the Judaean kingdom.\textsuperscript{182} Ironically, they seemed to understand the power structure as much as Herod did when they decided to approach Antony. Judaea was not a state that could stand on its own, and they needed Roman permission to make any political changes. Herod also recognized Roman control, but was better equipped and knew how to use it. He had to show that he could control the Jews so that he could keep his position and protect Jewish values. At the same time, Herod had to strike the balance of not appearing as a Roman puppet, while still not opposing the Romans. Josephus quotes Herod as claiming that as a result of the prestige that he had acquired abroad, he was able to guarantee the wants of Jews abroad and Judaeans at home.\textsuperscript{183} Herod announced at the inauguration of the Temple, “I think I need not speak to you, my countrymen, about such other works as I have done since I came to the kingdom, although I may say they have been performed in such a manner as to bring more security to you than glory to myself.”\textsuperscript{184} Only after Herod began his leadership as king was he able to show his dedication to the protection of the Jews.

With Antony’s support, Herod attended a meeting accompanied by both Antony and Octavian.\textsuperscript{185} Octavian was clearly impressed with Herod’s abilities and successful policies. In 40 BCE, Herod formally received and accepted the throne. Together with Octavian and Antony, he deposited a sacrifice at the capital to confirm the earlier decision of the senate, which now had Antony and

\begin{footnotesize}
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Octavian’s authorization. Though offering a sacrifice in a pagan Temple was against Jewish tradition, as the client king, Herod made the decision to accompany his patrons to the Temple and participate as an act of solidarity. In truth, Herod may not have cared that he was sacrificing in a pagan temple for any personal religious reasons, but he did maintain that in order to keep the relationship that he had just earned, he needed to participate in this ceremony at least for the sake of appearances. Herod’s absence from such a ceremony may not have harmed the relationship dramatically, but his presence would be noted and celebrated as a consecration of friendship between the two parties. Herod established for himself a reputation among Roman senators, citizens, and, most importantly, the two remaining parties of the second triumvirate.

Once Herod was rewarded with the position of client king, his next task was to take over the land which he was to rule. Herod still had to overcome those who supported Antigonus and sided with the Parthians. To help in these efforts, Rome sent military assistance to Herod. Herod allowed the people the opportunity to put an end to the bloodshed they would incur should he have to fight. Before even starting, he gave his enemy the option of preventing the war so the people would not be harmed. Herod negotiated these terms knowing that if the people would surrender before having gone to war, he would begin his rule in a better atmosphere, not as a cruel king. Roman support made his victory absolute, so his offer to the enemies to surrender immediately was a gift. However, the supporters

186 Feldman, *Studies in Hellenistic Judaism*, 42
of Antigonus refused the offer and the war continued. The enemy in Jerusalem was defeated and Antigonus was shipped to Rome and later beheaded.

Following his victory in Jerusalem, Herod faced another, more delicate challenge. One of the advantages of fighting in a such a war was the collection of spoils from the defeated city. The soldiers would pillage a city as payment for their services. Herod would never be forgiven if he allowed the soldiers to pillage Jerusalem, and more importantly, the Temple. Though he had just fought a war there, he now had to rule over the people he overcame. Realizing this problem, Herod found a solution which saved face in dealing with Jerusalem while also preventing his relationship with Rome from collapsing as a result of depriving the Romans of such pleasures: he personally paid off the Romans and their armies.

From his own funds, Herod provided a large sum of money to their leader, Gaius Sosius, the governor of Syria, as well as the eleven legions Sosius had brought with him. Rocca is of the opinion that Herod’s decision to pay the Romans off was a grand act of mercy. On the one hand, Herod was trying to protect the nation he would rule in the future, but the true nature of his decision was twofold. As a client king, his job was to serve both the Judaeans and the Romans. To keep both, he paid whatever was necessary to appease the Romans, and keep from losing whatever support he may be able to accrue in the Jewish realm.

187 Sicker, Between Rome and Jerusalem: 300 Years of Roman-Judaean Relations, 75
188 Grant, Herod the Great, 59
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190 After fighting the Parthians in 38 BCE, Antony had an excess of newly unemployed troops. He gladly sent the troops to Herod to keep them occupied and transfer source of payment for their services. See Sicker, Between Rome and Jerusalem: 300 Years of Roman-Judaean Relations, 75
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While Antony and Octavian were both in control of their respective areas, Herod most often dealt with Antony, as ruler of the East. Herod had a friendship with Antony, which proved valuable once Antony became entangled with Cleopatra. Cleopatra, the last ruler of Ptolemaic Egypt, had her heart set on reinstating the empire her predecessors had once possessed. Along with some of the Greek lands, she was determined to acquire Judaea, or parts of it, in her effort. As for the other Levantine dynasties, she had one client king executed and took his land, recovered several coastal cities in Phoenicia, and nearly their entire maritime strip. Given the fate that his fellow client kings suffered, Herod could assume that his would be the same.

In preparation for the future diplomatic relations between Judaea and Antony, Herod built a fortress by the Temple in Jerusalem named Antonia, after Mark Antony himself, in recognition of Antony’s support in conquering his kingdom. Kasher claims that the only reason Herod chose this name was because of his manipulative nature. Kasher is correct in his assertion that this was the reason for Herod’s choice, but he misinterprets Herod’s probable motivation: naming buildings to bolster political friendships was a standard procedure. Like any good politician, Herod knew the source of his backing and protected it. He was as manipulative as anyone is in diplomatic matters, and through these manipulations he kept Antony’s support. Later when he was accused of having his

---

192 Grant, *Herod the Great*, 77-78
nephew Aristobulus III drowned, he was able to overcome Cleopatra’s insinuations in support of Alexandra, Herod’s sister in law. The fortress and further gifts shielded Herod from Cleopatra’s wrath.

Herod, in another impressive display of diplomacy and persuasion, weathered the effects of Cleopatra’s notorious hold on Antony. Initially, Cleopatra suggested to Antony that he depose Herod, but Antony refused to eliminate such a loyal supporter, especially just after he had put down the Jewish rebellion. Instead of implementing Cleopatra’s alternate plan to attain land just fifteen miles from Jerusalem, which could endanger the safety of the city, Herod and Cleopatra settled on a compromise. Originally Antony proposed giving the city of Jericho to Cleopatra along with all of its agricultural riches. Herod saved the land, and circumvented the possibility of future conflict by establishing a payment of rent under which Cleopatra received two hundred talents per year. In addition, Herod ensured that Cleopatra would receive the rent promised by Malchus, the Nabataean king, in order to keep the Egyptians out of the districts east of the Dead Sea. This arrangement satisfied Cleopatra. The Judaeans could rest assured that they would not have the Egyptians, who were bent on taking over,

194 Aristobulus III was the last direct descendant of the Hasmonean family, a clear incentive for Herod to have him killed as he was a threat to Herod’s rule.
196 Cleopatra inspired to recreate the empire that once existed under Arsinoe Philadelphus, during the Ptolemaic golden age. these lands included all of southern Syria. In 37 - 36 BCE, she had Antony execute Lysanias, tetrarch of the Ituraeans. She turned next towards Malchus and Herod’s land. See Jones, The Herods of Judaea, 49
197 Jones explains that the palm groves and balsam gardens were one of the greatest sources of revenue for the king in Judaea. See Jones, The Herods of Judaea, 49-50
198 Jones, The Herods of Judaea, 50 - 51
in their backyard. Jews in this area were also able to continue to benefit from the medicinal balsam trees that grew in the groves. Herod’s great wealth was put to use in protecting the economic basis and general well being of his people, making sure that they did not feel threatened. Herod’s manipulation kept him in good standing with Antony.

