

Appendix 4B, III

HIGH PRIESTS (THEOPHILUS-) MATTHIAS THROUGH (ANANUS-) THEOPHILUS¹

Cited Narrative

Resumed from Appendix 4B, II.

While the Pheroras *embroglio* “was doing,” Bathyllus, also, Antipater’s freed-man, came from Rome,” “came under examination, “was tortured also,” “was found to have brought another potion, to give it unto the hands of Antipater’s mother, and of Pheroras”--“another deadly potion, the poison of asps, and the juices of other serpents”--“that if the former potion did not operate upon the king, this at least might carry him off.”

Additionally, Bathyllus brought letters that Antipater III had written against half-brothers Archelaus and Philip, for Antipater, “set...[to] get rid of [them] as soon as he could...and to that end he forged letters against them in the name of his friends at Rome.” Some of the letters had been sent before Antipater had left Judea and before his father’s suspicions of him began to solidify. The letters, “procured by great rewards/bribes,” accused Archelaus and Philip of sympathies in the slaughter of Miriamne [I’s] sons. Antipater feigned an excusing attitude toward his half-brothers, when the Great summoned Archelaus and Philip to return to Judaea.

“[Y]et did no one [who] came to Rome inform Antipater of his misfortunes in Judea.” Unaware of events and confessions after his departure, he wrote from Rome about his work related to the Sylleus affair, and how he had been successful “in getting interest among the great men; and...had bought [them] splended ornaments...which cost 200 talents.” (Antipater pretended necessity of spending large sums in the Sylleus matter and also spent considerable sums on personal items, thus bringing “his accounts into confusion.”) Antipater “then wrote from Rome, and informed² that he would soon come to them, and how he was dismissed with honour by Caesar.”

“Now one may wonder how it came about, that while so many accusations were laid against him in Judea during seven months before this time, he was not made acquainted with any of them. The causes of which were, that the roads were exactly guarded, and that men hated Antipater; for there was nobody who would run any hazard himself to gain him any advantages.”

AJ XVII.IV.1-3; Wars I.XXX.1-7, I.XXXI.1-2.

Antipater received news of Pheroras’ death at Tarentum “and made great lamentations” which the majority believed were more due to the failed murder of the king. In Cilicia, Antipater received a letter from the Great who, “desirous to get this plotter...into his hands,” wrote deceitfully to Antipater and “expressed his entire affection for him”--that the “some little complaint” about Doris would be laid aside on Antipater’s return, and to not delay. “Antipater was not ignorant that his mother had been expelled.”

Suspicion descended on Antipater when he reached Celenderis that his mother’s troubles might involve him. Advised by some “friends” that he ought to “tarry” and by others, the sooner he arrived home the sooner there an “end to all accusation,” the latter proved most persuasive; Antipater sailed on and landed at Sebastus, Cesarea’s harbor, where he received neither welcomers nor salutes as he had previously. There was no turning back for the now fearful Antipater. Still ignorant of the full extent of his circumstances, he “put on a forced boldness of countenance” and proceeded to the palace in Jerusalem “without any

¹ Citations for this material from *Josephus* are given at regular intervals; family tree charts in Attachments 1 and 2 complement the narrative.

² *Josephus* editors add “[his friends]”.

friends with him; for these were affronted, and shut out at the first gate.

Quintilius Varus, “sent to succeed Saturninus as president of Syria,” was at Jerusalem (“happened to be at the palace”) with the Great, “who had desired his advice in his present affairs; and, as they were sitting together, Antipater came upon them. [W]ithout knowing any thing of the matter [he] came into the palace clothed in purple.” The porters refused entry to Antipater’s “friends,” in great disorder, [Antipater] presently understood the condition he was in [when], upon his going to salute his father,” the king repulsed him as a murderer of brethren and plotter of parricide, announced that Varus would be his judge, and gave Antipater until the morrow to prepare his defense. Leaving the room, the confounded Antipater met his mother and wife (“which wife was the daughter of Antigonus, who was king of the Jews before Herod”), who informed him fully on the situation.

“[T]he day following, [at] the court of his [the King’s] kinsmen and friends and Antipater’s friends,” “Varus and the king sat together in judgment (“Herod, himself, with Varus, were the presidents”), and both their friends were also called in, as also the king’s relations, with his sister Salome, and as many as could discover any thing, and such as had been tortured; and besides these, some slaves of Antipater’s mother” who had been intercepted with a note from Doris to Antipater that “all...things have been already discovered to thy father; do not thou come to him, unless thou canst procure assistance from Caesar.”

AJ XVII.V.1-3; Wars I.XXXI.3-4, XXXII.1.

Antipater fell at the Great’s feet and begged to make his case first personally to his father. The Great, however, delivered an eloquent opening statement—lamenting his aged arrival at such a state at the hands of his indulged children; deploring that he had allowed Antipater III to dupe him with regard to Miriam I’s sons; and ending his admonishments to Varus about Antipater’s duplicity and craftiness with the remark, “Yet am I resolved that no one who thirsts after my blood shall escape punishment, although the evidence should extend itself to all my sons.” “When Herod had thus spoken, he fell a weeping, and was not able to say any more....

“[A]t his [the Great’s] desire, Nicolaus of Damascus, the king’s friend” took over the prosecution’s statement. Antipater turned and appealed to his father with a lengthy and heartfelt description of his proven filial affection, protections of the king, and dedicated labors on behalf of the kingdom, including successes at Rome—shouldn’t letters sent by Caesar himself (who often called Antipater ‘Philopater’ [lover of his father] be the greater evidence? Antipater’s words evoked pity in the assembly, moving “all the rest, and Varus in particular, to commiserate his case. Herod was the only person whose passion was too strong to permit him to weep, as knowing that the testimonies against him were true” (“it appeared plainly that Herod himself was affected...although he was not willing it should be taken notice”).

Now Nicolaus proceeded at very great lengths to prosecute “what the king had begun, and that with great bitterness; and summed up all the evidence which arose from the tortures, or from the testimonies” in a dramatic contrast of the youthful thoughtfulness of Miriam I’s sons, who had perished largely pursuant to Antipater III’s designs, with the latter’s out-and-out wickedness. Antipater’s “ruin was now hastened,” as a large number of other men came forward and volunteered corroborations of his behavior they had before kept private and against which he “was not able to say one word to the contrary.” All that Antipater III said when Varus asked for his defense was, “God is my witness that I am entirely innocent” (“this being the usual method of all men destitute of virtue....”) Varus then asked that the potion be produced and gave it to be drunk by another condemned prisoner “who died upon the spot” (“died presently”).

Varus ended his one-day stay and left for Antioch, his city of residence and the Syrian palace, the next day, “upon which Herod laid his son in bonds. But what were Varus’s discourses to Herod was not known to the generality, and upon what words it was that he went away; through it was also generally supposed that whatsoever Herod did afterward

about his son was done with his [Varus'] approbation." Herod sent letters and messengers to inform Caesar of "Antipater's wickedness."

AJ XVII.V.3-8; Wars I.XXXII.1-5.

"Now at this very time there was seized [from "one of Antiphilus's domestic servants"] a letter of Antiphilus, written to Antipater out of Egypt," which said, "I have sent thee Acme's letter, and hazarded my own life; for thou knowest that I am in danger from two families, if I be discovered. I wish thee good success in thy affair."

A search produced from within a seam on the servant's coat another letter from "Acme, a Jew by birth," "a maid-servant of Julia [/Augusta/Livia A³]" stating that Acme had complied with Antipater's wishes and had "written such a letter to thy father as thou desirest me. I have also taken a copy and sent it, as if it came from Salome to my lady; which, when thou readest, I know that Herod will punish Salome, as plotting against him" ["As thou desirest, I have written a letter to thy father, and have sent that letter, and am persuaded that the king will not spare his sister when he reads it. Thou wilt do well to remember what thou hast promised when all is accomplished"]. "Antipater had forged [the referenced] letter...as if Salome had laid a sudden plot entirely against him [while Acme] herself had sent a copy of [the] epistle as coming from Salome," claiming Acme had been found it among her lady's papers.

Salome heatedly decried against any such involvements while the Great's questioning of Antipater concerning other plotting associates yielded nothing. "So he laid all upon Antiphilus, but discovered nobody else. Hereupon Herod was in such great grief ["in a passion"--ready to have Antipater III "slain immediately...because he [Herod] had almost slain his sister on Antipater's account" besides now given to question whether Antipater also had forged letters about Alexander III and Aristobulus IV--) he was ready to send his son to Rome to Caesar...to give an account; however, fearing Antipater might get assistance there and escape punishment, "he kept him bound as before, and sent more ambassadors and letters to accuse his son, and an account [to Caesar] of what assistance Acme had given."

Herod's ambassadors "made haste to Rome...instructed beforehand, what answers they were to make to the questions put to them." Herod, who "fell into a severe distemper" during this time, "sent for his testament, and altered it, and therein made Antipas [his youngest son] king, as taking no care of Archelaus and Philip, because Antipater had blasted their reputations to him; but he bequeathed to Caesar, besides other presents that he gave him, a thousand talents; as also to his ["Caesar's] wife ["Julia"], and children, and friends, and free-men about five hundred: he also bequeathed to all others a great quantity of land, and of money ["distributed among his sons and their sons his money, his revenues, and his lands"], and showed his respects to Salome his sister, by giving her most splendid gifts ["made Salome...very rich"]. And this was what was contained in his testament, as it was not altered."

AJ XVII.V.8, VI.1; Wars I.XXXII.6-7.

"Now Herod's distemper became more and more severe...[being] almost seventy [and] ...brought low by the calamities" and aggravated by the circumstances of Antipater, "whom he resolved to put to death now not at random, but as soon as he should be well again, and resolved to have him slain."⁴ Nearly 70, bitterly angry and despairing of recovering, he additionally was faced with a "[certain popular] sedition...excited against him, the occasion of which was as follows." The apparent instigators were (Sepphoris/Saripheus-) Judas and (Margalus/ Margalothus-) Matthias--"two of the most eloquent men among the Jews, and the most celebrated interpreters of the Jewish laws ["two men of learning in the city...who were thought the most skilful in the laws of their country, and...in very great esteem over the nation"--), well beloved by the people because of their education of the youth (for all those that were studious of virtue frequented their lectures every day)." "There was a great

³ Josephus editor adds, correctly, "[Caesar's wife]."

⁴ Josephus editors add, "[in a public manner]."

concourse of the young men to these men when they expounded the laws, and there got together every day a kind of an army of such as were growing up to be men.”

“Now then these men were informed that the king was wearing away...[“found that the king’s distemper was incurable”], [they] excited young men to a sedition at the temple” [“dropped words...how it was now a very proper time to defend the cause of God, and to pull down what had been erected contrary to the laws of their country”], while exhorting the virtues of possible martyrdom in the process. “At the same time that these men made this speech to their disciples, a rumour was spread abroad that the king was dying.” “[A] report being come...that the king was dead,” emboldened youths lowered themselves from the temple top at midday and with axes “cut down that golden eagle” [“of great value”] that the Great had erected over the temple’s main gate.

The king’s captain “came running with a great body of soldiers” who fell on “this bold attempt [done] in foolish presumption rather than a cautious circumspection, as is usual with the multitude; and while they were in disorder...caught no fewer than forty of the young men...together with...Judas and Matthias.” Questioned by the king, Judas and Matthias attempted no defense, maintaining Moses’ authority over Herod’s, and their readiness to die “not for any unrighteous actions, but for our love to religion.” The Great had the perpetrators bound, “sent to Jericho, and called together the principal men among the Jews.” Lying on a couch, “because he could not himself stand,” he enumerated the many labours that he had endured on their account [comparing his greater accomplishments to those of “the Asmoneans, during the 125 years of their government”], and his building of the temple,” etc.

The Great “made a terrible accusation against those men.” The people, “afraid lest a great number should be found guilty,” and “on account of Herod’s barbarous temper,” sanctioned punishment of the actors, testifying that what had been done had been absent their approval. The Great “dealt more mildly with [these] others of the assembly” but ordered those that had let themselves down, together with their Rabbins, to be burnt alive, [and] delivered the rest that were caught to the proper officers, to be put to death by them.” The Great also “deprived Matthias of the high priesthood, as in part an occasion of this action, and made Joazar, who was Matthias’ wife’s brother, high priest in his stead...and burnt the other Matthias, who had raised the sedition, with his companions, alive. And that very night there was a eclipse of the moon.”⁵

AJ XVII.VI.1-4; Wars I.XXXIII.1-4.

The Great’s debilities and pain and debilities now were reaching the limits of human tolerance (inflamed abdomen and ulcerated intestines accompanied by an insatiable appetite; dropsical tumours around his feet, genital putrefaction, intolerable itching, breathing difficulty and overall convulsions), as he submitted to treatment by physicians. He had himself taken across the Jordan to the “hot baths at Callirrhoe, which ran into the lake Asphaltitis [Dead Sea], where physicans submerged his body in warm oil...whereupon...he came and went as if he was dying.” Herod revived at the shouts of his servants, but he now gave up hope of recovery. He issued orders for each soldier to receive 50 drachmae and his commanders and friends, large sums, and then returned to Jericho.

At Jericho, Herod-- the Great, “grew so choleric...[as to do] all things like a madman,” knowing he had no loyalty from the kingdom’s leading men. Further, he “was not unacquainted with the temper of the Jews, that his death would be a thing very desirable, and exceedingly acceptable to them, because during his lifetime they were ready to revolt from him;” so he took steps to ensure a cause for true mourning on the people’s part when he finally died.

“[I]n a wild rage against ...the innocent as well as those [with] ground for accusation,”

⁵ Here Josephus relates that during the Matthias’ time as high priest one “Joseph, the son of Ellemus, his kinsman,” was made high priest for one day, “the very day which the Jews observed as a fast,” in that Matthias the night before “seemed, in a dream, to have conversation with his wife and...could not officiate himself on that account...[as] attested to both in the *Mishna* and *Talmud*.”
App4B.III

he commanded--on pain of death for non-appearance--the assembly of "all the principal men ("the most illustrious men") of the entire Jewish nation wheresoever they lived" ("out of every village"--"a great number...because the whole nation was called"). Herod ordered the arriving men "to be all shut up in the hippodrome"⁶ and extracted a promise from Salome and her husband Alexas that--immediately after he died and before releasing the news--they were to have the hippodrome surrounded by soldiers to "slay them ["shot with darts"]...and then all Judea, and every family of them, will weep at it [his death] whether they will or no"--"...[H]e gave order that one of every family should be slain, although they had done nothing that was unjust."