The benefits of this relationship came to a halt following the battle at Actium in 31 BCE. In this final battle, Antony and Cleopatra were defeated, and Octavian claimed control over of the Roman Empire. As luck would have it, Herod was ordered to fight off the Nabataean “barbarians” at the direction of Cleopatra. Cleopatra wanted to loosen the relationship between Antony and Herod by preventing Herod from fighting to support Antony’s campaign. When Herod later needed to make amends with Octavian as his father did with Julius Caesar, he was able to claim less involvement in fighting against the new emperor thanks to Cleopatra. Instead, Octavian was able to focus on the future advantages of keeping Herod as the client king of Judaea. Following a meeting in Rhodes in 30 BCE, Herod recovered the title of king, as did other client kings. Not only
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was Herod granted the position of king, but Octavian returned lands lost to Antony and Cleopatra including Joppa, Judaea’s prime seaport.\textsuperscript{202}

As far as Octavian was concerned, Herod had proved himself to be an ideal client king, and Octavian welcomed his future support.\textsuperscript{203} Herod ensured his own protection, at least for a time, and by virtue of his relationship with Octavian, maintained the ability to safeguard the customs of the Jews. According to Josephus, as a result of the close ties between Augustus and Herod, other proconsuls around the empire gave rights to the Jews too. These politicians did not want to incur that wrath of the imperial master’s favorite vassal.\textsuperscript{204} Again, this assertion may have been an exaggeration on Josephus’ part, but it does shed light on the extent to which other magistrates and kings knew and respected their relationship.

Over time the relationship between Augustus and Herod grew stronger. Herod’s sons Alexander and Aristobulus were raised in Rome under the auspices of Gaius Asinius Pollio\textsuperscript{205} to be educated in Roman life and culture. Augustus was fond of Herod’s sons and welcomed the family members of a dear friend.\textsuperscript{206} Josephus comments on the closeness that Herod enjoyed with the emperor, claiming that Herod was only second to Augustus after Agrippa, his closest confidant, and vise versa.\textsuperscript{207} Josephus may have overstated the actual strength of
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the friendship, but his statement still provides insight as to the way that Herod and Augustus regarded each other. The two shared many similarities as figures who both struggled to establish their rule, created building programs, and brought a renewal in the cultural foundations of the states. While the two were definitely situated in very different places politically, they often saw eye to eye. Philo notes that Augustus had a bull and two lambs sacrificed in the Temple of Jerusalem on a daily basis as a gesture to his friendship with Herod and his Jewish god. In response to the good will of Augustus, the Jews included a prayer for him, their leader abroad, in their daily services.\footnote{208} To further Augustus’ good will towards his new protégée, he supplied Herod with the four hundred Galatians who once worked as the guards of Cleopatra. Herod was extremely successful in eschewing any negative associations that could have affected his friendship with Augustus.

As noted by Josephus, the friendship that Herod most treasured was not just with Augustus, but also with his right hand man Marcus Agrippa. When Agrippa travelled to Antioch in 15 BCE, Herod immediately sought to meet him and insisted that Agrippa should visit Judaea to receive a true welcome. Herod prepared a feast and gave him the tour of the luxurious buildings he had erected.\footnote{209} Josephus reported that the Jews in Jerusalem also dressed in their best attire to meet Agrippa upon his arrival. Flattered by the procession and general festivities, Agrippa sponsored a hecatomb to be sacrificed in the Temple and joined the people at the banquet. Josephus also notes that Agrippa would have

\footnote{208} Philo, "On the Embassy to Gaius: The First Part of the Treatise on Virtues," 317. Josephus comments that it was not actually a gesture to the Judeans since in the end they would have to pay for the sacrifices themselves. Schurer on the other hand points out that the money actually did come from the emperor. See Josephus, “The Antiquities of the Jews,” 2.10.4, 2.17; 2-4)\footnote{209} Lichtenberger, Achim, "Herod and Rome: Was Romanisation a Goal of the Building Policy of Herod," 48
stayed longer if not for the dangers of bad weather.\textsuperscript{210} Herod had been working on this friendship for several years before Agrippa actually made the trip to Jerusalem. Herod met Agrippa during his first reign as governor in Mytilene, and again in east Asia in 17 BCE. In 14 BCE, Agrippa asked Herod for ships while he was trying to settle the disturbances in Bosphorus. In the end, though Herod did attempt to comply with Agrippa’s request, his ships were stopped by winds at Chios. Nevertheless, Agrippa appreciated Herod’s efforts and invited him to join him in Ephesus.

Herod saw the closeness that Augustus shared with Agrippa and was glad to have another supporter in Rome, and especially one with such great influence. Agrippa also had influence in territories in his own right, and Herod sought to benefit from this influence as well. When the two were in Ephesus, the Jews requested an audience with Agrippa to settle their complaints against the Greeks. The local Greek citizens insisted that the Jews should not have citizenship, as they did not worship the local Ionian gods. Not only did these Greeks want to deprive the neighboring Jews of their rights as citizens, but they also forced them to participate in the military and attend to court matters on the Sabbath. The Greeks prevented money meant for payment of the Temple tax to be sent to Jerusalem because they felt that the money should go to their government, as the civic duty of all citizens.\textsuperscript{211} Although the imperial decrees had already allowed the Jews to
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practice their customs as they desired, the decrees evidently did not hold the force that Jews hoped they would. While in Ephesus with Agrippa, Herod was able to convince Agrippa to hear the Jewish grievances. Had Herod not interceded on behalf of the Jews in Ephesus, they may never have been able to present their case. Following the discussion regarding the Jewish appeal, Agrippa granted the Jews all that they requested to repay Herod’s good will towards him.212

Just as Attalus protected his people, Herod protected the inhabitants of Judaea and the neighboring cities. He was able to restore the Judaean state to approximately the size of the Hasmonean kingdom before him. The lands that he recovered included coastal cities, which were useful for trade, a business in which Herod himself was involved. Herod refurbished Joppa, Judaea’s main city for international commerce. He also was aware that most of the Judaeans worked as farmers. On several occasions the rural population were overcome with troubles as a result of famines. On these occasions, once in 25 - 24 BCE, and again in 20 - 19 BCE, Herod melted down gold and silver from his own palace in order to provide gifts of wheat and general necessities for the wellbeing of his people.213 Herod also provided clothing to warm the people during the winter.214 According to Josephus, “There had been nobody in want, that was left destitute of a suitable assistance by him.”215 Once Herod met the needs of Judaea, he also sent grain and other gifts to neighboring Syrians as a friendly gesture.
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The ability to distribute these gifts was not solely a monetary matter; it was a matter of relationships. The Hasmonean kings before him had not had the connections or the funds to provide for their people the way that Herod did. Herod sent the money for the corn to his friend Petronius, a prefect in Egypt, who took Herod’s case first out of many, and assisted Herod in purchasing and exporting the corn. Herod paid for the wheat from his own funds\textsuperscript{216} so that his people did not suffer.\textsuperscript{217} On other occasions, when Judaeans were having difficulty economically, Herod subsidized the tax burden to a third of the amount usually required, again from his own funds and royal properties. Herod gathered a substantial amount of wealth such that he would be able to give aid to his people, or other nations should they need it. Using these funds was Herod’s way of building friendships and future prosperity.