AJ XVII.VI.5-6; Wars I.XXIII.5-6.

Herod's ambassadors returned from Rome; Caesar had had Acme put to death and, "as to Antipater, himself, Caesar left it to Herod to act...either to banish him, or to take away his life." Herod revived a bit; however, "overbourned by his pains," he threatened to kill himself, "and he had done it, had not his first cousin, Achiabius, prevented him, and held his hand [from the knife], and cried out loudly." At that "through the palace...a great tumult was made, as if the king were dead" and "Antipater [III], who verily believed his father was deceased, grew bold" and attempted to bribe his jailers to let him go. Instead, the "principal keeper of the prison" informed the Great, who "although he was at death's door,... sent for some of his guards, and commanded them to kill Antipater without any further delay, and to do it presently, and to bury him in an ignoble manner at Hyrcania."

"And now [again] Herod altered his testament...; he appointed Antipas, to whom he had before left the kingdom, to be tetrarch of Galilee and Perea, and granted the kingdom to Archelaus. He also gave Gaulonitis, and Trachonitis, and Paneas to Philip, who was his son, but own brother to Archelaus⁷ ...and bequeathed Jamnia, and Ashdod, and Phasaelis to Salome...with five hundred thousand⁸ of silver that was coined." Herod's provisions also left "all the rest of his kindred...in a wealthy condition" by way of grants and annual revenues; and he bequeathed "ten millions [of drachmae] of coined money, besides vessels of gold and silver" to Caesar, and "garments exceedingly costly to Julia, Caesar's wife; and to certain others, five millions." Herod died finally, after accomplishing the testamentary changes, having "survived the slaughter of his son five days...having reigned thirty-four years since he had caused Antigonus to be slain...thirty-seven years since he had been made king by the Romans."

Before Herod's death was made public, Salome and Alexas released "those that were in bonds, whom the king had commanded to be slain, and told them that he had altered his mind, and would have every one of them sent to their own homes. When these men were gone," "the king's death was made public when Salome and Alexas gathered the soldiery ["and the rest of the multitude"] together in the amphitheatre at Jericho," where the assembly was addressed by "Ptolemy [undesigned], who was intrusted by the king with his signet-ring."⁹

Ptolemy first read the epistle providing payments to the military and exhorted good will by its members' to Herod's successor. Ptolemy then read the Great's last will, "wherein Philip was to inherit Trachonitis, and the neighbouring countries...Antipas was to be tetrarch...Archelaus was made king," and "the dispositions he [Herod] had made were to be kept as they were in his former testament."

⁶ *Josephus* editors here have the fn.: "A place for the horse-races."

⁷ Here *Josephus* editors have the fn.: "When it is here said that Philip the tetrarch, and Archelaus the king, or ethnarch, were...*genuine brothers*...there must be here some mistake; because they had indeed the same father...but different mothers...[although they] were indeed brought up together privately at Rome like own brothers; and Philip was Archelaus's deputy when he [Archelaus] went to have his kingdom confirmed to him at Rome."

⁸ Here *Josephus* editors add, "[drachmae]."

⁹ Ptolemy, "brother of Nicolaus?"--see below following *AJ XVII.IX.1-3; Wars II.1-2.*

It was Ptolemy's duty to take Herod's ring to Caesar for confirmation of the testamentary settlements while funeral preparations were put underway, "it being Archelaus's care that the procession to his father's sepulchre should be very sumptuous." A purple-draped bier of gold and precious stones held the dead king's also purple-draped body, surrounded by "his sons and his numerous relations," was accompanied by "soldiery, distinguished according to their several countries and denominations...in the following order:..his guards, then the band of Thracians, and after them the Germans; and next the band of Galatians...and behind these marched the whole army," all arrayed as if for war,¹⁰ "followed by five hundred of his domestics carrying spices. So they went eight furlongs, to Herodium," where Herod had designated he was to be buried.

According to "the law of our fathers" Archelaus invoked a mourning period to a seventh day, before he put on a white robe and "went up into the temple [where, with] acclamations and praises [he] took his seat, in a throne made of gold, and spake kindly ["and civilly"] to the multitude"--thanking it for the demonstration of good will, not bearing him ill will for acts of his father, and for their submission, "as if he were already settled in the kingdom. Further, Archelaus stated, although the "army would have put the diadem on [him] at Jericho, he would not accept it until 'the superior lords should have given him a complete title to the kingdom," at which time he would make, he promised, "abundant requitals, not to the soldiers only, but to the people."

The people clamoured then, nonetheless, for redress and reforms (e.g. reduction of annual payments/taxes and release of prisoners--"who were many"--incarcerated by the Great). He "contradicted them in nothing, since he pretended to do all things" and "answered readily to their satisfaction", "looking upon that good-will to be a great step towards his preservation of the government."
AJ XVII.VII; VIII.1-4; Wars I.XXIII.7-9; II.1.1-2.

After the assembly, Archelaus, who "proposed...to go to Rome immediately to look after Caesar's determination about him," feasted with friends. "[A] great many of those that desired innovations came in crowds towards the evening," lamenting those that Herod had murdered relative to the golden eagle affair. The mourning "was loudly heard all over the city...for those men who had perished for the laws of their country, and for the temple. They cried out that a punishment ought to be inflicted...and that, in the first place," Archelaus "deprive that high priest [Joazar?¹¹] whom Herod had made, and...choose one more agreeable to the law, and of greater purity, to officiate as high priest. This was granted by Archelaus." On the second item Archelaus, noting that it was a matter of law, privately sent a general to negotiate a postponement until his rule was secured, which depended greatly on unanimity of the people during transition. But they "threw stones at him [the negotiator], and drove him away, as he came into the temple," and treated likewise all others of "many" intermediaries Archelaus subsequently sent.

That year's Passover feast was at hand, with people in "tents without the temple." "[A]n innumerable multitude of the people came out of the country to worship; some...stood in the temple bewailing the [murdered] Rabbins., begging, in order to support their sedition." "[T]he seditious lamented Judas and Matthias ["those teachers of the laws"], and kept together in the temple." Archelaus, "afraid lest some terrible thing should spring up," sent out a "regiment"/"cohort" ordered to use force against instigators. "[T]he whole multitude were irritated," while "those that were seditious on account of those teachers" incited and encouraged "the people...[, who] made an assault upon the soldiers...and stoned the greatest part of them ["and killed them"]. Some ran away wounded, including the tribune of the cohort.

¹⁰ *Josephus* editors note: "At eight *stadia* or furlongs a-day..., Herod's funeral, conducted to Herodium, (which lay at the distance from Jericho, where he died, of 200 *stadia* or furlongs... War, B. I, ch. xxxiii, sect. 9) must have taken up no less than twenty-five days."

¹¹ Archelaus' appointment of Joazar is not reported textwise until later (in quotations below following *AJ XVII.XII.1-2; Wars II.VII.1-2.*

Archelaus “thought there was no way to preserve the entire government but by cutting off those who made this attempt upon it.” “Nor did it appear...that the multitude could be restrained without bloodshed; so he sent his whole army upon them [“on the sudden, as they were offering their sacrifices”], the footmen in great multitudes, by the way of the city, and the horsemen by the way of the plain,” “to prevent those that had their tents without the temple from assisting those that were within the temple, and to kill such as ran away from the footmen when they thought themselves out of danger.” Archelaus’ forces slew 3,000 men; the rest dispersed into nearby mountains, and Archelaus sent heralds after them, “commanding them retire to their own homes, whither they all went, and left the festival.”

“Archelaus went down to the sea-side with his mother and his friends, Ptolemas, and Nicolaus.... Salome went also along...with her sons, as did the king’s brethren and sons-in-law [“Herod’s sister Salome, her children and many of her kindred”--the latter pretending for the time being to support Archelaus, “but in reality to accuse him for his breach of the laws by what he had done at the temple.”] Archelaus “left Philip his brother as governor of all things belonging both to his own family and to the public” [“his steward in the palace, and to take care of his domestic affairs”].

At Caesarea, Archelaus met up with “Sabinus, Caesar’s steward for Syrian affairs [“procurator”] ...making haste into Judea to preserve Herod’s effects.” But Syria’s president Varus, who had been summoned “by Archelaus, by the means of Ptolemas...came [also] at that time [and] restrained him from going any farther.” Sabinus, “out of regard to Varus,” promised to “neither seize upon any of the castles that were among the Jews, nor...seal up the treasures in them,” but tarried at Caesarea.

As soon as Archelaus sailed on for Rome and Varus removed [back] to Antioch, Sabinus went to Jerusalem, and seized the king’s palace. Varus called for, and publicly demanded an inventory and accounting from all “the keepers of the garrisons” and of those who “had the charge of Herod’s effects [“the stewards”]... and [“when he had called for the governors of the citadels...he tried...to take possession of the citadels.” Sabinus “disposed of the castles in the manner he pleased;” “But the governors...were not unmindful of ...commands laid upon them by Archelaus, and continued to guard them, and said the custody of them rather belonged to Caesar than to Archelaus”.] *AJ XVII.IX.1-3; Wars II.1.2.*

Antipas (the Great’s once-designated successor; “buoyed up by Salome”) also set sail for Rome, set upon gaining the government on the basis that the Great’s penultimate testament was the valid one. “Salome had also promised to assist him, as had many of Archelaus’s kindred, who sailed along with Archelaus himself.” Accompanying Antipas were his mother [Malthace] and Ptolemas, “the brother of Nicolaus,”--“one that had been Herod’s most honoured friend, and was now zealous for Antipas.” “[I]t was Ireneus the orator...who had prevailed over advisers who urged him [Antipas] to yield to his elder brother [Archelaus].” Ireneus, “one who, on account of his reputation for sagacity, was intrusted with the affairs of the kingdom,...[he] most of all encouraged him [Antipas] to attempt to gain the kingdom.”

Arriving at Rome, “all of his [Antipas’] relations revolted to him; not out of their goodwill to him, but out of their hatred to Archelaus” (--the “inclinations...of all Archelaus’s kindred who hated him were removed to Antipas...; although in the first place every one rather desired to live under their own laws”¹²)--“desirous of gaining their liberty, and to be put under a Roman governor; (“but if they should fail in that point,”) “if there were too great an opposition made to that,” then “they thought Antipas preferable to Archelaus” (--“desired that Antipas might be their king”). Sabinus, in letters to Caesar, lent assistance to the Antipas faction by lauding Antipas and accusing Archelaus. “Salome, and those with her” organized their accusations against Archelaus and delivered them to Caesar.

¹² *Josephus* editors add, “[without a king].”
App4B.III

“Archelaus wrote down the reasons of his claim” and sent Ptolemy with his father’s ring and accounts to Caesar. [“Archelaus had sent in his papers to Caesar, wherein he pleaded his right to the kingdom, and his father’s testament, with the accounts of Herod’s money, and with Ptolemy, who brought Herod’s seal, he so expected the event.”] Caesar, after review of the papers, accounts and letters from Varus as well as Sabinus, appreciated fully “the great burden of the kingdom...largeness of the revenues...[and] the number of the children Herod had left behind,” and “understood that Antipas had also sent letters to lay claim to the kingdom.”

Caesar Octavian “summoned his friends together, to know their opinions...[W]ith them Caius/[Gaius], the son of [Marcus] Agrippa [Vipsanius], and of Julia [#4] his [Caesar’s] daughter [by Scribonia], whom he [Octavian] had adopted and took him [Caius/Gaius], and made him sit first of all.” (Caesar assembled “the principal persons among the Romans.” In the “first seat” next to Caesar sat “Caius, the son of Agrippa and his [Octavian’s] daughter Julias, but by himself [Caesar] adopted for his own son.”)

Caesar “desired such as pleased speak their minds about the affairs now before them.” Salome’s son, Antipater IV, “of all Archelaus’s antagonists...the shrewdest,” spoke for Antipas: that Archelaus had seized kingly power and “usurped that authority” before Caesar’s determination and committed an intolerable abuse of royal authority. “Of what sort of a king will this man be...who hath slain so many before he hath obtained it?,” Antipater asked, adding that, even absent the fact that the Great’s mental condition was more sensible when he had named Antipas his successor, Archelaus’ barbarity was cause enough to deny confirmation. Antipater “also touched sharply” on Archelaus’ “changing the commanders in the army...sitting in the royal throne beforehand, and his determination of law-suits; all done as if he were no other than a king.” Antipater ascribed to Archelaus also the release of those Herod had imprisoned in the hippodrome, among other things. By far Archelaus’ greatest crime, however, stressed Antipater, was that Archelaus should pretend to come for confirmation by Caesar after unilaterally already having “acted in all things.” Antipater then “produced a great number of Archelaus’s kindred as witnesses, to prove every part of the accusation.”

Next “stood up Nicolaus to plead for Archelaus. Nicolaus alleged that “the slaughter in the temple could not be avoided” and that the slain were enemies of Caesar as well as Archelaus, and he “demonstrated that Archelaus’s accusers had advised him to perpetrate other things of which he might have been accused”--that Archelaus merely had attempted to control those who would disrupt the festival and been goaded against his will. Nicolaus took the opposite tack from Antipater by pointing out that Herod’s former will was less reliable, given Herod’s varying condition. He posed that Herod was in right mind, naming Archelaus--”Nor can Herod at any time have been mistaken in his judgment about a successor, while he showed so much prudence as to submit all to Caesar” [“he, that so well knew whom to choose for arbitrator of the succession [you, Caesar], could not be unacquainted with him whom he chose for his successor”]; thus Herod could “not be supposed [simultaneously] mistaken in...judgment about him [Archelaus] that was to be his heir.”

Archelaus prostrated himself before Caesar at the end of Nicolaus’ plea, “whereupon Caesar...obliging[ly]...raised him up” and, showing himself far moved in Archelaus’ favour, said that Archelaus well deserved the kingdom [“truly he was worthy to succeed his father”]; and...he would not act otherwise than his father’s testament directed, and than was for the advantage of Archelaus.” “While he gave this encouragement,” Caesar “made no full determination;” he considered privately whether he ought not confirm anyone over the Great’s entire kingdom and instead “part it among all Herod’s posterity; and this because they all [“because of the number of those that”] stood in need of much assistance to support them.”

AJ XVII.IX.5-7; Wars II.II.3-7.

“[B]efore Caesar had determined any thing...Malthace, Archelaus’s mother, fell sick and died” [“fell into a distemper, and died of it”].

After Archelaus had sailed Varus foresaw trouble, as “it was manifest” to Varus that “the nation would not be at rest;” and he went to Jerusalem to restrain seditious promoters. “Varus...brought the authors of the [initial] disturbance to punishment; and when he had restrained them for the most part from this sedition, which was a great one,” Varus returned to Antioch from Jerusalem, but he left one legion of his army there to keep things quiet. However, Sabinus (Caesar’s procurator), who stayed behind, armed the “multitude of his own servants” besides relying on the soldiers left by Varus, “used force in seizing the citadels and zealously pressed on the search after the king’s money”--“so oppressing the Jews...that at length they rebelled.”

“[O]n the approach of pentecost [“Pentecost” (*i.e.* the 50th day [from Passover])...]a great many ten thousands of men got together.... [“the people got together, but not on account of the accustomed...worship”]. A great number there was of Galileans, and Idumeans, and many men from Jericho, and others who had passed over the river Jordan, and inhabited those parts.” “[N]or did they come only to...the festival, but out of their indignation at the madness of...and at the injuries [by] Sabinus,” and most zealous to assault him. [“A]n immense multitude ran together, out of Galilee, and Idumea, and Jericho, and Perea, that was beyond Jordan; but the people that naturally belonged to Judea itself were above the rest, both in number, and in the alacrity of the men.” “They distributed themselves...and pitched their camps in three places.” One group “seized on the hippodrome; ...one pitched...from the northern part of the temple to the southern, on the east quarter; ...the third held the western part of the city, where the king’s palace was. Their work tended entirely to besiege the Romans, and to enclose them on all sides.”

Sabinus, overwhelmed at the number and courage of the people, sent repeated messages to Varus to come and save the legion and took himself to the “highest tower of the fortress, which was called Phasaelus.” From there he eventually gave a signal that the legionnaires attack; “the soldiers leaped out into the temple, and fought a terrible battle.” “Though it is true the Romans [ultimately] beat their adversaries,” and despite “the sight of that terrible slaughter that was made,” many of the undaunted foe got to the top of the cloisters that “encompassed the outer court of the temple” and reigned arrows/darts and stones downward on their enemies. After “this sort of fight lasted a great while,” the Romans secretly set fire to the cloisters” (their highly combustible roof consisted of wood, pitch and wax-held gold). The roof collapsed and “those vast works...were destroyed utterly.” “[O]f those that went up to the top of the roof, not one escaped,” dying in the fall or at the hands of the Romans or by desperate suicide. “[A]t last some of the Jews being destroyed, and others dispersed by the terror,” the Romans made their way inside and “seized on that treasure where the sacred money was deposited. A great part...was stolen by the soldiers, and Sabinus got openly four hundred talents.”

Now the destruction of temple works and human losses “occasioned a much greater number...of a more warlike sort to get together, to oppose the Romans.” The Judean forces had the palace surrounded and threatened to destroy everyone within, unless they “went their ways quickly.” Sabinus, doubting a promise of no harm “if he would go out with his legion.” At that point “the greatest part of the king’s troops deserted,” however, to various Roman-led forces under different commanders; [“a great many of the king’s party/soldiers deserted the Romans, and assisted the Jews;” but 3000 “men of Sebaste, “the most warlike body of them all,” went over to the Romans,” along with their captains, Gratus (over the foot soldiers) and Rufus (over the horse).] Nonetheless, “the Jews went on with the siege,” digging mines under the palace walls and beseeching the deserters not to hinder their chances for victory. Sabinus, disbelieving the promises of safety and “because he expected Varus was coming,” continued to bear the siege.

AJ XVII.X.1-3; Wars II.III.1-4.

“At this time there were “great disturbances in the country...in many places” [“ten thousand other disorders in Judea [of men] either out of hope to gain to themselves or out of enmity to the Jews”], offering “opportunity that...induced many to set up for kings.” “In

particular, in Idumea, "two thousand of Herod's veteran soldiers" ("who had been already disbanded") got together ("in Judea itself"), and armed themselves, and fought against those of the king's party ("the king's troops"); against whom Achiabus, the king's first cousin, fought, and that out of some of the places that were the most strongly fortified; but so as to avoid a direct conflict with them in the plains" (Achiabus "opposed them; but as he was driven out of the plains into the mountainous parts by the military skill of those men, he kept himself in the fastnesses that were there, and saved what he could.")

Three other factions were prominent, in addition to the Herodian veteran party. Each of their leaders is described as an exceedingly "strong" and/or "bold" man:

(Ezekiel¹³ -) Judas (one of "the robbers") had "ambitious desire" and once was arrested with great difficulty by Herod the Great. This Judas got together a "multitude of men...[from] about Sepphoris in Galilee, made an attack against the palace¹⁴ ..., seized upon all the weapons that were laid up in it...armed every one...with him, and carried away what money was left there." ("In Sepphoris...one Judas (the son of that arch-robber Hezekias...subdued by Herod); ...got no small multitude together, and brake open the place where the royal armour was laid up, and armed those about him," etc.¹⁵)

In Perea one Simon ("comely [and] robust;" a former "slave of king Herod"/"one of the servants to the king], "elevated at the disorderly state of things..was so bold as to put [on] a diadem on his head [and by]...a certain number [who] stood by him...was declared to be a king." Simon "burnt down the royal palace at Jericho, and plundered what was left in it." Simon also "set fire to many other of the king's houses in several places of the country" but was prevented from doing worse by Gratus. Gratus, "the captain of the king's party," with a force that included the Roman soldiers with whom he had joined, "Trachonite archers, and the most warlike of Sebaste") gave Simon "a great and a long fight" in which "no small part of those...from Perea...[whose boldness was greater than their skills] were destroyed." Gratus overtook Simon as he fled via "a certain ["strait"] valley...and cut off his head" ["gave him an oblique stroke upon his neck...and brake it"]. Members of Simon's party went on to burn "the royal palace...at Amanthus, by the river Jordan."

The third, Athronges/Athrongeus, also "was so bold as to set up for king ("put a diadem about his head")." Athronges, "a shepherd...not known by any body," was supreme chief of four individual bands, each commanded by one of his "brethren," each reputedly equally superior of height and strength; and "those that got together to them were very numerous." Athronges "retained his power a great while...called king," and he and his forces "slew a great many both of the Romans and of the king's forces," falling on the former out of current injuries and the latter for their conduct during the Great's reign, "nor did any Jew escape...if any gain could accrue."¹⁶ "Their (the Athrongesians') end was not till afterward, while at present they filled all Judea with a piratic war."

"And thus did...great and wild fury spread itself over the nation, because they had no king.., and because those foreigners who came to reduce the sedit[ions]...on the contrary set them more in a flame, because of the injuries...and the avaricious management of their

¹³ "who had been head of the robbers."

¹⁴ *Josephus* editors add, "[there]" (at Sepphoris).

¹⁵ *Josephus* editors note a consideration that this Judas may have been "Theudas, mentioned Acts v. 36," which Theudas, then, *Josephus* must have omitted...; for that other Theudas, whom he afterwards mentions..., B. XX. ch. v. sect. 1, is much too late to correspond to him... mentioned in the Acts. The name Theudas, Thaddeus, and Judas [however] differ but little;" however, Theudas of the Acts "might [have been] at the head of one of those ["10,000"] seditions, though not particularly named by him [*Josephus*]."

¹⁶ At Emmaus, Athrongesian arrows and darts killed one Arius and 40 foot soldiers under him in a company carrying corn and weapons for the Roman legion. Gratus saved the rest of Arius' company, coming to Romans assistance "with the king's troops that were about him."

Varus, as soon as he heard from “Sabinus and the captains” of the state of Judea, concerned for his legion there he assembled a large expedition. Varus, taking with him the remaining two of Syria’s three legions and their “four troops of horsemen,” made haste for Ptolemais, where he ordered that he be met by “several auxiliary forces which...kings or certain of the tetrarchs afforded.” “Aretas also, the king of Arabia Petra, out of his hatred to Herod, and in order to purchase the favour of the Romans, sent him no small assistance.” “Aretas...brought a great army of horse and foot.” Varus also received 1500 auxiliaries from Berytus, as he passed through that city.

Varus divided his forces into companies. One he committed “to his son, and to a friend of his, and sent them upon an expedition into the Galilee” [with “Caius, one of his friends, for their captain”], where they “made an attack upon the enemy, and put them to flight [“Caius put those that met him to flight”], and took Sepphoris [“Caius...took the city Sepphoris, and burnt it”].” They “made its inhabitants slaves, and burnt the city.” Varus marched into Samaria “with his whole army.” He avoided Samaria city (“because it had not at all joined with the seditious) and pitched camp “at a certain village [named Arus] that belonged to Ptolemy [“and on that account was plundered by the Arabians” and by them] [“burnt” by, out of their hatred to Herod, and...enmity they bore to his friends.” “...[A]nother village...Sampho...the Arabians plundered and burnt,” and Varus burned deserted Emmaus to avenge Arius. (“[A]ll places were full of fire and slaughter.”)

Varus then marched for Jerusalem. There he was met by “Joseph, the cousin-german of king Herod [“the first cousin of Archelaus”], as also Gratus and Rufus, who brought their soldiers along [“as well as the king’s army”]... [and] those Romans who had been besieged [“those of the Roman legion”].” (Sabinus “stole out of the city privately, and went to the sea-side.”) “...[T]hose Jews whose camp lay there [at Jerusalem]...left the siege [of the Roman army] imperfect [Varus “made their camps disperse”].” But “the Jerusalem Jews [“citizens received him” and], when Varus reproached them...cleared themselves,” alleging “that the conflux of the people was occasioned by the feast [and] that the war was not made with their approbation, but by...strangers, while they were on the side of the Romans, and besieged together with them....”

Varus sent parties throughout the country to search out the “authors of the revolts; [“caught great numbers of them”]...punished some...and some he dismissed.” “...[S]uch as were the most guilty he crucified;” “the number of those that were crucified on this account were [“about”] 2,000.”

Varus was “informed that there continued in Idumea ten thousand men still in arms.” Varus “disbanded his army, which he found no way useful...for they behaved themselves very disorderly, and disobeyed his orders...out of regard to that gain which they made by the mischief they did.” (Varus sent away “the Arabians [because] they did not act like auxiliaries, but managed the war according to their own passions.”) He, however, “made haste, with his own legions, to march against those that had revolted [there]; but these, by the advice of Achiabus, delivered themselves up to him before it came to a battle.”

“When...Varus had settled matters at Jerusalem...[he] left the former legion there as a garrison [and] returned to Antioch.” “...[H]e forgave the crime of revolting to the multitude, but sent their several commanders to Caesar to be examined by him.” Caesar dismissed “many”

¹⁷ The four brethren of Athronges “continued the war a long while” but eventually would be subdued: “one of them in a fight with Gratus, another with Ptolemy; Archelaus [would take] the eldest of them prisoner; while the last...dejected...[and with] no way...left., his army being worn away with sickness and continual labours...[would deliver] himself up to Archelaus.... But these things came to pass a good while afterward.” (“And when these men had thus served both their own countrymen and foreigners, and that through this whole war, three of them were, after some time, subdued; the eldest by Archelaus, the two next by falling into the hands of Gratus and Ptolemy; but the fourth delivered himself up to Archelaus, upon his giving his right hand for his security. However, this their end was not till afterward,” etc.)

of them--"the several [unnamed] relations of Herod who had been among these men in this war were the only persons whom he punished." Caesar "gave orders that certain of the king's relations (for some of those that were among them were Herod's kinsmen) should be put to death, because they had engaged in a war against a king of their own family."

AJ XVII.X.8-10; Wars II.V.3.

"Archelaus...had new sources of trouble come upon him at Rome" ["another accusation...which he was to answer to"]. Varus had permitted "the nation to send" "an embassy of the Jews...that they might petition for the liberty of living by their own laws." The appeal "was made by those ambassadors who, before the revolt, had come, by Varus's permission...fifty in number; but there were more than eight thousand of the Jews at Rome who supported them" (--to the ambassadors were "joined above eight thousand of the Jews that were at Rome already").]

Caesar held a council in the palace temple of Apollo, assembling "his friends, and the chief men among the Romans." "...[T]he ambassadors came, and a multitude of the Jews that were there already came with them, as did also Archelaus and his friends." Archelaus' "several kinsmen," although "they thought it too gross...to assist the ambassadors," "would not join themselves with him." "The multitude of the Jews stood with the ambassadors, and on the other side stood Archelaus, with his friends; but as for the kindred of Archelaus, they stood on neither side." "Archelaus's' brother Philip also was come hither out of Syria, by the persuasion of Varus, "his great friend", with [the] principal intention to assist his brother;..but...if...any change happen in the form of government (which Varus suspected...) that he [Philip]...might have his share."

In their prologue "the Jewish ambassadors..., they who hoped to obtain a dissolution of kingly government," spoke to the tyranny endured under the Great, detailing torture of citizens, harm to his own country's cities while expensively embellishing foreign ones, slaying nobility and confiscating estates (there having been "no way of obtaining a freedom from unjust violence without giving either gold or silver for it"), and how he had reduced a flourishing nation to poverty. Initially it had appeared that Archelaus would be "more mild to them" and they had stood "ready to oblige him...if they could meet with any degree of moderation." Archelaus, however (they continued), "seemed to be afraid lest he should not be deemed Herod's own son¹⁸ ...without delay...[and] immediately let the nation understand his meaning;" and he "had given a specimen" of the type of governing "his own citizens" could expect, when--"before his dominion was established [by Caesar--] he made the slaughter of three thousand of his own countrymen at the temple."