Herod’s generosity crossed the bounds of Judaea as he embarked on more building projects in distant cities. He erected marble temples in these cities to honor Caesar and decorated them inside with beautiful sanctuaries. One function of these projects was to make up for the lack of emperor worship in the more Jewish areas of the kingdom.\textsuperscript{218} He also constructed aqueducts, theaters, and stadiums for Olympic games. He supplied the necessary items and funds to cities that could not produce the revenues they needed. Herod’s building projects were widely scattered and included cities such as Chios, Tyre, Athens, Damascus,
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\textsuperscript{218} Josephus, \textit{Josephus, the Jewish War ; Newly Translated with Extensive Commentary and Archaeological Background Illustrations}, 78
Antioch and Laodicea. In Rhodes he dedicated a temple to Apollo and repaired the Rhodian war fleet, a favor for which Rome was thankful. He built public buildings in Nicopolis, and financed the restoration of the Olympic center in Elis. Roller claims that the temple of Rome and Augustus on the Acropolis was erected at Herod’s expense. Given the extent of Herod’s investments, it is surprising that he did not build in Alexandria. Rocca believed that Herod did not want to undermine Augustus’ domination in Egypt, an imperial province. Herod was consciously making a good name for himself and for his people to strengthen the support of Rome and of other surrounding cities. He also knew, however, when his services would not be well received.

The ideal Hellenistic king supported cities abroad, but also brought Hellenistic themes to his own state. Conforming to this practice, Herod named his new architectural masterpieces after Roman rulers. He changed the name of Samaria to Sebaste, the Greek word for Augustus, and the newly fortified Straton’s tower was renamed Caesarea. Herod also built a temple by Jordan dedicated to the Pagan god Pan. In Jerusalem, Herod constructed an amphitheater where he hosted athletic games. He put up inscriptions honoring Augustus, displayed gilded trophies depicting Augustus’ conquered foes, and invited
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222 Though Herod was trying to honor Augustus through these gilded trophies, these trophies also contributed to friction between Herod and the Jews. Jews were nervous that these trophies were actually images for worship underneath. In an effort to allay the fears of the Jews, Herod ordered that the trophies be stripped of decoration in order to prove that there was nothing there. Though the point was proven, there was still some discomfort in the placement of these trophies. See Karl Galinsky, "The Augustan Programme of Cultural Renewal and Herod," in *Herod and Augustus: Papers Presented at the IJS Conference, 21st-23rd June 2005*, ed. David M. Jacobson and Nikos Kokkinos (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 39 - 40.
leaders from all over the Roman empire to visit Jerusalem, to view the great accomplishments of the Judaean state. Herod hosted festivals in Jerusalem and offered large prizes as rewards to add to the festivities.\textsuperscript{223} Inspired by the games, Augustus himself sponsored gladiator tournaments and equipped the men in the arena. As a token of his appreciation, Herod donated three hundred talents to the games in the Circus Maximus in celebration of Augustus’ new title as pontifex maximus in 12 BCE.\textsuperscript{224}

Herod was calculating and strategic in his diplomacy with Rome, making sure that all the essential Roman figures could see his accomplishments firsthand. Herod’s projects were only one step below that of the imperial family in quantity and grandeur. He familiarized himself with the trends of the Roman revolution and built accordingly. Augustus was putting together an empire through cultural cohesion, and Herod of all client kings was going to comply magnificently. Though many Romans did not recognize the building methods he used or the shapes of his structures meant to imitate those of the Romans, they did produce the appearance of great luxuries and up-to-date technology.\textsuperscript{225}

One of Herod’s greatest accomplishments, specifically meant to pacify his Jewish constituency, was his plan to build a newly refurbished Temple in Jerusalem in 19 BCE. When the idea was first revealed to the people of Jerusalem, it was met with some uneasiness. The inhabitants of Jerusalem and the religious
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communities of Judaea were afraid that although Herod may have had big plans, he would not follow through with the project. The Jews were worried that after Herod had decimated the original Temple, the replacement would never be completed, and they would be left without their prized sanctuary. When Herod did finish the project of rebuilding the Temple, the result was magnificent. In the Talmud Bava Batra there is a discussion that mentions a supposed conversation between Bava ben Buta and Herod. Here Herod is praised for rebuilding the Temple and the passage asserts that people have never seen a building as beautiful as this one. The sages concurred, “He who has not seen the Temple of Herod, has never seen a beautiful building.” Though there was definite hesitation in permitting Herod to take on such an overwhelming and essential task, he was able to once again prove his reputation. The Temple was admired by all who came to view the celebrated sanctuary.

As the intermediary between the Romans and Judaea, Herod constantly needed to address the cultural differences between the two groups. One of the clearest displays of his split policies is the case of his currency. Most of Herod’s coins did not change remarkably from earlier generations in that they did not contain any images of rulers. Jewish law dictated that this was against the religion, and Herod, though not always careful about Jewish laws in his personal life, made

226 According to the Babylonian Talmud Baba Batra, Rav Hisda explains that a synagogue cannot be taken down unless there is a new one to replace it. The two reasons suggested for this are that in the interim there will be no place for prayer, and that the community may fail to completely replace the synagogue after it is taken down. Bava Ben Buta advises Herod to rebuild the Temple possibly because the original showed signs of disrepair, or the fact that it was Herod the king that made the gesture rather than an ordinary man, the Jews would be more secure in his promise. See Yosaf A. Weiss and Hersh Goldwurm, eds., *[Masekhet Bava Batra] = Tractate Bava Basra : The Gemara : The Classic Vilna Edition, with an Annotated, Interpretive Elucidation...* (Brooklyn, NY: Mesorah Publications, 1992), 4a - 4b.
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sure to keep the coins neutral, as he attempted in his national policies. While
upholding the Jewish law, he did depict some Roman and Hellenistic symbolism
in an effort to simultaneously support his non-Jewish inhabitants, as well as rulers
abroad. The coins were decorated with elements such as a star on a helmet, the
star representing Augustus, and the helmet being Julius Caesar’s head. On other
coins there were images of a tripod which may have symbolized Apollo, the god
Augustus was most faithful to, in addition to coins with shields, winged caduceus,
poppy pod, pomegranates, and palm branches. These coins were produced for
the army and laborers of Herod’s building projects. Coins, a common tool for
propaganda, presented the combination of Jewish restrictions and Hellenistic
symbolism in the life of Herod. The coins also witnessed Herod’s desire to
comply with Jewish tradition and to work within the law to achieve his other
goals.

Because of this dichotomy in his career, Herod, like his father, was able to
see that his fellow Jews abroad were provided for and protected adequately.
Antipater set a precedent for securing Jewish rights from Roman and Greek
magistrates, and Herod committed himself to keeping these rights alive. As long
as there was stability in the countries of the empire, Rome did not need to
intervene on anyone’s behalf. Because of the past history and common thread
between Herod and Augustus, Herod’s requests as well as those of the Jews he
represented did not go unanswered. In one of Augustus’ edicts in favor of the
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Jews in Asia, he stated that Jews had the right to follow their own customs in accordance with their laws and the laws of their fathers. The Jews were given permission to observe their Sabbath, a concept Augustus never fully understood, and if anyone should steal religious books or money, his land would be confiscated and deposited in the Roman treasury. The fact that Augustus needed to specify each offense suggests that Jews in Asian cities truly needed the laws. The threat of public punishment was meant to highlight the seriousness of the decrees. Augustus was upholding the policy of Julius Caesar, and it would have been an insult to both emperors if anyone should think himself above these laws.

Augustus had letters written to magistrates in Delos after hearing that they were keeping the Jews from observing their laws, obliging them to once again allow Jews to live in accordance with their customs and contribute money to common meals and sacred rights. In addition, Augustus reintroduced Julius Caesar’s previous policies in regard to public societies. Just as Julius Caesar had done, Augustus excused the Jews from this rule against gathering as an organization and allowed them to assemble in their religious societies.

Augustus concluded the letter by proclaiming that any city that had passed laws
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depriving the Jews of their rights had to revoke those laws, as the Jews have shown good will towards Rome and were worthy of friendship. This worthiness of course was a result of Herod’s constant vigilance and promotion of Roman policies.

Augustus also made sure that celebrating the Sabbath would not be an obstacle in the daily lives of Jews in Rome and in cities around the empire. He ordered that if the monthly corn dole was distributed on the Sabbath, the officials should hold the portions meant for Jews so that they could pick them up on the following day. Jews were not allowed to receive or give any gifts and especially could not be involved in work relating to commerce on the Sabbath. In another instance, Augustus issued a decree announcing that no one should stop the Jews from keeping the Sabbath. The pronouncement was made following several petitions to Greek and Roman officers. Again the fact that Augustus had to present yet another decree shows the necessity to have Augustus back their pleas. Without him, Jews could not hope to overcome these daily challenges.

Augustus sent out more decrees addressing complaints about stolen money that was supposed to have been sent to the Temple in Jerusalem for the Temple tax. The difficulty of sending money outside of the city, even after the case against Flaccus never disappeared. For this reason, Jews constantly needed to appeal to Roman support. The Jews in Cyrene sent envoys to Augustus Caesar explaining the situation. Following the meeting, Caesar granted them equality in
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taxation, thereby allowing them to pay the taxes of the cities they inhabited and to
send additional monies to the Temple without the risk of having it stolen. In a
similar situation, Augustus sent a letter to Gaius Norbanus Flaccus for the
magistrates of Sardis. The decree written in 12 BCE reinforced the laws of his
predecessor.

Other rights granted to Jews included the permission to establish their own
courts and a formal exemption from military service. Jews were allowed to be
judged in their own courts should both parties be of Jewish descent, and were
allowed to perform judicial services according to their native customs and laws.235
Regarding Roman military service, a letter was sent explaining the reasons that
Jews could not join the military. Though the letter with the explanation may have
helped leaders to understand the reasons for rights in question, the force behind
these letters was the fact that there was a precedent. Governors and magistrates
looked at the laws of those before them and of other cities to decide how to rule in
their own territory. In another instance, Dolabella received an envoy who asked
him to exempt the Jews from military service so that they could worship
according to their traditional values. After this audience he immediately sent his
officials to enforce these laws throughout Asia.236 Since Jews in many cities were
previously allowed to gather together to perform their sacred rites without the
disturbance of military service, the decision to allow for the continuance of these
rites was easier to uphold.

235 Askowith, The Toleration and Persecution of the Jews in the Roman Empire, 185
As the client king of such a diverse and unstable area as Judaea, Herod’s success is quite impressive. No king in the east was out of Rome’s sphere of influence, and Herod advanced in the ranks while other client kings did not even survive. His accomplishments were praised by the Roman leaders at each stage of his rise towards election as the king, and the praises continued throughout his reign. He was victorious over the Nabataeans and Parthians, and acquired tremendous wealth, which he later used to supply comforts and luxuries in Judaea and in other Roman properties. Herod was strategic in the placement of support, so that if he ever needed Roman help for his own purposes, he would have no trouble securing it. As Attalus did in his kingdom, Herod was fully committed to his constituents and allowed their sacred laws and customs to thrive in cities throughout the empire.
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Chapter 5: The Collapse of Herod’s Kingdom

Immediately following Herod’s death in 4 BCE, the client kingdom that Antipater and Herod had worked so diligently to build began to crumble. Antipater’s balancing act between the interests of Rome and those of Judaea deteriorated with Herod’s passing. Herod’s sons put minimal effort into securing the rights of the Judaean people under Roman rule, as their father had done through skillful diplomacy, gifts, and military assistance. Once they were awarded their positions in Rome, each neglected the extra maintenance necessary to prolong the unity and success of the Judaean lands. Augustus, who enjoyed a close relationship with Herod, was rightfully skeptical of the leadership capabilities of Herod’s sons, especially, those of Archelaus. Antipater and Herod knew how to direct the Roman client system to their advantage, whereas Archelaus was never able to accomplish what his predecessors had. Augustus gave Archelaus the chance to prove himself as ethnarch of Judaea. Archelaus did not possess the skills set his father and grandfather possessed, and within one generation Archelaus lost control of his people, Judaeans were massacred by Romans and the Judaean royal army, and the prosperity Judaea had once enjoyed collapsed.

Augustus trusted Herod and honored him by allowing him to choose his own successor. Though Augustus would later have to confirm this decision in order for Herod’s last will to be enacted, Herod’s proposal for the next client king of Judaea carried a heavy weight. Herod recognized, however, that the expansive
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state that he had cultivated through careful leadership and public relations could not be safeguarded by the rule of any one of his sons. Sicker argues that Herod was so sure that his sons would fail that, rather than choosing one son to rule over the entire kingdom, he broke it down into three parts.\textsuperscript{239} Herod understood that choosing only one son as his successor in order to keep the kingdom intact would be more dangerous than having two sons rule a portion of the kingdom as tetrarchs, and a the third as the Judaean king. A kingdom that was pieced together over two generations, and which had enjoyed a steady economy as well as political and religious freedoms under Rome, was consequently dismantled. In Herod’s final will, which was read before Augustus, he chose Archelaus as his heir to the throne to rule over Judaea proper and Samaria, and Phillip and Antipas as tetrarchs in the remaining parts of the kingdom.\textsuperscript{240}

In his zeal to rule as king of Judaea, Archelaus immediately made his first error as a client king by beginning his reign without the emperor’s confirmation. Instead, Archelaus’ initial step as king was to respond to the complaints and requests of his subjects. With a new king on the throne, some Judaeans felt a new confidence to make demands, whereas with Herod they had not acted with such audacity. Herod’s rule was over,\textsuperscript{241} and if his subjects could influence the new king from the beginning, it would set the atmosphere for the rest of his reign. Citizens of the city insisted that he decrease the payments for personal taxes, remove duties on manufactured goods, and release the prisoners arrested during
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Herod’s reign. In the hopes of gaining popularity, Archelaus erred a second time by immediately considering these complaints. He resolved to soon take the high priest, Joazar, out of office, and replace him with a high priest of the people’s choice, rather than a high priest who would serve as his pawn. As soon as the Judaeans saw that Archelaus could be approached without fear, they began to make more demands. Archelaus, who originally wanted to please all of his subjects, became frustrated. He informed the people that he could not make any changes until he was fully instated as the client king by Augustus Caesar. By then, however, he had already presented himself as a weak and malleable king, and, even worse, he had shown his dependence on Rome.

Since Archelaus chose to not resolve the people’s demands before he left for Rome, he left Judaea in a state of great tension. Passover was approaching, a time when people from all over Judaea made a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, and Joazar, who was still the high priest, would lead the processions. The crowds in Jerusalem grew as people arrived to celebrate Passover, and to advocate for the removal of Joazar. The fact that the Jews felt able to assemble and create such a disturbance while Archelaus was still in the country shows that they did not feel threatened by him, but rather felt empowered to pressure him to honor their requests. Archelaus, nervous that Rome would perceive him as impotent, immediately sought to suppress this rebellion. He realized that he needed to show that he would not tolerate disrespect, but he went too far in his response. In an effort to quickly end the riots that broke out around the city uniting against his
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policies, Archelaus triggered an even greater riot when he placed troops by the Temple to calm the people. Though it may not have been Archelaus’ intention, his army massacred 3,000 Jews in Jerusalem. Archelaus so adamantly wanted to prove to Rome that he could control the kingdom, in order to officially gain his title, that he acted rashly, without considering the repercussions. In order to get the quick fix he needed, Archelaus used unnecessary force to end the problem. These actions set the tone of Archelaus’ rule and gave his people an unpleasant preview of what they could expect in the future.