The "main thing they [the ambassadors] desired was this: That they might be delivered from kingly and the like forms of government, and might be added to Syria, and be put under the authority of such presidents...as should be sent"--that, given moderate governors, the people would prove "they would live in an orderly manner." (The ambassadors "prayed that the Romans...would join their country to Syria, and administer the government by their own commanders.")

AJ XVII.XI.1-2; Wars II.VI.1-2.

Nicolaus, who responded to the accusations, "reproached all those kinsmen of Archelaus who had...gone over to his accusers" and "vindicated the kings," claiming it was lame now that unpunished acts of the dead father be used in the current proceedings. Nicolaus instead "accused the Jewish nation...hard to be ruled, and as naturally disobedient to kings," and claimed it was willful lawless behavior by those who had persisted in sedition, before Archelaus' confirmation, that precipitated the temple incident.

A "few days" after the hearing Caesar changed Archelaus' status to "ethnarch of the one half of that which had been subject to Herod," promising to give him "that royal dignity

¹⁸ ?Apparently meant *in the sense of a similar nature*?--this relates, however, to a mildly lingering confusion as to Archelaus' parentage.

[t]hereafter, if he governed his part virtuously. ...[T]he other half he divided [“into two tetrarchies,” between] two other of Herod’s sons, to Philip and to Antipas, that Antipas who disputed with Archelaus for the whole kingdom.” Under the new governance, Antipas would receive the 200-talent tribute paid annually by Perea and Galilee, and Philip, the 100 talents paid by Batanea, Trachonitis, Auranitis, and “a certain part of what was called the *House of Zenodorus*” (--“certain parts of Zeno’s house about Jamnia”). “[W]hen [tetrarch] Philip...took the government [of Batanea], he made them pay some small taxes, and that for a little while only.”) Archelaus would receive tribute from “Idumea, and Judea, and the country of Samaria;” Caesar ordered, however, that one-fourth of Samaria’s tribute be taken off, in that “they did not join in this revolt with the rest of the multitude.” Archelaus also received the tribute of certain cities--“Strato’s Tower and Sebaste, with Joppa and Jerusalem.” (Caesar “also made subject to him the following cities, viz. Strato’s Tower, and Sebaste, and Joppa, and Jerusalem.” Eliminated, however, were certain “Grecian cities [“Gaza, and Gadara, and Hippos”], which Caesar separated [“cut off”]...and added...to the province of Syria.”) “Now the tribute money that came to Archelaus every year from his own dominions amounted to six hundred talents.” (“Now the revenue of the country that was given to Archelaus was four hundred talents.”)

Caesar bestowed on Salome “a royal habitation at Askelon [/Ascalon],” in addition to that which she was bequeathed in the Great’s testament (Jamnia, Ashdod, Phasaelis, and five hundred thousand in coined silver¹⁹); and she now “was made mistress of Jamnia, and Ashdod, and Phasaelis.” “[I]n all, her revenues amounted to sixty talents by the year, and her dwelling-house was within Archelaus’s government” (Caesar “put her house under the ethnarchy of Archelaus.”

Caesar married “Herod’s two virgin daughters²⁰ ...to Pheroras’s [unnamed] sons,” and added “two hundred and fifty thousand...of silver” to what already had been bequeathed to them. “The rest...of the king’s relations [“of Herod’s offspring”] received what his testament allotted.” Caesar, however, gave the “one thousand five hundred” [“a thousand”] talents bequeathed him to the Great’s sons, retaining “a few of the vessels...[as] memorials of the king to him.”

AJ XVII.XI.3-5; Wars II.VI.2-3.

After Caesar’s settlement there emerged “a certain young man” who bore great resemblance to Alexander [III]. This young man--“by birth a Jew but brought up by a Roman freed-man in the city Sidon”--“declared himself to be [secretly-survived] Alexander...son of Herod [and Miriamne I], but stolen away by one of those that were sent to slay him, who, in reality, slew other men, in order to deceive the spectators, but saved both him and his brother Aristobulus [IV].” In an “endeavour to obtain the government,” the spurious Alexander was assisted by “a man of his own country [“nation”] (“one that was well acquainted with the affairs of the palace, but...[otherwise] an ill-man”).”

The self-claimed Alexander collected a large following. Visiting Crete he obtained “much money” in that he “made all the Jews that came to discourse with him believe;” obtained “much more” at Melos, “out of belief...that he was of the royal family,..would recover his father’s principality, and reward his benefactors;” and when he landed at Dicearchia²¹ he managed “to bring the Jews...there...into the same delusion [and from whom he got “very large presents”]; and not only other people, but also all those that had been great with Herod...joined themselves to this man as to their king.” The young man’s resemblance “procured him so much credit, that those who had seen Alexander, and had known him very well, would take their oaths that he was the very same person.” He proceeded to Rome, where he “was conducted...by those strangers who entertained him.” Reports preceding his arrival brought out “the whole multitude of the Jews that were there who [“very joyful on

¹⁹ *Josephus* editors add here (as at earlier mentions of coined silver), “[drachmae].”

²⁰ Salome III and Roxana?

²¹ *Josephus* editors add, “[Puteoli].”

account of his mother's family," were] ascribing it to Divine Providence" that Alexander had escaped." The young man, "flocked [by] mighty acclamations," "was carried in a royal litter through the streets [with] all the ornaments...such as kings are adorned...at the expense of those than entertained him."

Caesar, "who knew perfectly well the lineaments of Alexander's face...discerned the fallacy in his countenance, even before he saw the man." But in view of the fame apparently accompanying the young man, and to erase all suspicion, Caesar had him brought into his presence by Celadus, a freed-man of Caesar's who personally had been acquainted with the Miriam's sons. Celadus, however, was "no more accurate in judging about him than the rest of the multitude," whereas Caesar noticed that "this spurious Alexander had his hands rough, by the labours he had been put to; and instead of that softness of body [that] the other had...derived from his delicate and generous education, this man, for the contrary reason, had a rugged body ["like that of a slave"]. When, therefore, Caesar saw how the [unspecified] master and the scholar agreed in this lying story," Caesar asked why Aristobulus was not present, also, to which the response was (from whom is not specified) was that Aristobulus IV had remained on "Crete" ["Cyprus"] to ensure that "the posterity of Mariamne might not utterly perish" in some accident at sea ("because it would be harder for plotters to get them both...while they were separate").

"...[H]e [who, is not specified] persevered in his affirmations, and the author of the imposture [who, is not specified] agreed in supporting it," Caesar privately offered the young man amnesty if he revealed his true identity and "who is was that had boldness enough to contrive such a cheat...too considerable a piece of villany to be undertaken by one of thy age.' Accordingly, because he had no other way to take, he told Caesar the contrivance, and after what manner and by whom it was laid together. ["...[H]e followed Caesar, and pointed to that Jew who abused the resemblance...to get money."] So Caesar put the young man "among those that were to row among the mariners, but slew him that induced him to do what he had done" ["ordered him...to be put to death"]." AJ XVII.XII.1-2; Wars II.VII.1-2.

Archelaus, commencing his ethnarchy in Judea, "accused Joazar, the son of Boethus, of assisting the seditious and took away the high priesthood from him, and put Eleazar his brother in his place." Archelaus rebuilt Jericho's royal palace, planted palm trees there and, to water them, diverted and drew off into the plain "half the water with which the village of Neara used to be watered."

When previously "Alexander was slain by his father, Glaphyra [B] was married to Juba, the king of Lybia." (Glaphyra, Alexander's former wife, had been "a virgin" when she married him, and as already said had borne him three children.) "After Juba was dead," the "widow" Glaphyra "lived in Cappadocia with her father," Archelaus, king of Cappadocia. "Then it was that Archelaus, the ethnarch, saw her..." divorced "Mariamne" [IV?]--"who was then his wife"²²--and married Glaphyra ("a thing detestable among the Jews, to marry the brother's wife").²³

"Nor did...Eleazar abide long in the high priesthood, Jesus, the son of Sie, being put in his [Eleazar's] room while he was still living."

"...[I]n the tenth [or "ninth"] year of Archelaus's government, both his brethren and the principal men of Judea and Samaria...accused him before Caesar" as not abiding by his pledge of moderate rule. (Archelaus "used not the Jews only, but the Samaritans, also, barbarously...out of his resentment of their old quarrels with him.") An angry Caesar summoned "Archelaus's steward, who took care of his affairs at Rome, and whose name was Archelaus also," and sent him sailing to fetch ethnarch Archelaus as quickly as possible.

²² This earlier marriage of Archelaus to a Miriamne is not related in the text.

²³ *Josephus* editors note "it was forbidden the Jews to marry their brother's wife when she had children by her first husband."

“And when he [Archelaus] was come, Caesar, upon hearing what certain accusers of his had to say, and what reply he could make, both banished him, and appointed Vienna, a city of Gaul, to be the place of his habitation, and took his money away from him.” (Archelaus “was called to his trial” and in “the ninth year of his government he was banished to Vienna, a city of Gaul, and his effects were put into Caesar’s treasury.”)

Five nights before Archelaus was taken away to Rome, he had a dream involving “ten”/“nine” ears of corn; he called in “the diviners” (“whose study was employed about reams”), and “some of the Chaldeans” to interpret the dream/vision. A “Simon, a man of the sect of the Essenes...said that the vision denoted...the time of Archelaus’ government was over.”

“The like accident befell Glaphyra, his wife..who, during her marriage to him [Archelaus]”--“[w]hen...she was come into Judea, and had been there for a little while”--had a dream [“vision] of Alexander, in which he chastized her for her remarriage. Glaphyra related to “her female companion” that, in the dream, Alexander III had told her, “I will...cause thee to be mine again’ [“I shall have thee again, whether thou wilt or no”]; and, “in a few days’ time she departed this life;” “Glaphyra hardly survived the narration of this dream of hers two days.”

“Archelaus’s country was laid to the province of Syria; and Cyrenius,..was sent by Caesar to take account of people’s effects in Syria, and to sell the house of Archelaus.” Cyrenius, “a Roman senator...who had gone through other magistracies...till he had been consul, and...of great dignity, came at this time into Syria, with a few others, being sent by Caesar to be a judge of that nation, and to take an account of their substance. Coponius also...of the equestrian order...was sent together with him, to have the supreme power over the Jews;” Coponius “came himself into Judea, which was now added to the province of Syria, to take an account of their substance, and to dispose of Archelaus’s money.” [“Archelaus’s part of Judea was reduced into a province, and Coponius, one of the equestrian order among the Romans, was sent as a procurator, having the power of ...death put into his hands by Caesar.”]

[“Under his [Coponius’] administration...a certain Galilean, whose name was Judas, prevailed with his countrymen to revolt.”] At first the “Jews,” although they took the “report of a taxation heinously, were persuaded by high priest (Boethus-) Joazar²⁴ to “leave off any further opposition...so they gave an account of their estates.” However, “Judas, a Gaulonite,”²⁵ of a city whose name was Gamala,..taking with him Sadduc, a Pharisee, became zealous to draw them to a revolt...and exhorted the nation to assert their liberty.” Judas called his countrymen “cowards if they would endure to pay a tax to the Romans, and...submit to mortal men as their lords,” and that God would assist them only if they joined and unstintingly persevered together.

Judas was “a teacher of a peculiar sect of his own and was not at all like the rest of...their leaders;” and “...[M]en received what [was] said with pleasure, and [his] bold attempt proceeded to a great height.” “[T]he nation was infected with this doctrine to an incredible degree; one violent war came...after another; and we lost our friends which used to alleviate our pains; there were also very great robberies and murders of our principal men. ...[the] desire [[being] that none of the adverse party might be left.... [A] famine also coming upon

²⁴ It is unclear whether the reference to Joazar here is as a divisional ‘high’ priest (as opposed to ‘chief’ priest), or had regained the position--see below, following *AJ XVIII.1.5-6; Wars II.VIII.2-14*, where it is noted that (at some point) the “dignity had been conferred on him by the multitude.”

²⁵ *Josephus* editor notes (a) why *Josephus* “should here call him [Judas] a Gaulonite” and everywhere otherwise “a Galilean” (*AJ XVIII.1.6, XX.V.2; Wars II.VIII.1 and II.XVII.8*), especially *vis-a-vis AJ XX.V.2*’s “Judas of Galilee...who caused the people to revolt, when Cyrenius, etc.,” and (b) that there “is a great question where this Judas was born, whether in Galilee on the west side, or in Gaulonitis on the east side, of the river Jordan.... As for the city of Gamala...there were two of that name, the one in Gaulonitis, the other in Galilee.”

us reduced us to the last degree of despair, as did also the taking and demolishing of cities; nay, *the sedition increased so high, that the very temple of God was burnt down....* Such were the consequences of this, that the customs of our fathers were altered, and such a change was made.; ...Judas and Sadduc...excited a fourth philosophic sect among us, and had a great many followers therein; [that] filled our civil government with tumults at present...by this system of philosophy, which we were before unacquainted withal, concerning which I will discourse a little...rather because the infection which spread thence among the younger sort, who were zealous for it, brought the public to destruction.”

AJ XVII.XIII.3-5, XVIII.I.1; Wars II.VII.3-4, II.VIII.1.