As a result of the casualties after the riot in Jerusalem, an effort began during Archelaus’ reign to rid Judaea of the client king and instead become a province of Rome. While Archelaus was gone, Sabinus, the Syrian procurator, took a particular interest in Judaea’s instability. He claimed it was his responsibility to take over Judaea after Herod’s death, and Judaea, angry with Archelaus, was perfectly positioned for Sabinus to take charge. The only reason Sabinus’ effort was deflected was because the legate, Quinctilius Varus, defended Archelaus’ right follow his father. Varus dealt with Sabinus to keep the kingdom under Archelaus’ rule, but in actuality he had no particular affinity for Archelaus, and his support was temporary. Sabinus ignored Varus and stepped in to take control of Herod’s fortresses and treasury in Judaea. As Sabinus began to take over Judaea, he sent a report to Augustus that outlined Archelaus’ inability to rule effectively. Not only did Sabinus undermine Archelaus’ rule by seizing his
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kingdom, but he also tried to sabotage Archelaus’ effort to retain his position with Rome, in defense of which Archelaus had departed for Rome, and left Judaea vulnerable, to begin with.\textsuperscript{247} Sabinus’ ability to come so close to destroying the rule of Archelaus before it even officially began illustrates the clear lack of support for Archelaus among both his people and Varus. Varus was willing to defend Archelaus’ right to rule in Judaea, but had no interest in physically repelling Sabinus’ forces. Archelaus did not make the appropriate efforts to gain trust and build alliances among the Roman rulers on the eastern frontier before or during his reign, and consequently could not count on anyone’s support.

Archelaus’ campaign to keep the title of king in Judaea endured several more setbacks. In addition to the accusatory report sent by Sabinus, Varus attested to the fact that the situation in Judaea was deteriorating. There was virtually a full-scale revolt against Rome and the Herodian family: Jews wanted to free themselves from Herodian rule, and to live under the general oversight of the Syrian legate.\textsuperscript{248} Now that Herod was gone, the Jews who lived in Rome saw no need to support the new client king. When Herod was king, these Jews could trust that their relationship with Rome was protected. Keeping a stable relationship with Rome had been essential to Herod, as had been his relationship with Jews abroad, who could vouch for him in Rome itself. Jews who lived in Rome could not count on Judaea to keep Roman support under the rule of Archelaus. In 40 BCE, Antigonus, the son of Aristobulus II, had sided with the Parthians, and Archelaus could potentially do the same, putting Jews living in Rome in an
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extremely dangerous situation. These Jews therefore abandoned their support for Judaeans and sought autonomous rule under Rome as well, under the relationship that Herod had established for them.

Once in Rome, Archelaus was beleaguered by his brothers, who also sought the throne, or at least to increase the lands under their jurisdiction. Antipas made four arguments to Augustus as to why Archelaus, of the three, was the least appropriate candidate for the throne. First, Antipas pointed out that Archelaus ignored the necessity of getting Augustus’ approval before he began his reign. Archelaus flagrantly ignored the laws mandated on client kings and undermined Augustus’ authority. Antipas also expressed contempt for the lack of respect that Archelaus showed their father, Augustus’ friend, by mourning in the daytime, enjoying lavish parties with festivities at night, which were inappropriate so soon after their father’s death. He also suggested that Archelaus sowed unrest among the people, and was cruel: before Archelaus’ arrival in Rome, he had three thousand Jews put to death. Lastly, Antipas claimed that although Herod did choose Archelaus as his successor to the throne, Herod was not sound of mind when he wrote this final will. Antipas suggested that though he respected his father’s decision, he did not believe it was his true desire, especially since in earlier wills, written before he was ill, Herod had selected Antipas for the throne.
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Though Archelaus brought Nicolaus of Damascus, who had once defended Herod, to come to his rescue, his defense was in vain. Augustus had already decided how to divide Judaea and who should reign as king. Augustus chose Archelaus, at least temporarily, to rule over Judaea as an ethnarch, with the potential to earn the position of client king. Augustus was no longer dealing with the skilled and reliable Herod, and could not depend on Archelaus to serve him as Herod once had. Augustus did provide incentives such that in the unlikely event that Archelaus could prove himself as a viable ruler, he would be able to take the throne. He split the sectors of Judaea between the brothers and Salome, Herod’s sister. He gave Salome control of Phasaelis in the Jordan valley, and two coastal cities, Jamnia (Yavneh), and Azotus (Ashdod), and gave Antipas Galilee and Peraea. Philip was allotted the northeast section of the kingdom including Trachonitis, Batanea, Gaulanitis, Auranitis, and parts of Ituraea around Panias. Augustus fulfilled his duty to Herod, but it would only be only a matter of time before he would need to redivide the territory.

While each of the potential heirs to the throne presented his case before Augustus, Judaea was in chaos. Districts in northern Transjordan were overrun with pretenders who claimed the throne, plundered towns, and slaughtered the inhabitants. Without any central leadership in Judaea, anyone could rule until
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he was defeated, at which point another, similarly merciless leader would take control. Sabinus used the garrison in Jerusalem to attack the city and loot the temple. When Varus heard about the revolts he sought to suppress them by bringing his own legions and auxiliaries. He occupied Galilee, Samaria, and headed towards Jerusalem. Varus rounded up 2,000 rebels and crucified them, and sent their leaders to Rome for trial. The lack of control in Judaea was obvious, and the dramatic and gory consequences only strengthened the Jews’ resolve for autonomous rule.

It is easiest to see the weaknesses in Archelaus’ rule by comparing it to that of his father’s. Both Herod and Archelaus had weak support from the Jews in Judaea, but Archelaus ignored this problem, whereas Herod had tried to improve his image. Both were born of parents outside of the Hasmonean line, and, according to some of the population, outside of the Jewish community altogether. In that respect, Archelaus did not have an advantage over Herod. In recognition of his lack of Jewish ancestry, Herod encouraged the adherence to Jewish law when possible. When Herod’s sister Salome was offered a marriage proposal by the Arab king Sillaeus, Herod did not allow the marriage to take place until the king was circumcised. Without this essential piece of the Jewish identity, Herod could not allow him to join the royal family. Archelaus, on the
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other hand, sought a wife for himself who was illegal according to Jewish law: in Deuteronomy it states that if a man dies childless, the law requires that his brother marry the widow. If she has children, however, the marriage is forbidden.²⁵⁹ Archelaus tried to arrange a marriage with the widow of his half brother, Glaphyra, who already had children. According to Jewish law, this type of relationship is considered incestuous. Where Herod was sensitive to the customs of his people’s religion, Archelaus felt he was above the law and ignored others’ protestations.

Archelaus did not seek better standing with the emperor, but was instead carried by the steady relationship his father built. Regardless of whether Archelaus was aware that these coattails could not support him forever, he did not care to impress the imperial family in his own right. Archelaus only ruled for nine years following these revolts, and his great accomplishment was founding one village, which he named *Archelais*, honoring himself.²⁶⁰ He also set up some palm plantations to replace those that were under the jurisdiction of Salome following Augustus’ division of Judaea. When Augustus’ grandson Gaius Caesar, an heir for the position of emperor, was traveling through Syria to Armenia, he bypassed Jerusalem. When Herod had heard that Agrippa was in the east, he had made several trips to visit him and had convinced him to share in the festivities in Judaea. Herod made the effort to build ties and show off the beauty and impressive attractions in Judaea. Archelaus, on the other hand, did not make any gestures by travelling to meet members of the imperial family or by hosting them.

²⁵⁹ Deut. 25:5-10.
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in Judaea in an attempt to regain favor. Augustus actually approved of Gaius’ omission of Jerusalem on his trip because he had already become dissatisfied with Archelaus. According to Suetonius, Augustus felt no need to show Archelaus any imperial favor, and he did not thereafter. Archelaus no longer enjoyed the imperial favor and as a result, neither did the Jewish communities throughout the empire. While Herod used to travel with important magistrates and rulers in the Roman empire, and saw to it that Jewish communities were heard and taken care of, Archelaus ignored their causes. Based on the estimated dates of the decrees made on behalf of the Jewish communities, most ended by 4 BCE, the year of Herod’s death. After this, Josephus does not reference any decrees on behalf of the Jews until over forty years after.