“The Jews had for a great while three sects of philosophy peculiar to themselves; the sect of the Essens, and the sect of the Sadducees, and the third sort of opinions was that of those called Pharisees...”²⁶ (“For there [were] three philosophical sects among the Jews. The followers of the first...Pharisees; of the second, the Sadducees; and the third sect, which pretends to a severer discipline, are called Essenes. These last...Jews by birth...seem to have a greater affection for one another than the other sects have.”) *AJ XVIII.I.2; Wars II.VIII.2.*

“[T]he Pharisees are those who are esteemed most skilful in the exact explication of their laws... [and] ascribe all to fate.., and to God, and yet allow that to act what is right, or the contrary, is principally in the power of men, although fate does co-operate in every action.” “[They]...live meanly, and despise delicacies in diet; and they follow the conduct of reason; and what that prescribes to them as good for them they do; and they think they ought earnestly to strive to observe reason’s dictates for practice.... ...[T]heir notion is, that it hath pleased God to make a temperament, whereby what he wills is done, but so that the will of man can act virtuously or viciously. They also believe that souls have an immortal vigour,...and that under the earth there will be rewards or punishments, according as they have lived virtuously or viciously in this life; and the latter are to be detained in an everlasting prison, but that the former shall have power to revive and live again”--“They say that all souls are incorruptible, but that the souls of good men only are removed into other bodies--but that the souls of bad men are subject to eternal punishment.” Pharisaic doctrines and discourses were “able greatly to persuade the body of the people” and caused “cities [to] give great attestations to them.” “Moreover, Pharisees are friendly to one another, and are for the exercise of concord, and regard for the public.” *AJ XVIII.I.3; Wars II.VIII.14.*

Sadducees behave toward one another “in some degree wild, and their conversation with those...of their own party is as barbarous as if they were strangers.” According to the “doctrine of the Sadducees...souls die with the bodies”--there is neither “immortal duration of the soul or punishments and rewards in Hades”--and they do not “regard the observation of any thing besides what the law enjoins...[and] dispute with those teachers of philosophy whom they frequent.” The Sadducees “are those that compose the second order, and take away fate entirely, and suppose that God is not concerned in our doing or not doing what is evil”--believing “that to act...good, or...evil, is at men’s own choice.” Their doctrine “is received but by a few, yet by those still of the greatest dignity.” Sadducees, however, “are able to do almost nothing of themselves,” but “addict themselves to the notions of the Pharisees” when per force they become obliged to become magistrates, “because the multitude would not otherwise bear them.” *AJ XVIII.I.4; Wars II.VIII.14.*

Of Essenes there are two orders, “who agree...as to their way of living, and customs, and laws, but differ...in the point of marriage.”

The doctrine of all Essenes is that “the matter [bodies] are made of is not permanent; but that the souls are immortal, and continue for ever; and that they come out of the most subtile air...united to their bodies as to prisons;” and “when...released...rejoice and mount upward”--like “the opinions of the Greeks, that the good souls have their habitations

²⁶ Josephus devotes far more text space, as reflected below, to the Essenes than to the other sects.

beyond.; while they allot to bad souls a dark and tempestuous den.”²⁷ The “Divine doctrines of the Essenes about the soul...lay an unavoidable bait for such as have once had a taste of their philosophy.”

The Essenes “have stewards appointed to take care of their common affairs [with] no separate business for any, but what is for the uses of them all.” They “have no one certain city, many dwell in every city.” “It is a law among them...[to] let what they have be common to the whole.; and so there is, as it were, one patrimony among all the brethren.” They carry no personal possessions when they travel (except “they take their weapons with them, for fear of thieves”): a representative is appointed to provide necessities in every city, where sect members always are familiarly received and treated. Never is there “clamour or disturbance to pollute their house, but they give every one leave to speak in their turn; [a] silence...the cause of which is that perpetual sobriety they exercise;” they “reject pleasures...[and] esteem continence...and the conquest over our passions.”

Essenes “take great pains in studying the writing of the ancients, and choose out of them what is mostly for the advantage of soul and body; and they inquire after such roots and medicinal stones as may cure their distempers.” Their “judgments...are most accurate and just...by the votes of a court that is fewer than a hundred. ...[W]hat is determined by that number...is unalterable. ...[T]hey most of all honour, after God himself,...the name of their legislator,”²⁸ “think it a good thing to obey their elders” and majority rule, and “are stricter than any other of the Jews [regarding] the seventh day.” “They are eminent for fidelity, and are the ministers of peace; whatsoever they say also is firmer than an oath” (but avoid swearing, esteeming it “worse than perjury...he who cannot be believed without²⁹ God is already condemned.”

The Essenes require “fidelity to all men, and especially those in authority, because no one obtains the government without God’s assistance;” and that if one of them “be in authority, he will at no time whatever abuse his authority, nor endeavour to outshine his subjects.” An Essene’s duties were to be “...perpetually a lover of truth...to reprove those that tell lies...keep his hands clear from theft, and his soul from unlawful gains...neither conceal any thing from those of his own sect, nor discover any of their doctrines to others...at the hazard of his life [but] to communicate their doctrines to no one any otherwise than as he received them himself; ... abstain from robbery, and...equally preserve the books belonging to their sect, and the names of the angels.”³⁰ And as for their piety towards God, it is very extraordinary,” as are their daily disciplines.³¹ They indulge in no personal extravagances, and neither buy nor sell to each other but instead accept returns “in lieu” if within the receiver’s capacity. Some among them “undertake to foretell things to come, by reading the holy books, and using several sorts of purifications, and being perpetually conversant in the discourses of the prophets; and it is but seldom that they miss in their predictions.” “They are

²⁷ “[I]ndeed the Greeks seem to me to have followed the “same notion, [as] when they allot the islands of the blessed to their brave men, whom they call heroes and demi-gods; and to the souls of the wicked, the region of the ungodly, in Hades, where their fables relate [e.g.] Sisyphus, and Tantalus, and Ixion, and Tityus, are punished.”

²⁸ *Josephus* editors add, “[Moses].”

²⁹ *Josephus* editors add, “[swearing by].”

³⁰ Refer to Appendix 4D, *Messenger*.

³¹ e.g. prayers before sunrise; diligent labour in “arts wherein they are skilled...till the fifth hour;” clothed in white veils they assemble for a cold water bath (“they think that to be sweaty is a good thing” and that oil anointment, per Roman mode of cleansing, “is a defilement; and if any one of them be anointed without his own approbation, it is wiped off”), after which they enter “the dining room, as into a certain holy temple” for a shared single plate of one sort of food (it being unlawful to eat before “grace” has been said). Afterwards, shedding their (*Josephus* editors add “[white]”) “garments,” they “betake themselves to their labours again till the evening,” and then sup in the same manner as before. (*Josephus* also outlines rules of organization, entry to the order, trial periods for novices, etc. and notes that members cast out for heinous sinning “often die after a miserable manner...bound by the oaths [of piety] and customs [by which] he is not at liberty to partake of that food that he meets with elsewhere, but is forced to eat grass, and to famish his body with hunger, till he perish,” although the order often does “receive many of them again, when they are at their last gasp, out of compassion....”)

long-lived, also,..many of them live above a hundred years.”

The Essenes “do not absolutely deny the fitness of marriage, and the succession of mankind thereby continued;” but they “neglect wedlock” and “guard against...behaviour of women,...persuaded that none of them preserve their fidelity to one man.” An Essene practice is to “choose out other persons’ children, while they are pliable, and fit for learning, and esteem them to be of their kindred, and form them according to their own manners.”] “There are about four thousand men that...neither marry wives, nor are desirous to keep servants...but live by themselves [and] minister one to another. ... They none of them differ [otherwise] from others of the Essens in their way of living, but...most resemble those Decae who are called *Polistae*.”³²

The other “order of Essens...differ. [in] thinking that [by] not marrying they [would] cut off the principal part of human life, which is the prospect of succession [and without it] the whole race of mankind would fail.” That order tries their spouses “three years;” and if they find that they [their spouses] have their natural purgations thrice, as trials that they are likely to be fruitful, they then actually marry them.” (They do not “accompany with their wives when they are with child, as a demonstration they do not marry out of regard to pleasure, but for the sake of posterity.”) “...[Y]et is their course of life better than that of other man; and they entirely addict themselves to husbandry.”

“But the fourth sect of Jewish philosophy Judas the Galilean was the author. These men agree in all other things with the Pharisaic notions but...have an inviolable attachment to liberty and say that God is to be their only Ruler and Lord,” and for whom dying is welcomed rather than to “call any man lord.” [“As for death, if it will be for their glory, them esteem it better than living always.” “...[T]his immovable resolution of theirs is well known...I shall speak no further about that matter, nor am I afraid,” concludes Josephus on the subject, “that any thing I have said of them should be disbelieved, but rather..., that what I have said is beneath the resolution they show when they undergo pain.”

AJ XVIII.1.5-6; Wars II.VIII.2-14.

Returning to the administration of procurator Coponius in Judea, when “the taxings were come to a conclusion, which were made in the thirty-seventh year of Caesar’s victory over Antony at Actium,” Cyrenius deposed high priest Joazar, “which dignity had been conferred on him by the multitude, and he appointed Ananus, the son of Seth, to be high priest.”

Antipas Herod and Philip Herod had settled affairs in their tetrarchy and proceeded with certain public works: Antipas built “a wall about Sepphoris, which is the security of all Galilee, and made it the metropolis of the country. He also built a wall round Betharamphtha...itself a city also, and called it Julias, from the name of the emperor’s wife. Philip built Paneas, a city at the fountain of the Jordan [and] named it Cesarea. He also advanced the village Bethsaida, situate at the lake of Gennesareth, unto the dignity of a city, both by the number of inhabitants...and its other grandeur, and called it...Julias [after] Caesar’s daughter.”³⁴

Certain “accidents” occurred during Coponius’ administration, as follows. “...[I]t was customary for the priests to open the temple-gates just after midnight” when “the Jews were celebrating the feast...Passover.” At one such time [of a year unspecified], “some...

³² Per Josephus editor’s note (*AJ XVIII.1.5*), “Who these [*polistae*]...or *kristai* in Strabo, among the Pythagoric Decae, were, it is not easy to determine. Scaliger offers no improbable conjecture, that some of these Decae lived alone, like monks, in tents or caves; but that others of them lived together in built cities.” (*Greek dictionary*, p. 396: “KTISTUS...Ion. for KTIOIS,” relates to “founder,” or founding, creating [of the universe].)

³³ Given the next clause, “months” seems logical.

³⁴ No data is provided to correlate their works with other events.

Samaritans came privately into Jerusalem...and threw about dead men's bodies in the cloisters." "...[T]he Jews afterward excluded [the Samaritans] out of the temple, which they had not used to do at such festivals," and "watched the temple more carefully than they had formerly done. A little after which accident Coponius returned to Rome, and Marcus Ambivius came [as] his successor." Sometime during Ambivius' tenure³⁵ "Salome, the sister of king Herod, died." Salome left to Caesar's wife Julia "all the toparchy of Jamnia...Phasaelis in the plain, and Archelais, [with its] great plantation of palm trees."

After Ambivius "came Annus Rufus, under whom died [Octavian/Augustus] Caesar, the second emperor of the Romans...whose reign was fifty-seven years, besides six months and two days (of which time Antonius ruled together with him fourteen years; but the duration of his his [Augustus'] life was seventy-seven years)."

Upon the death of Caesar Octavian/Augustus (c. 14 a.d.), "Tiberius Nero [CDN]³⁶, his wife Julia's [Livia A Drusilla/Julia Augusta's] son, succeeded. ...[H]e sent Valerius Gratus to be procurator of Judea...to succeed Annus Rufus."

Gratus "deprived Ananus of the high priesthood, and appointed Ismael, the son of Phabi," in his stead. After "a little time" Gratus deprived Ismael, also, "and ordained Eleazar, the son of Ananus, who had been high priest before, to be high priest, which office...he held for a year," at which time Gratus replaced him with "Simon, the son of Camithus;" after he "possessed that dignity no longer than a year, Joseph Caiaphas was made his successor."

"[W]hen the Roman empire was translated to Tiberius...both Herod [Antipas] and Philip continued in their tetrarchies; and the latter of them built the city Cesarea, at the fountains of Jordan, and in the region of Paneas; as also the city Julias, in the lower Gaulonitis. Herod [Antipas] also built the city Tiberius in Galilee, and in Perea³⁷ another that was also called Julias." Antipas "was in great favour with Tiberius...built a city...[and] called it Tiberias," "in the best part of Galilee, at the lake of Gennesareth." (A short distance away were warm baths of a village named Emmaus.)

Tiberias became the residence of both "strangers [and] a great number of...Galileans;" some of the relocated persons were "of condition" and some were "poor." "[M]any... were compelled to move there by Antipas from "out of the [other] country belonging to him." Antipas made himself "benefactor" to "some [who] were not quite free-men...made them free in great numbers...[and] building them very good houses at his own expenses, and by giving them land also," as Antipas was sensitive to the fact that "many sepulchres were to be...taken away [a "transgress (of) Jewish ancient laws"] to make room for the city.

When Gratus had been procurator "eleven years," he returned to Rome; Tiberius [CDN] replaced Gratus with Pontius Pilate. AJ XVIII.II.1-3; Wars II.IX.1-2.

"[N]ow Pilate, the procurator of Judea, removed the army from Caesarea to take their winter quarters there [at Jerusalem]." A furor was raised when there was conveyed into Jerusalem by night of "those images of Caesar that are called ensigns;" former procurators had refrained from displaying such "ornaments" upon entry, because "our law forbids...the very making of images." "[A]s soon as they [the people] knew.....[Pilate's act "excited a very great tumult [of the people] the next day...as indications that their laws were trodden"], "a vast number of people came running out of the country" and came in multitudes to Cesarea, and interceded with Pilate many days" to remove the ensigns. Pilate denied their request. When they persevered, Pilate "on the sixth day" called the multitude to his "judgment seat[/"tribunal"]...in the open place ["market place"]" where, surrounded by soldiers, Pilate

³⁵ Generally fixed at some three years.

³⁶ Refer to Appendix 4A, Attachment 1, Detail A chart.

³⁷ Josephus editors add, "[beyond Jordan]."

threatened “immediate death, unless they would leave off.” The people prostrated themselves and “laid their necks bare,” willingly ready to be slain rather than acquiesce to transgression of their laws. (The people, “upon Pilate’s denial...fell down prostrate...and continued immovable in that posture for five days and...nights.”) Pilate, “deeply affected with their firm resolution to keep their laws inviolable”--“greatly surprised at their prodigious superstition”--“presently commanded the images to be carried back from Jerusalem to Cesarea.”

The next furor reported was over Pilate’s “expending that sacred treasure which is called corban upon aqueducts, whereby he brought water from the distance of four hundred (“two hundred”) furlongs.” “When Pilate was come to Jerusalem” and sat in tribunal there, “many ten thousands of the people got together...made a clamour...and insisted that he should leave off that design.” Pilate, informed in the premises, concealed soldiers in the crowd (“who [although they] carried daggers under their garments]”) were instructed that, at his signal, they were to beat the clamourers but only with staves. The soldiers, however, “laid upon them much greater blows than Pilate had commanded;” “many perished by the stripes;” “many...trodden to death by themselves; ..the multitude...astonished at the calamity of those that were slain...held their peace.” “And thus an end was put to this sedition.”

AJ XVIII.III.1-2; Wars II.IX.2-4.

“[A]bout this time Jesus, a wise...doer of wonderful works, a teacher... ..drew over to him both many of the Jews and many of the Gentiles. ...Pilate, at the suggestion of the principal men amongst us...condemned him to the cross.”³⁸

AJ XVIII.III.3.

“About this time died Phraates, king of the Parthians, by the treachery of Phraataces his son.”³⁹

“At this time” Antiochus, the king of Commagene, died. Its multitude and nobility both sent ambassadors; “the men of power were desirous that their form of government might be changed into that of a province; [where]as were the multitude desirous to be under kings, as their fathers had been. The Roman senate sent “Germanicus...to settle the affairs of the East.”

AJ XVIII.II.5.

“About the same time also...certain shameful practices happened about the temple of Isis that was at Rome” resulted in its destruction, as follows: One Decius Mundus “fell in love” with Saturninus’ wife, Paulina,⁴⁰ a woman “of a virtuous life...very rich...[and] beautiful...who did lead a life of great modesty,” and who had rejected Mundus’ advances and abundant presents. Ide (a “freed-woman” made so by Mundus’ father), “much grieved at Mundus’ resolution to kill himself” because of his failure to win Paulina, in exchange for “fifty thousand drachmae for the entrapping of the woman.” Ide enlisted “some of Isis’s priests...by words, but chiefly by the offer of money;” and “the oldest of them” went to Paulina [who “was very much given to the worship of Isis”), and “told her that he was sent by the god Anubis, who was fallen in love with her, and enjoined her to come to him.”

Saturninus, “satisfied with the chastity of his wife,” agreed to her spending the night at the temple; there she supped, after which all the lights were extinguished and the priest

³⁸ An indication of the tandem chronology of the *Josephus* text is that the murder of Jesus’ cousin, John [the ‘baptizer’] is reported subsequently--see at fn. 49.

³⁹ *AJ XVIII.II.4ff.* has great detail regarding the mother’s involvements, and ensuing events vis-a-vis Parthian ambassadors asking for one Orodes as king; Rome sending in Vonones; the Parthians called in Artabanus, king of Media (also of the race of Arsaces), who battled Vonones. Artabanus first was beaten, fled to mountains of Media, and then a while after gathered an army and beat Vonones. Subsequently Vonones wound up in Armenia and eventually delivered himself up to Silanus, the president of Syria, who “kept” him, while Artabanus gave Armenia to Orodes, one of his own sons.

⁴⁰ Note three paragraphs below--Tiberius banishment of “all the Jews” from Rome--after an incident involving [another?] Saturninus’ wife, “Fulvia.”

shut the temple doors. Thereafter, Mundus--who had been hiding in wait--"did not fail of enjoying her...all the night long, as [she] supposing he was the god." Paulina "came early to her husband, and told him how the god Anubis had appeared to her." Paulina's friends "partly disbelieved...and partly were amazed...having no pretence for not believing...when they considered [her] modesty and dignity." Three days later, however, Mundus revealed himself, telling Paulina she had saved him "two hundred thousand drachmae, which sum thou mightest have added to thy own family; yet has thou not failed to be at my service in the manner I invited thee."

Paulina, when she was "come to the sense of the grossness of what she had done...told her husband of...this wicked contrivance." Saturninus "discovered the fact to the emperor." Tiberius, after "examining the priests...ordered them to be crucified, as well as Ide.... He also demolished the temple of Isis, and gave order that her statue should be thrown into the river Tiber." Tiberius "only banished Mundus...because he supposed that what crime he had committed was done out of the passion of love." AJ XVIII.III.4

Next reported is an incident that resulted in the expulsion and banishment of "all the Jews...out of Rome." An [unnamed] "Jew...driven away from his own country by an accusation...of transgressing their laws," lived at Rome, where he "professed to instruct men in the wisdom of the laws of Moses." He and three partners of similar character moved Saturninus' wife, Fulvia, "a woman of great dignity [who] had embraced the Jewish religion, to provide "purple and gold to the temple at Jerusalem," which treasure they spent on themselves instead. Tiberius, on information from Saturninus, made an inquiry, and then "ordered all the Jews to be banished out of Rome; at which time the consuls listed four thousand men out of them, and sent them to the island Sardinia; but punished a greater number of them, who were unwilling to become soldiers, on account of keeping the laws of their forefathers."⁴¹

"[T]he nation of the Samaritans did not escape without tumults." An [unnamed] man-- "one who...contrived every thing so that the multitude might be pleased" and promised to show them sacred vessels placed under Mount Gerizzim by Moses--"bid them to get together upon the mount." Men gathered; "armed... [they] abode at a certain village, which was called Tirathaba...to go up the mountain in a great multitude together; [however] Pilate prevented [it] by seizing upon the roads with a great band of horsemen and footmen." Pilate's troops fell on those in the village; and, "when it came to an action, some of them they slew...others of them they put to flight, and took a great many alive, the principal of which, and also the most potent of those that fled away, Pilate ordered to be slain."

The "Samaritan senate sent an embassy to Vitellius...now president of Syria, and accused Pilate of the murder of those [who, they claimed] did not go to Tirathaba in order to revolt from the Romans, but to escape the violence of Pilate." Vitellius ordered Pilate to Rome, to answer the Jews' accusations before Tiberius, and sent his friend Marcellus to oversee Judea's affairs. Pilate (who "had tarried ten years in Judea") could not disobey Vitellius and "made haste...but before he could get to Rome Tiberius was dead."⁴² AJ XVIII.IV.1-2.

Vitellius entered Judea and went to Jerusalem at the time of a Passover festival, where he was "magnificently received," and released its inhabitants from all taxes on buying and selling of fruits. After the festival he left "the high priest's vestments, with all their ornaments...under the custody of the priests of the temple," instead of being returned to the Roman captain of the guard as before. Previously, under the Rome's governance, "these vestments reposit in a stone chamber...[from where, "seven days before a festival]" "they were delivered...by the captain of the guard; [and after] the high priest...purified them...[and]

⁴¹ *Josephus* editor adds a note, that the supposition "Jews could not, consistently with their laws, be soldiers...is contradicted by one branch of the history before us, and contrary to innumerable instances of their fighting," etc.

⁴² Additional time elapses as follows, however, in the *Josephus* narrative, before Tiberius' actual death.

made use of them, [they had been] laid up again in the same chamber...the very next day after the feast was over.” “This [had been] the practice at the three yearly festivals, and on the fast day; but Vitellius put those garments into our own power, as in the days of our forefathers, and ordered the captain of the guard not to trouble himself.”⁴³

Vitellius “also deprived Joseph, who was called Caiaphas, of the high priesthood, and appointed Jonathan, the son of Ananus...to succeed him.”

Tiberius commanded Vitellius to make a league of friendship with Parthian king Artabanus (who “had taken Armenia”), but to place trust only upon receipt of hostages--especially his [king Artabanus’] son, [also-named] Artabanus.” Vitellius offered “great presents of money [which] persuaded both the king of Iberia and the king of Albania...to fight against Artabanus;... they would not do it themselves [but gave] the Scythians a passage through their country, and opened the Caspian gates to them, and brought them upon Artabanus. So Armenia was again taken from the Parthians...Parthia was filled with war, and the principal of their men were slain...; the king’s son [Artabanus] also himself fell in these wars, together with many ten thousands of his army.”

Vitellius attempted to bring about the assassination of King Artabanus with bribes of “great sums of money to [his] kinsmen and friends.” King Artabanus, seeing “that the plot laid against him was not to be avoided, because it was laid by the principal men...a great many in number,” and judging that even the faithful “were likely, upon trial, to go over to his enemies, he made his escape to the upper provinces, where he afterwards raised a great army out of the Dahae and Sacae, and fought with his enemies, and retained his principality.”

“When Tiberius had heard of these things, he desired to have a league of friendship made between him and [king] Artabanus,” which proposal was accepted. Vitellius and king Artabanus, surrounded by their respective guards, met at the mid-point of a bridge over the Euphrates. “And when they had agreed upon the terms of peace Herod [Antipas], the tetrarch erected a rich tent on the midst of the passage, and made them a feast there.”

“Artabanus...not long afterward, sent his son Darius [to Rome] as an hostage, with many presents, among which there was a man over seven cubits tall, a Jew he was by birth, and his name was Eleazar, who, for his tallness, was called a giant. After which Vitellius went to Antioch, and Artabanus to Babylon; but Herod [Antipas] being desirous to give Caesar the first information that they had obtained hostages, sent posts with letters [and] described all the particulars, and had left nothing for the consular Vitellius” to report. “Vitellius was very much troubled at it; and...he kept up a secret anger...till he could be revenged” (--which he was [later], after Caligula became Roman emperor).
AJ XVIII.IV.3-5.

“About this time [c. late 33 a.d.] it was that Philip, Herod’s [Antipas’ half-] brother, departed this life, in the twentieth year of the reign of Tiberius, after he had been tetrarch of Trachonitis and Gaulanitis, and of the nation of the Bataneans also, thirty-seven years.” Philip, who “died at Julias/[Bethsaida]⁴⁴,” had been “a person of moderation and quietness in the conduct of his life and government; he constantly lived in that country which was subject to him; he used to make his progress with a few chosen friends; his tribunal also, on which he sat in judgment, followed him in his progress; and when any one met him who wanted his assistance, he made no delay, but had his tribunal set down immediately, wheresoever he happened to be...”

⁴³ High priest Hyrcanus the first had kept the garments “lawful for him [the high priest] alone to put on,” in the tower he built near the temple (in which “he generally dwelt”), where the garments “repositied when he went down into the city [in] his ordinary garments; the same things were continued to be done by his sons, and by their sons. When Herod [the Great] rebuilt the tower (“Antonia”), and “found these vestments lying there, he retained them in the same place, as believing, that while he had them in his custody, the people would make no innovations against him.”

⁴⁴ (See Appendix 4C, *Bethsaida*.) Note: Textwise this might appear to be c. 33/34 a.d., but other *Josephus* data may indicate c. 37 c.e.; refer to Appendix 4A, at and in fn. 122.

Philip's "principality Tiberius took, (for he [Philip] left no sons behind him,) and added it to the province of Syria, but gave order that the tributes...from it should be collected, and laid up in his [Philip's former] tetrarchy." AJ XVIII.IV.5-6.

"About this time" a final falling-out occurred between Herod Antipas and Aretas, king of Arabia, who "had also some quarrel...about their limits at the country of Gamalitis."

The "first occasion of [Aretas's'] enmity between him and Herod" had been Antipas' decision to change his marital alliances, as follows. Once while at Rome he had stayed with "Herod [B], who was his [half-] brother...not by the same mother; for this Herod [B] was the son of the high priest Simon's daughter [Miriamne II]."⁴⁵ Herod [B] was married to "Herodias,..the daughter of Aristobulus [IV], and the sister of Agrippa [I] the Great." Antipas was "married [to] the [unnamed] daughter of Aretas, and had lived with her a great while." Antipas "fell in love with Herodias." At some point he "ventured to talk to her about a marriage between them," to which she responded favorably. It was agreed she would "change her habitation, and come to him as soon as he should return from an anticipated trip of Antipas to Rome."⁴⁶ "[O]ne article of this marriage...was that he should divorce Aretas's daughter."

"So Antipas, when he had made this agreement, sailed to Rome; but when he had done there the business he went about, and was returned again," Aretas's daughter, who secretly had advance knowledge of his plans, and "without informing Antipas of any of her intentions," "desired him to send her to Macherus ["which was subject to her father" and situated]...in the borders of the dominions of Aretas and Herod." "[A]ll things necessary for her journey were made ready for her by the general of Aretas's army; and...she soon came to her father, and told him of Herod's intentions."

Aretas and Antipas "raised armies on both sides, and prepared for war, and sent their generals to fight instead of themselves;...Herod's army was destroyed by the treachery of some...of the tetrarchy of Philip, joined with Aretas's army." "Now some of the Jews thought the destruction of Herod's army came...justly...as a punishment of which he did against John, that was called the *Baptist* [/Baptizer]; for Herod slew him." "John...a good man [who] commanded the Jews to exercise virtue [and] righteousness⁴⁷ towards one another, and piety..., and so to come to baptism [which] washing⁴⁷ would be acceptable to him...not in order to the putting away⁴⁸ of some sins,⁴⁹ but for the purification of the body; supposing still that the soul was thoroughly purified beforehand by righteousness." Antipas had "feared lest the great influence John had over the people might put it into his power and inclination to raise a rebellion," for the people had gone "in crowds about him, [being] greatly moved...by hearing his words." John had been "sent [as] a prisoner, out of Herod's suspicious temper, to Macherus...and...there put to death."⁵⁰

Tiberius, to whom Herod had written about the battle with Aretas, was "very angry at the attempt made by Aretas, [and] wrote to Vitellius to make war upon him...to take him alive, and bring him to him [Tiberius] in bonds, or to kill him, and send him his head. This was the charge that Tiberius gave to the president of Syria." Vitellius took two legions and "all those

⁴⁵ *Josephus* editor notes that, although "This Herod seems to have had the additional name of Philip," he was not the tetrarch Philip.

⁴⁶ It appears from this sentence and the first of the next paragraph that, at this time, Herod [B] and Herodias were not living at Rome.

⁴⁷ *Josephus* editor adds, "[with water]."

⁴⁸ *Josephus* editor adds, "[or the remission]."

⁴⁹ *Josephus* editor adds, "[only]."

⁵⁰ It would appear that Antipas had ousted Aretas from Macherus (although there is some indication that the feast preceding the killing of John was at Tiberius).

of light armature, and of the horsemen which belonged to them,...drawn out of those kingdoms which were under the Romans, and made haste for Petra” via Ptolemais. “[A]s he was...leading his army through Judea, the principal men met him, and desired that he would not thus march through their land...[with] those images...of which there were a great many in their ensigns.” Vitellius had his army “march along the great plain,” instead, “while he himself, with Herod the tetrarch and his friends, went up to Jerusalem to offer sacrifice..., an ancient festival of the Jews being then just approaching.”