When the complaints against Archelaus grew too great, Augustus summoned him to Rome, along with each of his brothers. Archelaus had ignored Augustus’ advice to rule with moderation, and Augustus was ready to dispose of him. Archelaus’ brothers saw this as an opportunity to gain more land for themselves, not realizing that they too were being judged. Augustus studied each of their records and noted their shortcomings. While Augustus did, in the end, allow the other brothers to keep their jurisdictions, Archelaus’ power was taken away.

Archelaus’ brothers continued to rule and support their cities using Herod’s leadership tactics, and the success of Archelaus’ kingdom deteriorated. Phillip, the tetrarch in Batanaea, Trachonitis, and Auranitis, enlarged his capital, giving it the status of city under the new name “Caesarea Philippi,” and
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established a mint. He also fortified the village Bethsaida and renamed it Julias after Augustus’ daughter. Antipas, the tetrarch of Galilee and Peraea, rebuilt Sepphoris, the capital of Galilee, and refortified Betharamphtha in Peraea. Archelaus was sent into exile in Gaul where he died within ten years. Judaea became a minor Roman province, which included Samaria and Idumaea, and was governed by the prefects in Caesarea with only a brief change to kingship under Agrippa I.

Though Herod’s sons desired the same prestige as their father, they were ill prepared and unfamiliar with the skills needed in order to achieve at his caliber. The kingdom that Antipater and Herod had built up until the end of Herod’s reign depended on diplomacy with both Judaea and Rome. Archelaus’ brothers improved their portions through building projects and encouraging diplomatic relations with Rome. Archelaus, however, could not even uphold the state of Judaea, as it was given to him. Archelaus lost the support of the Judaeans and appeared weak to the Romans. Archelaus never made the same gestures of friendship as Herod, such as travelling to the meet the Roman leaders and honoring the imperial family, unless it suited him personally. Even if he had only been a strong leader for his subjects in Judaea, whose customs he was familiar with, Archelaus could potentially have kept Judaea stable through the transition from Herod, and maintained the status quo. Since he failed at this task, however,
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\[263\] Smallwood, *The Jews under Roman Rule: From Pompey to Diocletian*, 114

\[264\] Josephus, “The Antiquities of the Jews,” 17.13.2

\[265\] Grant, *Herod the Great*, 219 - 222

\[266\] None of the brothers had strong enough political a military bases to impose order on the whole area as their father had done. See Peter Richardson, *Herod: King of the Jews and Friend of the Romans*, 26.
his usefulness to both Romans and Jews ran thin. Within ten years of Herod’s death, Archelaus undid all that Herod and Antipater had built, and Judaea became another Roman province.
Conclusion

The strength of Antipater and Herod’s leadership in Judaea can most clearly be seen when compared to the history that bonded Rome and Judaea before and after their rule. The years of their rule presented a time of security and prosperity for the Jews in Judaea, as well as for Jews in Greek and Roman communities throughout the Roman Empire. Establishing this peace within Judaea and in its relations to the Roman Empire was not a simple feat. The finesse necessary to establish good relations with Roman leaders was significantly heightened in the case of Judaea. The success of Antipater and Herod’s reigns in Judaea were largely a credit to their personal abilities as rulers, and the policies they enacted in that capacity. Both were able to accurately evaluate the necessary obligations they had to Rome and to the Judaean people, and perceived when one needed to take precedent over the other. Antipater and Herod were also sensitive to the smaller gestures that helped cultivate a relationship. Many of projects they began and meetings they arranged were not necessary from a client king, but the accumulation of such gestures is what strengthened the relationship with Rome, and generally kept this relationship consistent during their rules. Antipater and Herod were cognizant of the difference these gestures made in their relationships with Roman rulers, and used them to the advantage of their Jewish subjects who needed the extra security. Aristobulus II, before Antipater, and Archelaus, after Herod, did not comprehend the need for this kind of diplomacy within Judaea and with Rome, and therefore failed to achieve the prosperity which Antipater forged in Judaea, and which Herod sustained.
These gestures were even more crucial when they related to the Jewish people, which was not infrequent. Jews were in the difficult situation of needing request permission and exemptions to protect their right to practice some of their customs in Roman and Greek communities, while simultaneously being unable to fully compensate for the dissociation between them and their neighbors. Jews could not work on the Sabbath, and the celebration of this holiday kept them from conversing as they usually did. Jews also could not join their neighbors in worship, as Jews only worshipped their own god and, according to Jewish law, could not worship any others, as their neighbors considered normal. They requested exemptions from military activities, and therefore were not a part of the camaraderie that formed through this practice. The separation between them and their communities created a lack of trust. Rumors about the origin of the Jewish people circulated, resulting in a stereotype of a people who hated and wanted to harm all others. The combination of the stories that circulated, in addition everyday observations of the Jews’ unusual practice, was cause for suspicion of disloyalty and treason. This impression set the backdrop for Roman and Jewish relations, and made it difficult for Jews to protect their religious practices in foreign communities.

To restore the Jewish reputation in Judaea and abroad, Antipater needed to address obstacles within Judaea. The client state was fractured culturally, and even more so within the Jewish sectors. Arguments over religious law and philosophy divided the Jews, and when Hyrcanus II and Aristobulus II fought for the throne, the state divided even further. Judaeans were not unified in their
beliefs, and the heirs to the throne split the communities while campaigning to be king. The one policy that did unite the Jews in Judaea stemmed from the fact that ever since they won their independence from the Seleucid empire, the dream of independence had never disappeared. Pompey hoped to annex the Syrian and Judaean states, and Judaea did not have a designated leader to direct the international affairs of the state, as Aristobulus II and Hyrcanus II were both vying for the throne in Judaea, and for Rome’s support in that endeavor. Though both were seeking recognition from Pompey, they had distinct agendas. Aristobulus II did not properly assess the political situation before him, and was still insistent on the freedom of Judaea. Antipater, on the other hand, who ruled through the figurehead of Hyrcanus II, understood that the days of Judaea as a free state had ended. He wanted Hyrcanus II to win the throne, and through his position, to be able to secure the freedom of the Jews, insofar as this was possible under the Roman empire. Even if at some points, as with Crassus’ robbery of the Temple, Judeans were angry at the way they had been treated by Romans, Antipater was able to prevent consequences that were far worse such as enslavement in foreign countries and riots suppressed through violence. Antipater focused his attention on devising a practical scenario through which Jews could still keep the lifestyle of self-rule they were accustomed to, under the inevitable rule of the Roman Empire.

Antipater’s greatest skill in ruling Judaea through Hyrcanus II was his ability to balance the needs of both Rome and Judaea. Antipater needed to show Rome that Judaea could be reliable and stable should Rome need assistance from
the Judaeans, and he needed to show the Jews that if they satisfied the needs of the Romans, they could more easily ensure that their religious customs would be protected, not just in Judaea, but also in the communities that Jews inhabited throughout the Roman empire. Antipater’s philosophy was that if Judaeans had good relations with Rome, when communities throughout the Roman empire needed to request that a decree be made to protect their religious practices, Rome would come to their defense. If the Jews made a poor impression on the Romans, and were regularly seen as a public disturbance, Rome would have no reason to support them, since practically, it made no difference to the empire that the Jews received their rights, so long as there were no disturbances. Antipater was greatly accomplished in his ability to unify the Judaeans and support Rome whenever he was given the opportunity to do so. He used his resources and the personal connections at his disposal to create relationships with Roman leaders, including Pompey and Julius Caesar, depending on who was powerful on the Eastern frontier. His dedication to each of the Roman leaders was consistent, and he was able to prove that Judaea would always support Rome. The various decrees attributed to Caesar on behalf of the Jews resulted from Antipater leveraging all that he could in order to impress Caesar. To ensure that this legacy would continue, he placed his son Herod in line for the throne.