“[H]onourably entertained by the multitude of the Jews, he [Vitellius] made a stay there for three days, within which time he deprived Jonathan of the high priesthood, and gave it to his brother Theophilus.” “[O]n the fourth day letters...informed him of the death of Tiberius [37 a.d.]” Vitellius “obliged the multitude to take an oath of fidelity to Caius [Caligula]...recalled his army, and made them...go home, and take their winter quarters there, since, upon the devolution of the empire upon Caius, he had not the like authority of making this war which he had before.” (It was reported Aretas had been told by “diviners that it was impossible that this army of Vitellius’s could enter Petra and that one or the other of them would die in the attempt.) “So Vitellius truly retired to Antioch....” AJ XVIII.V.1-2.

Agrippa [I] had lived at Rome “a little before the death of Herod the king [the Great], and was generally brought up and conversed with Drusus, the emperor Tiberius’s son.” Agrippa “contracted a friendship with Antonia [B], the wife of Drusus the Great [GNC], who had his [Agrippa’s] mother Bernice [A] in great esteem, and was very desirous of advancing her son.” Agrippa restrained his expenditures while his mother was alive; “but when Bernice was dead...left to his own conduct, he spent...extravagantly...[including] immoderate presents...chiefly among Caesar’s freed-men...to gain their assistance,” by which Agrippa was, “in a little time, reduced to poverty, and [then] could not live at Rome any longer.” Agrippa had sailed to Judea, having “creditors...many in number, and such as gave him no room for escaping them.”

Agrippa I had “retired to a certain tower, at Malatha, in Idumea, and had thoughts of killing himself,” from which “his wife Cypros [III]...to divert him” wrote for help to Agrippa’s sister Herodias, “the wife [by that time] of Herod [Antipas],” and asked that she “engage her husband to do the same.” “So they sent for him [Agrippa I] ...allotted him Tiberias for his habitation...and made him a magistrate of that city.” Antipas, however, “did not...long continue in that resolution of support.” At a feast at Tyre, while they were “in their cups...Herod hit him [Agrippa] in the teeth with his poverty...” Agrippa then went to “Flaccus...[“who had been consul”] and...a very great friend to him at Rome formerly, and was now president of Syria. “

Agrippa I lived for a while with Flaccus, who “received him kindly.” Aristobulus [V]...Agrippa’s [half?-] brother, [who] was at variance with him,” also lived with Flaccus, who at first treated them equally “honourably.” Aristobulus V, however, “at length...brought [Agrippa] into ill terms with Flaccus,” by informing Flaccus that Agrippa had accepted promise of money from the Damascens if he exerted influence on Flaccus, who was scheduled to hear a border dispute between the Damascens and Sidonians. Flaccus made “a thorough examination;” and, when “it appeared plainly so to be, he rejected Agrippa out of the number of his friends.”

Agrippa I--“reduced to the utmost necessity...[and knowing not where else to get a livelihood]--went to Ptolemais, from where he hoped to sail for Italy. He set his freed-man, Marsyas, to find someone from whom to borrow money. Marsyas “desired of Peter” (freed-man of Bernice [A]...by her testament...bequeathed to Antonia”) “to lend so much upon Agrippa’s own bond and security.” Marsyas “made the bond [for] 20,000 Attic drachmae,” but was compelled to take 2,500 less by Peter, who “accused Agrippa of having defrauded him [formerly] of certain sums.”

Agrippa I secured a ship and was ready to set sail from Anthedon (wife Cypros III apparently then with him), when he was detained by “Herennius Capito,..procurator of Jamnia,

[who] sent a band of soldiers to demand...three hundred thousand drachmae of silver, which were by him [Agrippa] owing to Caesar's treasury while he was at Rome." Agrippa "pretended that he would do as bid; but when night came...went off, and sailed to Alexandria, where he desired Alexander [undesigned], the alabarch, to lend him two hundred thousand drachmae." Said Alexander would not lend it to Agrippa but "would not refuse it to Cypros...so she undertook to repay it. ... Accordingly, Alexander paid them five talents at Alexandria, and promised...the rest at Dicearchia So this Cypros set her husband free, and dismissed him to go on...to Italy, while she and her children departed for Judea."
AJ XVIII.VI.1-3.

At Puteoli [/Dicearchia], Agrippa I wrote to Caesar Tiberius, living then at Capraea, and asked leave to visit. Tiberius acquiesced obligingly; but the next day he received information from Herennius Capito about Agrippa's failure to pay the 300,000 drachmae due and instead had "ran away like a fugitive." "Troubled," Caesar refused further presence to Agrippa until the debt was paid. Agrippa prevailed on "Antonia [B], the mother of Germanicus (and of Claudius, who was afterward [to be] Caesar himself) to lend him the sum, which she did "out of regard to the memory of Bernice his mother...[and] his and Claudius's education together." "After this [there being "nothing to hinder Tiberius's friendship"], Tiberius recommended to him his grandson [Tiberius Gemellus?] and ordered that he should always accompany him when he went abroad."

Agrippa did not fail to pay respects to Antonia's [B's] grandson, Caius [Caligula], who was "in very high reputation by reason of the good-will [borne] his father [Germanicus]." Subsequently, Agrippa was able to borrow "a million of drachmae" from "one Thallus, a freed-man of Caesar;" and, after repaying Antonia, used "the overplus in paying...court to Caius [Caligula, and] became a person of great authority to him."
AJ XVIII.VI.4.

"In the meantime" (still during Pilate's tenure--) "a year before the death of Tiberius," "Agrippa, the [step?-] son of Aristobulus [IV] who had been slain by his father Herod [the Great]," had gone "up to Rome...in order to treat of some affairs with the emperor if he might be permitted," and "to accuse Herod [Antipas] the tetrarch;" but Caesar Tiberius had not been "admitting of his accusations." Agrippa I had "staid at Rome, and cultivated...men of note,..principally...Caius [Caligula], the son of Germanicus," while Caius "was then but a private person."

"Now as the friendship which Agrippa had for Caius was come to a great height, ...there happened some words...in a chariot together...Agrippa praying...that Tiberius might soon go off the stage, and leave the government to Caius." Agrippa, once while they feasted together, also "openly wished that Tiberius might die, and that he [Agrippa I] might quickly see him [Caius Caligula] emperor." The words were heard by one Eutyclus, Agrippa's freed-man chariot driver. Subsequently Eutyclus was accused by Agrippa of stealing some of his garments, and he ran away. When he was caught and was brought before "Piso, who was governor of the city," Eutyclus claimed he had run because he knew something that related to the emperor's security.

Piso had Eutyclus taken to Capraea, where evidently he lodged accusation against Agrippa I; however--as was the general custom of Tiberius ("being a delayer" in affairs"⁵⁴)-- Eutyclus was left a while in his bonds. "However, some time afterward, [when] Tiberius came from Capraea to Tusculanum...about a hundred furlongs from Rome," Agrippa I "desired of

⁵¹ Josephus editor adds the footnote: "The governor of the Jews there."

⁵² Josephus editor adds, "[Puteoli]."

⁵³ Josephus editor notes, "Tiberius, junior."

⁵⁴ Josephus gives examples of Tiberius habit of allowing matters to settle out, before introducing new potential causes of harrassment, and remarks that, although Tiberius "was emperor twenty-two years, he sent in all but two procurators to govern the nation of the Jews, Gratus...and Pilate."

Antonia [B] that she would procure a hearing.” (Antonia, Tiberius’ “brother Drusus’s [GNCs] wife [--who] in her widowhood...refused all other matches despite Augustus encouraging her to remarry--a woman of “eminent chastity...[and] still a young woman,” was “greatly esteemed by Tiberius on all accounts... ..[H]e depended upon her in all things.”⁵⁵ When Antonia asked that Tiberius “examine Eutychus, he answered, ‘If indeed Eutychus hath falsely accused Agrippa...he hath had sufficient punishment by what I have done to him already; but if, upon examination, the accusation appears to be true, let Agrippa have care, lest...he do not rather bring a punishment upon himself.’”

Antonia [B] so informed Agrippa I, but he nonetheless pressed her. After a dinner, as Tiberius took his ease in the presence of Agrippa, Antonia and “Caius [Caligula], her grandson,” Antonia “walked by...and desired him to call Eutychus, and have him examined.” Tiberius exclaimed of finally being “forced” by her to do so against his own inclinations, and he summoned “Macro, who succeeded Sejanus, to bring Eutychus.”

Eutychus repeated what he had heard Agrippa I say to Caius Caligula, “once riding in a chariot, when I sat at their feet,..’Oh that the day would once come when this old fellow will die, and name thee for the governor of the habitable earth! for then this Tiberius [Gemellus]⁵⁶ his grandson, would be no hindrance, but would be taken off by thee [Caius], and that earth would be happy, and I happy also.” Caesar Tiberius could accept the words most easily as true, having observed how Agrippa I had “disobeyed his commands, and transferred all his regard to Caius [Caligula],” instead of nurturing Tiberius (Gemellus). Caesar told Macro, “Bind this man.” (Macro, balked by first uncertainty and next disbelief, twice had Caesar to confirm whom he meant.)

Agrippa I supplicated Caesar Tiberius, reminding him of “his [Caesar’s] son [Drusus A], with whom he was brought up, and of Tiberius [Gemellus] whom he had educated; but all to no purpose...they led him about bound.”⁵⁷ (In his bonds under a tree in front of the palace, Agrippa spied above him “a certain bird...(the Romans call this bird bubo⁵⁸”). Agrippa--“by nation a Jew, and one of the principal men of that nation”--received an erudite address (from “a German by nation” “via an interpreter”) predicting he would overcome all present ill and enjoy long-lived prosperity, but expect to die within five days of seeing the bird again.

Antonia [B] took Agrippa’s circumstances to heart, and “she did procure of Macro” orders to the soldiers to treat Agrippa gently (daily baths; soft materials for bedding; visits from freed-men and friends, and receipt of favorite foods). “And this was Agrippa’s condition for six months’ time, and in this case were his affairs.” (Alternately, after one of Agrippa’s “domestics” divulged his remarks, Tiberius “ordered Agrippa to be bound, and had him very ill-treated in the prison for six months, until Tiberius died.”)

“Tiberius, upon his return to Capreae...fell sick” to an increasingly worsening “distemper...[until] he had small or no hope of recover.” Tiberius had brought to him “the children...to talk to them before he died.” (“...[H]e had at present no sons of his own alive; ... Drusus [A]...his only son was dead;...Drusus’s son Tiberius [“whose additional name was

⁵⁵ A primary reason being her former uncovering to Tiberius of a conspiracy being worked against him by the army’s general, Sejanus, together with “many members of the senate and...freed-men..” (Tiberius...when he understood it, slew Sejanus and his confederates.”)

⁵⁶ See four paragraphs below, where Tiberius Gemellus’ name is given; it appears, however, that he may have borne the name, “Sempronius,” also.

⁵⁷ The weather was very hot and he was wearing his purple still; Agrippa received water from “one of Caius’s slaves...Thaumastus.” Agrippa promised, given future ability, freedom from Caius, “who has not been wanting to minister to me now I am in bonds, in the same manner as when I was in my former state and dignity.” (As matters would develop, the future king Agrippa I would liberate Thaumastus, make him “steward over his own estate” and bequeath him “to Agrippa [I] his son, and to Bernice [B] his daughter, to minister to them in the same capacity,” whence Thaumastus “grew old in that honourable post, and therein died. But all [that] happened a good while after.” (Refer to Appendix 4B, Attachment 2, I, for Agrippa I descendancy.)

⁵⁸ Josephus editor adds, “[an owl].”

Gemellus”] was still living.”

“[T]here was also living Caius [Caligula], the son of Germanicus, who [said Germanicus] was the son..of his [Tiberius CDN’s] brother [Drusus GNC].” Caius now was grown up, had a “liberal education, and...in esteem and favour with the people, on account of the excellent character of his father, Germanicus,” by virtue of which “the soldiery were so peculiarly affected to him [Caius], that they reckoned...if need were, to die themselves, if he might but attain to the government.” (Antonia’s grandson, Caius, was “in very high reputation by reason of the good-will [borne] his father.”) AJ XVIII.VI.4-8; Wars II.IX.5.

“Tiberius had been very much given to astrology... ..[and] addicted to diviners...because he had found them [formerly] to have told him truth in his own affairs.” He was “very desirous to leave it [the empire] to his son’s [Drusus A’s and Livia B’s] son, but still depending upon what God should foreshow...so he made this to be the omen, that the government should be left to him who should come to him first the next day.” Tiberius then sent word to his grandson’s [Tiberius Gemellus’] tutor to bring him to his door early in the morning,” but the grandson “staid waiting for his breakfast.” Caius [Caligula], instead, was first to approach Tiberius’ chamber; and when the emperor sent his servant “to call in that child which should be there ready...he went out, and found Caius...; [and in that he] knew nothing of what his lord intended...brought him [Caius] in.” “As soon as Tiberius saw Caius, and not before, he reflected on the power of God, and how the ability of bestowing the government...was entirely taken from him.” “O child!,” he told Caius, “although Tiberius [Gemellus] be nearer related to me than thou art, I, by my own determination, and the conspiring suffrage of the gods, do give and put into thy hand the Roman empire.” Tiberius lamented his own now-dangerous⁵⁹ circumstances privately; in speech he supplicated Caius be reasonable as to the grandson.

Tiberius lived “but a few days” after he “at this time appointed Caius [Caligula, “the fourth emperor”] to be his successor.” Caesar Tiberius [CDN], who “had held the government twenty-two years five months and three days,” had brought a vast number of miseries on the best families of the Romans...easily inflamed with passion...anger irrevocable...fierce in all the sentences he gave..., death the penalty for the lightest offences.” “[T]he Romans heard the rumour about his death gladly [but] restrained [their] enjoyment...[lest their] hopes proved ill-grounded.” Agrippa I’s freed-man, Marsyas, ran to him with the news as soon as he heard.” “[F]inding him going out to the bath, he gave him a nod, and said, in the Hebrew tongue, ‘The lion⁶⁰ is dead;’” Agrippa, “understanding his meaning,...said...I wish that what thou sayest may prove true.”