Though Herod continued a relationship that had already been built between Rome and Judaea, his accomplishments were no less impressive. Like his father, Herod regularly had to consider which Roman leader to support as the second triumvirate began to fracture. Also like his father, he needed to
compensate for when he aligned himself with the defeated Roman leader. Herod was always careful to make the right connections by sending Roman leaders monetary gifts, and volunteering military services. His reputation preceded him: he was well known as a reliable ally. Herod fortified and improved the status of Judaea as a client kingdom. He lived by the philosophy of Euergetism, and supported building projects outside of his own state to gather prestige for Judaea. He also showed compassion to neighboring states in addition to Judaea, and supplied them with necessities during times of famine. He built a friendship with Augustus, and had the support of Agrippa, Augustus’ right hand man. Herod recognized that each relationship he created needed to be nurtured so it would not deteriorate. Even when he could boast of his friendship the emperor of Rome, he continued to show tangible acts of allegiance through gifts, invitations, building projects and honorary dedications. Even while Herod served as a Jewish king, he build stadiums for Olympic Games and Pagan Temples dedicated to the imperial family. He strove to create the ideal Hellenistic client kingdom under the Roman Empire to serve Augustus. Herod knew what Rome wanted from the client king of Judaea, and took measures above and beyond the regular expectations.

The status that Herod built for Judaea, and the unification under a client king that he had secured, fell apart after his death. Archelaus was not mindful of the necessity for the diplomatic policies that Antipater and Herod insisted upon to strengthen the ties between the Herodian dynasty and Rome. Archelaus was given the opportunity to be promoted by Augustus from ethnarch to king, but because he could not uphold the stability and dependability his predecessors established in
Judaea, he was exiled. Archelaus could not maintain control in Judaea, which encouraged rioting and violence, which he in turn suppressed. Herod’s reign was prosperous and generally peaceful, while Archelaus could not get through the transition from Herod’s rule to his own. He did not possess the political savvy that Herod and Antipater had to sustain beneficial relationships with Roman leaders, and consequently never earned their support. Jews preferred to be a province under Rome than a client kingdom under a Judaean king, as they saw that their freedoms would be more secure there. Herod and Antipater knew how to utilize their resources to satisfy the Romans and still address the needs of the Judeans who were so often on the brink of revolt. Since Archelaus was not able to tend to the nation internally to prevent rebellions, and did engage in active diplomacy with the Roman Empire, he did not survive as a client king.
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1- (Left) Map of Judaea under the Maccabees  
2- (Right) Map of Judaea after Pompey’s settlement
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3- Map of Judaea under Herod’s Sons
Appendix C: List of Herod’s Building Projects


A. In Jerusalem
1. Antonia Fortress, with porticoes connecting it to Temple, apartments, cloisters, bath, four towers (site of al-Omariyya school)
   BJ 1.401; 5.238–46; AJ 15.292, 409, 424; 18.91–95; 20.30
   [37–35 BCE]
2. Hasmonean Palace rebuilt
   BJ 2.344; AJ 20.190
   [mid-30s BCE]
3. Royal Palace (Caesareum and Agrippeum—two buildings—with banqueting hall, one hundred guest rooms, cloisters, courtyards, and pools)
   BJ 1.402; 5.156–83, 246; AJ 15.292, 318
   [23 BCE]
4. Phaselis, Mariamne, and Hippicus Towers
   BJ 1.418; 2.46, 439; 5.144, 147, 161–75; 7.1–2; AJ 16.144; 17.257
   [mid-30s BCE]
5. Family Tomb (north of Damascus Gate)
   BJ 5.108, 507
   [possibly later]
6. Temple, Temple, Courtyards
   Sanctuary, BJ 1.401; AJ 15.380–425; 17.162; 20.219–22;
   cf. Pliny NH 5.70 (BJ 1.401 implies 23; AJ 15.380 implies 20)
   [23–22 BCE]
   Forecourt
   Temple with retaining walls, various gates
   Royal Basilica, BJ 5.184–227
   Solomon’s Porticoes (remodeling only?)
   Other Porticoes, AJ 17.259–63
   Exits and overpasses at south-west corner (Robinson’s Arch) and south-east corner
   Bridge to upper city (Wilson’s Arch)
   Streets and shops
   Plazas and Miqvehs outside Huldah Gates
   Water and sewage systems
   Gate, BJ 2.5
   Gate of Marcus Agrippa, BJ 1.416
   Golden Eagle, AJ 17.151
   [23–15 BCE]
   Beautiful Gate
7. Memorial at entrance of David’s Tomb (unknown)
   AJ 16.179–84; 7.392–94; 16.188
   [before 15 BCE]
8. Theater (slope of south side of Wadi es-Shamm)
   AJ 15.268–91
   [before 28 BCE]
9. Amphitheater (Rephaim Plain?)
   AJ 15.268
   Hippodrome (probably identical to previous)
   BJ 2.44; AJ 17.255
   [before 28 BCE]
Aqueducts and Reservoirs

10. Solomon’s Pools (south of Bethlehem, with aqueducts to Jerusalem and S. to ‘Arrub)
11. Pool of Mamulah (Western Jerusalem)
12. Hezekiah’s Pool (north of Petra Hotel)
13. Sheep Pool (St. Anne’s), 5 porticoes (Herodian acc. to Jeremias)
14. Struthion Poo. (Antonius Fortress)
15. Pool of Israel (at North wall of Temple Mount)
16. Birkat Sitti Mryam (at St. Stephen’s Gate)
17. Gihon Spring; Hezekiah’s Tunnel; Siloam and Hamra pools
18. Various aqueducts to serve the pools mentioned above and Temple needs

B. In His Own Territory

1. Alexandreion (Sartaba), fortified palace restored by Pheroras
   BJ 1.133–37, 161–72; 308, 334, 528–29, 551; AJ 13.417;
   14.48–52, 82–94, 394, 419; 15.84, 185; 16.13, 317; Strabo
   Geog. 16.2.40; m.Rosh Hash. 2.4
   [39/38 BCE]
2. Hyrcania (Khirbet Mird), refortified palace with water system
   17.187; Strabo Geog. 16.2.40
   [37 (32?) BCE]
3. Masada
   490; 15. 184; Strabo Geog. 16.2.44; Fliny NH 5.73
   Fortification: casemate wall around top
   Western Palace
   Other palaces
   Storehouses
   Administrative buildings
   Barracks
   Synagogue
   Baths
   Cisterns
   Northern Villa
   Pools and gardens
   [37–10 BCE]
4. Machaerus (M.khwar), fortified palace with ramparts, towers, cisterns, adjacent town, aqueducts
   BJ 1.161, 164–77; 2.485–86; 4.555; 7.164–210; AJ 13.83,
   89–97, 417; 18.111; Strabo Geog. 16.2.40; m.Tamiid 3.8;
   j.Shviit 9.2.38d
   [20s BCE]
5. Cypros (Kipros) Fortified Palace above Jericho
   BJ 1.407, 417; 2.484; AJ 16.143
   [30s BCE]
6. Docus (Jebel Qarantal) Fortress
   Strabo Geog. 16.2.40; 1 Macc 16:11–16; AJ 13.230–35; BJ 1.54–56
   [30s BCE]

7. Herodium West (= Har Hordos; Jebel el-Fureidis) Fortress
   BJ 1.265, 419–21, 673; 3.55; 4.55, 518–19; 7.163; AJ 14.360;
   Upper palace with towers, apartments, cisterns
   Stadium or course
   Monumental building
   Pool with gazebo, gardens
   Large intermediate palace by course
   Other palaces, service buildings
   Aqueducts and cisterns
   [23–15 BCE]