Agrippa I’s centurion guard, suspecting “some great innovation of affairs,” pried the news from Agrippa, who “was already become his friend.” He joined in Agrippa’s pleasure, made him supper and loosed his bonds. The centurion changed attitude swiftly, however, on receipt of a contrary rumor as they feasted “that Tiberius was still alive, and would return to the city in a few days.” The centurion “ordered Agrippa to be bound again....and kept a severer guard over him, [in which] condition was Agrippa that night.” Certainty of Tiberius’ death increased the next day, followed by letters from Caius Caligula--one to the Senate and another to “Piso, the governor of the city”--informing of Tiberius’ death and Caius’ accession. Caius ordered that Agrippa, “although still in custody,” “be removed out of the camp and go to that house where he lived before he was put in prison.” Caligula “was much disposed to set Agrippa at [full] liberty” the “very day” he “come to Rome,” where he had brought Tiberius’ body for a sumptuous funeral. Antonia [B], however, delayed Caius from releasing Agrippa--“not out of any ill-will to the prisoner, but out of regard to decency...lest...men believe that he [Caius] received the death of Tiberius with pleasure.... However, there did not many days

⁵⁹ Caius promised he would be; but, “when he [later] was settled in the government, he took off this Tiberius.”

⁶⁰ *Josephus* editor notes that tyrants were “also sometimes compared to or represented by wild beasts, of which the lion is the principal [citing references]”--“especially by the Jews, such as Agrippa [citing references].”

pass ere” Caius, at his own house, had Agrippa bathed and dressed, “after which he put a diadem upon his head, and appointed him to be king of the tetrarchy of Philip [and] also gave him [“promised” him] the tetrarchy of Lysanias.”⁶¹

Caius sent Marcellus to be procurator of Judea.

Agrippa I asked Caius Caligula “in the second year of [his, Caligula’s] reign” for leave “to sail home, and settle the affairs of his government,” promising to return once all was in order there; and Caius gave permission. “So,” Agrippa “came into his own country, and appeared to them all unexpectedly as a king.” (“...[W]hen Caius was made Caesar, he released Agrippa...and made him king of Philip’s tetrarchy, who was now dead.”)

AJ XVIII.VI.9-11; Wars II.IX.6.

“Herodias, Agrippa’s [half-] sister, who now lived as wife to that Herod [Antipas] who was tetrarch of Galilee and Perea [was]...envious...grieved...much displeased” at Agrippa’s elevation, which also “inflamed the ambitious desires of Herod [Antipas] the tetrarch, who was chiefly induced to hope for the royal authority by his wife Herodias...[who claimed] it was only because he would not sail to Caesar [Caligula, who, having] made Agrippa a king from a private person, much more would...advance him [Antipas] from a tetrarch.” Herodias urged that they spare no expense and go to Rome. Antipas finally acquiesced, “got all things ready...and took Herodias along with him.” Informed, Agrippa I prepared to sail also; meanwhile, he sent his freed-man Fortunatus ahead with presents for Caligula and letters against Antipas.

At Dicearchia, where both Antipas and Fortunatus landed, they “found Caius [was] at Baiae⁶² ...a little city of Campania...about five furlongs from Dicearchia.” Fortunatus’ voyage went so well he arrived and was able to deliver his letters at the same time that Antipas was with Caligula. Agrippa accused Antipas of having been “in confederacy with Sejanus against Tiberius’s government; that he was now confederate with Artabanus, the king of Parthia,” in opposition to the government of Caius; and that Antipas “had armour sufficient for seventy thousand men ready in his armoury,” which latter claim Antipas “could not deny...the truth of it being notorious.” “Caius took that to be sufficient proof of the accusation that he [Antipas] intended to revolt.”

“So he [Caligula] took away from him [Antipas] his tetrarchy, and gave it by way of addition to Agrippa’s kingdom; he also gave Herod’s [Antipas’] money to Agrippa and, by way of punishment, awarded him [Antipas] a perpetual banishment, and appointed Lyons, a city of Gaul, to be his place of habitation.”

Caligula offered leniency to Herodias, however, when “informed that Herodias was Agrippa’s [half-] sister,” and “made her a present of what money was her own.” Herodias declined, citing “the kindness” she had for her husband and that it would be unjust if she, “a partner in his prosperity, should forsake him in his misfortunes.” Angry Caligula then “sent her with Herod into banishment, and gave her estate to Agrippa.”⁶³

“Caius [Caligula] managed public affairs with great magnanimity during the first and second year of his reign, and...with such moderation, that he gained the good-will of the Romans themselves, and of his other subjects. But, in process of time, he went beyond the bounds of human nature in his conceit of himself, and by reason of the vastness of his dominions made himself a god” (“and to desire to be so called also...[he] cut off those of the greatest nobility out of his country [and] extended his impiety as far as the Jews”).

⁶¹ *Josephus* editor notes, “yet was it [the Lysanias tetrarchy] not actually conferred upon him [Agrippa I] till the reign of Claudius, as we [later] learn.”

⁶² A place of “royal palaces...sumptuous apartments...[and] warm baths...[affording] health and...luxury.”

⁶³ “Herod [Antipas] died in Spain, whither his wife had followed him.”

“[N]ow a tumult...at Alexandria, between the Jewish inhabitants and the Greeks,” caused an embassy to Caligula of “three ambassadors⁶⁴ ...out of each party.” From the “people of Alexandria was Apion, who uttered “severe things...by which he hoped to provoke Caius to anger,” contrasting the Jews’ willful resistance to honors due Caesar to the obeisance of all of Rome’s other client-subjects. Philo (“the principal of the Jewish embassy, a man eminent... [and] brother to Alexander the alabarch⁶⁵)...was ready to make defence...but Caius prohibited him, and bid him begone...in such a rage, that it openly appeared he was about to do them some very great mischief.”

“Hereupon Caius...sent Petronius to be president of Syria, and successor...to Vitellius, and gave him order to make an invasion into Judea, with a great body of troops; and if they would admit of his statue willingly, to erect it in the temple of God; but if they were obstinate, to conquer them by war, and then to do it.” Petronius assembled “as great a number of auxiliaries as he possibly could, and took with him two legions of the Roman army, and came to Ptolemais, and there wintered...to set about the war in the spring.” (Petronius marched out of Antioch, with three legions and many Syrian auxiliaries, and into Judaea, with orders to erect Caius’ “statues in the temple and...in case the Jews would not admit of them, he [Petronius] should slay those that opposed it, and carry all the rest of the nation into captivity.) Petronius informed Caius of his plans; Caius “commended him...and ordered him to go on...to make war.”

“Now as to the Jews, some of them could not believe the stories...of a war; but those that did...were in utmost distress how to defend themselves.” “[T]error diffused itself presently through them all; for the army was already come to Ptolemais.” “[T]here came many ten thousands of the Jews to Petronius, to Ptolemais, to offer their petitions.” “[T]he Jews got together in great numbers with their wives and children into that plain that was by Ptolemais,” and supplicated Petronius...for their laws, and...for themselves.” Petronius acknowledged that, were he the emperor, their “words would be justly spoken,” but that he had a duty to the emperor. Petronius, “prevailed upon by the multitude...left his army and statues at Ptolemais...went forward into Galilee,” and “hasted to Tiberias [city], as wanting to know in what posture the affairs of the Jews were.”

AJ XVIII.VIII.1-2.

At Tiberias Petronius again was met by “many ten thousands of the Jews.” Petronius “called together the multitude and all the men of note to Tiberias...showed them the power of the Romans, and the threatenings of Caesar; and...proved that their petition was unreasonable [in that] all the nations in subjection...had placed the images of Caesar in their several cities, among the rest of their gods.” Their behavior, he alleged, “was almost like...revolters, and was injurious to Caesar.” Still unable to quiet the dissenters, Petronius asked whether they would “then make war against Caesar?” They pointed out they willingly made daily sacrifices for Caesar and the Romans, but “the whole multitude...[insistently remained] “ready to suffer for their law,” claiming, “We will not by any means make war with him, but still we will die before we see our laws transgressed.” Throwing themselves down, throats stretched, “they were ready to be slain; and this they did for forty days together, and in the mean time left off the tilling of their ground, and that while the season of the year required them to sow it. (“[I]t was about seed time that the multitude continued for fifty days together, idle.”) Petronius, “astonished...pitied them, on account of the inexpressible sense of religion the men were under, and that courage...to die for it; so they [at that time] were

⁶⁴ *Josephus* editor notes that, according to the Jews’ “principal ambassador,” Philo (whose account it “does not appear” *Josephus* had as reference), “the Jews’ ambassadors were...no fewer than five, towards the end of his legation to Caius.”

⁶⁵ *Josephus* editor notes, “This Alexander, the alabarch, or governor of the Jews, at Alexandria, and brother to Philo, is supposed by Bishop Pearson” to be the same Alexander mentioned in *Acts* 4:6 (with Annas, Caiaphas, and John “and as many as were out of the race chief priestly,” questioning Peter, Jesus’ former right-hand man). [An undesignated “Alexander” is mentioned both at *Mark* 15:21 (“Simon Cyrenian...the father of *Alexander*) and at *Acts* 19:33 (an *Alexander* present during an uproar of Greeks and Jews in Ephesus, during Paul’s travels.)]

dismissed without success.”

“When matters were in this state, Aristobulus [V], king Agrippa I’s [half?-] brother, and Helcias the Great, and the other principal men of that family with them, went in unto Petronius, and besought him...[to] write to Caius, that the Jews had an insuperable aversion to...the statue...[had] left off the tillage...were not willing to go to war...but were ready to die” etc.--their hope being, that “Caius might be thereby moved” when made to consider the problems (fallow land, robberies, loss of revenues) that his inflexibility would cause in the territory. (Those at Tiberias “thought they must run a mighty hazard if they should have a war with the Romans, but judged that the transgression of their law was of much greater consequence.” “Aristobulus [V], and the rest with him, supplicate[d] Petronius to inform Caius that, should he continue “in his former opinion to bring a war upon them, he may then set about it himself.”)

Petronius counseled “the men of power privately, and the multitude publicly,” variously using “persuasions [...and...] advice;” but “chiefly...threatenings.” Those persons addressed, however, “could no way be prevailed upon, and he saw that the country was in danger of lying without tillage....so he at last...told them [he would] run some hazard himself;...either prevail with Caesar [whereby all would escape the danger of war]; or, in case Caesar continue in his rage,” Petronius had to be ready to risk his life. Privately Petronius “thought it a horrible thing for him to be such a slave to the madness of Caius, as to slay so many. “Accordingly, he determined to hearken to the petitioners,” saying he would “send to Caius...let him know what your resolutions are, and...assist your suit as far as I am able.” He “dismissed the multitude, who prayed greatly for his prosperity,” and he “desired of the principal of them to take care of their husbandry, and to speak kindly to the people, and encourage them to have good hope,” which did “readily bring the multitude to be cheerful again.” Petronius then “took the army out of Ptolemais, and returned to Antioch.”

Meanwhile, the expansive generosity of “king Agrippa [I], who lived at Rome,” had taken him to the greatest favor with Caius Caligula. One night, merry over wine, Caligula spoke warmly of Agrippa’s loyalties and good will. Caligula said that his gifts to Agrippa, in comparison, thus far had been little; and he wished to make amends with some greater bestowal. Caligula expected that Agrippa “would ask for some large country, or the revenue of certain cities.” At first Agrippa modestly denied himself deserving of any more from Caesar than already given. On being pressed, however, Agrippa asked that Caligula no longer think of the dedication of that statue...ordered to be set up in the Jewish temple by Petronius.” “[S]o great was the affair in his [Caligula’s] opinion,” Agrippa knew “how dangerous a thing it was so to speak.”

Caligula--on spot both with his offer and the great admiration and respect he held for Agrippa I, “granted him what he had requested.” Caligula “wrote thus to Petronius, commending him for his assembling his army, and then consulting him.” ““If therefore,” Caligula wrote, “thou hast already erected my statue, let it stand; but if thou hast not yet dedicated it, do not trouble thyself further...but dismiss thy army, go back, and take care of those affairs which I sent thee about at first, for I have now no occasion for the erection of this statue. This I have granted as a favour to Agrippa.”

In the meantime Petronius had sent from Antioch “an epistle to Caesar...[about] the irruption he had made into Judea, and of the supplications,” and that--unless Caesar was of a mind to lose the country and its men, he ought to countermand the former injunction and let them keep their law. However, Caligula’s letter to Petronius to abort erection of the statue was written “before he received his [Petronius’] letter...that the Jews were very ready to revolt, etc.” (Caligula, “much displeased that any attempt should be made against his government,” composed a response “in a violent way, “ threatening to have Petronius put to death for delaying execution of his command, “seeing thou esteemest the presents made thee by the Jews to be of greater value than my commands, and art grown insolent enough to be subservient to their pleasure, I charge thee to become thy own judge, and to consider what

thou art to do, now thou art under my displeasure; for I will make thee an example [to all who dare] to contradict the commands of their emperor.”

“[T]he epistle which Caius [Caligula] wrote...Petronius did not receive...while Caius was alive. The ship carrying the emperor’s representatives was “tossed by a storm, and...detained on the sea for three months.” Meanwhile, “others that brought the news of Caius’s death had a good voyage. ...Petronius received the epistle concerning Caius [that he had died] seven and twenty days before he received that [epistle from Caius]...against himself,” which had “commanded him to kill himself with his own hands.” AJ XVIII.VIII.3-9; X.1-5.

“Caius [Caligula] had reigned three years and eight months, and had been slain by treachery.” He was succeeded by Claudius. Wars II.XI.1.

Here essentially ends the timeframe of volume four. However, Appendix 4A cites some subsequent events through the deaths of Agrippa I and Herod [A] (and bestowal of regional territories on Agrippa II), and Attachment 1 to that appendix provides some data on ensuing Roman emperors.