8. Herodium East (= Kh. es-Samra?) Arabian frontier
   BJ 1.41
   [after 30 BCE]

9. Hebron, memorial to Patriarchs and Matriarchs over Cave of
   Macphelah
   BJ 4.530–33
   [30s BCE]

10. Mamre (= Ramat et Khalil), memorial
    BJ 4.530–33
    [30s BCE]

11. Si‘a (near Canatha), temple of Ba‘al Shamim
    [32–31 BCE]

12. Jericho (= Tulul Abu el-Alaq) BJ 1.407; Strabo Geog. 16.2.40
    Reconstruction of Hasmonene Palace
    Second Palace (now covered over)
    Winter Palace on Wadi Qelt
    Gardens and pools
    Strabo, Geog. 16.2.40
    Hippodrome 22m theater, plus pavilion (= Tel es-Samrat)
    BJ 1.659, 666
    [Amphitheater? probably part of above]; AJ 17.161, 175–78,
    194
    Adjacent town with manufacturing areas (perfume? wine?
    dates? balsam?)
    Aqueducts – Wadi Qelt
    Cemetery (= Nuseib el-Aweishireh)
    [37–35 BCE]

13. Betharamphtha (= Tell Er Rama), palace; renamed Livias/
    Julius by Agrippa
    BJ 2.59, 168, 252; 4.438; AJ 17.277; 18.27; 20.159; Pliny NH
    13.44; Ptol. Geog. 5.15.6; Eus. Onom. 49.12; j. Shebit 9.2
    [18–9 BCE]

14. Sepphoris (= Zippori), palace
    BJ 2.56, 574; AJ 18.27; 17.271
    Arsenal?

15. Caesarea Maritima (Qesari)
    Harbor, mole, breakwater, towers, docks
    Warehouses and commercial buildings
    [22–12 BCE]
Promenade
Temple to Roma and Augustus
Amphitheater
Theater
Hipódrome (all three for quinquennial games)
Promontory Palace (= Praetorium, Acts 23.35)
Walls and North gates
Aqueducts
BJ 1.156, 408–16; 2.266; AJ 14.76, 121; 15.293, 331–41; 16.135–41; 20.173

16. Sebaste (Shomeron)
   Walls, gates, fortifications, AJ 15.292, 296–98
   Colonnaded streets (probably later)
   Temple to Roma and Augustus, AJ 15.298
   Forum
   Pre-Basilical building (later?)
   Stadium (Pre-Herodian—Busink; Herodian—Netzer)
   Theater (later?)
   Aqueducts
   BJ 1.64, 403, 415; AJ 13.275; 15.292–93, 296–98, 342; 16.136–41; Strabo Geog. 16.2.34

17. Panias (= Banyas), Temple to Roma and Augustus
   Palace
   Walls and fortifications?
   BJ 1.404–406; AJ 15.363–64

18. Phasaelis (El Fasayil), new city
   BJ 1.418, 2.98, 167; AJ 16.145; Pliny NH 13.4.44
   [after 30 BCE]

19. Ascalon (Tel Ashqelon), baths, fountains, colonnades, palace
   BJ 1.422; 2.98; AJ 17.321
   [after 30 BCE]

20. Antipatris (Afek), new city
   [9 BCE]

21. Agrippia (Anthedon), port—refounded and rebuilt
   BJ 1.87, 118, 416; AJ 13.357; 14.9
   [after 30 BCE]

22. Pente Romai (= Fondaquema), village for soldiers, AJ 15.296
   [27–20 BCE]

23. Gaba (Staár ha-'Amaqim) military colony
   Life 115–18; BJ 2.459; 3.36; AJ 15.294, 299; Pliny NH 5.19.75
   [28–24 BCE ?]

24. Bathyra (Busr El-Hariri?), Babylonian military colony
   Life 55–61; AJ 17.23–29 [ = Samamim?]
   [9–6 BCE]

25. Heshbon (Hisban near Amman), military colony refortified
   [28–24 BCE ?]

26. Ezbus (fortress?), AJ 15.294, 299

27. Idumean settlement in Trachonitis
   [9/8 BCE]
Uncertain

1. Aroer, fortified town in Negev
2. En Boqeq, industrial installation near Dead Sea
3. Batanea, fortresses
4. Malatha, fortress (84x56 m.) settlement adjacent
5. Gittha, rebuilt by Machaeras for Herod, War 1.326
6. Agrippina (Jarmuth), at Belvoir
7. Oresa, BJ 1.266, 294; AJ 14.361, 400
8. Zif, fortress, 7 km south of Hebron
9. Adora (= Dura), fortress, BJ 1.2.6; AJ 13.9.1; 1 Macc 13:20
10. Tell Qasile (Joppa), Herodian public building in Stratum IV
11. Calirhoe, hot springs
12. Gedor (east of es-Salt)
13. Keren Naftali (west of Lake Huleh)

C. In Phoenicia and Roman Province of Syria

1. Ptolemais (Akko), gymnasium, BJ 1.422
2. Damascus, BJ 1.422
   Gymnasium
   Theater
3. Tyre (= Sour) BJ 1.422
   Halls
   Porticoes
   Temples
   Market places
4. Sidon, theater (BJ 1.422)
5. Byblos, walls, BJ 1.422
   —amphitheater, baths, porticoes]
   Halls
   Porticoes
   Temples
   Market places
7. Tripolis (Tablus), gymnasium, BJ 1.422, 212
8. Laodicea-on-sea (Latakia), aqueduct, BJ 1.422
   [36 BCE ?]
9. Balanea (near Latakia), lightened taxes, BJ 1.422
10. Antioch (Antakya), broad paved street, colonnade
    BJ 1.425; AJ 16.148, 427
    [30 or 20? BCE]

D. In Asia Minor and Greece (mostly 14 BCE on occasion of visit
   with Marcus Agrippa)

   BJ 1.400; AJ 15.12-15; 16.16ff (re Itinerary) 16.24 (re
   benefactions)
1. Unnamed towns in Cilicia, "tax relief," BJ 1.428
2. Lycia, "gifts," BJ 1.425
3. Phaselis in Lycia, "tax relief," BJ 1.428
5. Pergamum, "Herod’s offerings," BJ 1.425
6. Rhodes, restored city
   Rebuilt Pythian Temple
   Money for ship-building
   BJ 1.280, 387, 424; AJ 15.183; 16.147; 14.378
7. Cos, revenue for gymnasiarch (endowment?), BJ 1.423
8. Chios, colonnades, money to repay loan from Augustus,
   AJ 16.18-19, 26
10. Athens, "Herod’s offerings," BJ 1.425
11. Elis, Olympic Games, endowed with funds
    restoration work? BJ 1.426-27; AJ 16.149
12. Lacedaemon (Sparta) "Herod’s offerings," BJ 1.425
13. Nicopolis, "the greater part of their public buildings"
    BJ 1.425; AJ 16.147
14. Delos (?Syros) epigraphic reference
    possibly for gymnasium (xystos) at stadium
15. [40? BCE]
16. [40, 30? BCE]
17. [12 (8?) BCE]
18. [after 29 BCE]
Appendix D: Herod’s Coins


*Obverse:* Tripod with lebes, standing on a podium, with date on the left (LΓ = year 3), monogram on the right and surrounding inscription: ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΗΡΩΔΟΥ.

*Reverse:* Helmet with straps, surmounted by a star on a flat base, flanked by two palm branches.

Figure 1. Bronze coin of *Herod*; average weight 7 g.

*Obverse:* Crested helmet with two cheek pieces, with date on the left (LΓ = year 3), monogram on the right and surrounding inscription: ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΗΡΩΔΟΥ.

*Reverse:* Decorated Macedonian shield.

Figure 2. Bronze coin of *Herod*; average weight 5 g.
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